

Parrish, David (2013) *Jacobitism and the British Atlantic world in the age of Anne*. PhD thesis.

<http://theses.gla.ac.uk/4697/>

Copyright and moral rights for this thesis are retained by the author

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the Author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the Author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

Jacobitism and the British Atlantic World in the Age of Anne

Thesis submitted as a requirement for the degree Ph.D.

David Parrish

School of History

College of Arts

University of Glasgow

October 2013

Abstract

This thesis demonstrates the existence and significance of Jacobitism in the British Atlantic World, c. 1688-1727. Throughout the period under investigation, colonists were increasingly integrated into Britain's partisan politics, religious controversies, and vibrant public sphere. This integrative process encouraged colonists to actively participate in British controversies. Moreover, this integration was complex and multi-faceted and included elements of a Tory political culture in addition to their Whig counterparts. During this period, colonists increasingly identified themselves and others according to British political and religious terminology. This was both caused and encouraged by imperial appointments, clerical appointments/SPG activity, and an increased consumption of British political news and commentary. All three informed and shaped colonists' views regarding Jacobitism.

In light of these developments, this thesis examines in three case studies colonial manifestations of Jacobitism within a larger British Atlantic context. Taking into account the voluminous recent research on Jacobitism, this examination reveals that there was an identifiable transatlantic Jacobite subculture. This subculture is recognizable by its associations with elements of British culture inextricably linked to Jacobitism: nonjuring, Scottish Episcopalianism, high church Anglicanism, and – increasingly after 1710 – Toryism. These associations were demonstrated by overt expressions of Jacobitism, such as seditious words and celebrations of Jacobite holidays. They are also illustrated by accusations of Jacobitism. This thesis seeks to incorporate Jacobitism into the burgeoning field of Atlantic History and demonstrate the significance of Jacobitism as an important element of a process of colonial

Anglicization. This contribution to historical understandings of the Anglicization of the British Atlantic World seeks to encourage discussions between the disparate fields of British and colonial history.

Table of Contents

	Acknowledgements	v
	Abbreviations	vii
	Introduction	1
	Part One	
1.	Jacobitism, Party Politics, and the British Atlantic	40
2.	Jacobitism and Religious Belief in the British Atlantic	81
3.	Jacobitism and Anti-Jacobitism in the Atlantic Public Sphere	125
	Part Two	
4.	Occasional Conformity in Miniature: Jacobitism and South Carolina, c. 1702-1716	167
5.	‘An Echo to that on the Other Side’: Jacobitism and the Mid-Atlantic Colonies, c. 1710-1717	202
6.	‘Now the Mask is Taken Off’: Jacobitism and Colonial New England, c. 1702-1727	242
7.	Conclusion	280
	Bibliography	288

Acknowledgements

This thesis would still be an unintelligible mess of papers if not for the guidance, direction, and support of my supervisors, Karin Bowie and Murray Pittock. Both have given more time and energy than should be required of any supervisor, and for that I will be forever grateful. The amount of time they have spent critiquing countless draft chapters borders on the absurd.

I would also like to thank the participants of the Early Modern Research in Progress seminar at Glasgow University. They have provided valuable direction on two chapters and have been a regular source of interesting discussion.

Most importantly, I would like to thank my wife Amanda. Her support made this thesis possible and kept me sane. Luckily, she did not know what she was getting herself into when she agreed to move across the Atlantic. If she had known from the beginning how many conversations about Jacobitism she would have to endure over three years, it would have seemed much less of an adventure and this thesis would never have been written!

I declare that, except where explicit reference is made to the contribution of others, that this dissertation is the result of my own work and has not been submitted for any other degree at the University of Glasgow or any other institution.

Signature David Parrish

Abbreviations

Add MS	Additional Manuscripts
AWM	American Weekly Mercury
AOM	Archives of Maryland ed. by William Hand Brown, (Baltimore, MD: Maryland Historical Society, 1910)
BNL	Boston Newsletter
BL	British Library
CSPC	<i>Calendar of State Papers Colonial, America and West Indies</i> , eds. W. Noel Sainsbury, J.W. Fortescue, and Cecil Headlam, 45 vols, (1860-1969).
FP	Fulham Papers Colonial
MHS	Massachusetts Historical Society
NAS	National Archives Scotland
NEC	New England Courant
SPG	American material in the archives of the USPG

Introduction

*...any man would be ashamed to make use of such evidences or talk of
dethroneing a great prince among the pine trees 4000 miles from her*
[Queen Anne]...

-Thomas Nairne-¹

In the summer of 1708 Thomas Nairne lay confined in a hot and humid jail cell in Charleston, South Carolina after having been accused of Jacobitism and arrested for treason. He was forced to lie ‘like a dog in a hot hole’ which, in his mind, in a Charleston summer, was as good as a death sentence. What was his (treasonable) offence? Nairne was accused of high treason for speaking against Queen Anne’s right to the throne of Great Britain. Although he was no leader of a colonial contingent of Jacobite irregulars seeking to liberate South Carolina from the rule of a usurper, his words were no different or any less seditious than if they had been spoken in London, Edinburgh, or Dublin.

Nairne’s lament noted above is illustrative for two important reasons. First, his case demonstrates a vigorous response to suspected Jacobitism in a British colony 4000 miles away from London. Second, his comment in response, quoted above prompts an intriguing question. What should historians make of evidences or talk of dethroning a prince in a colony with a fairly insignificant population 4000 miles away from the

¹ CSPC, Thomas Nairne to the [Earl of Sunderland?], 28, July 1708, item 662.

metropolitan centre of London? Until recently, many historians of Britain have been hesitant to believe that Jacobitism, or support for the exiled Stuart dynasty, is a serious historical problem and had failed to acknowledge the serious nature of the Jacobite threat in the British Isles. If this was true for the historiography of the British Isles, it remains all the more true for studies of the British colonies. There is a historiographical consensus, amply illustrated by the near-absence of scholarship, that examples of Jacobitism 4000 miles away from the British Isles have very little historical importance. Evidence of seditious words, disaffection, or high treason is curiously left unexplained, almost as if historians are ashamed to make use of such evidences. Nairne's words, though spoken hundreds of years ago, presciently speak the opinion of the current historical record. This project is an attempt to fill this important gap in the historical record and demonstrate the existence, expression, and significance of Jacobitism in the British Atlantic World from 1688, the year of the 'Glorious Revolution', to 1727, the year George II acceded to the throne of Great Britain.

Before making a case for the existence and significance of Jacobitism in the British Atlantic, it is necessary to define what is meant by Jacobitism. In its broadest sense, Jacobitism entails support for James VII & II and his heirs. This simple definition masks the complexity inherent in the idea of support. What counts as support and how much 'support' must one show in order to be counted a Jacobite? If rebellion is not the measure, what is? Paul Monod's 1989 work *Jacobitism and the English People* provides a helpful guide. Monod argues that Jacobitism is both 'the idea and the expression of support' for the Stuarts, and that these ideas and expressions possess an internal coherence. As such, they are a subcultural element of the larger English political

culture.² This definition is useful and applicable for the larger British Atlantic World. Expressions of Jacobitism in the colonies are examples of the expression of a complex British subculture in a remote British province. In other words, a Jacobite subculture, which represented one facet of the cultural totality of Britain, was transatlantic. Therefore, expressions of Jacobitism in a colony are not necessarily examples of a colonial Jacobite subculture; they are representative of a larger transatlantic subculture. This is not to imply a monolithic Jacobite movement or a sophisticated transatlantic Jacobite organisation, but rather a transatlantic subculture bound by a series of shared ‘words, images,’ and ‘forms of behaviour.’³

This thesis consciously refers to the period under examination, 1688 to 1727, as the ‘Age of Anne’, a term adopted from Geoffrey Holmes’s study *British Politics in the Age of Anne*. Although Holmes was primarily interested in explaining the rage of party politics during the reign of Anne (1702-1714), he understood that the period was inexplicable if constrained to the reign of a single monarch.⁴ Moreover, Holmes’s work captures the essence of the tripartite relationship between politics, religion, and the public throughout the period; a goal the present work seeks to emulate. The majority of this thesis examines events which occurred between the years 1702 to 1722 but it too understands that these events were rooted in developments occurring prior to Anne’s accession. This wider period provides a colourful backdrop to the expansive geographical scope of the study. It includes a civil war (1688-1691), the growth and centralisation of an empire, the maturation of party politics, and a series of Jacobite plots, intrigues, and rebellions, the last of which, the Atterbury plot, was discovered and

² Paul Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People, 1688-1788* (Cambridge, 1989), 7-8.

³ Monod, *Jacobitism*, 7.

⁴ Geoffrey Holmes, *British Politics in the Age of Anne* revised ed. (London, 1987).

thwarted by the British government in 1722. All of these were profoundly important to Britons living in remote British plantations across the Atlantic. The accession of George II to the throne of Great Britain in 1727, five years after the failure of the Atterbury plot, marked a decline in Britain of the immediate dynastic threat posed by the Jacobites, a decline in the heats aroused by party passions, and therefore, tempered motives and outlets for expressing Jacobite sympathies, both in Britain and its colonies.

I

Jacobitism has only recently emerged as a significant element in British historical scholarship. Its long wander in the historical wilderness is due in large part to the overwhelming influence of the long-lived and undeniably distinguished Whig tradition in British historiography which characterised much of historical writing for over a century.⁵ G. M. Trevelyan, the archetypal Whig historian, was himself writing within an established tradition rooted in the Enlightenment ideals of progress and beliefs in the advancement of human achievement, made famous over the centuries by notable figures such as David Hume and Thomas Babington Macaulay.⁶ This celebration of progress and human achievement, however, always an undercurrent in Whig history, is little more than a celebratory 'ratification' of the present; a celebration rooted in the assumption that the triumph of Protestant Whigs was the triumph of liberty.⁷ This precludes any opponents of the Whigs throughout Britain's history from appearing as anything other than a regressive or reactionary party standing in the way of the inevitable march of progress. Arguably, the general and popular understanding of eighteenth century Britain

⁵ John Kenyon, *The History Men: The Historical Profession in England since the Renaissance*, 2nd ed. (London, 1993)

⁶ Kenyon, *The History Men*, 88-285

⁷ Herbert Butterfield, *The Whig Interpretation of History* (London, 1931), v.

remains one of progress, homogenisation, and secularisation with the gradual democratisation of politics and the corresponding rise of the power of parliament which rightfully undermined the power of the church and the monarchy. Much of this is due, no doubt, to the teleological value of the narrative but as Herbert Butterfield noted over seventy years ago, this narrative can present a distorted and abridged view of the past.⁸ Despite the fact that Butterfield presciently called for changes and improvements in historical writing to combat the Whig narrative in the 1930s, it was not until the 1970s that a movement within historical writing emerged with the objective of correcting the Whig narrative of British History.

Yet, in spite of repeated calls for revision stretching back to the 1930s, Whig history has weathered many challenges, evolved, and even prospered. Linda Colley's *Britons* is a brilliant, influential example of neo-Whig history.⁹ The homogenous Protestantism and emergent British nationalism portrayed by Colley, minimises deep political, ethnic, religious and societal divisions and thus perpetuates an Anglo-centric Whig tradition. Similarly, the progressive thematic constructs of stability, modernisation, politeness, secularisation, and moderation contribute to the reinforcement of the Whig tradition in British history.¹⁰ Though the Whig tradition continues to be well represented, other interpretive frameworks also dependent on teleology of sorts, such as Marxist histories, have in many respects, lost much of their appeal and fallen by the wayside.¹¹

⁸ *ibid*, 1-33.

⁹ Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837*, 2nd ed. (New Haven, 2005).

¹⁰ John Brewer, *Pleasures of the Imagination, English Culture in the Eighteenth Century* (London, 1997); John Brewer, *Sinews of Power: War, Money, and the English State, 1677-1783* (Cambridge, MA, 1988); Paul Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People: England 1727-1783* (Oxford, 1992); Colley, *Britons*; Steve Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution* (New Haven, 2009); for an exception see Julian Hoppit, *A Land of Liberty?: England 1689-1727* (Oxford, 2000).

¹¹ Marxist history, as written by Christopher Hill and others has been largely proven to provide an untenable interpretation. Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the*

Regardless of the different teleological foundations, works such as these contain one major similarity: the marginalisation of Jacobitism.

Butterfield's criticism of the Whig tradition, though writing prior even to some of Trevelyan's work, insightfully addressed some of the major consequences arising from the divergent interpretations which continue to provoke historical debate today.

Butterfield considered works such as Trevelyan's as little more than a ratification of the present emphasising certain events and people in the past in order to celebrate the present.

Butterfield also noticed that what was more damaging to the field was the tendency of historians to ignore, deemphasize, or mischaracterise events or people that seemed to impede the narrative of progress. This was certainly true of Jacobitism which did not properly fit into a narrative as anything other than an barbaric foil to Whig successes and progress. It is this element of simplicity which relegated Jacobites to a historical dustbin for, as Butterfield stated, 'if we can exclude certain things on the ground that they have no direct bearing on the present, we have removed the most troublesome elements in the complexity and the crooked is made straight.'¹²

The characterisation of Jacobitism in the Whig narrative is made all the more apparent when one considers other works being produced at the time. While Trevelyan was writing works featuring detailed accounts of England's greatness, Sir Charles Petrie, in his work *The Jacobite Movement* (1948) attempted to redress the imbalance by injecting studies of Jacobitism into the historical debate and demonstrating that Jacobitism was indeed a serious political movement in the eighteenth century. Although

English Revolution (London, 1972); Christopher Hill, *The Century of Revolution, 1603-1714*, 2nd ed. (London, 1980); for a detailed discussion of the collapse of Marxist history see J.C.D. Clark, *Revolution and Rebellions: State and Society in England in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Cambridge, 1986).

¹² Butterfield, *The Whig Interpretation of History*, 25.

his works do demonstrate some scholarly merit, they were not taken seriously at the time because, rather than demonstrating the place of Jacobitism within the established narrative, he constructed a counter-ideology.¹³

Lewis Namier's works sparked a wave of revisionist studies which, through detailed manuscript analysis, countered aspects of the Whig narrative. Namier's notions of history as a scientific discipline competed with and reacted against Trevelyan's history as a patriotic story detailing the unfolding greatness of a providentially blessed nation and the notion of Englishmen as a 'sensible' people.¹⁴ Indeed, Namier's desire to create an almost anti-narrative in which there is no story of national progress and where 'joint achievement does not concern us' was antithetical to historical writing rooted in ideology and progress as imagined by Macaulay and Trevelyan.¹⁵ Although aspects of Namier's methodology demonstrated in his *Structure of Politics at the Accession of George III* (1929, 2nd ed. 1957) temporarily won out, and he inspired a number of historians to pursue similar studies minimising ideology, it was Trevelyan's narrative, especially in his *England Under the Stuarts* (1965) and *English Revolution* (1938) that would continue to capture the imagination of the public and historians.¹⁶ Not surprisingly, the divergence in historical method and interpretation led to very different understandings of the past which had vitally important consequences for the future of historical writing. In the rush to challenge the Whig narrative Namier and his followers' ideas veered away from ideology and religion as substantive topics and instead focused on short-term interest as the

¹³ Sir Charles Petrie, *The Jacobite Movement: The First Phase, 1688-1715* (New York, 1948).

¹⁴ G.M. Trevelyan, *The English Revolution, 1688-1689* (London, 1938), 1.

¹⁵ Sir Lewis Namier, *The Structure of Politics at the Accession of George III*, 2nd ed (London, 1957), xi.

¹⁶ Sir Lewis Namier, *The Structure of Politics*; G.M. Trevelyan, *England Under the Stuarts: The Political, Constitutional, and Social History of England in the Seventeenth Century*, 2nd ed. (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: 1960); G.M. Trevelyan, *The English Revolution, 1688-1689*, (London, 1938); G.M. Trevelyan, *England Under Queen Anne: Ramillies and the Union with Scotland*. (London, 1965); G.M. Trevelyan, *England Under Queen Anne: The Peace and the Protestant Succession* (London, 1965).

primary motive of politicians. By removing ideology from the argument and focusing on the short-term interest of individuals Namier did not seriously undermine the foundation of Whig history which was the belief in the long arc of ideological progress.

Namier's influence was soundly rebuffed by a number of scholars who thought it necessary to reintroduce ideology as a major component of eighteenth century Britain. J. H. Plumb, in his *The Growth of Stability* (1967), noted the importance of ideological conflict underpinning the party divisions of late Stuart Britain, though he argued for the establishment of political stability after the Hanoverian accession and the Tory proscription in 1715, thus minimising continued disaffection and ideological divisions evident in the Tory party.¹⁷ H. T. Dickinson also disputed the Namierite approach by emphasizing the role of ideology in the politics of the eighteenth century in his study *Liberty and Property* (1977). Despite his focus on ideology, Dickinson relied heavily on Whig narratives and he essentially restated the Whig position by reviving the importance of Locke's theories as the victor in the ideological battles of the eighteenth century.¹⁸ Though this work contains much worthwhile information about aspects of the major parties' political ideologies, it espoused an ascendancy of secular ideology in the period which mischaracterized much of the party conflict of the eighteenth century by emphasizing the secular and downplaying the confessional dimensions of the political debates. It also diminished the importance of dynastic politics in the period by arguing that the revolution in 1688 destroyed the foundations of divine right ideology.¹⁹

¹⁷ J.H. Plumb, *The Growth of Political Stability, 1675-1725* (Basingstoke, 1967).

¹⁸ H.T. Dickinson, *Liberty and Property: Political Ideology in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (New York, 1977).

¹⁹ *ibid*, 13-56.

It was Geoffrey Holmes's works, especially his masterful study of *British Politics in the Age of Anne* (1967, 1987), that proved most influential. His interpretations emphasised the importance and vitality of ideology and party politics in early eighteenth century Britain.²⁰ Holmes convincingly argued 'that politics in the age of Anne does not make sense outside of understandings of Whig and Tory ideology'.²¹ By analysing the ideas, structure, practice, and religious context of party politics, Holmes decisively demonstrated the prevalence and importance of Tory/Whig divisions and paved the way for a resurgence of studies examining party politics in eighteenth century Britain.

Due to the work of Plumb, Dickinson, Holmes and others, debate has since been forced to account for party conflict and ideological diversity; more specifically, the significance and widespread appeal of ideas, both secular and religious. The re-emergence of religion in historical studies has dramatically altered interpretations of Britain's long eighteenth century. Certainly, the continuity and political import of religious ideologies are vital to interpretations detailing the continuity of an *ancien regime* inherent in the eighteenth century, as famously argued in J.C.D. Clark's *English Society*, which have seriously challenged long held assumptions about the development and secularisation of Britain.²² Clark's work has provoked a tremendous amount of controversy, yet scholars are now growing increasingly comfortable with the tension between a continuing *ancien regime* and the growth of politeness, moderation, and liberty.

Much debate regarding Britain's long eighteenth century hinges on interpretations of the causes and outcomes of the 'Glorious Revolution'. Arguments range from

²⁰ Holmes, *British Politics*; Geoffrey Holmes, *The Making of a Great Power: Late Stuart and Early Georgian Britain, 1660-1722* (London, 1993).

²¹ Holmes, *British Politics*, 9

²² Jonathan Clark, *English Society, 1660-1832, Religion, Ideology, and Politics During the Ancien Regime* (Cambridge, 1985, 2nd ed. 2000).

depictions of a decided break with the past and a step into modernity to a conservative coup. Traditional Whig narratives, which argued that 1688 was the moment when English liberties were sensibly and bloodlessly defended against a reactionary Catholic menace, leave little room for opponents of the Revolution. They also contend that the contractual nature of the revolution settlement forced Tories to abandon notions of divine hereditary right, further marginalising the intellectual impetus underpinning Jacobitism.²³ However, a number of revisionist studies have contested this interpretation. They argued against the prevalence of Lockean contract theory noting that the revolution was no revolution at all and could more readily be described as a foreign invasion.²⁴ Tony Claydon has shown the religious nature of William's propaganda offensive following his accession and notes the continued significance of religious arguments and the sustained importance of hereditary legitimacy.²⁵ Furthermore, this reminds us that William's invasion and accession was contested, thus requiring a propaganda offensive. Clark, too, has amply illustrated the continued significance of divine right arguments at least until 1760.²⁶ This revisionist approach posits that, although many Tory Anglicans were largely responsible for or supportive of William's invasion, they were deeply uneasy with the revolution settlement. It was this disaffection with the revolution settlement, and not the invasion itself, which created ideological fissures in Britain and provided both the catalyst and sustenance for Jacobite opposition to the new regime.

Recent studies have broadened the context of the Glorious Revolution to include Continental Europe, Scotland, and Ireland. The complexity of 1688, including both the

²³ Trevelyan, *The English Revolution*; Dickinson, *Liberty and Property*, 13-56

²⁴ Eveline Cruickshanks, *The Glorious Revolution* (Basingstoke, 2000); Eveline Cruickshanks, ed. *By Force of Default: The Revolution of 1688-1689* (Edinburgh, 1989).

²⁵ Tony Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution* (Cambridge, 1996).

²⁶ Clark, *English Society*, 119-161.

religious element and the political settlement, is exacerbated when the revolution is examined in a larger British context. The revolution and the resulting settlements were not conservative or bloodless Scotland and Ireland, as Tim Harris and others have demonstrated.²⁷ The revolutionary period of 1688-89 represents a moment of severe ideological and religious dissention throughout the British Isles, and therefore created an atmosphere for sustained conflict.

If there is now broad agreement that ideology was important, there is little consensus on exactly what the ideological divide portends. The successful challenges to a Whig narrative posed by recent works opens up a great many possibilities for further questions in the period following the revolution. If the 'Glorious Revolution' is no longer viewed as a sensible, bloodless reaction against the catholicising policies of James VII & II, it suggests a new direction for studying the ideological divides of Anne's reign. One of the more provocative studies of the Revolution is Steve Pincus's *1688: The First Modern Revolution*.²⁸ Pincus argued that the roots and radical effects of the revolution including changes in foreign policy, ideas of empire, and economic policy, lie in the radical Whig tradition, and emphasises the deep ideological divides caused by the Revolution settlement. Pincus's book, while overstating modernisation and diminishing confessional divisions, provides a reminder that the revolution was created by, while simultaneously exacerbating, severe ideological differences. Although generally neo-Whig in its caricature of Jacobitism as absolutist and Catholic, Pincus's approach does suggest that Jacobitism was not inherently a regressive backward ideology but a complex, viable political alternative. Thus Jacobites, while supporting the claims of an exiled

²⁷ Tim Harris, *Revolution: The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720* (London, 2007); Edward Vallance, *The Glorious Revolution: 1688: Britain's Fight for Liberty* (London, 2007).

²⁸ Pincus, *1688*.

monarch, were not pining for days gone by; they were participating in a viable and dynamic political, religious, and cultural discourse. Dynastic priorities and religious beliefs divided politics and society in England, Scotland, and Ireland, as did confessional identities. As these issues are further researched, it becomes increasingly difficult to rely on notions of a monolithic and unified Protestantism or an uncontested conception of liberty or modernity and progress to explain the development of society after the revolution in 1688.

These research developments regarding 1688 form part of the much larger debate about the centrality of ideas, religion, and party politics in the years 1688 to 1745. Clark's *English Society* has been instrumental in redefining the period as the 'long eighteenth century' and has convincingly argued in great detail the importance of the hierarchical and confessional nature of English society from 1660 through 1832.²⁹ His arguments detailing the continued prominence of the established church, divine right, and the increasing power of the monarchy seriously question the role of a hegemonic, secularising whiggery in a society strongly influenced by religion. They also challenge the existence of a Lockean consensus amidst a population concerned with dynastic issues and confessional identities, suggesting the importance and continued existence of competing confessional ideologies.³⁰

Clark demonstrated that competing confessional and legal ideologies directly impacted party divisions and dynastic loyalties in the long eighteenth century. Clark's work, however, was not a study created in a splendid scholarly isolation. The *History of Parliament 1715-1754* (1970), edited by Romney Sedgewick, with an important

²⁹ Clark, *English Society*.

³⁰ *Ibid*, 124-231.

introduction by Eveline Cruickshanks, was a hugely influential revisionist work.³¹

Cruikshanks's introduction rehabilitated the idea that the Tory party existed as a viable political party, and argued the continued powerful appeal of Jacobitism in the period after the failure of the 1715 rebellion within the Tory party. This directly challenged notions of both a general ideological consensus in the century following the 'Glorious Revolution' and political stability after 1715. Cruickshanks followed in 1979 with the publication of *Political Untouchables*. She argued that Jacobitism was rife among the Tory party and suggested that many Tories were willing to support a French invasion in 1745, thus disputing long held assumptions of an unshakeable political stability or a growing political consensus.³² The existence and strength of the Tory party in the period 1727 to 1760 was further illustrated in Linda Colley's work *In Defiance of Oligarchy*, though she disputed Cruickshanks's belief in the strength of the Jacobite commitment within the Tory party.³³ The existence of political stability after 1715 was further questioned in *Britain in the Age of Walpole*, a series of essays examining the social and political instability caused by uncertainties regarding foreign policy, religious disputes, and the press.³⁴

Daniel Szechi demonstrated the remarkable depth of the relationship between Jacobitism and the Tory party in the years 1710-1714 in his 1984 study *Jacobitism and Tory Politics*. Szechi amply detailed the existence and manoeuvres of a Jacobite wing of the Tory party in the years leading up to the Hanoverian accession, thus showing that

³¹ Romney Sedgwick, ed., *The History of Parliament: The House of Commons, 1715-1754* (2 vol., London, 1970).

³² Eveline Cruickshanks, *Political Untouchables: The Tories and the '45* (New York, 1979)

³³ Linda Colley, *In Defiance of Oligarchy, 1714-1760* (Cambridge, 1982).

³⁴ Jeremy Black ed., *Britain in the Age of Walpole* (London, 1984).

frenetic Whig accusations of Tory Jacobitism were not simply imagined.³⁵ The connection between Jacobites and party political divisions, therefore, not only emphasised the importance of Jacobitism, but also demonstrated that Jacobitism was a foundation of the lasting legacy of party divisions in British society. Szechi's research established the role of Jacobitism as an active, dynamic, and viable political option for the Tory party throughout the eighteenth century, rather than simply the politics of insurance, showing the notable depth and continuity of Jacobite sympathies at the highest echelons of a highly politicised society. Jacobitism was an integral ideological feature of a wing of the Tory party in Westminster. This was clearly reflected in the larger society in which this complex Tory party functioned. For example, high church Anglicanism provided an ideological impetus for the Tory party while also championing the Jacobite virtues of passive obedience and non-resistance.³⁶ Thus, Jacobite sympathies existed as an integral part of Tory party political ideology and political party manoeuvring was inseparable from Jacobitism. Similarly, Clark argued that Jacobites and Tories shared a 'common currency of discourse...which allowed Jacobite and Tory to shade equivocally into each other'.³⁷ The wide-ranging implications of a Jacobite-friendly Tory party sparked a flurry of scholarly activity which only further increased the prominence and importance of Jacobite studies.

Recent scholarship has also shown that Jacobitism was inextricably intertwined with religious beliefs.³⁸ Scottish Episcopalians, high church Anglicans, nonjurors and

³⁵ Daniel Szechi, *Jacobitism and Tory Politics, 1710-1714* (Edinburgh, 1984).

³⁶ Monod, *Jacobitism*.

³⁷ Clark, *English Society* (1985), 143.

³⁸ Bruce Lenman, 'The Scottish Episcopal Clergy' in in *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1759*, ed. by Eveline Cruickshanks (Edinburgh, 1982), 36-48; Mark Goldie, 'The Nonjurors, Episcopacy, and the Origins of the Convocation Controversy', in *ibid*, 15-35; Clark, *English Society*, 83-

Roman Catholics provided ideological pillars of Jacobite resistance. The relationship between England's Anglican Church and the state, each finding its titular head in the person of the monarch, created a peculiar problem in that clergymen and bishops were required to swear oaths of allegiance to the reigning sovereign. This requirement proved problematic upon the accession of William and Mary who had replaced a reigning monarch, James II & VII. James, exiled to France, was still alive and proclaiming his right to rule, giving the lie to the arguments that James had abdicated which were a vital aspect of the Revolution settlement. Arguments over oaths and the application of divine right created a schism in the Church, forcing nonjurors, men who refused to swear the oaths to a *de facto* monarch, to create a separate communion. The theology of divine right was prevalent throughout British society, yet its practical application, as practiced by the nonjurors, provided an important ideological pillar of Jacobite resistance.³⁹

Work on the history of Jacobitism has not been exclusively the history of parliamentary and religious elites. E. P. Thomson in his 1975 monograph *Whigs and Hunters* drew connections between popular unrest, crime, seditious words, and Jacobitism.⁴⁰ These conclusions were supported by Frank McLynn's 1988 monograph *Crime and Punishment*.⁴¹ Nicholas Rogers demonstrated the popular political and cultural appeal of Jacobite and anti-Whig seditious words among the lower classes in his 1998 study *Crowds, Culture, and Politics in Georgian Britain*.⁴² Similarly, essays by Paul Monod have demonstrated conclusively the role and prominence of Jacobitism in a

105; Daniel Szechi, *The Jacobites: Britain and Europe, 1688-1788* (Manchester, 1994); Monod, *Jacobitism*, 126-158.

³⁹ Clark, *English Society*, 83-105.

⁴⁰ E.P. Thompson, *Whigs and Hunters: The Origins of the Black Act* (New York, 1975).

⁴¹ Frank McLynn, *Crime and Punishment in Eighteenth Century England* (London, 1989); see also Paul Monod, 'Dangerous Merchandize: Smuggling, Jacobitism, and Commercial Culture in Southeast England, 1690-1760, in *Journal of British Studies* 30 (1991), 150-182.

⁴² Nicholas Rogers, *Crowds, Culture, and Politics in Georgian Britain* (Oxford, 1998), 21-57.

number of aspects of English political culture including the theatre and the press.⁴³ These studies rightly accorded to Jacobitism an influence within the larger political culture throughout British society, including popular politics. Not only do these works show how the ideology of Jacobitism could capture the popular imagination, they illustrate how this ideology could manifest itself in a variety of social contexts. By doing so, they expanded the purview of Jacobite studies by bringing attention to the appropriation of language and ideology among the lower social orders. Furthermore, these studies examined Jacobitism in a largely English context, providing further impetus for moving Jacobitism from the peripheral Celtic fringe of the Scottish Highlands. They also remind us that Jacobitism was far more widespread than participation in Jacobite rebellions alone can indicate.⁴⁴

The reality of Jacobites and Jacobitism as something other than a romanticized, dynastic sympathy among a parochial landed party exerting its dying influence, or a failed romantic, nationalist movement demonstrates that Jacobitism can no longer be contained within an ‘othered’ Celtic fringe.⁴⁵ As recent scholarship has decisively shown, the level of support throughout British society both for the Jacobites and the Tory party, and the severe divide between dynastic loyalties suggests that Jacobitism was more than simply a romantic by-product of misplaced loyalty. It was a potent blend of political, religious, and social cultures at odds with the Williamite revolution settlement, the accession of the Hanoverian dynasty, religious dissent, and the Whig party.

⁴³ Paul Monod, ‘The Jacobite Press and English Censorship, 1689-1695’, in *The Stuart Court in Exile, and the Jacobites* (London, 1995), 125-142; idem, ‘Pierre’s White Hat: Theatre, Jacobitism and Popular Protest in London, 1689-1760,’ in *By Force or Default?: The Revolution of 1688-89*, ed. Eveline Cruickshanks (Edinburgh, 1989), 159-189.

⁴⁴ Monod, *Jacobitism*.

⁴⁵ For a fuller critique of the romantic notions of Jacobitism see Murray Pittock, *The Myth of the Jacobite Clans: The Jacobite Army in 1745*, 2nd edition (Edinburgh, 2009).

The significance of Jacobitism outside the Celtic fringe has clearly been demonstrated and the subject is now being addressed within the context of three separate national historiographies: Scotland, Ireland, and England. The growth of Jacobite studies in a wide variety of national contexts has created a complex and increasingly diverse understanding of Jacobitism in the Early Modern British Isles and therefore a more complete picture of eighteenth century Britain. Jacobite studies have reshaped much of the historiographical landscape and it is no longer possible to discuss eighteenth century politics without a discussion of Jacobitism.

Even within the individual national historiographies there is great diversity. This diversity has done much to revise conceptions of support for the exiled Stuart dynasty in England and Scotland as a peripheral, regressive, Celtic, and Catholic phenomenon and have replaced it with interpretations of Jacobitism as mainstream, connected to Toryism, nonjuring, popular politics, and Scottish nationalism. Murray Pittock, Daniel Szechi and Allan Macinnes have explored the significance of Jacobitism in Scottish society.⁴⁶

Daniel Szechi's study of the *mentalité* of a lowland Episcopalian Scottish Jacobite in his *George Lockhart of Carnwarth* defines aspects and illustrates the complexity of Scottish Jacobitism.⁴⁷ Pittock's *Poetry and Jacobite Politics* has shown the connections between a Jacobite cultural and political sphere in Scotland and Ireland. Indeed, studies of Scottish Jacobitism and Jacobite culture have re-evaluated and redefined general understandings of what constituted a Jacobite. Pittock's *The Myth of the Jacobite Clans* and Bruce Lenman's *The Jacobite Risings in Britain* have both been instrumental in

⁴⁶ Daniel Szechi, *George Lockhart of Carnwarth, 1689-1727: A Study in Jacobitism* (East Linton, 2002); Allan Macinnes, 'Jacobitism in Scotland: Episodic Cause or National Movement?', in *The Scottish Historical Review* 86 (2007), 225-252

⁴⁷ Murray Pittock, *Poetry and Jacobite Politics in Eighteenth Century Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge, 1994); Szechi, *George Lockhart of Carnwarth*.

challenging the myth of the Jacobite as a Highland Catholic and demonstrating the depth of Jacobite military support found outside the Scottish Highlands.⁴⁸ The works of Pittock and Lenman have effectively shown the diversity in Scottish Jacobitism, with huge implications for the Whig portrayal of Jacobitism as a peripheral and Catholic other.

Additionally, detailed studies of the Jacobite armies which participated in the rebellions of 1715 and 1745 have further undermined the notion that the Jacobite armies were almost exclusively Highland and Catholic, thus showing the extent to which Jacobitism was central to British politics and culture. Szechi's work on the 1715 rising and Pittock's examination of the composition of the army in the rising of 1745 have challenged the notions left over from the romanticism of the nineteenth century still surviving in historical studies by showing that the armies had substantial numbers of Scottish Episcopalians and Lowlanders.⁴⁹ Christopher Duffy and Frank McLynn provide evidence for the gravity of the military threat posed by the rebellion in 1745, arguing against misconceptions which suggest that the rising was destined to fail.⁵⁰ Jeremy Black has further detailed the significance of the Jacobite threat in an international, European context. His work examining the role of the Jacobites as key players or pawns in European politics is instrumental for understanding the potential posed by the Jacobite rebels in Britain and also how the Jacobites were dependent on the diplomatic successes of the Stuarts in exile.⁵¹

⁴⁸ Pittock, *The Myth of the Jacobite Clans*, 65-109; Bruce Lenman, *The Jacobite Risings in Britain, 1689-1746* (New York, 1980).

⁴⁹ Daniel Szechi, *1715: The Great Jacobite Rebellion* (New Haven, 2006), 102-198; Pittock, *The Myth of the Jacobite Clans*, 65-109.

⁵⁰ Christopher Duffy, *The '45* (London, 2003); Frank McLynn, *France and the Jacobite Rising of 1745* (Edinburgh, 1981).

⁵¹ Jeremy Black, *British Foreign Policy in the Age of Walpole* (Edinburgh, 1985), 138-159.

Building on the numerous works establishing the place of Jacobitism in the British Isles, studies have also begun to examine Jacobitism outside a British context and have focused on a great variety of different topics including, diasporas, identity, empire, and exiles.⁵² Historians have studied aspects of Jacobitism as diverse as connections between Jacobitism and Free Masonry and other social networks.⁵³ This is an increasingly fascinating area of study because it does much to place Jacobitism in a larger European and world context. Many Jacobites left England, Scotland and Ireland in search of a new home or new opportunities and consequently created or joined exile communities throughout Europe. Edward Corp has produced substantive works exploring the Stuart courts in exile, increasing our understanding of the significance of Jacobitism on a European stage. His studies, especially *The Stuart Court in Rome*, demonstrate the existence of a viable Stuart Court in exile which sustained the image and prestige of monarchy for the Jacobite community.⁵⁴ There have been other excellent works examining diasporic communities of Jacobites including soldiers and merchants. Jacobite exiles of all social classes made new homes in Spain, France, Russia, and the British colonies. Work has really only just begun in this area and there is still a great deal of research to be done regarding how Jacobite exiles interacted with their adopted societies. Steve Murdoch and Rebecca Wills have shown the successes encountered by some Jacobite communities abroad in *Network North* and *The Jacobites and Russia* respectively and the collection of essays edited by Thomas O'Connor titled *The Irish in*

⁵² Paul Monod, Murray Pittock, and Daniel Szechi, ed., *Loyalty and Identity: Jacobites at Home and Abroad* (Basingstoke, 2010); Geoffrey Plank, *Rebellion and Savagery: The Jacobite Rising of 1745 and the British Empire* (Philadelphia, 2006), 77-100; Margaret Sankey, *Jacobite Prisoners of the 1715 Rebellion: Preventing and Punishing Insurrection in Early Hanoverian Britain* (Burlington, VT, 2005).

⁵³ Steve Murdoch, 'Tilting at Windmills: The Order del Toboso as a Jacobite Social Network,' in *Loyalty and Identity: Jacobites at Home and Abroad*, ed. By Paul Monod, Murray Pittock, and Daniel Szechi (Basingstoke, 2010).

⁵⁴ Edward Corp, ed., *The Stuart Court in Rome: The legacy of Exile* (Burlington, VT, 2003).

Europe contains excellent information about the integration, or lack thereof, of Irish Jacobite exiles.⁵⁵ Moreover, Jacobite exiles or migrants were not limited to continental Europe. Over the last decade, David Dobson has documented a great number of Jacobites transported to the British colonies in America.⁵⁶ The transportation of Jacobite prisoners to the Americas after the 1715 rising was further explored by Margaret Sankey in her 2005 monograph *Jacobite Prisoners of the 1715*.⁵⁷ Despite the rapid growth of Jacobite studies, there still remains a great deal of unexplored territory especially within the diasporic communities in the Americas and the larger empire.

The long eighteenth century, in which Jacobitism played such a crucial role, also witnessed the growth, maturation, and eventual loss of the American colonies. Indeed, colonial development in the British Atlantic occurred concurrently with the rise and fall of Jacobitism in the British archipelago, suggesting the possibility that Jacobitism, and all its potential associations, might have been a prominent feature of colonial society. A handful of studies such as Geoffrey Plank's *Rebellion and Savagery* briefly explore the impact of the rebellion of 1745 on the British American colonies. These provide a tentative first step towards what could be a promising field of inquiry.⁵⁸ Thus far, however, Jacobite studies have not yet examined the potential implications of the role of Jacobitism in shaping the growth and evolution of the British Atlantic colonies during the early eighteenth century. The only major study of Jacobitism to address the issue prior to

⁵⁵ Steve Murdoch, *Network North: Scottish Kin, Commercial and Covert Associations in Northern Europe, 1603-1746* (Leiden, 2006), 313-348; Rebecca Wills, *The Jacobites and Russia, 1715-1750* (East Linton, 2002); Thomas O'Connor, ed., *The Irish in Europe, 1580-1815* (Dublin, 2001).

⁵⁶ David Dobson, *Scots on the Chesapeake, 1607-1830* (Baltimore, MD, 1992); David Dobson, *Directory of Scots Banished to the American Plantations, 1650-1775*, 2nd ed. (Baltimore, MD, 2010); David Dobson, *Scottish Emigration to Colonial America* (Athens, GA, 1994).

⁵⁷ Sankey, *Jacobite Prisoners*, 59-76.

⁵⁸ Geoffrey Plank, *Rebellion and Savagery*, 77-100; Jonathan Hawkins, 'Imperial '45: The Jacobite Rebellion in Transatlantic Context,' in *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 24 (1996), 24-47.

Sankey's 2005 study was Charles Petrie's *The Jacobite Movement* (1948) which involved only a very brief mention of possibilities inherent in the shared culture and ideologies by implying that there were Anglican clergymen in the colonies sympathetic to the exiled Stuarts.⁵⁹ Petrie included this intriguing piece of information as a brief aside, but his use, though minimal, of the papers of the Society of the Propagation of the Gospel to Foreign Parts (SPG) demonstrates the existence of evidence available for further research. As studies of Jacobitism continue to demonstrate the prevalence of Jacobite sympathies and illuminate aspects of societies in and beyond the British Isles, it is possible, indeed necessary, to use that information to examine how Jacobitism affected British subjects across the Atlantic in the British Atlantic colonies.

II

The historiography of colonial America possesses its own traditional Whig narrative extolling the exceptionalism of the thirteen American colonies which eventually became the United States of America. Consequently, it has its own revisionist impulse. In many respects, this revisionism remains a distinct field of study from its British counterpart.⁶⁰ Yet an important element of revisionist arguments has been an emphasis on 'Anglicization' and the Britishness of colonial America (although as this thesis demonstrates, 'Briticization' might be a more apt term).⁶¹ Over the past thirty years,

⁵⁹ Sir Charles Petrie, *The Jacobite Movement: The First Phase, 1688-1715* (New York: Macmillan, 1948), 73.

⁶⁰ For two interpretations of this see Jonathan Clark, 'The Strange Death of British History?: Reflections on Anglo-American Scholarship,' in *Historical Journal* 40 (1997), 787-809; David Armitage, 'Greater Britain: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis?' in *The American Historical Review* 104 (1999), 427-445

⁶¹ John M. Murrin, 'Anglicizing and American Colony: The Transformation of Provincial Massachusetts (Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, Yale University, 1966); T.H. Breen, 'An Empire of Goods: The Anglicization of Colonial America, 1690-1776,' in *The Journal of British Studies* 25 (1986), 467-499; Jack P. Greene and J.R. Pole, eds., *Colonial British America: Essays in the new History of the Early Modern Era* (Baltimore, 1984); David S. Shields, *Civil Tongues and Polite Letters in British America* (Chapel Hill, 1997); David S. Shields, *Oracles of Empire: Poetry, Politics, and Commerce in British America, 1690-*

historians of colonial America have increasingly rediscovered the importance of Britain and British events on colonial developments. As studies increase awareness of the social, economic, religious, and political bonds tying the British world together, colonists are becoming increasingly British and increasingly aware of British events and controversies. The British turn has led to further developments used to revise the exceptionalist tendencies in the historiography of colonial America, most notably, the embrace of an Atlantic turn. Trevor Burnard has noted that colonial historians have ‘eagerly adopted Atlantic perspectives’ in order to combat exceptionalist inclinations.⁶² However, even within this British or Atlantic turn, colonial historians continue to make use of British neo-Whig interpretations to inform their own work.

Recently a number of studies have employed elements of colonial British history or have embraced themes of Anglicization within a colonial context. Scholars have increasingly insisted that the colonies were cultural provinces of Britain whose ‘legal and social systems, perceptual frameworks, and social and cultural imperatives were inevitably in large measure British in origin’.⁶³ For instance, the British monarchy, traditionally viewed in Whig histories as anathema to Americans, has been rehabilitated in histories of the colonies. In his recent monograph *The King’s Three Faces*, Brendan McConville has argued convincingly against an ingrained American exceptionalism by demonstrating that colonial Americans were not little ‘protorepublicans’ living in isolation from British society. He has accomplished this by successfully illustrating the

1750 (Chicago, 1990); Ned Landsman, *From Colonials to Provincials: American Thought and Culture, 1680-1760* (New York, 1997).

⁶² Trevor Burnard, ‘The British Atlantic’, in *Atlantic History: A Critical Appraisal*, eds Jack P. Greene and Phillip D. Morgan (Oxford, 2009), 111-136.

⁶³ Jack P. Greene and J.R. Pole, ‘Reconstructing British-American Colonial History’ in *Colonial British America*, 1-17, quote from page 14.

importance of monarchy in the political culture of British America.⁶⁴ McConville has shown that within colonial political culture there existed a deep affection for the monarchy and an abiding respect for royalty. The royalism evident in colonial America clearly illustrates the power of the British monarchy in the British colonies and indicates parallels between political cultures in colonial America and Britain. Similarly, Owen Stanwood has identified in a number of studies the significance of anti-Catholicism and the Protestant succession as important cultural imperial unifiers.⁶⁵ However, McConville and Stanwood have pursued a neo-Whig, Colley-esque focus on conceptions of the Protestant monarchy post 1688 and largely ignore the ideological conflicts inherent in conceptions of identity, the monarchy, and Protestantism.⁶⁶

These works, while demonstrating transatlantic cultural connections, illustrate a larger problem in the histories of colonial America. By embracing Atlantic or British frameworks, historians of colonial America have displayed 'homogenizing tendencies in their relentless search for connections' which tend to portray a homogenous Whig political culture.⁶⁷ For example, the works of McConville and Stanwood, while demonstrating elements of a transatlantic British political culture, have focused primarily on defining features of Britain's Whig political culture. Thus, many aspects of history which have created such a rancorous debate in the historiography of Britain over the previous four decades, such as the heterogeneous and contested political culture evident during the first half of the eighteenth century, have been largely overlooked in colonial

⁶⁴ Brendan McConville, *The King's Three Faces: The Rise and Fall of Royal America, 1688-1776* (Chapel Hill, NC: Chapel Hill, 2006), 4.

⁶⁵ Owen Stanwood, *The Empire Reformed: English America in the Age of the Glorious Revolution* (Philadelphia, 2011).

⁶⁶ Tony Claydon and Ian McBride, eds. *Protestantism and National Identity, c. 1650-1850* (Cambridge, 1998).

⁶⁷ Burnard, 'The British Atlantic', 128.

American history. Historians of the British colonies in America use studies of Britain which emphasise homogeneity such as Linda Colley's *Britons*, to explain events and conditions in the colonies. Because the specialist literature of England, Ireland, and Scotland has become so voluminous, when historians of colonial America attempt to bridge the Atlantic, they often rely on general narrative studies which continue, consciously or not, to include generalizations reflecting whiggish myths. These generalizations are then perpetuated by other historians dependent on general studies and so, despite the best efforts of British revisionists and the challenges presented to the Whig narrative by revisionist British history, the American and British revisionist approaches have not yet been fully incorporated.

This is especially true for Jacobitism. As demonstrated above, the significance of Jacobitism within late-Stuart Britain has been reasserted. Yet the existence or prevalence of Jacobitism as a transatlantic British ideology or subculture in the colonies has not been adequately explored. The impact of certain important events directly relating to Jacobitism, such as the effect of the revolution of 1688 in the American colonies, has been studied and debated in many works. For example, David Lovejoy pursued a Whiggish description of the revolutions that occurred in Massachusetts, New York, and Maryland in the aftermath of the Revolution in England in his *The Glorious Revolution in America*.⁶⁸ Richard Dunn's essay in the first volume of the *Oxford History of the British Empire* argues that the revolutions were transatlantic in nature, but the implications of this have not been fully realized.⁶⁹ Owen Stanwood's excellent study *The Empire*

⁶⁸ David Lovejoy, *The Glorious Revolution in America* (New York, 1972).

⁶⁹ Richard Dunn, 'The Glorious Revolution and America,' in *The Oxford History of the British Empire, vol 1, The Origins of Empire: British Overseas Enterprise to the Close of the Seventeenth Century*, ed. by Nicholas Canny (Oxford, 1998), 445-466.

Reformed recognizes the transatlantic repercussions 1688 in terms of imperial policy and political culture, though much more work needs to be done.⁷⁰ Despite a growing awareness of the transatlantic impact of the revolution of 1688, little has been said about the transatlantic reverberations of the revolution settlement.

Histories examining Jacobitism in a colonial context tend to view it as an ‘imagined’ threat or a ‘rhetorical hysteria’.⁷¹ As such, it becomes little more than a Catholic bogeyman. Jacobitism has been addressed in the colonies in terms of local disputes. As a consequence, it is used as a foil or means of explaining cultural developments in the colonies rather than being examined on its own terms. For example, Thomas Kidd uses Jacobitism in order to explain the construction of ‘the Protestant interest’s identity’, in which Jacobitism operated as the Catholic other.⁷² This approach emphasises a transatlantic cultural homogeneity while minimising the significance of Jacobitism as an important British subculture. Other studies examining Jacobitism in the colonies have treated it as a concept impacting local events, yet decidedly foreign.⁷³

This view of Jacobitism within colonial history is directly tied to understandings of Toryism and nonjuring. The rehabilitation of the Tory party as a viable political movement in British historiography has gone largely unnoticed in the historiography of colonial America, and historians of the British colonies continue to view the development of American society through the lens of a Whig hegemony and political stability. Rather than being a viable, transatlantic political ideology, Toryism, even during the rage of

⁷⁰ Stanwood, *The Empire Reformed*.

⁷¹ Thomas S. Kidd, *The Protestant Interest: New England After Puritanism* (New Haven, 2004), 116; Jonathan Clark, *The Language of Liberty, 1660-1832: Political Discourse and the Social Dynamics in the Anglo-American World* (Cambridge, 1994), 255

⁷² Kidd, *The Protestant Interest*, 116-117.

⁷³ Thomas Wendal, ‘Jacobitism Crushed: An Episode Concerning Loyalty and Justice in Colonial Pennsylvania,’ in *Pennsylvania History* 40 (1973), 58-65.

party, rarely appears as anything other than an aberration or a novelty on a largely hegemonic Whig stage. For instance, in L. H. Roper's recent work, *Conceiving Carolina* (2004), Sir Nathaniel Johnson, the Tory governor of South Carolina, is understood not in terms of an Atlantic Toryism but only in terms of local faction.⁷⁴ Similarly, nonjurors in the colonies are characterized not as part of a larger Atlantic ideology, but as social anachronisms merely worthy of an interesting footnote.⁷⁵ This, despite the fact that nonjuring was a fundamental division in the established Church of England. There have been no major works on the role of Toryism in the American colonies and this absence has also left a notable void in the historiography and in the larger understanding of Anglo-American relations.

Studies of Britain's Atlantic empire have laid the foundation for studies of Jacobitism, Toryism, and nonjuring in the British Atlantic. A number of older studies of Britain's Atlantic empire have noted a shared transatlantic religious and political culture including Toryism. Alison Gilbert Olson in her book, *Making the Empire Work* (1992), has explored links between English politics and American political interests in the hundred year period preceding the American Revolution in a variety of contexts, focusing primarily on interest groups as an essential element of Anglo-American political relations.⁷⁶ She has shown how different colonial interest groups interacted with various individuals and political parties in order to achieve local and imperial political aims. This has demonstrated the many connections between colonial governance and the partisan politics of Westminster. Her other works, most notably *Anglo-American Politics* (1973),

⁷⁴ L.H. Roper, *Conceiving Carolina, Proprietors, Planters, and Plots, 1662-1729* (New York, 2004);

⁷⁵ John Woolverton, *Colonial Anglicanism in North America* (Detroit, 1976).

⁷⁶ Alison Gilbert Olson, *Making the Empire Work: London and American Interest Groups, 1690-1790*. (Cambridge MA, 1992).

have explored a wide variety of different links including the role of colonial governors and the commissaries of the Bishop of London showing how these offices functioned as liaisons between British and Colonial politics.⁷⁷ Ian K. Steele's study, *Politics of Colonial Policy* (1968), is an excellent work which identifies the mechanics of the emerging imperial administration and its effects on colonial policy including how party politics could affect the administration of the empire; a topic which would reward further study.⁷⁸ Despite an overly Anglo-centric approach, there still remains an absence of information regarding imperial administration and how party politics in Britain affected all aspects of imperial policy and how this was made manifest in colonial politics.

Dominant Anglo-centric accounts of the Empire tend to downplay the Jacobite threat within the British Isles, relegating it to little more than a peripheral conflict located within a larger struggle for imperial supremacy. For example, Ian Steele describes the Jacobite rebellions as 'spasmodic' episodes of Scottish resistance to British integration.⁷⁹ Perhaps more surprisingly, Tom Devine and Michael Fry's examinations of a Scottish empire largely ignore Jacobitism; in their works Jacobite rebellions are portrayed as far off events which resulted in forced migration of Jacobite Scots.⁸⁰ Even studies which note the continued importance of Jacobitism and party political conflicts in imperial appointments mistakenly refer to the Jacobite army in Scotland as '9,000 swordsmen'.⁸¹

⁷⁷ Alison Gilbert Olson and Richard Maxwell Brown, ed., *Anglo-American Political Relations, 1675-1775* (New Brunswick, NJ, 1970); Alison Gilbert Olson, *Anglo-American Politics, 1660-1775: The Relationship Between Parties in England and Colonial America*. (Oxford, 1973).

⁷⁸ Ian K. Steele, *Politics of Colonial Policy: The Board of Trade in Colonial Administration, 1696-1720* (Oxford, 1968).

⁷⁹ Ian K. Steele, 'The Anointed, the Appointed, and the Elected: Governance of the British Empire, 1689-1784, in *The Oxford History of the British Empire, vol II, The Eighteenth Century*, ed. by P. J. Marshall (Oxford: 1998), 105-127.

⁸⁰ Tom Devine, *Scotland's Empire, 1600-1815* (London, 2004); Michael Fry, *The Scottish Empire* (East Lothian, 2001).

⁸¹ Webb, *Marlborough's America* (New Haven, 2013), 323.

Although imperial histories have not reconciled the disparate historiographies of colonial America and Britain, they have successfully reconstructed aspects of the early Empire which connect the two areas under consideration. However, the recent rise and renewal of interest in imperial history has coincided with the more revisionist tendencies in British historiography, suggesting possible avenues for future research. J. G. A. Pocock's 1975 call for a 'new British history' has brought about some changes in imperial history and John MacKenzie has noted the need for a four-nations imperial history which combats Anglo-centric approaches.⁸² MacKenzie's call for four-nations imperial history exploring the heterogeneity of the British Empire has been ably answered, at least for Britain's Atlantic Empire, by the rise of Atlantic history.

The emergence of Atlantic history over the past fifty years has opened new doors of historical inquiry and provided a new means of historiographical integration for historians of Britain and America.⁸³ As mentioned above, it has supplied a much needed framework for Atlantic impulses observable in histories of colonial America. Moreover, it has, in some respects, rehabilitated histories of the early modern Atlantic empires, especially the British Empire, by encouraging new directions of study and drawing much needed connections between the multiple societies all under the umbrella of the British monarchy.⁸⁴ Atlantic history is, according to Jack Greene, 'best seen as a framework, an angle of vision, an arena of analysis.'⁸⁵ This 'angle of vision' is often remarkably similar to that used by imperial historians, yet it encourages a broader approach to similar themes.

⁸² J.G.A. Pocock, 'British History: A Plea for a New Subject,' in *The Journal of Modern History* 47 (1975), 601-621; John M. MacKenzie, 'Irish, Scottish, Welsh, and English Worlds? A Four-Nation Approach to the History of the British Empire,' in *History Compass* 6 (2008), 1244-1263.

⁸³ For an overview of the development of Atlantic History see Bernard Bailyn, *Atlantic History: Concept and Contours* (Cambridge MA, 2005).

⁸⁴ David Armitage and Michael Braddick eds., *The British Atlantic World, 1500-1800* (Basingstoke, 2002).

⁸⁵ Jack P. Greene and Phillip Morgan, *Atlantic History: A Critical Appraisal* (Oxford, 2009), 10.

Atlantic history creates a framework independent of institutions and boundaries. Atlantic history does not require an institutional centre. Connections with Westminster no longer remain the only focus of Atlantic politics, though they do remain important. Atlantic History ties together the diverse peoples, Scots, Irish, English and colonists, of the British Atlantic World. While it cannot and is not intended to fully replace imperial histories, it does allow a different perspective.⁸⁶

The creation of a British Atlantic World was an organic development. Joyce Chaplin's description of the British Atlantic as English and Scottish colonization which became a 'British Empire with Atlantic dimensions' is particularly helpful.⁸⁷ It reminds us of the national complexities involved when discussing a British Atlantic. This new Atlantic perspective or framework has broken up exceptionalist tendencies in both American and British history. In doing so, it has begun the process of creating bridges that allow us to examine aspects of society, politics, and culture in a much larger and diverse context; a trend much more evident in histories of colonial America than British history.⁸⁸ Historians of colonial America have recognised the importance of British history in the colonial story and have successfully appropriated British histories to explain colonial developments. Revolutions and rebellions of huge historical import in Britain and once simply part of an archipelagic or English story have begun to be interpreted in a transatlantic perspective as a means of explaining developments in the colonies. The Wars of the Three Kingdoms, the revolution of 1688, and the American

⁸⁶ For a discussion about the value of Atlantic History see Jack P. Greene and Phillip Morgan, *Atlantic History: A Critical Appraisal* (Oxford, 2009); Nicholas Canny and Phillip Morgan eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the Atlantic World, c. 1450-1850* (Oxford, 2011), 516-532.

⁸⁷ Joyce Chaplin, 'The British Atlantic,' in *The Oxford Handbook of the Atlantic World, c. 1450-1850*, ed. by Nicolas Canny and Phillip Morgan (Oxford, 2011), 219-234.

⁸⁸ Burnard, 'The British Atlantic', 111-136.

Revolution have been recognized as having transatlantic repercussions.⁸⁹ Culture, religion, trade, and society are all being investigated within the framework of the British Atlantic, yet some important events and potential interactions remain untouched. This is partly due to the scope of Atlantic History. It suffers from many of the same issues as imperial history in that there can be an overreliance on generalizations of events or ideologies that do not directly affect the issue under consideration. For example, in a recent essay examining the British Atlantic, admittedly an enormous task, Joyce Chaplin has argued that Jacobitism factors as little more than a Scottish Nationalist response to a 'British Empire'.⁹⁰

Despite the Atlantic turn of colonial American historiography and the rising prominence of Atlantic History, British historians have been less likely to study what David Armitage has called 'Greater Britain' than their colonial counterparts. Armitage advocates the appropriation of the conception 'Greater Britain' arguing that it encourages a 'rapprochement between the New British History and Atlantic History'.⁹¹ Jacobitism and Toryism are now widely accepted as significant factors within a multi-national British History and so the relative absence of debates about Toryism or Jacobitism in imperial, colonial, and Atlantic history suggests the possibility of new avenues of research. If we examine the historiographical debates which have caused such

⁸⁹ Eliga H. Gould, 'Revolution and Counter Revolution,' in *The British Atlantic World, 1500-1800*, ed. by David Armitage and Michael Braddick (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002); ⁸⁹ Dunn, 'The Glorious Revolution and America,' 445-466; David Armitage, 'The American Revolution in Atlantic Perspective,' in *The Oxford Handbook of the Atlantic World, c. 1450-1850*, ed. by Nicholas Canny and Phillip Morgan (Oxford, 2011), 516-532.

⁹⁰ For an example of this reliance on generalizations see Chaplin, 'The British Atlantic,' 219-234.

⁹¹ For an explanation of 'Greater Britain' see David Armitage, 'Greater Britain: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis?' in *The American Historical Review*, vol. 104, no 2 (1999), 427-445, quote on pg 439; For exceptions see Jonathan Clark, *The Language of Liberty, 1660-1832: Political Discourse and the Social Dynamics in the Anglo-American World* (Cambridge, 1994); Grant Tapsell, ed., *The Later Stuart Church, 1660-1714* (Manchester University Press, 2013) which includes Jeremy Gregory, 'The Later Stuart Church and North America,' 150-172.

controversy in British history using an Atlantic framework as a bridge, new interpretations of ‘Greater Britain’ become possible. As mentioned above, Jacobitism was a central component of the British world. This includes distinct Irish, Scottish, and English variants. Moreover, the British colonies encompassed a blend of Irish, Scottish, and English religious and political cultures. Therefore, this study eschews an Anglo-centric approach and pursues a British Atlantic perspective in order to develop a broader interpretation of Jacobitism in the British Atlantic World. A study of Jacobitism within an Atlantic framework is a study of the circulation of ideas, ideologies, people and politics in a larger dynamic British Atlantic World. If Jacobitism is understood as a vital element of British society, investigations of Jacobitism within the context of the British Empire should provide evidence of a complex and dynamic transatlantic British political culture. This literature review raises new questions about the heterogeneity of opinions regarding religion, imperial appointments, ideology, or dynastic politics and provides a helpful reminder of the transatlantic nature of eighteenth century Britain.

III

Jacobitism, throughout the British Isles, was a significant and enduring aspect of the cultural and political *milieu* after 1688. The depth of support it possessed and the amount of controversy it generated in eighteenth century British culture should not be underestimated. As Monod, Pittock, and others have shown, both Jacobitism and anti-Jacobitism were pervasive themes and motifs in the language and discourse of the eighteenth century British archipelago. As such, they provide a great deal of information

about political and religious cultures in Scotland, Ireland and England.⁹² The various Atlantic colonies under the control of the British monarchy in the eighteenth century were an integral part of the British world. It is likely that language and ideas regarding Jacobitism, and the realities this language underscored, so prevalent in the British Isles, would be a pervasive themes in the larger British Atlantic. An examination of the variety of conceptions and understandings of Jacobitism within the British Atlantic provides a great deal of insight into a British Atlantic culture, Atlantic connections between ideologies and denominations, and illustrates an important aspect of the emerging empire.

This prompts two distinct but interrelated research questions. First, how was Jacobitism manifested in the colonies? As mentioned above, Jacobitism as a political ideology does not require rebellious action in order to be legitimate or to be worthy of further study. The limited number of works examining Jacobitism as a part of religious or political party or ideology in the colonies in the aftermath of 1688 articulates the general, unspoken assumption that Jacobitism did not exist in the British colonial world, except perhaps in isolated cases. Yet if the Revolution of 1688 was a transatlantic phenomenon, it is likely that there would be shared implications for the aftermath of the rebellions. This points us towards the potential for studies of Jacobitism in the colonies. In 1997 Ned Landsman noted that ‘there were few avowed Jacobites in America.’⁹³ Although the statement is probably accurate, seeing that not many people would openly admit treasonous beliefs, it needlessly and unfortunately infers much more than Landsman may have originally intended. His argument implies that the absence of vocal,

⁹² Monod, *Jacobitism*; Pittock, *Poetry and Jacobite Politics*; Eamon O’Ciardha, *Ireland and the Jacobite Cause, 1685-1766: A Fatal Attachment* (Dublin, 2002); Paul Fritz, *The English Ministers and Jacobitism Between the Rebellions of 1715 and 1745* (Toronto, 1975).

⁹³ Ned Landsman, *From Colonials to Provincials: American Thought and Culture, 1680-1760* (New York, 1997), 151.

avowed Jacobites can be equated with the absence of Jacobitism. This is not necessarily true. Very few individuals harbouring Jacobite sympathies would have openly professed their affection for a Stuart king or their disaffection towards a Hanoverian king, as doing so could result in serious repercussions. Moreover, the colonies were not a strategically sensible place to stage a rebellion, but it is a stretch to argue that the lack of rebellion can be equated with the absence of sympathy for restoration. The absence of Jacobite led or inspired rebellions in the Atlantic colonies, while perhaps suggesting that an active ideological Jacobitism or explicit support for the exiled Stuart dynasty directly comparable in scope or power to that in Scotland, England and Ireland did not exist, does not mean that Jacobitism as a part of the transatlantic cultural, social, and political *milieu* of Britain did not exist. In fact, the absence of rebellion means that a proper understanding of Jacobitism, as a part of the political or religious culture, and transatlantic public sphere is all the more important in an Atlantic context.

The suggestion the Jacobitism was part and parcel of a larger, shared British culture prompts the second research question. What can Jacobitism tell us about a pan-Atlantic British political culture? Rather than assuming that the absence of rebellions leaves little to be studied or that Jacobitism in the colonies can be easily explained away as a cultural anomaly or a fanciful fabrication, the presence of references within the political, religious, and cultural discourse to open Jacobitism in the colonies indicates the operation of a transatlantic British political culture. Jacobitism was an essential part of eighteenth century British political, religious, and print culture and therefore it is likely to have been an important element of an eighteenth century British Atlantic culture. The very existence of a transatlantic Jacobite subculture, despite the absence of rebellions, as

a part of the colonial vernacular culture illustrates the contemporary relevance of Jacobitism in a religious, political, and cultural context. Many Puritans in New England were quick to use accusations of Jacobitism against those who professed high church Anglican beliefs. Though there was no likelihood of a local rebellion seeking to topple a colonial government, these should not be dismissed as paranoia or empty rhetoric. Reactions against local manifestations of a transatlantic Jacobitism, as it was understood, or responses to a transatlantic Jacobite threat, should clearly suggest the cultural understandings of Jacobitism as well as the importance and the widespread nature of Jacobitism as an integral part of the cultural totality of the British Atlantic World.

This thesis will demonstrate that Jacobitism appeared in political and religious controversies within an Atlantic public sphere and will argue that Jacobitism, as a vital element of British political culture, was an integral facet of transatlantic political culture in the British Atlantic World in the age of Anne. To substantiate this claim, it is necessary to set a strong contextual background by examining various aspects of the culture and society in which Jacobitism existed in the Atlantic world. Part one of this thesis takes a thematic approach, encompassing the entirety of the British Atlantic World excepting West Africa. The first chapter examines the relationship between Jacobitism, party politics, and imperial governance following the revolution of 1688. Issues about the legitimacy of William's invasion and accession were not solely debated in the British Isles. Whig and Tory party divisions in Britain rooted in religious conflicts affected political developments throughout the British Atlantic, including imperial appointments and colonial interests. Thus, colonists were not only exposed to the realities of party political divisions, they were also willing participants. This connected them directly to

elements of a transatlantic political culture inherently related to Jacobitism through Toryism and Whig perceptions of a Tory Jacobite threat.

Chapter two discusses the relationship between Jacobitism and religious beliefs. Jacobitism was rooted in the ideologies of divine hereditary right, passive obedience, and non-resistance prevalent in both the Anglican Church and among Scottish Episcopalians. These confessional groups provided an ideological foundation for Jacobitism and it is therefore necessary to examine the role of the churches in an Atlantic context to fully understand colonial understandings and expressions of Jacobitism and disaffection. Similarly, Whig and Tory politics were divided along religious lines. Divisions between high church and low church Anglicans, and Anglican and Episcopalian attitudes towards dissenters, were flashpoints in a British party political system and political culture; a problem exacerbated by the conspicuous high church Tory relationship with Jacobitism. Catholicism, too, was inherently tied to Jacobitism due to the religious affiliation of the exiled Stuarts.

Chapter three posits the existence of, and discusses the importance of transatlantic Jacobitism and anti-Jacobitism within an Atlantic public sphere. Party political debates during the reigns of William, Anne, and George I were not confined to the roll calls and votes of Westminster or its colonial equivalents. Nor were religious controversies relegated to the Anglican Convocation. Grub Street, coffeehouses, inns, taverns, and the popular press were instrumental in shaping political and religious debates in London and similar patterns were emerging in the colonies. Slanderous polemics, religious and political pamphlets, newspapers, and broadsides were part and parcel of a transatlantic print culture, and where printing was not widely available, in private correspondence.

These informal and non-institutional networks of information exchange facilitated the communication of elements of a Jacobite subculture as well as anti-Jacobite rhetoric.

After examining these three thematic issues, part two of the thesis provides separate case studies, each illustrating aspects of the broader contexts mentioned above, within a specific colonial context. Chapter four will examine the debate surrounding the passage of Establishment and Test Acts in South Carolina in 1704 and their relationship to debates about occasional conformity in England. The passage of these acts was tied to party political developments in London and clearly demonstrates elements of a transatlantic political culture. The controversies surrounding the passage of the Acts resulted in numerous accusations of Jacobitism. Furthermore, the acts were an essential component in the creation of a transatlantic high church culture in the colony, a culture which encouraged and inculcated Jacobite sympathies. Chapter five explores the relationship between a nascent high church culture, a Whig governor, and Jacobitism in the Mid-Atlantic Colonies of New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania in the period leading up to and surrounding the Jacobite rebellion of 1715. The chapter provides a colourful example of the heady mix caused by imperial politics, religious developments and an emerging print culture. Chapter six demonstrates the relevance of Jacobitism and the significance of debates about Jacobitism in New England print culture, focusing especially on the years surrounding the Atterbury Plot. Though predominantly Whig, New England was not isolated from British Atlantic developments. Its maturing print culture fostered a series of religious controversies reflecting expressions of the transatlantic Jacobite subculture, and consequently, elements of an informed, political and religiously minded anti-Jacobitism.

IV

A study of Jacobitism in the British Atlantic poses two primary conceptual and material difficulties. Firstly, if Jacobites are notoriously difficult to identify in Britain, the same is true for their provincial equivalents. Jacobites were not keen to allow evidence of sedition to remain available for contemporaries, and therefore, for posterity. Thus, most of the evidence available is in the form of accusations and legal penalties. Accusations are difficult sources to interpret as they might possibly be malicious and inaccurate. However, this thesis is not a Jacobite witch hunt and therefore, not an examination of Jacobites. Rather, it is an examination of Jacobitism as a part of a transatlantic political culture. Rather than providing a series of smoking guns (which are not needed), the accusations provide evidence of a transatlantic culture. Paul Monod has argued regarding Jacobite seditious words that context is essential for evaluating the veracity of accusations and this proves true for accusations of Jacobitism in the colonies.⁹⁴ Individuals accused tended to conform to the general contours of Jacobitism outlined above: nonjuring, high church, Scottish Episcopalian, and Tory. It is the context that informs us about the political culture and the reasoning behind the charge. If the accusations in the colonies are understood within the context of the well-established historiography of Jacobitism in Britain, discussed previously, they strongly indicate the likelihood of Jacobite sympathies among those accused and provide a more comprehensive understanding of Britain's Atlantic world.

A second problem arises from the geographical scope of the project and the diversity of source material required for the thematic chapters. Together, these factors made it impossible to exhaustively review every relevant local archive. However, this

⁹⁴ Monod, *Jacobitism*, 239.

project is not dependent on a serendipitous discovery of a trove of new documents. Instead, it re-examines available sources, many of them printed, in order to provide a reinterpretation of Jacobitism in the British Atlantic. These include the papers of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts (available on microfilm), the Fulham Palace papers and the Calendar of State Papers Colonial (CSPC) series. These collections have proven especially important because they involve two groups more likely to be informed about and involved with elements of a Jacobite subculture. The SPG papers and the Fulham Palace papers include a voluminous amount of correspondence between Anglican missionaries sent to the colonies and the society, headquartered in Britain. It also contains correspondence from government officials, church vestries and the Bishop of London. The CSPC provides a well-edited collection of correspondence and official papers sent to and from government officials in the colonies and London. Both collections remark regularly upon religious and political developments. Due to the number of correspondents, these wide-ranging collections provide a great diversity of viewpoints. They offer an excellent foundation for demonstrating the significance of Jacobitism in transatlantic discussions in both religious and political contexts. These materials have been supplemented by further manuscript sources and a wide variety of contemporary prints, all of which have reinforced the significance of Jacobitism in the British Atlantic World.

Jacobitism, Party Politics and the British Atlantic World

In the late seventeenth century the British Empire in the Atlantic was a variegated, institutionally disjointed entity; in many respects, little more than a patchwork of diverse religious, political, ethnic, and economic cultures. Though largely English, settlers also migrated from Scotland, Ireland, and Continental Europe under the aegis of a composite British monarchy. Adding to the confusion, government structures and church establishments varied from colony to colony. Pennsylvania, Maryland, and South Carolina, among others, were proprietary colonies governed by proprietors and not the crown. Virginia and a number of the Caribbean colonies were royal colonies whose governors were royal appointees answerable to the King. By the late seventeenth century, England and Scotland possessed, through plantation or conquest, nearly twenty Atlantic colonies, each with a separate and unique government or charter, creating a lively variety of local institutions and political cultures. These diverse settlements, scattered throughout the Caribbean islands and across the eastern seaboard of the North American mainland, had little to unite them with each other or the British Isles other than a shared history, heritage, and the knowledge that they were part of a larger empire. Although the empire was a strange mix of state and private enterprises, the colonies, from Puritan New England in the north to the Caribbean plantations further south, looked to London as the metropolitan centre of an expanding empire. Although largely lacking a coherent

institutional imperial structure, the empire was knit together by ideologies, families, commerce, conceptions of law, and understandings of liberty.

As noted in the introduction, the history of Britain's Atlantic empire is often treated by historians of Britain as a distinct, separate field of inquiry outwith British history, despite David Armitage's plea to pursue 'Greater Britain,' including the Atlantic world, as a category of historical analysis.¹ Historians of Colonial America have been quick to adopt Atlantic approaches and appropriate elements of the 'new British History' and, in doing so, have detailed similarities between Britain and the colonies and have noted important connections regarding British religious and cultural identities.² The reluctance of British historians to include the history of the British Atlantic Empire either within 'new British history' or in an Atlantic framework has resulted in a strange divergence; historians of the American colonies are becoming increasingly mindful of British history while British histories, although examining issues with transatlantic ramifications, remain peculiarly parochial.³

British party politics exemplifies this problem. Prodigious amounts of scholarship have debated the origins, structures, and ideologies of British party politics in the early eighteenth century.⁴ Parties were divided by issues of religion, finance, and

¹ Armitage, 'Greater Britain', 427-445.

² For historians using Atlantic and 'new British History' see Stanwood, *Empire Reformed*; Jack P. Green, 'Empire and Identity from the Glorious Revolution to the America Revolution,' in *Oxford History of the British Empire*, vol 2, ed. by P.J. Marshall (Oxford, 1998), 208-230; For a discussion of new British History, Pocock, 'British History: A Plea for a New Subject', 601-621.

³ The Revolution of 1688 provides a perfect example of this trend. Colonial historians are beginning to see it in a larger transatlantic perspective Dunn, 'The Glorious Revolution and America,' 445-466, while admirable studies which employ a three kingdoms approach and encompass the British Isles have very little to say about Britain's colonies, Tim Harris, *Revolution: The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720* (London, 2007); see also, Szechi, *1715*.

⁴ Holmes, *British Politics*; Speck, *Tory and Whig*; Speck, *The Birth of Britain*; Harris, *Politics Under the Later Stuarts*.

theories of empire and though this party conflict is well established in a British context, the impact of this party conflict has not yet been adequately examined in the British Atlantic. In fact, little is known about how people in the British Colonies participated in British politics. This is remarkable as party conflict affected appointments, among other things, directly connecting colonists to British party divisions. Moreover, party politics was also undoubtedly linked to questions concerning the Protestant succession, an event with dramatic imperial consequences. Daniel Szechi has demonstrated the overlap evident in Jacobitism and Tory politics during the rage of party in Britain, focusing on the years 1710 to 1714.⁵ As the appointments discussed below illustrate, this blurred line between Toryism and Jacobitism was instrumental in shaping colonists' views of Jacobitism. The existence of Jacobitism and Toryism in the British Atlantic suggests, whether the result of local politics or imperial appointments, the likelihood and significance of both in larger transatlantic interactions. Jacobitism was a central aspect of Tory and Whig political divisions, and therefore, is an integral element of a British Atlantic World.

This chapter seeks to rectify (in a small way) the tendency of British historians to neglect the Atlantic world. It does so by outlining the significance of Jacobitism and party politics in the British Atlantic and suggests that Jacobitism, broadly defined as a part of the cultural totality of the British Atlantic and an integral facet of Whig and Tory divisions, acted as a linking element joining disparate political cultures in the British Atlantic World to a divided British body politic; an important theme in the case studies presented later. Moreover, Jacobitism as a key component of British party divisions was

⁵ Szechi, *Jacobitism and Tory Politics*.

inherently tied to other integrative features linking Britain's Atlantic world such as anti-Catholicism and the Protestant succession. The chapter firstly examines overt expressions of Jacobitism in the British Atlantic and demonstrates the existence of elements of a Jacobite subculture within the British Atlantic colonies, especially in the years 1689 to 1727. Secondly, building on the explanation of the existence of a transatlantic Jacobite subculture, it explores the impact and importance of British party politics in the management of Britain's Atlantic Empire in order to explain the continued existence and manifestation of Jacobite sympathies among colonists. This in turn, helps explain the lasting currency of accusations of Jacobitism. By doing so, it contributes to the larger discussion of the remarkable transatlantic impact of Britain's politically divided society and demonstrates the significance of Jacobitism in the political culture of the British Atlantic World.

The scope of this chapter does not allow for a detailed, study of the practice of politics in specific colonial contexts, with attention to local issues and interest groups. It is much more interested in outlining the transatlantic connections between colonial and British political cultures, with special attention reserved for Toryism and Jacobitism. As such, it relies heavily on the Calendar of State Papers, Colonial series, which constitutes an extensive body of correspondence between officials in the colonies and mainland British politicians. This is supplemented by other sources including printed pamphlets and manuscript correspondence, both official and unofficial.

After the restoration of the monarchy in 1660 the British presence in the Atlantic expanded rapidly. Charles II and James II & VII actively pursued imperial projects. The monarchs oversaw the acquisition of new territories through conquest and also used land grants to reward supporters resulting in the proprietary colonies of New York (1664), Pennsylvania (1682), the Jerseys (1664), and Carolina (1663). Each colony possessed a unique government structure and ethnic make-up creating a vast diversity of experience in Britain's empire. This institutional diversity caused numerous problems of government and administration; not least the constant tension between the English government and the colonial peripheries concerning constitutional issues.⁶ Unable to maintain imperial control during periods of uncertainty, the few imperial officials on foot in the colonies were ineffectual during times of institutional chaos, especially 1689. The proprietors, owners of colonies in the possession of private individuals, in the Jerseys and elsewhere were constantly in conflict with settlers, and colonists throughout the British Atlantic pursued illicit trading and smuggling in order to avoid the laws on trade imposed by the Navigation Acts. In order to curtail colonial resistance to the Navigation Acts and create a more centralised empire, Charles II and his successor James II & VII had begun by 1685 the process of revoking proprietary colonial charters and reorganising the empire in a manner similar to the Spanish empire in the Americas as a means of centralising authority in the crown.

Their schemes for remodelling the empire ended abruptly in 1689. The effects of Britain's revolution of 1688 reverberated across the Atlantic and resulted in a number of local revolts. Revolts in Boston, New York, and Maryland capitalized on William's

⁶ Jack P. Greene, *Peripheries and Center: Constitutional Development in the Extended Politics of the British Empire and the United States* (Athens, GA, 1986).

invasion and ousted James II & VII's or, in the case of Maryland, the proprietor's appointees.⁷ Rooted in a profound fear of Catholicism and the possible tyranny of central authority, these revolts reflect a shared political culture antithetical to popery while also demonstrating the colonial elites' dissatisfaction with the local impact of James II & VII's imperial designs. Although they were in part a reaction against greater imperial control, the revolts paradoxically resulted in an increased government control; a trend marked by the cohesion of disparate political cultures. As a result, the revolts, though in ways profoundly local, helped foster elements of a predominantly Whig British Atlantic political culture. A key component of this culture centred on the Protestant succession and Protestant monarchy.⁸ Yet the Protestant succession was not without its critics in Britain, and after 1688 there was a brief civil war in Scotland, a two year long war in Ireland, and almost constant political unrest in England.

Similarly, William of Orange's accession was not uncontested in the colonies. While few in the mainland colonies proved to be overly sympathetic to the Catholic James II & VII's plight, numerous colonists in the Caribbean were less reluctant to openly support James for a variety of reasons echoing responses from the British Isles. For example, in April 1689 Nathaniel Johnson, Governor of the Leeward Islands, wrote to an unknown correspondent in England that he would remain loyal to James despite his knowledge that James had retreated to France. His support was rooted in high church Tory understandings of passive obedience and non-resistance. Johnson claimed in his

⁷ Stanwood, *Empire Reformed*; Lovejoy, *The Glorious Revolution in America*; Dunn, 'The Glorious Revolution and America,' 445-466;

⁸ Stanwood, *Empire Reformed*; McConville, *The King's Three Faces*; Jack P. Green, 'Empire and Identity'; Thomas Kidd, *The Protestant Interest*.

letter that 'I think the Church of England teaches me the doctrine of non-resistance'.⁹

Johnson's eventual resignation from his post provides a reminder that colonial governors were not immune from the divisions disturbing Britain and that the colonies also witnessed similar divisions following the Revolution of 1688.

Nor was Johnson an isolated case of disaffection in the colonies. In 1689 the chaplain of a ship commanded by Admiral Hewetson reported that during the period of uncertainty following William's invasion the Admiral forced him to continue to pray for King James. Even upon receiving news of William's accession, the Admiral would not relent and bade the chaplain to pray for the exiled King.¹⁰ Sir Thomas Montgomerie, a recent convert to Catholicism in Barbados, carried on an extensive correspondence with French Jesuits in the Caribbean and acquaintances in England. Montgomerie received updates from his correspondents regarding William's invasion of England and James's intended invasion of Ireland.¹¹ Montgomerie's pursuit of patronage and power during the reign of James II & VII, including his conversion, proved rather untimely for him. The Lieutenant Governor of the island acquired Montgomerie's incriminating correspondence and had him arrested for conspiring with the French. A year later, Montgomerie was still in prison and Governor Kendall wrote to England that he believed Montgomerie's crimes were of a treasonable nature and, consequently, he was disinclined to release him. Kendall believed that the prisoner was still inclined to James and would 'escape to him if released'. He contrasted this with one of Montgomerie's allies, also in prison, who in

⁹ *CSPC*, 25 April 1689, item 88.

¹⁰ *CSPC*, 11 July 1689, item 247.

¹¹ *CSPC*, 30 May 1689, item 157i.

Kendall's opinion was a 'fat fool' who had changed his religion in hopes of gaining advantage.¹²

Some of those who proved to be hostile to the Revolution resorted to violence. Following the proclamation of William and Mary's accession and the onset of the Nine Years War between England and France 'malicious people of the Irish nation' revolted in support of James in the Leeward Islands. One deposition attested to the fact that the rebellious Irish were flying colours which observers noted they called 'King James's colours.'¹³ Another witness remarked that the Irish had 'set up a red flag with four white balls and J.R. thereon', likely referencing Jacobus Rex, and were threatening to kill any who would not declare for King James.¹⁴ Moreover, the Irish were supported by the French, who not only provided a safe haven for the rebels but attacked the English island of Anguilla, 'administered an oath of allegiance to King James' and installed an Irishman as governor.¹⁵ As late as 1694 the governor of Jamaica wrote that the Irish were providing intelligence to the French and that Roman Catholics and Irish went to serve the French as privateers because they 'thought it their duty to serve King James.'¹⁶

There were other more subtle acts of resistance to William III & II's accession. A number of officials throughout the colonies refused to take the oaths of allegiance to William and Mary required after their accession. In 1691 James Bray, a member of Virginia's House of Burgesses, refused to take the oaths and was disabled as a member. Two months later the Lieutenant Governor of Virginia explained that three of Virginia's

¹² *CSPC*, 26 June 1690, item 968.

¹³ *CSPC*, 9 July 1689, item 237

¹⁴ *CSPC*, 11 July 1689, item 253ii.

¹⁵ *CSPC*, 19 September 1689, item 444.

¹⁶ *CSPC*, 18 August 1694, items 1236 and 1236i.

councillors refused to take the required oaths from a 'scruple of conscience.'¹⁷ Isaac Richier, the governor of Bermuda, noted that the master of a ship and three mariners thought it 'no harm to perjure themselves when it is against the King,' suggesting the men harboured a sense of the illegitimacy of William III & II's accession.¹⁸ These subtle acts of resistance were not always voluntary. Officials in the colonies often knew of men who might not be reconciled to the accession of William and Mary and used oaths as a weapon against them. In 1698 the council of Maryland was advised that 'Mr. Joseph's seems to be a person disaffected' to the government and the council suggested that Josephs take the oaths appointed by parliament. Josephs refused to take the oaths 'saying that it was his opinion that if he took those oaths he renounced his God.'¹⁹ This is clearly an echo of events in Britain where a number of men, including ten English peers, sixty members of Parliament, and around 100 gentry families accepted lives of political exile rather than swear the oaths.²⁰ Thus, those in the colonies who refused the oaths were not isolated anomalies, but rather were part of a larger, transatlantic disaffected minority. Refusal to swear the oaths was at the very least a tacit acknowledgement that William III & II had usurped the crown, indicating that at least some colonists felt discomfort, if not disaffection, with the Revolution settlement and a likely sympathy for the exiled Stuarts.

In addition to rebellion and the refusal to acknowledge the legitimacy of William and Mary, seditious words were also the cause of regular complaints in the colonies. Although in many cases the context of both the background of the accused and the intentions of the accuser remain obscure, the nature of the words reported and the

¹⁷ *CSPC*, 18 May 1691, item 1510; *CSPC*, 10 June 1691, item 1583.

¹⁸ *CSPC*, 16 October 1691, item 1843.

¹⁹ *AOM*, vol 23, 513.

²⁰ Monod, *Jacobitism*, 142.

punishment inflicted indicate the seriousness with which authorities viewed the charge. Moreover, it suggests the likely accuracy of the accusations. It is also worth noting that the seditious words spoken in the colonies reveal a striking similarity to examples from England. Paul Monod has argued that evidence of spoken seditious words might not reveal a deep ideologically committed Jacobite, but it does indicate a level of disaffection and the persistence of Jacobitism as a meaningful element of British political culture; a claim equally true regarding examples from the colonies.²¹ Certainly, colonists understood the danger inherent in speaking or condoning the expression of seditious words, either in the form of prison, prosecution, fines, or the possibility of losing one's post, and so the examples imply a level of dissatisfaction with the revolution settlement making the presence of seditious words in the colonies a reminder of the cultural connections and discourses spanning the Atlantic. Also, just as in England, colonial complaints and prosecutions of seditious words witnessed a decline during the reign of Anne, a queen much more acceptable to Jacobites than either William III & II or George I, indicating that the words spoken demonstrate a genuine expression of disaffection.

Examples of seditious expressions appear as early as 1689. The numerous instances echo the sentiments of contemporaries in the British Isles. In July of 1689 the governor of Barbados noted that many people were 'taking the oaths cheerfully' but that a handful of men were in custody and would soon stand trial for using 'dangerous words.'²² A number of colonists faced stiff penalties as a consequence of their liberty of speech. In Maryland in 1697 Richard Smith, a Catholic and a person 'reputed to be a factious person much disaffected to his Majesty,' was forced to put up £2000 of security

²¹ Monod, *Jacobitism*, 234-244

²² *CSPC*, 2 September 1689, item 397.

for countenancing Jacobitism at his house by ‘laughing and grinning’ when Thomas Johnson said he would ‘never take an oath to any but King James.’²³ The council of Jamaica required James Hands to ‘answer for scandalous words spoken against their Majesties’ and reported the next week that Hands had been dismissed upon giving security for good behaviour.²⁴ Another complaint from Jamaica noted a Catholic exclaiming that ‘the Prince of Orange was a Dutch bastard’ and that ‘the people of the West were always rebelling and that he hoped one stone would not be left upon another in Exeter.’²⁵ Similarly, in 1700 the governor of Barbados reported on the arrest of ‘one George Duncan, a Scotchman’ who had spoken ‘several seditious words against his Majesty.’ Resulting from passions aroused by the failure of the Darien colony and a bit of strong drink, Duncan had declared that ‘the Scotch were as good as the English, no subjects of King William, and that there would soon be a change.’²⁶ Duncan’s lack of reticence can no doubt be attributed partly to his fondness for drink, but this intoxication does not discount the apparent disaffection underlying his statements or the importance of the transatlantic context of the words he chose to use.

Other seditious words cases indicate that imperial officials were implicated as complicit in the act or lenient towards the speaker. In the Leeward Islands in 1697 Captain Robert Arthur, ‘formerly commander of H.M.S. Mary’, was ‘committed for scandalous and treasonable words against the King and Government.’²⁷ His comments included statements damning the King and suggesting that ‘King William had never done good to the Kingdom’ because he was cursed by God for ‘taking it from his father to

²³ *AOM*, vol 23, 468.

²⁴ *CSPC*, 3 February 1690, item 753; *CSPC*, 10 February, item 758.

²⁵ *CSPC*, 29 January 1690, item 874v.

²⁶ *CSPC*, 23 March 1700, items 245, 245ii.

²⁷ *CSPC*, 12 February 1699, 219.

whom it justly belonged.’ Though brought to trial, Arthur was released because the witnesses necessary for his conviction were sailors whose ship had been sent on patrol by the governor. Governor Codrington’s opponents used his involvement in the dispatching of the witnesses to accuse him of supporting Arthur or condoning his actions and using his position to secure Arthur’s acquittal.²⁸

Although lacking the more substantial numbers of instances available in Britain, it is possible to discern a decline in the number of accusations and prosecutions of seditious words in the colonies during the reign of Anne, a trend similar to that in England. In the years 1702 to 1714, either those guilty were less likely to be prosecuted or there was less reason for many to be disaffected, as Anne was much more palatable to the Jacobites than had been William III & II or George I. However, just as in Britain, after the 1714 accession of George I there are notable examples of outspoken disaffection. Two men in Philadelphia were tried and punished for speaking against George I’s right to the throne.²⁹ In New Hampshire a customs official and ‘noted Irish Jacobite’ named Robert Armstrong was reported to have said, ‘Is it not a shame that we should be governed by Germans and Dutch, and have such a fine English prince of our own, but I hope I shall yet live to see the right heir upon the throne.’³⁰ The charges against Armstrong were serious enough that it appears the Board of Trade removed him from his post.³¹

There was also a remarkable use of Jacobite cant and seditious words by pirates for at least a decade after 1715 which suggests that the language of party politics and

²⁸ *CSPC*, 6 November 1697, items 31ii and 31i.

²⁹ *AMW*, 23 March 1721, no. 66.

³⁰ *CSPC*, 16 November 1722, item 345; ‘Journals’ November 1722, *Journals of the Board of Trade and Plantations*, vol 4: November 1718-1722, ed. by K.H. Ledward, <http://www.britishhistory.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=81488&strquery=>, accessed 15/05/2013.

³¹ *CSPC*, 20 August 1723, item 685.

sedition words were an essential aspect of a British Atlantic culture even as far down the social scale as plebeian criminals, thus providing a parallel to the relationship between Jacobitism and crime in England.³² E. T. Fox has shown that pirates, like smugglers in England, routinely uttered seditious words and some even corresponded with Jacobites in England.³³ For example, the famous pirate Bartholomew Roberts reputedly called King George a Turnip man.³⁴ Similarly, after the Jacobite Rebellion of 1715 pirates named their ships after prominent Tory leaders involved in the rebellion, including ships named *King James*, *Ormonde*, and *Windham Galley*.³⁵ The notorious pirate Blackbeard named his ship *Queen Anne's Revenge* further suggesting an acute political awareness among pirates.³⁶ Fox has further argued that the use of these seditious words represented the political beliefs of the pirates involved and a tool used to recruit new comrades through a shared disaffection to Hanoverian succession.³⁷ Monod's claim that Jacobitism provided criminals 'a means to legitimise their defiance of the law' is likely applicable to the pirates.³⁸

These instances of seditious words, spread out as they are over Britain's Atlantic colonies, are arguably local, isolated examples. However, if understood as common to a larger British Atlantic political culture, rather than representing colonial abnormalities, they demonstrate cultural and political cohesion in Britain's Atlantic empire in the years following the Revolution of 1688. Certain examples, such as those of Duncan, Sharpe, or the Irish rebels, illustrate the importance of ethnicity and the migration of people of a

³² Monod, *Jacobitism*, 111-119.

³³ E.T. Fox, 'Jacobitism and the 'Golden Age' of Piracy,' in the *International Journal of Maritime History* 22 (2010), 277-303, 286.

³⁴ Ibid, 288.

³⁵ Ibid, 287-288.

³⁶ Ibid, 303.

³⁷ Ibid, 296.

³⁸ Monod, *Jacobitism*, 113.

variety of ethnic backgrounds, and the consequent integration of Scottish and Irish political cultures into a comprehensive British Atlantic political culture. While these examples reflect larger themes such as a shared antipathy towards William III & II and George I, they also demonstrate the expression of uniquely Scottish, Irish, or provincial complaints within an Atlantic framework. Seditious words are not the full extent of expressions of Jacobitism in the British Atlantic World, but they serve to offer tantalizing glimpses of a political culture which bridged the Atlantic. They also demonstrate aspects of one of the most striking patterns that emerged regarding colonial political culture during the age of Anne: the intensification of colonial political integration into a larger British Atlantic political culture following the Revolution of 1688.

II

While seditious words and overt Jacobitism mark an important element of cohesion between political cultures, they represent only a minor manifestation of the integration of British and colonial political cultures in the age of party which dominated the 'age of Anne'. In the aftermath of the revolution of 1688, the English, and after 1707 the British, Empire experienced a long process of institutional reorganisation, a process that occurred in the context of vicious party divisions. This in turn, led to the formation of a new Atlantic political culture in the decades following 1688.³⁹ Historians disagree on precisely when and how this change took place. Alison Olson attributes the change to the prominence of informal interest groups in the first decade of the eighteenth century.⁴⁰ Stephen Saunders Webb attributes the change to the influence and patronage of the Duke of Marlborough as evidenced by his role in appointing governors who were able to

³⁹ Stanwood, *Empire Reformed*; McConville, *The King's Three Faces*; Kidd, *The Protestant Interest*; Olson, *Making the Empire Work*; Olson, *Anglo-American Politics*.

⁴⁰ Olson, *Making the Empire Work*, 61.

implement elements of the fiscal-military revolution in the colonies.⁴¹ Owen Stanwood and Brendan McConville have convincingly argued that this reformation occurred in the wake of 1688-9 and was due largely to a shared anti-popery, the concerted use of anti-Catholic rhetoric by imperial officials and a ‘cult of Protestant monarchy’ respectively.⁴² These are certainly vital aspects of the emergent British Atlantic political culture, yet all of these individual elements are inherently tied to the overarching and primary means by which the colonies were integrated into an Atlantic political culture: through participation in the party conflicts of the period known as the ‘rage of party.’ British historians such as Mark Knights and others have demonstrated that anti-popery and a celebration of the Protestant monarchy were, in part, elements of a Whiggish political rhetoric disparaged by many Tories as little more than a means of engendering fear and hysteria.⁴³ As such, colonial expressions of anti-Catholicism and support for the protestant succession, as addressed by historians, demonstrate predominantly Whig aspects of integration. They are, however, also representative features of party conflict, a trend especially apparent during the reign of Anne.

Certainly, the rancorous division between the Whig and Tory parties was one of the most notable features of the post 1688 British state.⁴⁴ British society was divided by an increasingly polarized political sphere. This party polarization increasingly led to the assumption that the opposing political party was antithetical to the prosperity or future of Britain. Debates about the church, political economy, and the succession tore

⁴¹ Webb, *Marlborough's America*.

⁴² Stanwood, *Empire Reformed*, 3, 20; McConville, *The King's Three Faces*, 15.

⁴³ Mark Knights, ‘The Tory Interpretation of History in the Rage of Parties,’ in *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, vol. 68, no. 1-2 (2005), 353-373; Scott Sowerby, ‘Opposition to Anti-Popery in Restoration England,’ in *Journal of British Studies*, vol 51, no. 1 (2012), 26-49.

⁴⁴ Holmes, *British Politics*; Speck, *Tory and Whig*; Speck, *The Birth of Britain*; Linda Colley, *In Defiance of Oligarchy*

constituencies apart and divided England, Scotland, and Ireland, and consequently, the British Atlantic. In England relatively sophisticated party systems mobilised and encouraged a large percentage of the population to participate in politics and elections.⁴⁵ These party divisions affected, to a large degree, the management of the colonies, including appointments and imperial policies. Consequently, party politics reverberated across the Atlantic.

From 1688 to 1715, Tories and Whigs battled for parliamentary supremacy. The primary Tory means of garnering political support was by exclaiming that the Church of England was threatened by the growth of dissent and heresy, and they attributed these problems to the Toleration act of 1689. Tory champions such as Henry Sacheverell, the high church cleric, used fiery religious rhetoric to ridicule the revolution settlement, and leading Tory politicians responsible for the creation of a ‘church party’, such as Bolingbroke, were in contact with the exiled Stuart Court, suggesting to antagonistic contemporaries that the Tory party was, at least in part, a Jacobite party. Thus, though the Whigs possessed no symbol of electoral importance comparable to the church in danger, they were able to rally around the Protestant succession, and disparage their Tory enemies as subversive enemies of the Revolution and the succession, especially, as Daniel Szechi has shown, in the latter years of Anne’s reign.⁴⁶ As a consequence, Jacobitism and anti-Jacobitism became an integral aspect of party politics in early eighteenth century Britain. Yet party struggles, propaganda, and language extended well beyond those Britons immediately involved in elections or governing.

⁴⁵ Speck, *Tory and Whig*, 18.

⁴⁶ Szechi, *Jacobitism and Tory Politics*.

Provincial Britons in the colonies possessed a shared history, heritage, and language with Britain and as a consequence were well placed to participate in the English party system contested by the Whig and Tory parties. This is not to say that colonists created complex party organisations as were evident in Britain. Local political issues such as taxes and trade, and the practice of politics including elections, appointments, and the differences in representation caused by smaller assemblies often differed markedly from those in Britain. Nevertheless, colonists began to contextualise local issues and events in terms of British party politics. By doing so, colonists participated in the culture of British party politics and actively identified themselves and their opponents in party terms. This adoption of Whig and Tory party language facilitated the creation of Whig and Tory interests in the colonies, a process inevitably linked to attitudes towards Jacobitism and the succession.

This colonial process has remarkable similarities to the integrative process in Scottish and Irish politics in the early eighteenth century as argued by David Hayton, and the same caveats apply. Hayton has argued that the introduction of party politics in Ireland was not simply produced by provincials following an English example, but rather a ‘complex interaction between two political worlds.’⁴⁷ He has shown that in both Ireland and Scotland, local issues may have predominated but that as influential individuals associated with an English party rose to prominence, such as the Duke of Ormonde in Ireland, locals appropriated party language and intentionally participated in

⁴⁷ David Hayton, *Ruling Ireland, 1685-1742: Politics, Politicians, and Parties* (London, 2004), 94; David Hayton, ‘Traces of Party Politics in Early Eighteenth-Century Scottish Elections,’ in *Parliamentary History*, 16 (1996), 74-99; D.W. Hayton, ‘Irish Tories and Victims of Whig Persecution: Sacherverell Fever by Proxy,’ in *Parliamentary History*, 31 (2012), 80-98.

party disputes, effectively creating a British party dynamic.⁴⁸ Thus, party politics were not transplanted wholesale to the colonies nor was the actual practice of politics identically reproduced among local political cultures. What is evident, however, is the increasingly partisan nature of political language, rhetoric, accusations, and identifications among colonial officials and colonists. Language was certainly a vital element of party divisions. As local political leaders were drawn into party politics and employed loaded party language, their opponents were forced to participate as well. Although the colonies do not exhibit a mirror image of party organisation, practise, or electioneering in Britain, colonists assumed, through the use of party language, a tacit acceptance of British party dynamics. Imperial officers such as governors were conscious of their party connections and utilised them to great effect, further reinforcing the import of party politics among colonists. Also, as is evident in Scotland and Ireland, this political assimilation was made possible by and was inseparable from the Atlantic integration of a more efficient and timely communications network.⁴⁹ As chapter three explains, newspapers, broadsides, almanacs, and pamphlets all contributed to the colonial development of party consciousness and participation in party disputes.

Party politics in Britain affected both the ideological foundations of empire as well as the day to day functioning of imperial business. Ideological divisions ranged from debates about the role of the established church in relation to dissent, to foreign policy. In fact, there was little that did not divide the Whigs and the Tories. Steve Pincus has reintroduced party politics into understandings of empire and suggested in a recent series of articles, 'the rage of party was not simply about religious and constitutional

⁴⁸ Hayton, *Ruling Ireland*, 35-95; David Hayton, 'Traces of Party Politics' 74-99.

⁴⁹ Steele, *The English Atlantic*; This emergent public sphere is discussed in greater detail in chapter 3.

issues.’⁵⁰ Party divisions over ideology affected every area of imperial business and Pincus has demonstrated that ideology and economic practice were inseparable, further delineating the Whig and Tory parties. Tories largely sought a land based empire which would exploit natural resources while Whigs sought to implement an empire based on labour. These theories of trade, rooted in party politics, divided colonial merchants as well as their British counterparts and even affected imperial governance.⁵¹ Doubtless these ideological divisions had practical consequences, especially in the form of appointments, and Alison Olson and Ian Steele’s explorations of Anglo-American politics illustrate the assimilation of colonial issues, such as the future of proprietary charters, into the larger orbit of British party conflicts.⁵² These ideological contests had practical consequences and shaped both the conceptions and functioning of the Atlantic empire.

The wars that erupted between Britain and France in the aftermath of William and Mary’s accession forced British policy makers to reorganize imperial government. They also increased the government’s need for reliable information about the colonies. In 1696, William created the Board of Trade and Plantations, a small group of seven men who reported to the Secretary of State Southern Division, as a means of organising and facilitating imperial correspondence. The Board was responsible for gathering information, advising the government on colonial issues, and suggesting appointees for

⁵⁰ Steve Pincus, ‘Addison’s Empire: Whig Conceptions of Empire in the Early 18th Century’, in *Parliamentary History* 31 (2012), 99-117; Steve Pincus, ‘Rethinking Mercantilism: Political Economy, the British Empire, and the Atlantic World in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries,’ in *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 69 (2012), 3-34.

⁵¹ Geoffrey Plank, *An Unsettled Conquest: The British Campaign Against Acadia* (Philadelphia, 2001), 58-6

⁵² Olson, *Anglo-American Politics*, 104-105; Ian K. Steele, The Anointed, the Appointed, and the Elected: Governance of the British Empire, 1689-1784, in *The Oxford History of the British Empire, vol II, The Eighteenth Century*, ed. by P. J. Marshall (Oxford: 1998), 105-127.

colonial governorships. As such, it acted as a clearing house for a large amount of the correspondence and complaints arriving from the colonies, including information from proprietary colonies, and as such it was partly responsible for deciding what needed to be sent along to the Privy Council. Appointments to the Board were made by the Secretaries of State, Southern Division, a crown appointee and member of the cabinet, and consequently were subject to and reflected party divisions and the direction of imperial policy.⁵³

When the board was created in 1696, in the aftermath of the Assassination plot against William, it leaned heavily Whig and included figures such as John Locke and John Pollexfen. Out of the seven men appointed to the board, there was only one Tory, William Blathwayt. The make-up of the board affected communications with the colonial administrators. For example, Steele shows that two Tory governors received harsh letters from the board which were drafted during periods of Blathwayt's absence from the Board's meetings.⁵⁴

British politicians recognised the Board's value as a means of shaping colonial policy and, as a result, party politics wrought havoc on the membership of the Board. The makeup of the Board was hotly contested from 1702 to 1714. In 1702, when the Tories rose to power under Nottingham and Harley, Nottingham replaced some of the Whig members with loyal Tory appointees, the Earls of Weymouth and Dartmouth. The Tories suffered a reversal in 1706 when the Whig Junto rose to prominence and Charles Spencer, the Earl of Sunderland was appointed as Secretary of State, for the Southern

⁵³ Steele, *Politics of Colonial Policy*.

⁵⁴ Steele, *Politics of Colonial Policy*, 19-24.

Division. Sunderland replaced all Tory members with staunch Whigs. Following Sunderland's dismissal after the Tory ascendancy in 1710, the new Tory administration filled the Board with Tories, and by 1713 Bolingbroke was the Secretary responsible for Board appointments and colonial policy.⁵⁵ British historians have long accepted that Bolingbroke's political aim was 'to fill the employments of the kingdom, down to the meanest, with Tories' and Bolingbroke's role as Secretary of State meant that he could pursue the same aim for colonial appointments.⁵⁶

The political battle over the membership of the Board reflected the party orientation of the current ministry and had implications for officials of Britain's empire. In the quickly shifting political waters, governors, who might have been appointed during the administration of one party might find their allies out of power before they even arrived at their post. In such cases, the appointees were forced to correspond with a potentially hostile Board. Robert Hunter, for example, recognised the value of a friendly ministry. Hunter, governor of New York and New Jersey from 1710 to 1719 and a Whig appointee, wrote to the Duke of Montrose in 1714 following four years of Tory rule, that he had been 'hollowing complaints into deaf ears for four successive years I hope that is at an end, nothing confirmed me more that it was so then the reading your Grace's name in the list of the Lords of the Regency', the peers responsible for overseeing the successful accession of George I.⁵⁷ Hunter also wrote to his friend, the Whig essayist Joseph Addison, congratulating him on his being 'employed' in the new ministry. Knowing he had a sympathetic ear, he noted having suffered due to not having received a

⁵⁵ Ibid, 78-149.

⁵⁶ Dickinson, *Bolingbroke*, 76.

⁵⁷ NAS, GD220/5/1895, Robert Hunter to the Duke of Montrose, 20 December 1714.

reply to his ‘enumerable complaints’ during the ‘late administration.’⁵⁸ The Tory governor of Antigua, Daniel Parke, was elated when his antagonist, the Whig Earl of Sunderland was replaced in 1710.⁵⁹ Similarly, the Whig governor of Nova Scotia Samuel Vetch (1710-1713) complained in 1714 in a petition to the King that he had been ‘intirely neglected or rather abandoned by the ministry at home’ and despairingly related to another correspondent that he had sent repeated entreaties to the late ministry only to be ignored.⁶⁰ The Whig Earl of Bellomont, governor of New York lamented to the Board of Trade that it was ‘a misfortune to me and great prejudice to the King’s affairs here that your Lordships send me no orders’ and that his opponents were exulting in the fact that he was not receiving letters because they said it was a mark of disgrace.⁶¹

If governors felt secure knowing they had the support of a friendly Board, the colonists they governed, too, understood the value of a friendly or unfriendly ministry. In 1719, the critics of Robert Lowther, the Whig governor of Barbados, noted that Lowther thought his opponents’ political tranquillity cowardice, saying that it proceeded only from ‘their knowing that he stood so well with the ministry.’⁶² As a consequence, prominent colonists were also keen on knowing the make-up of the current ministries, especially if they were likely to be friendly to their interests. This is evidenced by the New York merchant Robert Livingston’s possession of handwritten ministerial lists from 1715.⁶³

The contestation of the membership of the Board, and its vital role as a clearinghouse for much of the correspondence and complaints arriving from the colonies,

⁵⁸ BL, Egerton Mss, 1971, folio. 15, Robert Hunter to Joseph Addison, 8 November 1714.

⁵⁹ Webb, *Marlborough’s America*, 278.

⁶⁰ *CSPC*, December 1714, item 122i.

⁶¹ *CSPC*, 1699, item 116.

⁶² [William Gordon], *A Representation of the Miserable State of Barbadoes* (London, 1719), 21.

⁶³ *A List of the Names of the New Ministry*, 27 January 1715, Livingston Family Paper, microfilm, reel 3.

directly connected imperial officials and colonial correspondents to party divisions in Britain. The Board became an important point of contact for complaints and updates as it looked to colonial interest groups, governors, and individual colonists for information. As a consequence, it encouraged colonists and the agents they sent to represent their interests in Britain to appropriate party language as a means of securing support from British politicians. Colonists were quick to capitalize on both institutional and extra-institutional means of combating and influencing officials, a process which disrupted local colonial politics and reshaped colonial political cultures even as it drew colonists and colonial officials into the larger arena of transatlantic party politics.

The Board of Trade was not the only institutional contact available to colonists. The different factions in the various colonies tended to prefer employing differing channels of authority. Alison Olson has shown that British Whigs encouraged their friends in the colonies to address colonial issues in Parliament while Tories tended to favour working through the Privy Council or informal means such as the SPG.⁶⁴ Colonists engaged with the Westminster parliament when necessary, appealing to parliament as a means of contending with governors, the church, or other colonial parties, but in doing so, they were forced to participate in British party conflicts.⁶⁵ As a temporary colonial agent sent to England to pursue the interests of the colony of Massachusetts, Increase Mather sought the restoration of the Massachusetts Charter as early as 1689 by addressing King William and parliament through petitions and meetings,

⁶⁴ *ibid*, 104.

⁶⁵ Steele, 'The Anointed, the Appointed, and the Elected', 105-127.

a process facilitated by Mather's extensive network of dissenting correspondents.⁶⁶

Similarly, opponents of South Carolina's Test Act of 1704 appealed not to the Tory leaning House of Commons but to the stronger Whig presence in the House of Lords; a tactic which allowed the Whig lords to bring the bill's attention to the Queen, securing a royal veto of the Act.⁶⁷

There also existed a number of extra-institutional avenues for building political connections. Contacts in the Anglican Church, including the Bishop of London or the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, provided a means for colonists to cultivate party networks. For example, as the next chapter demonstrates, high church clergy and congregations in the colonies were quick to employ Tory rhetoric of the church in danger to seek sympathy among high church British churchmen in order to create transatlantic high church Tory networks. In 1712, William Vesey and Jacob Henderson, two clergymen in New York and Pennsylvania, worked together to send to the SPG representations against the governor of New York who, after noting the increasing successes of these high church Tory connections, was forced to respond by employing his father-in-law Thomas Orby to act as his personal agent and defend his interests before the SPG.⁶⁸ Similarly, a number of Massachusetts clergymen wrote to an unknown correspondent

very lately [during the Tory ministry] the charter of our province was threatened by a bill in Parliament, and in great danger of being taken away. This attempt has made us sensible that we need some standing friends in

⁶⁶ Olson, *Anglo-American Politics*, 99; Richard Johnson, *Adjustment to Empire: The New England Colonies, 1675-1715* (Leister University Press, 1981), 136-182.

⁶⁷ Olson, *Anglo-American Politics*, 99.

⁶⁸ SPG series C, Box 1, items 25 and 57.

and about London who will naturally care for us on like emergencies, and generally use their interest on our behalf.⁶⁹

Whether working through parliament, the Privy Council, or extra-institutional means, colonists were forced to frame local conflicts in British party terms and develop and rely on party connections as a means of securing support from party interests in Britain.

A brief examination of imperial appointments offers suggestive glimpses of the institutional impact of party politics on Britain's Atlantic colonies and the subsequent adoption of party political language. The appointment of officials, especially governors, was subject to the shifting winds of party dominance in Britain. The importance of a system of patronage inherently tied to party affiliations for the appointment of officials impressed on the colonists the significance of Whig and Tory party divisions, and therefore, the need to develop party associations. Indeed, the violent pendulous swings between the Tory and Whig parties in Britain directly affected the future prospects of colonial officials and therefore their colonial allies. This impacted not only the management of the colonies but it also influenced the practice and outcomes of local politics as is demonstrated in detail in chapters four and five. When patrons lost positions of power, appointed governors were forced to defend their actions to a hostile ministry led by the antagonistic party. Their colonial opponents were quick to capitalise on this by nurturing their own party connections. This dependency on parties at home for appointment, support, or guidance encouraged governors to serve party interests and cultivate party connections for their allies in the colonies. Undoubtedly, this meant that governors also acted as vital links or liaisons between the two great parties in Britain and the emerging party consciousness in the colonies.

⁶⁹ NAS CH8/196/2, 25 May 1716.

The relationships between colonial officials and British party politics influenced the perception of British party politics in the colonies. Consequently, governors and other imperial appointees remained an immediate, present reminder of the rancorous party divisions of Britain. Officials sent to the colonies also utilised party language and rhetoric which was appropriated by colonists, tying the colonies to Britain's political culture. As a result, the problematic relationship between the Tory party and Jacobitism was exploited by Whig officials in the colonies who were keen to discredit their opponents. This led to a number of interesting accusations of Jacobitism in the British Atlantic inherently tied to party language. However, allegations of Jacobitism were not simply examples of a transatlantic party rhetoric. They tended to be rooted in realities of both party ideology and party appointments. Lending credence to colonists' fears that the Tory party was intending to facilitate the return of the exiled Stuarts, there were a number of Tory appointees in the period from 1710 to 1714 who had a Jacobite past. For example, William Keith had been arrested for suspicion of treason for Jacobite plotting in 1703, but was appointed as Surveyor General of the Customs of the South District of North America by Bolingbroke's ministry in 1714. That Keith's Jacobitism was well known is evidenced by requests sent to the Whig Duke of Montrose asking to replace Keith after the fall of the Tories in 1715.⁷⁰ Additionally, the Jacobite Christopher Fleming, Lord Slane, was reportedly offered the governorship of New York in 1714 during the Tory heyday, but instead opted for an Irish peerage.⁷¹ Furthermore, the proscription of the Tory party in 1715, a seismic political shift in Britain, was replicated

⁷⁰ W.A. Speck, W. A.. 'Keith, Sir William, fourth baronet (c.1669–1749).' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: OUP, 2004. Online ed., edited by Lawrence Goldman, May 2010. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/68696> (accessed June 11, 2013); NAS GD220/6/1754, *Memorial of Archibald Forbes*, [c. 1715].

⁷¹ Webb, *Marlborough's America*, 312.

throughout the British Atlantic as the Whigs replaced Tory appointees with those they deemed loyal to the Whig party and the Protestant succession. The following three examples emphasise the importance of colonial appointees in the developing party divisions and consciousness in the colonies. This, in turn, places in context accusations of Jacobitism and demonstrates the ideological party realities they underscored in Britain's colonies. Chapters four and five will develop these themes further with case studies of South Carolina and the Mid-Atlantic.

Richard Coote, the Earl of Bellomont, was appointed governor of New York and Massachusetts in 1696 by the new Whig ministry. Bellomont was a Protestant Irish peer and a staunch supporter of William and Mary. He was sent as a replacement for the previous Tory appointee Benjamin Fletcher. Bellomont's tenure as governor is notable for a number of reasons and it coincided with the creation of new imperial structures such as the Board of Trade. One of the most intriguing aspects of his period as governor is the fact that he was one of the first governors to employ divisive English party language in colonial disputes. Bellomont viewed anyone who disagreed with him or contested his authority as a Jacobite or Papist.⁷² He regularly used anti-Catholic and anti-Tory rhetoric to galvanise support and discredit his opponents. By contextualising colonists in these terms, Bellomont was, in some respects, imposing metropolitan party conflicts onto provincial politics. Yet this imposition encouraged colonists to actively participate in imperial politics.

On Bellomont's arrival in 1698, New York was riven by factional strife. The colony was divided between two factions, the Leislerians and the anti-Leislerians. They

⁷² Stanwood, *Empire Reformed*, 189.

had vied for advantage ever since Jacob Leisler, the Dutch militia captain, had wrested power from the Royal governor during the revolution of 1688-89. Bellomont quickly sided with the Leislerians who had been supportive of William's bid for the throne in 1689 and led a rebellion against James II & VII's appointees. The Leislerians viewed themselves as supporters of William and Mary and so it was likely that Bellomont's strong ties with William III & II and the Whig party would endear him to the Leislerians while also encouraging his opponents in New York to seek out alliances with Tories in England, creating what John Runcie called 'durable affiliations' between factions in New York and parties in Britain.⁷³ Colonists understood the vagaries of party politics and after King William's death in 1701, the attorney general of New York noted that the death of the King did not bode well for the Whigs or Bellomont and that the accession of Anne, who was sympathetic to the Tories, was a discouragement to Bellomont's allies in the colony and an encouragement to his enemies.⁷⁴ Bellomont's tenure in government, then, represents an early instance of the subsuming of provincial politics under the larger umbrella of British parties.

The two local factions, Bellomont's and that of his opponents, understood the importance of British party politics and used transatlantic connections to effect local changes. Bellomont complained to the largely Whig Board of Trade that the 'Jacobite party' in New York was anxious to see him gone, and noted that his Tory predecessor Benjamin Fletcher was writing encouraging letters about Bellomont's impending dismissal from England to his friends in the colony and increasing local opposition to the

⁷³ John D. Runcie, 'The Problem of Anglo American Politics in Bellomont's New York', *The William and Mary Quarterly*, vol26, no 2 (1969), 191-217, quote from pg 217.

⁷⁴ Olson, *Anglo-American Politics*, 101-102.

governor by spreading rumours that Bellomont had lost influence at home. The governor lamented his plight to the Board of Trade in 1698, chastising them for their lack of communication as the ‘Jacobite party here take great notice of it, and give it out all the county over that I am therefore in disgrace with the King, for that the ministers neglect me.’⁷⁵ By 1699, reports stated that the ‘Leislerites’ referred to their opponents as the ‘Jacobite party’, indicating the diffusion of mainland party language to colonial factions.⁷⁶

Bellomont and the Leslerians’ complaints of a Jacobite party were not entirely without foundation. In 1699 he noted ‘a club of dissatisfied marchands to the number of 28 or 30, where one constant health was, to him that durst be honest in the worst of times,’ clearly a reference in Bellomont’s mind to the exiled Stuarts.⁷⁷ This reputed health drinking echoes a prominent element of mainland Jacobite culture, illustrating a reflection of British political culture. He also reported that a member of the House of Representatives in New York moved in relation to a bill referring to the Revolution of 1688-89 as the ‘late happy Revolution’ that ‘“happy” might be left out, for he did not conceive the Revolution to be happy’.⁷⁸ Whether this was meant to be an insult directed towards the Leislerians who were responsible for the revolution in New York matters little. According to Bellomont, it was a clear sign of disaffection and placed the opposition firmly in the Jacobite camp. The man who reportedly disapproved of the word happy owned a public house, suggesting a means of further ideological diffusion as his opinions would likely have been discussed and spread. Additionally, Bellomont was

⁷⁵ *CSPC*, September 21 1698, item 835; *CSPC*, oct 21, 1698, item 914.; *CSPC*, Dec 1698, item 116.

⁷⁶ *CSPC*, April 1699, item 317.

⁷⁷ *CSPC*, April 1699, item 317.

⁷⁸ *CSPC*, April 1699, item 317.

certain that in order to avoid taking the oaths to the King, 'a great many men pretended themselves Quakers to avoid taking the oaths' but soon after 'pulled off the mask of Quakerism'. The leaders of this party had 'uttered scurrilous and opprobrious language against His Majesty and declared themselves much in favour of the late King James.'⁷⁹ Furious factional disputes relating to land grants, taxes, and religious differences in New York became enmeshed in British party politics and so came to reflect concerns about the Tory relationship with Jacobitism. Tory election victories in England in 1701 at the end of William's reign did not bode well for the Whig Bellomont, especially in light of his regular anti-Tory and anti-Jacobite complaints, and likely would have led to his recall had he not died in 1701, before this recall could take place.

Bellomont was not the only governor to encounter such difficulties. Robert Lowther, Governor of Barbados (1711-1714, 1715-1720), also took aim at opponents he considered Tory Jacobite sympathisers. Lowther's tenure as governor provides a compelling example of the difficulties encountered by colonial officials during the period of party conflict yet it also illustrates the possibilities that these party divisions presented. Lowther was appointed governor by the Lord Treasurer Godolphin in 1710, just before Goldolphin's ouster in the wake of the Tory parliamentary victory. Prior to his appointment as governor of Barbados, Lowther served as a member of parliament from 1705 to 1708 holding the seat for Westmoreland. Classed as a Whig during his parliamentary career, he was also noted as being a churchman though 'indifferent to all religions,' likely implying that Lowther was a latitudinarian low churchman, and thus

⁷⁹ *ibid.*

exemplifying the Tory caricature of Whigs.⁸⁰ His time in Parliament also meant that he was well versed in the practise and language of Britain's party politics.

Upon his arrival in Barbados, Lowther almost immediately fell out with a local faction that possessed strong connections to Tory interests. His primary opponents were William Sharpe, William Cleland, two large landowners, and William Gordon, an Anglican minister. All of these men were members or were soon to be members of the SPG, and they supported a much stronger Church of England ecclesiastical establishment in the colony, including the appointment of a Bishop in the colony.⁸¹ They actively canvassed the Bishop of London, the SPG, and the Board of Trade in pursuit of a stronger church establishment, a goal Lowther vehemently opposed. They were able to capitalise on the Tory victory of 1710 and received sympathetic hearings of their propositions for advancing the cause of the established church from the SPG and the Bishop of London.

Not only were his opponents successful in utilising transatlantic arguments concerning the role of the Anglican Church to pursue a stronger church establishment, after 1710 they also lobbied the now heavily Tory Board of Trade and the SPG in hopes of securing the governor's dismissal.⁸² Their complaints included the Tory 'church in danger' rhetoric. Both Lowther and his opponents well understood the dangers of being a governor without the support of a friendly ministry at home. In a later description of the

⁸⁰ Eveline Cruickshanks and Richard Harrison, 'Lowther, Robert (1681-1745), of Maulds Meaburn, Westmld,' in *History of Parliament, 1690-1715*, in *The History of Parliament: the House of Commons 1690-1715*, ed. D. Hayton, E. Cruickshanks, S. Handley, 2002. <http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1690-1715/member/lowther-robert-1681-1745> [accessed 11 June 2013].

⁸¹ J. Harry Bennett, 'The S.P.G. and Barbadian Politics, 1710-1720,' in *The Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, vol. 20 (Jan, 1951), 190-206.

⁸² *CSPC*, 14 June 1714, items 696 and 697.

period printed in a pamphlet published in London in 1719 titled *A Representation of the Miserable State of Barbados*, the governor's critics noted that Lowther had claimed during the Tory ascendancy of 1710 to 1714, 'this ministry are not my friends...By God, if I had a Ministry that were my Friends, I would make you be glad to eat grass with your Cattle.'⁸³ The transition to an unfriendly Tory ministry at home, led by Robert Harley and Bolingbroke, meant that Lowther's defence of his conduct went unheeded, and in February 1714, orders for the governor's recall were issued by Bolingbroke in his capacity as Secretary of State, Southern Division. Lowther was just one of many Whigs who were replaced in the colonies. William Sharpe briefly succeeded Lowther as head of the Barbados government and wrote to Bolingbroke of the governor's shortcomings. Utilising Tory party issues such as the church in danger, Sharpe wrote that because of Lowther's antipathy to the Church, 'the Clergy had been of late very much discountenac'd.'⁸⁴ However, Sharpe's acting government met an abrupt end when the 1714 Hanoverian succession and the resulting Whig rout of the Tories in 1715, led to the reinstatement of Lowther as governor. As his antagonists noted, Lowther had expertly utilised fears of Jacobitism and party divisions to pursue his gubernatorial restoration by claiming to the Whig ministry that he believed 'the true reason of [his] recall was, that the then Ld. Bolingbroke might meet with no resistance in delivering up the Island to the Pretender.'⁸⁵

The Lowther case further illustrates how the party political nature of appointments led to the alignment of colonial politics to transatlantic party axes.

⁸³ [Gordon], *A Representation of the Miserable State of Barbadoes*, 19

⁸⁴ *CSPC*, June 1714, item 697.

⁸⁵ [Gordon], *A Representation of the Miserable State of Barbadoes*, 32-33; *CSPC*, 30 October 1719, item 436ii.

Lowther's brief recall and his past experience with British party politics also encouraged him to contextualise his ouster in transatlantic party, rather than factional and local, terms. The Barbados opposition's links to the now disgraced Tory party and their zealous support of the interests of the established church provided the opportunity to slander them with disaffection to the Protestant succession. The reverend William Gordon claimed in a pamphlet printed in London in 1719 that 'it was spread all over the Island, that whoever would venture to oppose his [Lowther's] measures, must expect to be represented to his Majesty as a person disaffected to the present establishment.'⁸⁶ He was himself a recipient of the charge and he stated:

I was not a little surprized to find, that I had been industriously and confidently represented as a furious Jacobite, and Pretender's Man...I would not be understood, as if I were surprized at being represented a Jacobite; for that is what every Man in Barbadoes, who has the misfortune to fall under his Excellency's frowns, expects to be.⁸⁷

After the proscription of the Tories and the Jacobite rebellion in 1715, Lowther's opposition was left bereft of political support among the ministry at home and stripped of much of their influence locally. Lowther was able to use his position to encourage the Grand Jury of Barbados to draft an address to the King assuring him that 'none but seditious, turbulent spirits find fault with his [Lowther's] conduct.'⁸⁸ Despite his good fortune, however, the governor's political battles were not over. Much of the conflict continued to be fought through public pamphlets printed in London as well as letters sent to and from England, further illustrating the transatlantic nature of the conflict. Indeed, transatlantic issues relating to the established church, which had featured prominently in

⁸⁶ [Gordon], *A Representation of the Miserable State of Barbadoes*, 20

⁸⁷ William Gordon, *A Sermon Preached before the Governor and Council, & General Assembly of the Island of Barbadoes* (London, 1719), xli.

⁸⁸ [Gordon], *A Representation of the Miserable State of Barbadoes*, iii.

Lowther's debates with his leading opponents in the assembly, continued to plague him and his primary opposition was led by the Rev. William Gordon. Though lacking support from a friendly Tory ministry, as he previously had been, Gordon continued to make use of his connections in the SPG as well as the Bishop of London. In 1716, Rev. Gordon, Lowther's inveterate enemy, was appointed the Bishop of London's commissary to the island of Barbados. Lowther contested Gordon's authority and motives and he connected Gordon's push to introduce high church Anglicanism to the questionable loyalty of the clergy of the established church throughout Britain. In a letter to the Bishop of London, later reprinted in the preface to a sermon printed by Gordon, Lowther wrote, due to the 'temper and principles of many of the clericks...(in these Seditious and Rebellious times),' he would not allow Gordon to exercise his responsibilities and wondered if Gordon had been appointed to 'gratify the malignity of an expiring faction [Tories]'.⁸⁹ The Bishop of London was not entirely convinced by Lowther's statements and sent a copy of the letter back to Gordon so he might better answer the charges against him.⁹⁰ Additionally, as Gordon recounted, after Lowther requested that Gordon preach a thanksgiving sermon on a day appointed to be observed for the 'happy suppression of the late unnatural rebellion,' he accused Gordon of preaching disaffection in the form of a 'virulent satyr against the King's best friends and subjects' and saying that the 'Whigs were the contrivers and fomenters of the late rebellion.'⁹¹ Lowther's accusations were clearly rooted in party language. In his complaints against Gordon's thanksgiving sermon, Lowther accused the minister of laying the blame for the rebellion at the feet of

⁸⁹ Gordon, *A Sermon Preached before the Governor and Council, & General Assembly*, x, xi.

⁹⁰ *ibid*, viii.

⁹¹ *Ibid*, iv, xiii.

the Whigs as a means of ridiculing the ‘solemnity of the day.’⁹² Gordon sought to vindicate himself from Lowther’s aspersions and had the entirety of the sermon printed in London with a preface demonstrating his loyalty to the Protestant succession and remarks detailing that the sermon made no mention of the Whigs.⁹³

Gordon was Lowther’s primary clerical opponent, but he was also representative of Lowther’s disputes with other clergymen on the island. In addition to his disagreements with Gordon, the governor refused to appoint Dominick Langton and Mr. Acourt, clergymen recommended by the Bishop of London, to benefices in 1713 because, as he claimed, they were ‘monstrous Toryes.’ He defended his actions to the Bishop by claiming that ‘no party have shown so palpable, so groundless and so general dissatisfaction and malice to H.M. and the protestant succession as that wch goes under the denomination of Tory.’⁹⁴ He also stated that Mr. Acourt had ‘resided here in my former government, [1710-1714] and behaved himself in such an extravagant and seditious manner both in and out of the pulpit’. In particular, he reported that ‘some people applauded’ him, a practice Lowther thought appropriate as fit only for the ‘Pretender’s chappell.’⁹⁵ Langton too was suspect, having formerly been a Roman Catholic who converted to the Church of Ireland. A pamphlet printed in Dublin claimed that even after his conversion, Langton supposedly encouraged others to continue as papists and was censured by the Irish House of Commons in 1711. Additionally, he had reportedly railed against dissenters as rebels, a common high church mantra, and was an

⁹² *Ibid*, xiii.

⁹³ *Ibid*,

⁹⁴ *CSPC*, 17 May 1717, item 573ii.

⁹⁵ *Ibid*.

associate of Francis Higgins, Ireland's Sacheverell.⁹⁶ Furthermore, among Langton's books were numerous works by nonjurors and high churchmen such as Charles Leslie, Francis Atterbury and others, further suggesting high church if not Jacobite sympathies.⁹⁷ Lowther's complaints, therefore, were rooted in local realities. In light of the high church Tory beliefs subscribed to by his opponents, Lowther's association with the Whig party in Britain stood him in good stead. He was able to utilise the transatlantic political culture and his opponents' likely disaffection to maintain his position as governor until his recall in 1720.

A brief examination of a period in the career of Samuel Vetch provides a further instance of the way party rhetoric impacted politics, the currency of Jacobitism, and the utility of accusations of Jacobitism in Britain's Atlantic Empire. Vetch was the son of a covenanting Scottish Presbyterian minister, and he came of age during the party divisions of Charles II and James II & VII's reigns.⁹⁸ He was a strong supporter of William of Orange's invasion of England. Vetch's loyalty to the Protestant succession contributed to his rapid rise in the British Army. Eventually, with the assistance of his acquaintance Francis Nicholson, he secured a post as Governor of Nova Scotia in 1710.

Vetch soon experienced similar disagreements with the ascendant Tory party after 1710, as had Lowther in Barbados.⁹⁹ Vetch conflicted with the Tory ministry on a number of different accounts including religion and the economic future of Nova Scotia.

⁹⁶ *The Report of the Committee of the Honble House of Commons: Appointed to inspect the examinations given in by Dominick Langton, clerck, Formerly a Fryar in this Kingdom* (Cork Hill, 1711); CSPC, 1717, item 573ii; D.W. Hayton, 'Irish Tories and Victims of Whig Persecution', 90.

⁹⁷ S.D. Smith, *Slavery, Family, and Gentry Capitalism in the British Atlantic: The World of the Lascelles, 1648-1834* (Cambridge, 2006).

⁹⁸ George Waller, *Samuel Vetch, Colonial Enterpriser* (Chapel Hill, 1960), 3-14.

⁹⁹ Geoffrey Plank, *An Unsettled Conquest: The British Campaign Against Acadia* (Philadelphia, 2001), 54-6

For example, Vetch, a Scottish Presbyterian, was hostile to the resident Anglican chaplain John Harrison and turned the Anglican chapel into a barracks; surely a decision unlikely to win the support of the high church Tories.¹⁰⁰ He was also at odds with the ministry over provision for the soldiers under his command and attempted continually and unsuccessfully to gain recompense for spending his own money and credit to provide for his garrison.¹⁰¹

In 1712 Vetch further alienated the Tory ministry when he accused George Vane, the engineer stationed with the garrison protecting Annapolis Royal, of disaffection and Jacobitism. Indeed, it was unlikely the ministry would approve of being reminded of the relationship of the Tory party with Jacobitism. Vane was a Jacobite who had served James II & VII in exile but returned to England in 1703 after Queen Anne passed an Act of Indemnity. Vane provides a compelling example of the rehabilitation of Jacobites into English political life after the accession of Anne as within four years he was appointed engineer for St. Johns, Newfoundland, a colony captured from the French during the War of the Spanish Succession. His Jacobite sympathies continued to cause him trouble and after the French recaptured St. Johns, his fellow British officers accused him of conspiring with the French. Held in captivity by the French from 1708 to 1710, he made his way back to England where, during the Tory ascendancy, he was assigned to Nova Scotia.¹⁰² Vetch quickly took a dislike to Vane and his politics and, likewise, Vane was quick to disparage Vetch in letters to the Board of Trade.¹⁰³ Vane's suspected Jacobitism irked a number of other officers in the garrison in addition to Vetch. Lawrence

¹⁰⁰ Plank, *An Unsettled Conquest*, 61.

¹⁰¹ NAS GD220/5/1910/13, Vetch to the Duke of Montrose, 31 March 1715

¹⁰² F.J. Thorpe, 'George Vane,' in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography Online*, http://www.biographi.ca/EN/009004-119.01-e.php?id_nbr=1139, accessed 9 May 2013.

¹⁰³ CSPC, 1712, item 403.

Armstrong, a Protestant Irishman, was so incensed at what he regarded as Vane's Jacobitism that he smashed a decanter of wine over his head and almost killed him.¹⁰⁴ Vane was later court-martialed for other offences but reinstated at the behest of Vetch's high church Tory successor.

By 1713, Vetch had alienated the Tory ministry in Britain to such a degree that they appointed General Francis Nicholson to replace him as Governor of Nova Scotia. Vetch believed that his removal was in part due to his antipathy towards the Jacobite Vane which, as one historian noted, marked him as 'no man to represent Bolingbroke in a colonial governorship.'¹⁰⁵ He also complained that the Tory ministry had been 'possessed with a character of him, as a partisan of the Whig Ministry' and were resolved 'to keep none in public posts but who were intirely in their interest.'¹⁰⁶ Though Nicholson and Vetch had once had an amiable working relationship, Nicholson was now such a polarising party figure that he acted only in the interests of the Tory ministry. Consequently, Vetch blamed much of his misfortune on Nicholson and claimed 'His malice followed me home to the then ministry' and that 'he represented me as one violently opposite to the then government.'¹⁰⁷

After the Hanoverian succession and the Tory loss of power in Britain, Vetch's complaints were likely to be heeded and he quickly utilised party rhetoric. From 1714 to 1715, Vetch sent a number of petitions and letters to high ranking Whigs including the Duke of Montrose remarking on the reasons and motives for his removal. In his letters he mercilessly attacked the Tory ministers and accused them of removing him from his

¹⁰⁴ Waller, *Samuel Vetch*, 248

¹⁰⁵ Waller, *Samuel Vetch*, 256.

¹⁰⁶ CSPC, December 1714 item 122ii.

¹⁰⁷ NAS, GD220/5/1919/13, Samuel Vetch to the Duke of Montrose, 31 March 1715,

post as a means of allowing the island to fall into the possession of the French. He argued that ‘so far from meeting with a reward from the then ministry that for saving the garrison, I was turned out’ for ‘firmness to his present majesty’s interest.’¹⁰⁸ He also claimed that Nicholson had informed him that ‘preserving the garrison was his greatest crime’ and that Nicholson’s errand was to ‘serve the Pretenders and French interest.’¹⁰⁹ Nicholson’s cosy relationship with the previous Tory ministry likely encouraged the new Whig ministry to assume the worst, as the Tory party under Anne had flirted openly with the possibility of a Stuart restoration.

He was also quick to attack his successor Nicholson as a ‘not only a countenancer of Jacobites in general [i.e. Vane] but even those particularly who publicly drank the Pretender’s health as King James the Third.’ He also stated that Nicholson was a ‘violent tool of the then ministry’ who acted against Vetch for no other reason than his ‘publicly supporting the right of the protestant succession in his present Majesty’s house.’¹¹⁰ Other statements he attributed to Nicholson further represent the significance of party heats and passions and the association of Toryism with Jacobitism in Britain’s Atlantic Empire in the years 1714 to 1715. Vetch claimed that Nicholson publicly said that ‘there was never such a damn’d nest of Whigs as in Cork and that they deserve to be extirpated’ and that ‘all that were not for indefeasible hereditary right were Whigs and Commonwealthmen.’¹¹¹ Vetch’s complaints, like Lowther’s, served him well and he was reappointed as Governor of Nova Scotia. His Whig pedigree and his unfriendly

¹⁰⁸ NAS, GD220/5/1919/13, Samuel Vetch to the Duke of Montrose, 31 March 1715; NAS GD220/5/577, Vetch to Montrose, 6 July 1715,.

¹⁰⁹ *CSPC*, December 1714, item 122ii.

¹¹⁰ NAS, GD220/5/1919/13, Samuel Vetch to the Duke of Montrose, 31 March 1715,

¹¹¹ *CSPC*, December 1714, item 122ii.; NAS, GD220/5/1919/13, Samuel Vetch to the Duke of Montrose, 31 March 1715, NAS, GD220/5/1919/13.

relationship with the Tory ministry marked him out among Whigs in Britain as an excellent choice to represent the Whig interest in the British Atlantic.

Vetch's comments no doubt reflect a great deal of personal acrimony and animosity because of Nicholson's appointment and his own demotion. However, they, along with the examples of Bellomont and Lowther, are representative of the significance of party language in colonial political cultures. Taking the illustrations of Lowther, Bellomont, and Vetch together, it is possible to trace the influence of important aspects of Britain's rage of party from imperial governance and appointments down to colonial political cultures. Colonial officials participated in the rage of party and consequently so to did colonists who opposed the governors.

Overt expressions of Jacobitism following the Revolution of 1688 illustrate elements of a transatlantic Jacobite subculture. Not only do these expressions elucidate features of Jacobite subculture, they point towards the larger workings of a British Atlantic political culture. An integral element of this larger political culture was the division between the Whig and Tory parties. The rage of party created by the divisions impacted imperial appointments and developments. This in turn, forced colonists to participate in transatlantic party rivalries. This joined a number of disparate political cultures into a larger cohesive British Atlantic political culture. This new transatlantic culture was both impacted and shaped by understandings of Jacobitism. Following 1715, the transatlantic reverberations of the rage of party created and encouraged a pervasive sense among Whigs in the colonies that the Tory party and Tory ministry were treasonous and sympathetic to the Jacobite cause. This assumption was not entirely mistaken and

was further encouraged by the problematic relationship between politics and religion, the subject of the next chapter.

Jacobitism and Religious Belief in the British Atlantic

Religious beliefs provided much of the intellectual foundation for Jacobitism.

Therefore, in order to appreciate fully Jacobitism in the Atlantic World, it is necessary to understand its complex relationship with the variety of religious beliefs which breathed life into it. Roman Catholics, members of the Church of England, and Scottish Episcopalians, each in their own manner, nurtured different notions of loyalty which helped perpetuate the Stuart claims to the kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland, and the empire throughout the Atlantic. For instance, Bruce Lenman has proven that Jacobitism was an integral aspect of Scottish Episcopalian belief from 1689 through at least 1745 while Paul Monod and others have shown its importance in the religious controversies that plagued the Church of England throughout the eighteenth century.¹ Older works on nonjurors have illustrated the complex relationship between religious beliefs and Jacobitism.² Furthermore, Gabriel Glickman has demonstrated that English Catholic Jacobites expressed Jacobitism both in terms of support for their co-religionist James and also an abiding royalism. As a result of these and other studies, our understanding of the importance of religious thought as a major aspect of the ideological foundation of the Jacobite movement has greatly enhanced our appreciation of the extent of the threat posed by the Jacobites.³

¹ Tristram Clarke, ‘“Nurseries of Sedition”?: The Episcopal Congregations After the Revolution of 1689,’ in *After Columba, After Calvin: Religious Communities in North-East Scotland*, ed. By James Porter, 61-69; Lenman, ‘The Scottish Episcopal Clergy’, 36-48; Goldie, ‘The Nonjurors, Episcopacy, and the Origins of the Convocation Controversy’, 15-35; Clark, *English Society*, 83-105; Daniel Szechi, *The Jacobites: Britain and Europe, 1688-1788* (Manchester, 1994); Monod, *Jacobitism*, 126-158.

² Henry Broxap, *The Later Nonjurors* (Cambridge, 1924).

³ Gabriel Glickman, *The English Catholic Community, 1688-1745: Politics, Culture, and Ideology* (London, 2009).

Beyond illustrating the widespread threat Jacobitism posed to the British state, these studies have helped explain how religious beliefs bred, encouraged, and inculcated Jacobitism at all levels of society.

Despite the notable relationship between Jacobitism and religious beliefs, scholars have not made use of this foundation in a broader Atlantic context. This is partially because the ideology of Jacobitism was itself confused, particularly in the immediate aftermath of 1688. The complexity of Jacobite ideology has really only been explained in a British context over the past thirty years. Jacobites in the three kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland had little to bind them together other than a belief in James VII & II's hereditary right to the throne. Nationalism in Scotland following the Union of 1707, was a far cry from English nonjuring beliefs or high church Anglican qualms about the accession of William of Orange or George I. As a result, Jacobite ideology throughout the British Isles rested on varying foundations. If this was true for Britain, it was equally if not more true for the British Atlantic. However, throughout the British Isles in the period after 1689, Jacobitism was increasingly associated with a coherent body of ideas and, consequently, Jacobitism became linked to a number of religious beliefs and controversies. This pattern was echoed across the Atlantic, but this echo has not received sufficient examination. The primary reason that the correlation between religious beliefs and Jacobitism has not been studied throughout the Atlantic world is because there was never any conspiracy or rebellion which would have encouraged an identical outward expression of these internally held beliefs. Nevertheless, despite the lack of opportunity to proclaim Jacobite sympathies in open rebellion, there was no shortage of religious controversies which allowed for expressions or fears of an ideological Jacobitism.

Recent works have begun to explore connections, including theology and politics, among religious groups in the Atlantic World and the Church of England has received notable attention in scholarly studies.⁴ The prominence of anti-Catholicism has also received excellent treatment.⁵ In fact, interpretations detailing the transatlantic integration of religious beliefs throughout the Atlantic are more informed than ever, and the importance of religion in the colonies has been reasserted in a number of studies.⁶ Yet despite the attention paid the numerous religious traditions and their Atlantic ties, Jacobitism, one of the major manifestations of certain beliefs during this period of intense religious and political conflict surrounding the reign of Anne, is rarely mentioned. This chapter seeks to redress this imbalance and contextualize the broad themes of the politics of religious controversies and denominational conflict in a larger Atlantic framework in order to illustrate the importance of Jacobitism in the British Atlantic World.

One of the most striking aspects of the British Atlantic World in the early eighteenth century is the diversity of Christian beliefs. Quakers, Anglicans, Presbyterians, Scottish Episcopalians, and Congregationalists battled for supremacy in a number of different regional conflicts both in Britain and throughout the British Atlantic World in a world that did not yet accept ideas of religious toleration. Ethnic

⁴ James Bell, *The Imperial Origins of the King's Church in Early America, 1607-1783* (Basingstoke, 2004); Carla Gardina Pestana, *Protestant Empire: Religion and the Making of the British Atlantic World* (Philadelphia, 2009); Travis Glasson, *Mastering Christianity: Missionary Anglicanism and Slavery in the Atlantic World* (Oxford, 2012); Clark, *The Language of Liberty*; Jeremy Gregory, 'Transatlantic Anglican Networks, c. 1680-c.1770: Transplanting, Translating and Transforming the Church of England,' in *International Religious Networks*, ed. by Jeremy Gregory and Hugh McLeod (Woodbridge: Ecclesiastical History Society, 2012), 127-142; Jeremy Gregory, 'The Later Stuart Church in North America,' in *The Later Stuart Church, 1660-1714*, ed. Grant Tapsell (Manchester University Press, 2013, 150-172; Kidd, *The Protestant Interest*.

⁵ Owen Stanwood, 'Catholics, Protestants, and the Clash of Civilizations in Early America,' in *The First Prejudice: Religious Tolerance and Intolerance in Early America*, eds. Chris Beneke and Christopher Grenda (Philadelphia, 2011), 218-240.

⁶ Jon Butler, *Awash in a Sea of Faith: Christianizing the American People* (Cambridge MA, 1990); Patricia Bonomi, *Under the Cope of Heaven: Religion, Society, and Politics in Colonial America* (Oxford, 1986); Chris Beneke and Christopher Grenda eds., *The First Prejudice: Religious Tolerance and Intolerance in Early America* (Philadelphia, 2011).

tensions and political disagreements, added elements of diversity which resulted in increasing religious discord; this was especially true in many of the colonies.⁷ In Pennsylvania, Quakers vied for supremacy against an emerging Anglican presence while in Massachusetts Anglicans and Baptists challenged Congregational pre-eminence. Yet these conflicts were all occurring within the orbit of other controversies occurring in Britain. As a result, a remarkable spectrum of beliefs existed within differing regional environments throughout the colonies, and this made the possibility of religious unity an almost unachievable illusion and religious conflict a regular staple. These religious conflicts were infused with political meaning which linked religious controversies to the question of Jacobitism.

The implications of fractured religious environment went well beyond the purely theological. Religious discord was often linked to strikingly different political affinities. This is not at all surprising. Ever since the 1640s religious strife in Britain was inextricably linked with political turmoil and this was also true for Britain's colonial possessions. As the colonies were drawn closer to Britain after the Revolution of 1688, religion and politics in the colonies became increasingly interconnected with ideas and events in Britain. The consequences of both British and Colonial religious controversies reverberated throughout the Atlantic. The ever present Jacobite threat permeated political ideologies and religious beliefs of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries and by 1701, the political issues which were to undergird the ideologies of Jacobitism in England, Scotland, and the colonies, and feed the politics of the rage of party, were inseparable from religious opinions.⁸

⁷ Ned C. Landsman, 'Roots, Routes, and Rootedness: Diversity, Migration and Toleration in Mid-Atlantic Pluralism', in *Early American Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 2 (2004), 267-309; Chris Beneke, *Beyond Toleration: The Religious Origins of American Pluralism* (Oxford, 2006).

⁸ Holmes, *British Politics*; G.V. Bennett, *Tory Crisis in Church and State, 1688-1730: The Career of Francis Atterbury, Bishop of Rochester* (Oxford, 1975); Eveline Cruickshanks, 'Religion and Royal Succession: The Rage of Party', in *Britain in the First Age of Party, 1680-1750: Essays Presented to*

This chapter explores the relationship between Jacobitism and religious belief in the British Atlantic. In order to appreciate the transatlantic nature of the relationship, one must first understand the British context. Thus, the first section will provide a brief topical overview of religious controversies and beliefs in Britain and their respective relationships with Jacobitism. Building on this foundation, the remainder of the chapter will explore these relationships in a much broader context spanning the Atlantic. This will demonstrate similarities in ideology, circumstance, and expression which facilitated or exemplified the development or inculcation of Jacobitism in religious communities or explain the reason for suspicion of Jacobite sympathies, first with the Church of England, followed next by Catholicism, and finally by Quakerism.

One of the most obvious examples of the manner in which religious controversy was inseparable from Jacobitism is the nonjuring schism in England. As Mark Goldie noted, this was the ‘clerical counterpart of Jacobitism’.⁹ Despite strong Anglican support for the revolution in 1688, in 1689 the Church of England experienced a traumatic division. The political settlement reached after the invasion of William of Orange proved unsatisfactory to a number of prominent clerics. The fact that the throne was offered to William, instead of a regency, put many of the clergy in a difficult position regarding oaths they had sworn to James II & VII. Many refused to swear oaths of allegiance to William and Mary because doing so would deny the sanctity of the oaths they had sworn to James. Those that refused to swear the oaths were known as nonjurors. Over 400, or as one scholar recently estimated four per cent, of the clergymen of the Church of England would not subscribe the

Geoffrey Holmes, ed. by Clyve Jones (London: Hambledon Press, 1987), 19-44; Goldie, ‘The Nonjurors, Episcopacy, and the Origins of the Convocation Controversy’, 15-35.

⁹ Goldie, ‘The Nonjurors, Episcopacy, and the Origins of the Convocation Controversy’, 15.

oaths of allegiance to William and Mary.¹⁰ The nonjurors were ‘Jacobites by definition.’¹¹ Even if not all of those who refused the oaths were active plotters in the Jacobite interest, their unwillingness to recognize the new king as *de jure* denied the legitimacy of William and Mary’s reign and thus, upheld the claims of the exiled Stuarts. Murray Pittock has noted the ‘dangerously thin line’ between a passive refusal to swear an oath and active attempts to alter the succession.¹² This is especially true after 1701 when a new oath explicitly abjuring the Stuart Prince of Wales was required. A refusal to swear this oath was a clear indication that the nonjuror in question supported the legitimacy of the exiled Stuarts’ claims to the throne. Whether nonjurors were active plotters makes little difference because they provided the religious and intellectual foundation for, if not active resistance to William, continued support and sympathy for James II & VII.

The influence of the nonjurors over the next fifty years far outweighed their numbers. Many of the most prominent clerics and scholars from the revolution to the accession of George I were nonjurors, including Henry Dodwell, a nonjuring polemist, Archbishop Sancroft, and five other bishops. Not only did the nonjurors provide the ideological support for the exiled Stuarts’ claim to the throne, the debates that Dodwell and others engaged in had a profound influence on the direction of the theology and politics of the high churchmen who were willing to swear the oaths to William and Mary.¹³ This prompts another question. What do the terms high church and low church actually mean? ‘High church’ and ‘low church’ were both descriptive and proscriptive terms in the early eighteenth century British Atlantic. Precise meanings have proven problematically elusive, but remain instrumental to our

¹⁰ Monod, *Jacobitism*, 142

¹¹ Monod, *Jacobitism*, 139

¹² Murray Pittock, ‘Treacherous Objects: Towards a Theory of Jacobite Material Culture,’ in *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 34 (2011), 39-63.

¹³ Goldie, ‘The Nonjurors, Episcopacy, and the Origins of the Convocation Controversy,’ 15-35.

understanding of the early eighteenth century. Because both terms possessed religious and political connotations, it is difficult to accurately define them. Beyond their rather slippery meanings, they were often pejorative terms of abuse which incorporated either or both the political and religious aspects of the sense of the terms. The terms do demonstrate a preference for certain devotional practices, but this was not exclusive. 'High church' often described a religious inclination to stress the divine necessity of episcopacy or an elevated view of the sacraments and a respect for patristic scholarship. 'Low church' Anglicans often supported the toleration of dissent, minimized the importance of an apostolic succession, tended towards latitudinarianism, and supported liberty of conscience and international Protestantism which often drove them towards an alliance with the Whig party. These trends proved to be remarkably similar throughout the British Atlantic Anglican communion.

The distinction between high and low church beliefs become all the more pronounced in light of the fact that the beliefs of nonjurors were often indistinguishable from their conforming high church brethren, excepting only the belief in the refusal to swear the necessary oaths. Mark Goldie has shown that the origins of the convocation controversy, which was an instrumental factor in the division of the Church of England into high church and low church parties, and often attributed to Francis Atterbury, can be found in the writings of the nonjurors.¹⁴ In the mid-1690s a number of nonjurors broke away from the Church of England to set up what they considered to be the true Church of England, thus creating a nonjuring schism. However, despite the schism many clergymen followed the example of Nathaniel Crewe, the Bishop of Durham, and swore the necessary oaths with mental

¹⁴ Goldie, 'The Nonjurors, Episcopacy, and the Origins of the Convocation Controversy', 15-35.

reservations.¹⁵ This created a pool of men sympathetic to Jacobitism and nonjuring, but unwilling to suffer the penalties of outspoken disaffection. It was also possible for nonjurors to return to regular communion as laymen of the Church of England while still declining to take the oaths. For example, Henry Dodwell and Bishop Ken left the nonjuring church and re-joined the juring communion in the year 1710 but continued to refuse to subscribe the oaths.¹⁶ The scholarship of the nonjurors and their passage in and out of the high church helped stimulate many of the conflicts between the high and low church during the reigns of William III & II, and Anne. This ambiguous relationship between a high church party willing to swear the oaths, and their sympathy for, and association with, the scholarship and practice of the nonjurors connected them with disaffection and made it easy for their opponents to question their loyalty to the Protestant succession.

The political and religious climate created by the Revolution settlement drove many high church clergy and laity towards support for the exiled Stuarts and high church Anglicanism became entangled with the politics of the succession crisis. The nonjuring schism was not the only divisive or polarizing issue facing the Church of England, even if it was the most extreme. The toleration act of 1689, which allowed Trinitarian dissenters freedom of worship, led many churchmen to bewail the increase in dissent and heresy.¹⁷ This seemingly unchecked growth of dissent and unorthodox beliefs stirred up fears among many churchmen that the Church of England was in danger. From the mid-1690s through 1714, the cry of ‘the Church in Danger’ was the clarion call which drew concerned clergymen and laymen to its banner and would continue to serve as a rallying cry of the high church party throughout the period.

¹⁵ Monod, *Jacobitism*, 147, 151.

¹⁶ Ibid, 140.

¹⁷ Tim Harris, *Politics Under the Later Stuarts: Party Conflict in a Divided Society, 1660-1715* (London, 1993), 152-153.

The differing levels of importance placed on elements of belief and practice had practical political consequences. As recent studies have argued, the religious meanings of high church and low church were often tangled with political ones.¹⁸ Fears for the Church of England drove many high church clergy and laity towards support of Tory party and consequently, high church Anglicanism became entwined with Tory politics and Jacobitism. The Whig party found much of its support among dissenters and those low church Anglicans sympathetic to dissent. Because of their antipathy towards the Whig pillars of dissent and latitudinarianism, high church Anglican Tories sought to suppress the growth of these invasive threats. These efforts were often inextricably linked to party including acts banning occasional conformity. Leading Tories, such as Daniel Finch, the Earl of Nottingham, were devout high church Anglican laymen, devoted to supporting the Church of England and were instrumental in pursuing bills limiting the power of dissent. Adding to the difficulty of definition, it was possible to be high church regarding religion but subscribe to Whig politics and vice versa, though this was not terribly common. Despite some exceptions, high church Anglicanism was almost inseparable from the Tory Party and has even been referred to as the Tory party at prayer.¹⁹ This entanglement of the high and low church groups with political parties was a direct result of the uncertainties facing the Church of England following the revolution in 1688 and the resulting politicization of religion.

The debates concerning the ‘church in danger’ became an instrumental element of party driven politics and they were illustrative of a major factor

¹⁸ John Walsh and Stephen Taylor, ‘Introduction: The Church and Anglicanism in the ‘long’ eighteenth century’, in *The Church of England c.1689-1833*, ed. By John Walsh, David Hayton, and Stephen Taylor (Cambridge, 1993), 1-66; Donald Spaeth, *The Church in an Age of Danger: Parsons and Parishioners, 1660-1740* (Cambridge, 2000); Pasi Ihalainen, ‘Preaching in an Age of Party Strife, 1700-1720: Contributions to the Conflict,’ in *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, ed. by Peter McCullough, Hugh Adlington, and Emma Rhatigan (Oxford, 2011), 495-513.

¹⁹ Walsh and Taylor, ‘The Church and Anglicanism,’ 34.

contributing to the ideological divide separating members of the Anglican Church. The Tory Party was increasingly linked to the high church, and Tory politics were soon inseparable from high church Anglican beliefs. For example, in three consecutive years from 1702 to 1704, the Tory party sought to end the practice of Occasional Conformity, by which dissenters would take communion in the Church of England once a year in order to qualify for public office. In addition to championing bills banning occasional conformity, Tories also supported the high church Anglican preacher Henry Sacheverell after he was impeached by the Whig ministry in 1709 for preaching and printing a sermon which celebrated the doctrines of passive obedience and non-resistance.²⁰ His sermon was viewed as an attack on the revolution settlement of 1689 and a tacit reminder that the Stuarts were the rightful heirs of the kingdom. Although not all high church Tories were Jacobites, this conflation of Toryism and high church Anglicanism, epitomised by Sacheverell, brought about by fears that the church of England was in danger from dissent and an unsupportive monarch, drew high church Anglicans ever closer to supporting the exiled Stuarts as the succession of the Lutheran Hanoverians approached.

If the nonjuring schism in England was distressing, an even more traumatic division occurred in 1689 in Scotland where almost the entirety of Scottish Episcopalians were forced into nonjuring following the refusal of the Scottish Bishops to swear the required oaths of allegiance. As a result of the Bishops' intransigence, William was forced to support the removal of bishops from the Scottish Church by a majority of Presbyterians in the Revolution convention, thus creating a Presbyterian establishment. The revived Presbyterian establishment was uncompromising towards

²⁰ For the most comprehensive account of Sacheverell see, Geoffrey Holmes, *The Trial of Dr. Sacheverell* (London, 1973); for more recent discussions of the importance of the Sacheverell trial see, Mark Knights, 'Introduction: The View From 1710' in *Parliamentary History*, vol. 31 (2012), 1-15; W.A. Speck, 'The Current State of Sacheverell Scholarship', in *ibid.*, 16-27; Brian Cowan, 'The Spin Doctor: Sacheverell's Trial Speech and Political Performance in a Divided Society', in *ibid.*, 28-46.

the episcopal ministers resulting in hundreds of forced evictions. This immediately created a substantial number of Jacobite supporters. Lenman argued that in Scotland the Episcopal clergy were ‘the most significant single group of men creating and transmitting articulate Jacobite ideology’.²¹ Over the next 30 years the new Presbyterian establishment worked to oust their episcopal antagonists. Almost 200 Episcopalian ministers were deprived of their parishes in 1689 and deprivations continued through the following decades.²² This forced eviction and persecution created a sizable pool of potential Jacobite support not only amongst clergy but Episcopalian laity as well.²³ Despite the deprivations, at least 110 Episcopalians, of whom eleven were listed specifically as nonjurors, continued to enjoy their benefices as late as 1710 and were likely instrumental actors in the continuing dissemination of Jacobite ideology in Scotland.²⁴ For example, one magistrate in the notoriously Jacobite friendly city of Aberdeen noted that ‘besides being educated under Jacobite masters, [at the Colleges] they [the gentry] had an episcopal minister who they heard preach. To these in a great measure the Jacobite spirit which prevails...is owing.’²⁵ The Episcopalians provided the backbone of support for the rising in 1715. After the rebellion ended in 1716, around 36 episcopal clergymen were evicted from their parishes on charges of Jacobitism.²⁶ Throughout the period there were not only active Episcopalian clergymen propagating Jacobite ideology from the pulpit, but King’s

²¹ Lenman, ‘The Scottish Episcopal Clergy’, 36.

²² NAS CH/12/12/202, Manuscript biographical accounts of episcopal clergy deprived of their parishes by the committee of the estates, 1689.

²³ Clarke, ‘Nurseries of Sedition’?, 61-69.

²⁴ NAS CH/12/12/202; see also Tristram Clarke, ‘Nurseries of Sedition’?, 61-69.

²⁵ NAS GD220/5/455/4, unknown to Adam Cockburn of Ormiston, 13 June 1715.

²⁶ Clarke, ‘Nurseries of Sedition’?, 62; Lenman, ‘The Scottish Episcopal Clergy’, 46.

and Marischal colleges in Aberdeen continued to instil conservative, episcopal, and Jacobite ideas in their students after the Presbyterian ascendancy until at least 1717.²⁷

After the Union of 1707, Scottish Episcopalian complaints of persecution, despite their overt Jacobitism, fed into the British Tory politics of the church in danger. Many Anglican high churchmen had initially refused to support the Union of 1707 because it would perpetuate the establishment of the Presbyterian Church in Scotland at the expense of an Episcopal Church, whose members the Church of England increasingly viewed as co-religionists.²⁸ After the Union, high church Tories supported their episcopal brethren in Scotland and pushed through the Toleration Act of 1712 which allowed for the toleration of juring Scottish Episcopalian worship in Scotland, though not many were willing to subscribe the oaths and increasingly Scottish Episcopalians associated their cause with the successes of high church Anglicans.²⁹ Toleration lasted until 1715 when Episcopalians joined the Jacobite rebels in large numbers. The political victories were fleeting as the death of Anne brought an end to a brief high church ascendancy which flourished in the years 1710 to 1714. The proscription of the Tory party following the accession of George I, and his reliance on his Low Church Whig allies in 1715, increased the disaffection of high church Tories and drove them ever further towards Jacobitism.

The threat of a Stuart restoration, especially in the years between 1689 and 1745, meant that theology became a politicized battleground. Religious controversies contributed to the growing high church attachment to Jacobitism. Throughout the early eighteenth-century, debates about the *jure divino* nature of

²⁷ NAS GD220/5/455/4, unknown to Adam Cockburn of Ormiston, 13 June 1715; Clarke, 'Nurseries of Sedition?', 64.

²⁸ For the relationship between Anglican and Scottish Episcopalian worship see Alisdair Raffae, 'Presbyterians and Episcopalians: the Formation of Confessional Cultures in Scotland, 1660-1715,' *English Historical Review* 125 (2010), 570-598.

²⁹ NAS GD220/5/455/4, unknown to Adam Cockburn of Ormiston, 13 June 1715.

episcopal church government brought Scottish Episcopalians into the confessional culture of the Church of England, but similar debates also encouraged Anglican schemes for a possible union with the Gallican Church in France.³⁰ This union was advocated by a number of different Anglican divines including William Wake and Charles Leslie, but the motivations were vastly different.³¹ In the case of the nonjurors like George Hickes and Charles Leslie, a union with the Gallican church would have paved the way for a Stuart restoration by bringing the Catholic Stuarts back into a more universal Anglican establishment. Derogatory accusations of Gallicanism are not simply anti-Catholic; they are, at the core, anti-Jacobite.³² Similarly, the high church belief in the *jure divino* nature of episcopacy led to debates about the validity of baptism and ordination outwith the presence of a bishop. If lay baptism was invalid, as many high churchmen and nonjurors claimed, then all dissenters outside of an episcopal church, were not legitimately Christians. Thus, according to many Jacobites, the previously Lutheran Hanoverians, though accepted into the Church of England upon accession, lacked a proper Christian initiation and were essentially dissenters and incapable of serving as the head of the Anglican Church.³³ In effect, debates about the divine nature of episcopacy raised questions regarding the legitimacy of the Hanoverians and potentially provided the intellectual rationale for a Stuart restoration. Yet this also provided those who were antagonistic to the growth of the Church of England a justification for accusing those who argued for the necessity for bishops in the colonies of Jacobitism and disaffection.

³⁰ Raffe, 'Presbyterians and Episcopalians', 570-598; George Every, *The High Church Party, 1688-1718* (London, 1956), 70.

³¹ For a different interpretation of the Gallican Union see William Gibson, *The Church of England 1688-1832: Unity and Accord* (London, 2001), 182-216

³² Every, *The High Church Party*, 70.

³³ Bennett, *The Tory Crisis in Church and State*, 151.

The politics of the rage of party and the party conflicts rooted in religious differences are too often isolated to Britain. Rancorous partisan debates about issues such as occasional conformity have parallels in the colonies; but too often the parallels are viewed as distinct colonial issues rather than as matters spanning the Atlantic. An overemphasis on the conflicts surrounding the push for an American episcopacy by historians studying the Church of England, while correctly noting Atlantic elements of the debate, has distorted views of Anglicanism in the Colonies.³⁴ Historians have noted the high church propensity for *jure divino* understandings of episcopacy, and have built a solid foundation for exploring the Atlantic context and implications of those beliefs.

The Bishop of London served as the diocesan of the Church of England in the colonies but this never proved to be an adequate settlement. Although the absence of local bishops in the colonial Church of England is important, and the Church operated in an environment very different from that in Britain, the Church of England in the colonies was not distinct or set apart from the mother church, nor was it disassociated from the controversies engulfing the Church in Britain. A great deal of the misunderstanding surrounding the importance of the interaction of politics and theology is based on the assumption that the Church of England in America was somehow separated from the mother church in England because it lacked an identical defined episcopal structure or government support. This is certainly true to a degree. The absence of a resident bishop created the need for commissaries, clergymen appointed by the Bishop of London to exercise aspects of his authority, and enhanced the importance of colonial governors in the administration of the Church. It also

³⁴ James Bell, *A War of Religion: Dissenters, Anglicans and the American Revolution* (Basingstoke, 2008); Bridenbaugh, *Mitre and Scepter*; Nancy Rhoden, *Revolutionary Anglicanism: the Colonial Church of England Clergy during the American Revolution* (Basingstoke, 1999); Woolverton, *Colonial Anglicanism*.

made it difficult for colonial men to seek ordination in the Church of England because ordination at the hands of a Bishop required a trip to London.³⁵ Additionally, the large numbers of dissenters in the colonies, including Quakers, Independents, and Presbyterians, created religious diversity unparalleled in England. This dominance of dissent went almost unchecked, especially in the absence of a local bishop who could ordain and discipline clergymen.

Despite the obvious variances and difficulties caused by the differing institutional aspects of the government of the Church of England in the Atlantic Empire, there were many elements of the Church which remained unchanged. The liturgy and the festival calendar created a transatlantic communion which increasingly included Scottish Episcopalians.³⁶ Additionally, the political inheritance of the Church's previous hundred years, remained unaltered. The lack of a resident Bishop had other profound effects. The Bishop of London acted as the diocesan of the colonies and colonial ministers were required to send regular reports back to Britain either to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel or to the Bishop of London. The need to report to supervisors in London kept the colonial ministers attuned to political and religious developments which were affecting the Church in Britain. In addition, at least 180 clergymen were sent to serve the Church of England in the colonies in the years between 1689 and 1727 and this does not account for the numerous chaplains who served on ships which plied the waters of the Atlantic.³⁷ Additionally, an increasingly active transatlantic Anglican network supplied ministers with books and pamphlets intended to instruct and inform both the ministers and laity

³⁵ Bell, *Imperial Origins*, 142-165.

³⁶ Raffe, 'Presbyterians and Episcopalians', 570-598

³⁷ James Bell, *Colonial American Clergy of the Church of England Database*, Jamesbell.com, accessed hereafter cited as jamesbell.com

in the traditions and beliefs of the Church of England.³⁸ These clergymen, serving in their various capacities, were an important vehicle of the circulation and transmission of beliefs, experiences, and ideologies rooted in the party politics and religious controversies which engulfed the British Isles.

Through these connections, belief and ideology were transported across to the colonies. Thousands of miles of Atlantic Ocean could not quench the high church zeal. Nor did it miraculously wash away beliefs about the taint of rebelliousness associated with Presbyterianism. Immediate political contexts might not be identical but ideology often was. Beliefs which divided the high church and low church factions in Britain spanned the Atlantic, even if the manifestation of those beliefs did not always exactly replicate the original. For example, nonjuring was often problematic in the colonies just as it was in Britain. Noting the divisions between high and low church beliefs is significant because, as demonstrated above, high church attitudes often went hand in hand with a pro-Stuart dynastic inclination, which shaped relationships among differing political and religious groups.

An important consequence of a shared ideology was the resulting political divisions rooted in religion. Throughout the British Atlantic, political parties were associated with specific religious traditions. As in Britain, those colonists who dissented from the Church of England or those Anglicans who maintained a more latitudinarian approach to dissent were closely associated with a transatlantic Whig party. Conversely, the aims of the Tory party were at times almost inseparable from the colonial high church Anglican interest. This is clearly seen in a manuscript list from 1722 noting the political leanings of Maryland's 22 Anglican clergymen. The descriptions, likely drafted by a Whig, are both colourful and insightful. One

³⁸ Gregory, 'Transatlantic Anglican Networks', 127-142

clergyman, James Williamson, is listed as ‘an idiot & Tory’, while two others, John Donaldson and Thomas Robinson, are listed as ‘grand’ Tories. The implications of ‘grand Tory’ were certainly a contrast to Giles Rainford who was listed as ‘a stickler for the present happy establishment’ and William Machonchie, a ‘mighty stickler for the present establishment.’³⁹ The political implications of religious beliefs directly impacted the relationship between the growing Church of England and dissenters, and just as in Britain, this would affect opinions concerning the Protestant succession. In order to better understand and appreciate the conflicts involving the Church of England in the colonies and the accusations of Jacobitism that resulted, it is necessary to keep these religious controversies in their proper Atlantic context.

It was amidst this background of religious and political conflict in Britain that the Church of England in America experienced a period of rapid expansion. In the years from 1688 to 1727 the Church became legally established, at least in part, in four colonies, despite concerted and even transatlantic resistance from Quakers and other dissenters. Acts establishing the Church were passed in 1693 in New York, 1702 in Maryland, 1706 in South Carolina, and 1715 in North Carolina. The strength of the Church grew rapidly even in colonies where legal establishment remained elusive. Furthermore, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel to Foreign Parts (SPG), a missionary organization designed to support Anglican missions to the colonies, was incorporated in 1701. One of its many goals was to provide ministers, paid by SPG funds, to the many vacant parishes throughout the colonies, especially those where establishment proved elusive. Additionally, it was responsible for sending countless books and pamphlets to its ministers. In the early eighteenth century, a growing Anglican population with the assistance of the SPG contributed to

³⁹ *FP*, vol III, microfilm, 20-21.

the building of numerous churches. From 1688 to 1727 over 180 ministers were sent either as missionaries by the SPG or licenced and sent to parishes as curates by the Bishop of London. The proliferation of Anglican ministers and religious and political literature spread aspects of religious controversies plaguing the political debates of Britain.

Often in studies of the Colonial Anglican Church, the terms so familiar to scholars of the Church of England in this period, such as high church, low church and nonjuring, are mentioned without an explanation of the meaning or the significance of the language.⁴⁰ As has been shown, in early eighteenth century Britain and America these terms were laden with a wide variety of meanings. It is a mistake to assume that the arguably lay controlled low church establishments, such as those in Virginia or South Carolina, can always be conflated with widespread, low church sentiment among clergy and laity.⁴¹ This mistake has created an assumption that the Church of England members and clergy in the different colonies were inherently low church regarding both ideology and practice because the local church establishments lacked the episcopal government so often celebrated by high church advocates of the divine right of episcopacy. A consequence of this has been the marginalisation of discussions about high church ideology and Jacobitism in the colonies. Jacobitism was so deeply interwoven in the fabric of the debates engulfing the Church of England that a misunderstanding of the Church in the colonies necessarily leads to a misinterpretation of Jacobitism. An appreciation of the nature of the divisions in the Anglican Church throughout the reigns of Anne and George I is essential for a proper understanding of Jacobitism in the British Atlantic World.

⁴⁰ Woolverton, *Colonial Anglicanism*, 95. According to Woolverton, high church represented an imperial church.

⁴¹ John Nelson, *A Blessed Company*,

One often overlooked aspect of the Church of England in America was the ethnic and political diversity of its clergymen. Men from different educational backgrounds and nations contributed to the wide variety of beliefs propagated throughout the colonies. The Anglican clergymen sent to the colonies, either by the SPG or the Bishop of London, included many Scottish Episcopalians who, unable to find employment in Scotland, accepted ordination in the Church of England. This added an interesting element of ethnic and ideological diversity to the colonial religious setting. At least 61 clergymen sent to the colonies, of the 180 cited above, were Scottish by birth and 63 had attended Scottish universities.⁴² Many of the Scottish clergymen sent as missionaries, had witnessed, participated in, or, at the very least, had opinions concerning the divisive political climate in Britain. This was equally true for those English or Irish clergymen who were educated during a period of intense religious and political controversy. In fact, at least eight clergymen in the colonies during the period were known Jacobites and one had even fought with the Jacobites at the battle of Prestonpans prior to his ordination.⁴³ This number also included prominent English nonjurors such as Richard Welton as well as Scottish Jacobites like William Skinner, but it also represented less overt Jacobites like John Talbot.

The number of Scottish Episcopalians who, with little prospect of gainful employment at home after the establishment of a Presbyterian church government, were ordained in the Church of England is especially significant because many of them had experienced the persecution of Episcopalians first hand. Not only had they witnessed the religious controversies, many had been educated in Jacobite principles. As noted earlier, the colleges in Aberdeen were a bastion of Jacobitism through the

⁴² *Jamesbbell.com*

⁴³ 'William Skinner', *Jamesbbell.com*

first three decades of the eighteenth century. At least 30 colonial ministers had been educated at either King's or Marischal colleges in Aberdeen prior to 1727, suggesting at the very least possible sympathy with Jacobitism. For instance, James Honeyman, a high church proponent and a SPG missionary in Rhode Island, was educated at Marischal College Aberdeen in the 1690s, and was the son of an Episcopalian minister in Scotland deprived of his parish in 1689.⁴⁴ Although there is no direct evidence that Honeyman was a Jacobite, the circumstances are certainly suggestive and would have been seen as such by contemporaries, and in fact, he was accused by contemporaries of disaffection.⁴⁵ Similarly, George McQueen, a minister in Virginia, had been driven out of Scotland by Presbyterian persecution after 1689 and likely possessed little love for William and Mary and the revolution settlement.⁴⁶ Moreover, in 1699, two Scottish ministers in Virginia, Samuel Gray and John Gordon, published and distributed a 'certain scandalous, false, malicious and seditious libel, wherein were contained several wicked and malicious reflections and aspersions on his Most gracious Majesty...' further suggesting a strain of disaffection among Scottish clergymen in the colonies.⁴⁷

Regardless of origin, the colonial clergy were serving during a period of intense political and religious controversy which reverberated throughout the British Atlantic World. The growing strength of the high church party in the first decade of the eighteenth century had parallels in the colonies. In fact, high church clergymen were often warned to moderate their zeal in order to avoid alienating dissenters. This was especially true in colonies with a large or active dissenting population such as Rhode Island and New Jersey. However, these warnings often went unheeded by

⁴⁴ 'James Honeyman', *Jamesbbell.com*; NAS, ch12/12/202.

⁴⁵ James Honeyman to the Secretary, *FP*, vol III, microfilm, 212-213.

⁴⁶ 'George McQueen', *Jamesbbell.com*

⁴⁷ Cited in George McClaren Brydon, *Virginia's Mother Church and the Political Conditions Under which it Grew* (Richmond, VA, 1947).

high church clergymen who viewed dissenters as enemies. The secretary of the SPG wrote in 1707 to a leading layman in New York asking him to 'qualify' the zeal of the young missionary from 'North Briton,' George Muirson.⁴⁸ John Talbot, a missionary in New Jersey, was repeatedly reprimanded by the secretary of the SPG for his immoderation and the secretary wrote that it would be in the interest of the Church and nation to send those of too warm a spirit to the 'Frozen poles'.⁴⁹ High church zeal was an increasingly active component in the growth of the Church of England in the colonies.

However, zeal was often regarded by authorities in Britain as an unwelcome aspect of missionary work. The SPG had a diverse membership in Britain, ranging from White Kennett, the leading Whig propagandist, to the respected nonjuror Robert Nelson, creating potential for disagreements regarding the direction and role of the society. Leading Whigs in the society, including the secretary, James Chamberlain, were conscious of the implications of religious and party divisions and sought to squelch what they considered a misdirected high church zeal, leading to resentment among high church clerics in the colonies. In 1711 Honeyman complained that the Secretary was too quick to 'foster divisions between missionaries and the society' regarding moderation.⁵⁰ This sentiment was seconded by James Henderson, a missionary in Pennsylvania, who was not surprised that 'my zeal should put me under the displeasure of the enemies of our holy church, yet I hoped for better things from our patrons at home.'⁵¹ High church zeal was not isolated to Britain.

Party conflict under the guise of religious zeal can be seen following the Sacheverell trial, when the Tory party won a decisive parliamentary majority in 1710.

⁴⁸ Secretary to Col. Heathcote, Lambeth Palace papers, vol. XIV, microfilm, 111.

⁴⁹ Secretary to Talbot, Lambeth Palace papers, vol. XII, microfilm, 239, 251

⁵⁰ Honeyman to Stubbs, 19 October, 1711, SPG Series A, vol VII, 543.

⁵¹ Henderson to the Secretary, 9 July 1713, SPG Series A, vol VII, 478.

The victory solidified the high church ascendancy in Britain and provided high churchmen in the colonies with an administration friendly to the cause. As a result, high church zeal in the colonies became more pronounced. Accusations of persecution of Anglicans echoed the previous complaints of Episcopalians from Scotland. Although the established church may have been in less danger in England, the Church of England was still on a precarious footing in the colonies and the cry of 'the church in danger' sprang up across the Atlantic. High church clergymen, aware that they had a sympathetic ministry in London, sent accounts from the colonies crying up the danger of the church to Britain. Moreover, SPG records reveal that stories of persecution of Anglicans also began to make their way to Britain in far greater numbers. For example, in 1712 the church in Stratford, Connecticut complained that they were prey to the independents who sought 'all opportunities to destroy the church both root and branch.'⁵² Similar accounts came from Pennsylvania and New York as well. In 1712, Evan Evans, the rector of Christ's Church in Philadelphia, accused the governor of the province of failing to adequately support the church after the governor appointed a Presbyterian to the office of sheriff.⁵³ Vestries and clergymen echoed complaints previously heard in Britain, protesting that they were oppressed and persecuted and that 'any encouragement given to any other society different from us is a discouragement to our church'.⁵⁴

Laymen and clergy were galvanised by local religious controversies. As a result, nascent church parties developed in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Barbados throughout the years 1701 to 1727. In each colony, clergymen were leaders of the parties and were supported by local laymen who

⁵² *An Account of the Sufferings of the Members of the Church of England at Stratford, Connecticut*, SPG Series A, Vol. VII, 350-355.

⁵³ Gov. Gookin to the Secretary, 21 January 1712, SPG Series A, vol. VII, 506.

⁵⁴ Henderson to the Secretary, 12 Dec, 1712, SPG, Series A, vol. VIII, 97.

subscribed to high church beliefs. Amidst antagonisms stirred up by local disputes, these parties were cultivating Tory alliances throughout the British Atlantic World. As chapter five shows, in 1714 the church parties in New York and New Jersey turned to Francis Nicholson, appointed by the Tory administration as Governor of Nova Scotia and as a spiritual inspector by the Bishop of London, for support and guidance. In Barbados, a local party led by William Gordon, an Anglican clergyman, relied on prominent local planters to develop relationships with the Tory administration and the SPG in Britain.⁵⁵ In both cases, the Hanoverian succession quickly ended any hopes the parties harboured of securing a high church ascendancy in their respective colonies. After their Tory allies were removed from office in 1715, any semblance of power they had managed to secure locally in the colonies slipped out of their grasp, clearly illustrating the demise of high church Tory hopes spanning the Atlantic.

Many high churchmen in the colonies had pinned their hopes and futures on the success of the 1710-1714 Tory administration. The death of Queen Anne and the Hanoverian succession dashed these expectations. Just as the failure of a high church program following the proscription of the Tories led many clergymen in England inexorably towards Jacobitism, many clergymen in the colonies followed much the same path. In 1716, a number of clergymen in South Carolina were accused of drinking the health of the pretender.⁵⁶ Clergymen in New York and New Jersey were thought to have created a local Jacobite party.⁵⁷ In Barbados, the governor was concerned that ‘the *Jure divino* Clergy, zealous Romanistes, and high-flown (indefeasible) Church-men have held a very strict correspondence of late, and have made more frequent visites to each other than are agreeable to the rules of common

⁵⁵ J. Harry Bennett Jr., ‘The S.P.G. and Barbadian Politics, 1710-1720’, in *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 20 (1951), 190-206.

⁵⁶ Taylor to the Secretary, 18 April 1716, SPG Series A, vol XI, 163-205.

⁵⁷ See chapter 5.

civility, hospitality, or friendship'.⁵⁸ The governor also wrote of one clergyman that 'he behaved himself in such an extravagant, turbulent, and seditious manner' and was only 'fitt to officiate in the Pretender's Chapell.'⁵⁹ In fact, following the Tory proscription and the Jacobite rebellion in 1715-16, the SPG had received enough complaints about their missionaries that they deemed it necessary to send letters to all the clergymen and governors, asking them to report any clergymen who were disaffected to the protestant succession.⁶⁰

Religious controversies occasionally pitted parishioners against their clergymen. One layman in Philadelphia in 1722 went so far as to author and advertise a pamphlet against his Jacobite preacher. The advertisement printed in the Philadelphia newspaper the *American Weekly Mercury* claimed that the pamphlet was 'occasioned by an incomprehensible sermon' about the obedience due the clergy. It was also to include an appendix which demanded a reason why '*those excellent prayers of the Church, for his Majesty, the Prince and the Royal Family, out not to be read with as much Fervency and Devotion, as the Prayer for the Clergy and People?*' He continued, complaining that the clergyman prayed for the royal family with 'Indecent Hastiness' and 'Confused Muttering.'⁶¹

Jacobitism and high church zeal were not exclusively the domain of the Church of England clergy. It was occasionally the laity who, contrary to the inclination of a minister, favoured the Stuarts. In 1724, a clergyman in Virginia complained that he suffered the 'displeasure of my friends or relations' for his duty and deference to King George.⁶² Similarly, in 1716 a clergyman in South Carolina reported, to his distress, that the people of Charleston regularly drank the health of the

⁵⁸ *CSPC*, 30 December 1715.

⁵⁹ *CSPC*, 17 May 1717, item 573 ii.

⁶⁰ 3 May 1716, *SPG journals*, vol III,

⁶¹ *AWM*, 8 November 1722, no. 152.

⁶² William Perry, ed. *Papers Relating to the History of the Church in Virginia, 1650-1776* (1870), 253.

Duke of Ormonde and that 'the Pretender and his friends' health are drank regularly' in the town.⁶³ As chapter six shows, John Checkley, a Boston Anglican layman, printed pamphlets trumpeting passive obedience and non-resistance.

Arguably, one of the most notable features of the Church of England in the colonies was the strength of vestries. Colonial vestries were different than their English counterparts. The vestries were usually a committee elected by the parishioners to help the churchwardens manage the temporal affairs of the church. Colonial clergymen were often at odds with their vestry for administrative reasons whether it be pay or discipline and vestries often had a great deal of say in the appointing of ministers. The strength of vestries has led to the conclusion that lay or vestry control led to a predominance of low church or latitudinarian beliefs. This is true to a degree but this was not always the case. A high church vestry could just as easily drive off a low church minister and a prominent Jacobite vestryman could use his position to promote high church or Jacobite beliefs in the parish. For instance, in 1715, Alexander Skene, a leading vestryman of St. Andrew's parish in South Carolina, worked to drive off a low church minister who he felt was not performing the rites of the church with enough reverence. Skene, a Scottish Episcopalian who had served as Secretary in Barbados, was associated with the nascent church party there and served until he was removed by the Whig governor Robert Lowther in 1713.⁶⁴ He was reinstated until the Tory proscription resulted in his being turned out of his position after the accession of George I. He then relocated to South Carolina and within a year was a leading vestryman in his parish. He sought to oust Ebenezer Taylor, the local Anglican minister. Skene's dismissal following the proscription, his Tory politics, and his Scottish Episcopalian background, suggest the likelihood of Jacobite

⁶³ Ebenezer Taylor to the Bishop of London, 18 April, 1716, SPG Series A, vol XI, 163-205.

⁶⁴ *CSPC*, 20 December, 1711, item, 228.

sympathies, a notion eagerly seized upon by his clerical antagonist. Additionally, Taylor's background provides further evidence that party conflicts and religious controversies were Atlantic in scope. Taylor had immigrated to the colony as a Presbyterian minister from England but had been convinced to conform to the Church of England by Gideon Johnston, the Bishop of London's commissary in the colony.⁶⁵ After his denominational conversion, he remained a low church Anglican. This caused friction between Taylor and his high church parishioners led by Skene. The vestry and parishioners sent a formal complaint to the Bishop of London in 1716 requesting that Taylor be discharged for reasons including 'Not administering the Holy Sacraments on Christmas Day, or reading psalms on that day,' and placing the pulpit in front of the altar, both representing very low church attitudes. The conflict was not one sided and the accusations clearly illustrate the religious and political elements underlying the dispute. Taylor responded to his detractors by complaining that one of his antagonistic parishioners was a 'villain Torrey.'⁶⁶ Even Commissary Johnston, who had been friendly with Taylor, confessed that the minister had a Presbyterian style of preaching which would have proved unacceptable to a high church audience.⁶⁷

Taylor retaliated against his antagonistic parishioners with accusations of Jacobitism, further demonstrating the Atlantic context. In a letter to the Bishop of London, he argued 'I little thought that he [Skene] who pretends to more learning, to better breeding, and to be a better church of England man, but as far as I can perceive, his is one of the worst sort; I mean a mighty friend to the pretender and a Jacobite.'⁶⁸ He continued, arguing that the reason Skene, who in his mind had nefariously

⁶⁵ Gideon Johnston to the Secretary, 27 January, 1716, SPG series A, vol XI, 106-117.

⁶⁶ Parishioners of St. Andrew's parish to the society, 11 Feb, 1716, SPG series B, vol IV, 84.85.

⁶⁷ Gideon Johnston to the Secretary, 27 January, 1716, SPG series A, vol XI, 106-117

⁶⁸ Ebenezer Taylor to the Bishop of London, 18 April, 1716, SPG Series A, vol XI, 163-205.

influenced others in the parish, was set against him was so that 'the Parish may have a better minister' who would no doubt be a 'greater Jacobite and a more jolly companion.'⁶⁹ He also complained that 'Mr. Skene has done and will do a great deal of harm in my parish with respect to King George and the pretender's interests' and that 'he is making King George as few and the Pretender as many friends as he can.'⁷⁰ In the accusations, both those of the vestry and Taylor, there is an unmistakable mixture of party affiliation and religious belief, which naturally affected views of the Protestant succession. The high church vestry was dissatisfied with Taylor's low church approach to ministry. But Taylor understood the vestry's complaints, rooted in high church beliefs as they were, and especially because they were influenced by Skene, as little more than half-veiled Jacobitism. Taylor's accusations may seem farfetched. However, William Guy, the minister the vestry was hoping to bring in to replace Taylor, had twice been accused of Jacobitism and had even been brought before the governor of the colony to answer charges of drinking healths 'under the name of Job', a curious equation of the suffering servant with the exiled Stuarts.⁷¹

It was not only high church sympathies that spoke of the Atlantic context of disaffection in the colonies. Nonjuring had an immediate impact on the Church of England in the colonies. The Church of England was a minority church in most of the colonies but this did not preclude the existence of problems identical to those in Britain. For example, in 1689 a number of clergymen throughout the colonies, like their brethren in England, questioned whether or not to take oaths necessary to demonstrate their loyalty to William and Mary. One of the only Anglican clergymen in New York refused the oaths and ceased officiating in any official capacity.⁷² In

⁶⁹ *ibid.*

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

⁷¹ Thomas Hasell to the Society, 20 September 1717, SPG Series A, vol. XII, 83-85.

⁷² Nelson R. Burr, *The Anglican Church in New Jersey* (Philadelphia, 1954), 14

Barbados, during the celebrations in honour of the accession of William and Mary, the clergy absented themselves ‘on some mistake or scruple of conscience as to their oath of allegiance to King James’ and the colony did not have sermons for a few weeks.⁷³ Their clerical Jacobitism was short-lived as after some cajoling from the governor, the clergy laid aside their ‘mistaken sentiments’ and followed the clergy and laity of England in ‘securing the Protestant religion.’⁷⁴ The governor attributed their decision to doubts about the validity of new oaths rather than a stubborn refusal to support the Protestant succession but he understood well that an obstinate group of clergy might have quickly become a ‘menace to peace on the island colony.’⁷⁵ Others were more conscientious than the Barbados clergymen mentioned above. In Jamaica in 1692, Thomas Scrambler, a ‘beneficed minister’, refused to take the oaths, was deprived of his living, and was later arrested.⁷⁶

After the initial confusion of 1689, nonjuring became less of an immediate problem in the colonies. The organizational structure of the Church of England in the colonies made nonjuring less of a threat in some important ways. All of the clergy who were licensed by the Bishop of London to officiate services in the colonies were required to subscribe to the necessary oaths prior to ordination or licensing.⁷⁷ This meant that all of the clergymen sent by the SPG or the Bishop of London were willing to take the oaths. This does not, however, imply that all of them remained steadfast in their juring beliefs. For example, John Talbot, a clergyman in New Jersey, became increasingly sympathetic to the nonjuring position, following the Hanoverian succession, thirteen years after he was sent as a missionary of the SPG, he refused to take the oaths when prompted. His only defence was that he had been ‘williamite

⁷³ *CSPC*, Governor Stede to the Earl of Shrewsbury, 30 May, 1689, item 155.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

⁷⁶ *CSPC*, 9 May 1692, item 221; *CSPC*, 19 May 1692, item 236.

⁷⁷ Bell, *Imperial Origins*, 159.

from the beginning' and, for evidence, he pointed his detractors towards the oaths he had sworn during the reign of William and Mary.⁷⁸ Old oaths did not guarantee static beliefs and Talbot's evolving beliefs led him to accept consecration as a bishop in the nonjuring communion in 1721⁷⁹ which he exercised quietly in the colonies until his activities were reported to the Bishop of London in 1725.⁸⁰

If the necessity of swearing the oaths prior to ordination and licensing prevented a good deal of nonjuring amongst ministers sent by the Bishop of London or the SPG, it could not stamp out all nonjuring. Nonjurors could easily move across the Atlantic and serve in an unofficial capacity. The distance between London and the colonial parishes and the time needed to receive information meant that there were a great number of colonial parishes that went for long periods without a settled minister. This was in part due to the daunting obstacles which needed to be overcome in order to achieve ordination for those colonists interested, including passage across the Atlantic. Often the vestries of vacant parishes would resort to accepting unlicensed, nonjuring ministers rather than do without a preacher. For example, in 1716, the vestry of Oxford parish in Pennsylvania wrote to the secretary of the SPG informing him of their need for a new minister. They also informed him that a 'nonjuring itinerant has been filling in' following the death of their settled missionary.⁸¹ Although the identity of the itinerant minister remains unknown, his presence demonstrates the existence of an anonymous nonjuring minister. Moreover, it illustrates the willingness of the vestry to allow a nonjuror to preach without a license if it were necessary to maintain the existence of the church. This could lead to interesting problems.

⁷⁸ John Talbot to Bishop Robinson, 21 October 1715, *FP*, vol VI, 128-129.

⁷⁹ Broxap, *The Later Non-Jurors*, 87.

⁸⁰ John Talbot to Bishop Gibson, 2 July 1725, *FP*, vol VI, 130-131.

⁸¹ Vestry of Oxford Parish to the Secretary, [c. 1716], SPG series A, vol XI, 234.

The most fascinating nonjuror in the colonies, by far, was Richard Welton. He was a high church cleric from London who, after refusing to swear the necessary oaths in 1715 following the accession of George I, had been deprived of his position as rector of Whitechapel in London. He was by no means a moderate nonjuror. Even the nonjuring bishops were unhappy with Welton's morals and controversial attitudes and objected to his consecration as a nonjuring Bishop.⁸² He was an active author in London, writing works extolling the virtues of the nonjuring church and claiming that the juring church was schismatic. For example, he anonymously attacked the Bishop of London for his lack of support during the persecution of the nonjuring church in 1715. He argued that the oath of abjuration was 'contrary to all the Laws of Truth, of Righteousness, and the Gospel of Jesus Christ' and that if 'it be possible for your Lordship to trim and to comply in these cases, either out of Fear or Interest, we [the clergy] must renounce our Obedience to You, as a perfidious and false Bishop.'⁸³

Despite the publication of numerous nonjuring polemics, he was best known for the altar piece set up in his church at Whitechapel which contained a picture of the last supper portraying Judas, the betrayer of Jesus, in the 'habit of a clergy-man'.⁸⁴ It was said that the figure of Judas was painted to look like Bishop White Kennet, a prominent low church bishop.⁸⁵ News of Welton's antics concerning the altar-piece reached as far as Boston.⁸⁶ His antipathy towards low churchmen and those who were willing to swear the oaths of abjuration knew few, if any, bounds.

⁸² Thomas Brett to Archibald Campbell, 24 October 1724, NAS CH12/15/109, 180-185.

⁸³ *The Clergy's Tears: or, a Cry Against Persecution. Humbly offered in a letter to the Bishop of London, in our Present great Distress and Danger.* (London, 1715).

⁸⁴ *The Whole Tryal and Examination of Dr. Welton, Rector of White-Chapel and the Church-Wardens, on Monday Last, in the Bishop of London's court* (London, 1714).

⁸⁵ G.V. Bennett, *White Kennet: Bishop of Peterborough, A Study in the Political and Ecclesiastical History of the Early Eighteenth Century* (London, 1957), 127-131.

⁸⁶ Jeremiah Dummer to Benjamin Colman, 15 January 1714/15, Benjamin Colman Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society (microfilm).

In 1721, Welton was consecrated in Britain as a bishop in the nonjuring communion along with John Talbot.⁸⁷ His arrival was noted in the colonies in June 1724. He was soon voted in and employed by the vestry as the rector of Christ Church in Philadelphia, which a contemporary estimated had 800 communicants, despite the fact that the local newspaper, the *American Weekly Mercury*, reported the year before that ‘Dr. Welton, the nonjuror’ had recently been taken into custody in Britain.⁸⁸ Church of England ministers in Philadelphia denied having anything to do with Welton and stated that he professed ‘to have come into these parts only to see the country.’⁸⁹ While many have taken at face value the assertion of Peter Evans, a vestryman of Christ Church, that the vestry employed Welton not knowing that he was a vocal and prominent nonjuror, this ignorance seems unlikely. In an attempt to defend the vestry’s appointment of Welton, Evans disingenuously claimed in a letter to the Bishop of London that he had read in London prints that Welton had sworn the necessary oaths.⁹⁰ Regardless, Welton’s appearance in the colonies caused quite a stir. The commissary of Maryland wrote to the Bishop of London stating that ‘the nonjuring schism has reached thither.’⁹¹ Another Church of England minister in New Haven, Connecticut, feared that with the arrival of two nonjuring bishops, Welton and Talbot, some of his parishioners, recently brought into the Anglican fold, would wander ‘out of one schism into another and with all into disaffection to the King.’⁹² Commissary Henderson of Maryland had heard by August 1724 that both Talbot and Welton were in episcopal orders. He claimed that Welton’s parishioners in

⁸⁷ Broxap, *The Later Nonjurors*, 88.

⁸⁸ Peter Evans to Bishop Gibson, [c. 1725], *FP*, vol VII, 121-122; for the number of communicants, see Patrick Gordon to the Bishop of London, 19 July 1726, *FP*, vol VII, 126-127; *AMW*, 16 May 1723, no. 178.

⁸⁹ Clergy of Pennsylvania to the Bishop of London, *FP*, vol II, 5-6.

⁹⁰ Peter Evans to Bishop Gibson, [c. 1725], *FP*, vol VII, 121-122.

⁹¹ Jacob Henderson to the Bishop of London, 16 August, 1724, *FP*, vol III, 41-42.

⁹² Joseph Browne to the Bishop of London, 15 March 1725, *FP*, vol I, 210-211.

Philadelphia were equally aware that Welton was a notorious nonjuror but were so fond of Welton that they 'would have him right or wrong.'⁹³ Equally important, the governor of Pennsylvania, William Keith, a member of Christ Church and a former Jacobite, knew of Welton's principles. In a self-justifying letter to the Bishop of London, Keith claimed that for the sake of peace, he 'was obliged to be passive in things which are both indecent and disorderly, such as suffering some of the clergymen to read prayers and preach without mentioning the King, Prince, or Royal family'.⁹⁴ How much of Keith's passivity was necessary is questionable, as it was charged against Keith that he also allowed Welton to officiate at the wedding of his daughter in law.⁹⁵

Not only were Welton and Talbot nonjuring bishops in the colonies, they were also active propagandists for the nonjuring cause. One antagonistic clergyman in Maryland claimed that Talbot had 'poisoned all the neighbouring clergy with his rebellious principles.'⁹⁶ Moreover, a clergyman in New England wrote to the Bishop of London that 'it is certain that the nonjurors have sent over two Bishops into America' and noted that 'one of them has travelled through the country ...to promote their cause.' He also expressed concern that 'my well meaning people otherwise well enough affected will be in great danger of being imposed on and led aside' and was 'sensible that their [the nonjuring bishops] powers of persuasion are very considerable.'⁹⁷ Perhaps even more important was the fact that Welton and Talbot had each brought to the colonies numerous tracts and pamphlets espousing the nonjuring cause. Talbot was noted as having come 'fraught from England' with

⁹³ Jacob Henderson to the Bishop of London, 16 August, 1724, *FP*, vol III, 41-42.

⁹⁴ Governor William Keith to the Bishop of London, 24 July, 1724, *FP*, vol VII, 114-115.

⁹⁵ Charles P. Keith, 'Sir William Keith', in *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* XII (1888), 1-33.

⁹⁶ Mr. Urmston to [?], 29 July, 1724, SPG Series C, Box 7, item 67.

⁹⁷ Joseph Browne to the Bishop of London, 15 March 1725, *FP*, vol I, 210-211.

scandalous pamphlets including one referred to as ‘The Case Truly Stated’. Although the exact pamphlet this refers to is unknown, the person mentioning it certainly viewed it as nonjuring propaganda.⁹⁸ Furthermore, Welton was accused of bringing revised and printed copies of his famous altar piece to which he had added a scroll coming out of the mouth of the Bishop of Peterborough, White Kennet, saying ‘I am not he who betrayed X^t though as ready to do it as ever Judas was.’⁹⁹

Word of their activity was certain to reach London. The nonjuring Bishops had been aware that Welton and Talbot had been ordained and sent to the colonies as early as 1724. In October 1724, Thomas Brett noted, ‘I suppose in about a years time we shall have an acct. in our public newspapers of these new Bps appearing in America...and what encouragement they find there.’¹⁰⁰ When news of the activities of Welton and Talbot did reach London, the Bishop of London and King George acted quickly to end what one critic described as Welton’s ‘chimerical prospects.’¹⁰¹ In Pennsylvania, Governor Keith, under the authority of the Bishop of London, served Welton with a writ of privy seal, commanding him to return to Great Britain.¹⁰² Welton never made it back to Britain, dying *en route*, but before he left the Church in Philadelphia, he preached and printed a final sermon titled *The Certain Comforts of God the Holy Ghost* which he advertised in the local paper.¹⁰³ The new commissary in Philadelphia wrote to the Bishop of London that Welton’s sermon attacked the established clergy in a ‘scurrilous manner’ and entreated his audience to reject any minister sent amongst them.¹⁰⁴ In the sermon, the nonjurant Bishop made a final plea

⁹⁸ Mr. Urmston to [?], 29 July, 1724, SPG Series C, Box 7, item 67.

⁹⁹ Mr. Stubbs to the Bishop of London, 16 April, 1725, *FP*, vol VII, 117-118.

¹⁰⁰ Thomas Brett to Archibald Campbell, 24 October 1724, NAS CH12/15/109, 180-185.

¹⁰¹ Mr. Cummings to the Bishop of London, 19 October, 1726, *FP*, vol VII, 128-129.

¹⁰² William Keith to the Bishop of London, 8 April, 1726, *FP*, vol VII, 124-125; British Library, Add Ms 36125, ff. 370, 372.

¹⁰³ Richard Welton, *The Certain Comforts of God the Holy Ghost, &c, Preached at the Episcopal Church in Philadelphia* (Philadelphia, 1726); *AWM*, 5 February 1725/26, no 321.

¹⁰⁴ Mr. Cummings to the Bishop of London, 19 October, 1726, *FP*, vol VII, 128-129.

for the case of the nonjuring church. He exhorted his ‘sorrowful congregation’ to find comfort in religion but more important, he charged his ‘Dear Lambs’ to beware of the ‘IMPOSTORS, and FALSE PROPHETS’ who would come amongst them.¹⁰⁵ Welton continued, throughout the sermon, to lambast not only the Church of England, but the Bishop of London as well. He reminded his congregation, without much subtlety, that the Bishop had treated them not as a ‘Tender Father’ but as a ‘STEP-FATHER’. He carried his arguments further by mocking the SPG and praying that his parish would be secure from ‘the PROPAGATIONS of those wolves.’¹⁰⁶ He prayed that his flock would not be seduced to ‘Betray the FAITH and UNITY in Christ’s Holy APOSTOLICK CHURCH.’ Referring again to the Bishop of London, he warned his auditors of the danger of the ‘Wolf’ who would send his ‘IMPS’ among them and finally exhorted them to ‘enter not into their secrets, whose prayers are an abomination to the righteous God!’¹⁰⁷ After venting his spleen against the established church, he urged his people to remember his ‘sacred Brother Jonathan [Talbot]’ who was the partner of his afflictions and ‘fellow labourer.’ This is the only evidence we have from either Welton or Talbot regarding their connections. It is fascinating to note that Welton claimed that if he was at all successful in his labour amongst the church in Philadelphia, it was owing to Talbot’s previous work serving that church when he was not needed at his own church in Burlington, New Jersey and the fact that he made Welton ‘Love, and Pity’ the church even before he settled there.¹⁰⁸

It was not only religious controversies and beliefs associated with the Church of England which can be linked to Jacobitism in the Atlantic world. Roman Catholicism contributed to the persistence of Jacobitism throughout the British

¹⁰⁵ Welton, *The Certain Comforts*, 3, 10, 20.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid, 21.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid, 22.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid, 23.

Atlantic. Roman Catholics in England, Scotland, and Ireland remained an important pillar of support for their co-religionist James Stuart and his heirs, and the same was often true for their fellow Catholics in the colonies. As in England and Scotland, Roman Catholics were a minority faith in the colonies, even in Maryland, which was in some respects a Catholic sanctuary. In the uncertain aftermath of the revolution of 1688, and its various manifestations in the colonies in 1689, accusations of Jacobitism were as common as they were confused and Catholics often bore the brunt of the vitriol, although not without reason. As a result, Jacobitism survived and even thrived among Catholics in the colonies.

In 1689 as word of the invasion of England by William of Orange reached the colonies, colonial governors appointed by James II & VII were caught unprepared. Unsure of how to proceed in the absence of orders from England, the governments in Boston, New York, and Maryland prevaricated and failed to act decisively either for James or William. Simultaneously, rumours of war and of a French and Indian conspiracy were circulating throughout the British Atlantic, stirring extant fears of a larger Catholic conspiracy.¹⁰⁹ Eventually, settlers in Boston, New York, and Maryland rose up against the governors and established new governments which promptly announced the accession of William and Mary to the thrones of England, Scotland, and Ireland. Fears of Catholic supporters of the Stuarts and France proved a heady mixture and in the wake of the revolution in 1688; the interim colonial governments set up by supporters of William and Mary in New England, Maryland, and New York regularly accused their opponents of popery and Jacobitism. For example, in Maryland, the popish party was accused of distributing pamphlets and

¹⁰⁹ Owen Stanwood, 'The Protestant Moment: Antipopery, the Revolution of 1688-1689, and the Making of an Anglo-American Empire,' in the *Journal of British Studies*, 46 (July 2007), 481-508.

arguing that ‘King James will be restored.’¹¹⁰ But accusations were not rooted in an ‘imagined’ threat; Catholics were legitimately associated with Jacobitism throughout the British Atlantic.

Roman Catholics in the colonies were regularly associated with the threat posed by an antagonistic Catholic French imperial state. Colonial participation in the Nine Years War (1688-1697) with France, including failed attacks on Quebec, increased the confessional antipathy. Fears that French supported Catholics posed a threat to the colonies gained credence in 1689 when Irish Catholic servants in the Leeward Islands, aided by the French, rose in rebellion and declared themselves for King James.¹¹¹ The possibility of similar revolts by Irish Catholics supported by French forces encouraged governors in the Caribbean to disarm the local Catholic population.¹¹² French action against the English continued to plague the colonists. In 1689, the French captured the island of Anguilla and installed in the position of governor an Irish Catholic who required the populace to take oaths of allegiance to James VII & II.¹¹³

It was possible for Catholic Jacobites to receive protection instead of denunciation from officials. In Pennsylvania in 1689, a justice of the peace complained that when he attempted to seize two Catholic gentlemen he was discouraged by his fellow justices who said ‘they were very honest persons’ and ‘after drinking King James’s health with them, allowed them to go.’¹¹⁴ Similarly, in Jamaica, the interim governor, who took counsel from a ‘popish’ priest, was censured by his council for refusing to hear charges against a papist who spoke seditious words

¹¹⁰ *CSPC*, 25 April, 1691, item 1497.

¹¹¹ *CSPC*, 31 July 1689. Item 312; 9 July 1689, item 237.

¹¹² *CSPC*, 31 July 1689. Item 312; *CSPC*, 27 June 1689, Item 212; *CSPC*, 2 May, 1689, Item 102.

¹¹³ *CSPC*, 19 September, 1689, item 444.

¹¹⁴ *CSPC*, 4 October, 1689, item 469

against King William.¹¹⁵ Although it was uncommon, official sanction of Jacobitism provided a means of perpetuating loyalty to the Stuarts among Catholics. Colonists were also fearful that Jacobitism among servants might not be punished by owners. In 1706, Governor Seymour of Maryland wrote of the ‘growing mischief’ of importing Irish servants who were mostly papists and noted that the Jacobite Charles Carroll had imported 200 servants.¹¹⁶

Catholics in the colonies also participated in the rituals associated with Jacobitism, such as health drinking and celebrating Jacobite holidays. Drinking the health of King James was practiced regularly in some Catholic houses. In Maryland in 1698, a group of men were accused of being in the home of Walter Smith when King James’s health was drunk. The accused denied that they participated but did admit that several others at the house took part.¹¹⁷ Also in Maryland Benjamin Hall was required to pay £1000 as a security for good behaviour for drinking King James’s health. Similarly, in Antigua in 1718, one critic complained that ‘in the evening of St. Patrick’s Day since H.M. accession 50 or 60 of them [Catholics] got together in St. John’s at midnight and drank ye Pretender’s health several of them with drawn swords and roved about ye town in a riotous manner.’¹¹⁸ Drinking the health of James VII & II provided a communal ritual which reinforced the relationship between Catholicism and Jacobitism for a number of colonists, especially in Maryland. Catholic Jacobite activity increased in the years before the rebellion in 1715 in anticipation of a Stuart restoration. After the news of the rebellion reached the colonies, Catholics were suspected of showing their disaffection to the monarchs by ‘spreading sundry false rumours’ about the ‘advantage gained by His Majesty’s

¹¹⁵ *CSPC*, May 1689, item 874 v.; *CSPC*, July 1689, item 299.

¹¹⁶ *CSPC*, 8 March 1706, item 160.

¹¹⁷ *AOM*, vol. 23, 461-462.

¹¹⁸ *CSPC*, 29 January 1718, item 335.

enemies' and 'drinking or offering to drink, the Pretender's health.'¹¹⁹ On 10 June in 1716, the birthday of the 'Old Pretender', two Catholics in Maryland drank James's health and spoke 'contemptibly' of King George. They were tried, found guilty and imprisoned until they could pay the £100 fine for their actions.¹²⁰ On the same day, two Irish Catholic servants loaded and fired the great guns in the fort in order to celebrate the birthday of the exiled Stuart king. The government responded swiftly. After notice of a reward of twenty pounds sterling was advertised, one of the servants, no doubt to the chagrin of his companion, 'confessed himself' and received a pardon while his companion was tried, convicted and received a whipping and time in the pillory.¹²¹

Jacobitism survived among Catholic gentry in the colonies, primarily in Maryland. As in the Jacobite gentry of Scotland, England, and Ireland, religion, associational rituals and family ties perpetuated Jacobite loyalties for generations.¹²² The Carroll family of Maryland provides a clear example of this trend. They maintained a family loyalty to the Stuarts over a period of almost thirty years. Charles Carroll immigrated to Maryland from Ireland in 1688 as an appointee of Lord Baltimore but soon after he arrived, his appointment was made null by the accession of William and Mary and the loss of Baltimore's charter. Carroll was a member of a staunchly Jacobite Irish family. Some of his immediate family remaining in Ireland fought and died for King James at the Battle of the Boyne.¹²³ Charles was temporarily imprisoned for 'discourses against the government' in 1689.¹²⁴ Carroll

¹¹⁹ *AOM*, vol 25, 334.

¹²⁰ *Ibid*, vol 30, 373-374.

¹²¹ *AOM*, vol 30, 373.

¹²² Monod, *Jacobitism*, 132-138.

¹²³ For information about the Carroll family in Ireland see, Ronald Hoffman, *Princes of Ireland, Planters of Maryland: A Carroll Saga, 1500-1782* (Chapel Hill, 2000).

¹²⁴ Richard J. Purcell, 'Irish Colonists in Colonial Maryland' in *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review* 23 (1934) 279-294, quote from 282.

remained a Jacobite throughout his life and in 1716 the government of Maryland, upon receiving notice that Carroll had acquired an appointment from the proprietor, required that he take the oaths of allegiance, supremacy and abjuration. Although he was willing to subscribe the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, he refused to swear the oath of abjuration.¹²⁵ Charles was not the only Jacobite in his family in Maryland; his nephew was imprisoned and fined for drinking the health of the pretender in 1716.¹²⁶ Outside the Carroll family, Richard Smith suffered fines after he refused to swear the oaths of allegiance and supremacy in 1698 due to his religious beliefs.¹²⁷

Catholic associations with Jacobitism led to numerous laws and declarations against this confessional group. After news of the attempted Jacobite rebellion of 1708 reached the colonies, Governor Seymour of Maryland noted that ‘the Roman Catholicks in this province discourse of the late designed invasion by the Pretended prince of Wales, and were listning after the success’, Seymour thought it best to ‘take the number of them’ in each county.¹²⁸ Also in Maryland in 1716, Governor Hart attempted to temper perceived Catholic Jacobite intrigues by issuing a declaration ‘against papists and nonjurors spreading false rumours about the victories of the rebels and drinking the health of a popish pretender.’¹²⁹ Additionally, it was ordered that the sheriffs of the counties in Maryland make a list of all the Roman Catholics in their respective counties. In Antigua, a law was passed which one contemporary noted was intended to ‘prevent the increase of papists and non-jurors in this island’ and to better govern those already settled there. This was passed in 1718 after

¹²⁵ *AOM*, vol 30, 374.

¹²⁶ Beatriz Betancourt Hardy, ‘A Papist in a Protestant Age: The Case of Richard Bennett, 1667-1749,’ in *The Journal of Southern History* 60 (1994), 203-228, 215 n. 51.

¹²⁷ *AOM*, vol 25, 21.

¹²⁸ *CSPC*, 1708, item 131.

¹²⁹ *AOM*, vol 25, pg 335.

complaints about ‘the extraordinary misbehaviour of the papists and their disaffection to His Majesty and the Protestant succession.’¹³⁰

Pennite Quakers in England had a curious relationship with Jacobitism and this consequently affected Quakers throughout the British Atlantic World, especially in the years 1689 to 1696.¹³¹ Quakers settled throughout the colonies were often slandered as Jacobites or suspected of harbouring sympathies for the Stuarts. The primary reason for these accusations of Jacobitism was their association with William Penn. Penn was very likely a Jacobite and was accused of Jacobitism, forced into hiding, and arrested by the British government at least four separate times from 1689-1691 for suspicion of Jacobitism.¹³² There are a multitude of reasons why Penn was suspected harbouring Jacobite sympathies. Penn was indebted to Charles II for the 1684 grant of Pennsylvania, and had supported James’s policy of toleration. He was also, arguably, a genuine friend of the exiled Stuart king.¹³³ Additionally, it was known that James II & VII had been kind to Quakers, letting many out of prison during his short reign. The questions raised by his known attachment to James reflected poorly not only on Penn himself but also the Quaker sect as a whole. The most prominent Quaker in both the British Archipelago and the colonies, Penn was influential in Quaker circles long before he was granted the colony of Pennsylvania by Charles II. His ownership of Pennsylvania and the initiation of his ‘Holy Experiment’ only increased his prominence, especially among the Quakers who settled in that area.

¹³⁰ ‘Journal, April 1718: Journal Book T’, *Journals of the Board of Trade and Plantations, Volume 3: March 1715 - October 1718* (1924), pp. 358-372. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=81428>, accessed 15 May 2013

¹³¹ For example, see David William Voorhees, ‘“to assert our Right before it be quite lost”,’: The Leisler Rebellion in the Delaware River Valley, *Pennsylvania History* 64, (1997), 5-27.

¹³² Mary Geiter, ‘William Penn and Jacobitism: A Smoking Gun?’, *Historical Research* 73 (2000), 213-219; Monod, *Jacobitism*, 155-156.

¹³³ Vincent Buranelli, *The King and the Quaker: A Study of William Penn and James II* (Philadelphia, 1962).

Although it is unlikely that many Quakers in the colonies were Jacobites, the curious Quaker relationship with Jacobitism illustrates the significance of Jacobite sympathies in the British Atlantic. In 1698, a prominent local Anglican wrote that the Quakers in Pennsylvania were ‘all Jacobites’ because they were antagonistic towards the growth of the Church of England in the colony of Pennsylvania.¹³⁴ He based this accusation on his testimony that a Quaker magistrate told him he was not worried about the defence of the colony because King James, who was in France, ordered Jacobite privateers not to meddle with Quaker merchants in Pennsylvania because of James’ loyalty to, and friendship with, Penn. While this accusation is seemingly unsubstantiated, it does indicate actual fears in the colonies of the malevolent influence wielded by the exiled Stuarts.

This is reinforced by the fact that the Quakers were slandered, not because of their vocal adherence to, and support of Penn or any militant Jacobite expressions, but rather from their stated adherence to what was viewed as the Jacobite principle of non-resistance. This proved to be extremely controversial among their fellow colonists, especially with the constant threat of a French invasion looming as a consequence of King William’s wars. Quaker antipathy towards supporting warfare of any kind, in any way, whether with money, men or supplies was construed as being support for the French, and therefore the Stuart interest. The location of large numbers of Quaker settlers in Pennsylvania near the border of French Canada greatly frightened those who already harboured suspicions or fears of Quaker loyalty due to their relationship with William Penn. This mistrust of the Quaker principles and the locations of many of their settlements near enemies coupled with the association of Pennite Quakers with Jacobitism led to accusations of Jacobitism. Francis Nicholson,

¹³⁴ Mr. Suder to Governor, Nov. 20, 1698, *Historical Collections Relating to the American Colonial Church*, ed. William Stevens Perry, vol. 2 (New York, 1969), 10.

Lieutenant governor of Virginia, and a staunch Anglican, expressed this fear of the Quakers' principles and questioned their loyalties when he wrote in 1691 to the Lords of Trade and Plantations that 'if they be of William Penn's pernicious principles they may hold correspondence with the French and Indians by land and with the French by sea'.¹³⁵ Similarly, following the declaration of War with France in 1689, the Quakers in Pennsylvania declared that they would not fight if invaded by the French. This led the council of Virginia to order in 1691 that 'no Quakers hold meetings without giving due notice as required by Act of Parliament, and that they receive no strangers and publish no strange news without informing a justice of the peace'.¹³⁶

It was not only in the mainland colonies that the distrust of the Quakers resulted in accusations of Jacobitism. In 1693 during the Nine Years War, Governor Kendall of Barbados echoed the sentiments of his fellow colonial governors when he stated that 'the Quakers indeed are very numerous here and a great weakness to the island, for they are wholly useless to its defence [sic]'.¹³⁷ He went on to argue that 'it is most certain that they are all Jacobites...the heads of them holding correspondence with William Penn, who governs them as absolutely as the King of France'.¹³⁸ Kendall's accusation demonstrated a keen awareness of the larger Atlantic religious and political context.

Many colonists in the late seventeenth century perceived Quakerism to be inherently disloyal, and therefore, as synonymous with Jacobitism. Quaker principles of non-resistance were viewed as disloyal in the face of the French threat. To many colonists their association with William Penn was a mark of questionable behaviour and placed them squarely in the Jacobite camp. Nonetheless, Charles Petrie's claim

¹³⁵ *CSPC*, 10 June 1691, item 1583.

¹³⁶ *CSPC*, 18 February 1691, item 1324.

¹³⁷ *CSPC*, 10 July, 1693, item 442.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*

that the 'Quakers in Pennsylvania were Jacobite to a man' seems largely unsubstantiated and is misleading.¹³⁹ The Quakers scattered throughout the British Atlantic may not, in fact, have been Jacobite to a man. However, the identification of Pennite Quakers with Jacobitism in England helps explain the colonial assumption that Quakers either favoured or were favoured by the exiled Stuarts.

In conclusion, Jacobitism was a vital aspect of the religious and political controversies gripping Britain from 1689 to 1727. This seemingly British controversy had transatlantic repercussions. Confessional groups, such as nonjurors, Scottish Episcopalians, Catholics, and high church Anglicans provided the ideological foundations of a transatlantic Jacobite subculture. These confessional groups had colonial analogues. There were a number of nonjurors in the colonies. The nonjurors even managed to send bishops to America, a feat the established church was never able to accomplish. Similarly, many Scottish Episcopalians were men educated in Jacobite principles at the colleges in Aberdeen and were later ordained and sent to the colonies as ministers for the Church of England. This created a pool of men in the colonies likely sympathetic to the exiled Stuart dynasty. Many Catholics also maintained sympathy for the Stuarts despite the penalties and suspicions they laboured under daily. Moreover, the religious controversies dividing the high church and low church parties in the Church of England were replicated throughout the British Atlantic. Religious controversies dividing the established church such as occasional conformity, lay baptism, and the 'Church in danger' all had parallels in the colonies. These transatlantic controversies helped foster transatlantic party alignments. The Tory ascendancy of 1710-1714 drew high church Anglicans in the colonies into the orbit of a Jacobite friendly Tory party. This in turn, affected the

¹³⁹ Petrie, *The Jacobite Movement*, 73.

perception of Anglicans and Jacobites in the colonies. Thus, the religious foundations of Jacobite ideology were an instrumental component of Jacobitism in the British Atlantic World.

Jacobitism and Anti-Jacobitism in the Atlantic Public Sphere

As the previous two chapters have shown, Jacobitism manifested across the Atlantic world through shared religious controversies and the operation of imperial politics and appointments throughout the Age of Anne. These religious and government networks served as institutional networks of communication and connected colonists to the religious controversies and politics of mainland Britain. Nevertheless, the communication of a cultural Jacobitism was not limited to these institutional links. Ideas also circulated via extra-institutional means such as newspapers, personal letters, and family networks. Jacobitism was a cultural phenomenon and part and parcel of all British society including Britain's Atlantic colonies. It permeated every aspect of British culture, including print, religion, poetry, architecture, and politics.¹ Cultural conflicts did not dissipate after emigrants left Britain's shores nor did they evolve beyond recognition. Informal personal networks and an increasingly vibrant print culture provided a means of further transmitting and sustaining British culture throughout the Atlantic. Contested religious and political beliefs circulated around the Atlantic, and so too did the news, pamphlets, and broadsides about these debates which resulted directly from the disputes. In the colonies as well as in Britain, Jacobitism was an important component of news and print culture primarily because it was a deeply rooted element of British culture and society. The informational and cultural exchanges permeated by Jacobitism were communicated to and throughout

¹ Pittock, *Jacobitism*; Monod, *Jacobitism*, 45-94; Eirwen Nicholson, "'Revirescit': The exilic origins of the Stuart oak motif", in *The Stuart Court in Rome: The Legacy of Exile*, ed. Edward Corp (Basingstoke, 2003), 25-48.

the colonies via a migration of peoples and a lively print culture which together fed a shared extra-institutional Atlantic public sphere. This public sphere effectively tied colonists to Britain and created a keen awareness among Whigs of the perils posed by Jacobites as well as solidarity between Jacobites which spanned the Atlantic.

The British Atlantic was a dynamic world of cultural and information exchange. Ian Steele's unsurpassed study of communication and community in the English Atlantic demonstrates the extensive communication networks which connected the Atlantic world.² Thousands of people from England, Scotland, and Ireland voyaged across the Atlantic to settle in Britain's colonies. Thousands more knit the disparate regions together through extensive trade and commerce. After arrival in the colonies, colonists were kept apprised of British news by correspondence with friends and family and also through interaction with traders who dealt in news as well as material goods. Packet boats, newspapers, postal routes, and merchants contributed to the growing integration of a communications network.

There is an extensive body of literature detailing the development of the English press and print culture which touches on the relationship between Jacobitism and the efflorescence of print. Studies by Jeremy Black, Paul Monod, Mark Knights and Bob Harris have illustrated the increasing prominence of newspapers in late seventeenth and early eighteenth century political culture and have shown the symbiotic relationship of the press and party in the party conflicts of the early eighteenth century. In doing so, they have shown how Jacobites utilized partisan presses to propagate Jacobite materials.³ The remarkable growth and impact of British provincial newspapers and their relationship with party politics and the

² Steele, *The English Atlantic*.

³ Bob Harris, *Politics and the Rise of the Press: Britain and France, 1620-1800* (London, 1997); Paul Monod, 'The Jacobite Press and English Censorship, 1689-1695', in *The Stuart Court in Exile, and the Jacobites* (London, 1995), 125-142; Jeremy Black, *The English press, 1621-1861* (London, 2001); Joad Raymond, *News Newspapers, and Society in Early Modern Britain* (London, 1999).

London metropolis is further detailed in G. A. Cranfield's study of English provincial newspapers.⁴ Knights has examined the explosive growth of a British print culture in the late Stuart period and demonstrated the importance of print as a vehicle for partisan political discussion during a period of massive political unrest and division.⁵ Knights' nuanced approach reminds us that texts often had a number of meanings and that words, ideas, and images were all contested entities, a confusion effectively utilized by Jacobites. Moreover, the press and prints in Scotland have recently received scholarly attention especially in the works of Karin Bowie who has explored the development of the press and public opinion in Scotland in the years leading up to the Union of 1707 and documented the relationship between Scottish public opinion and events in London.⁶ These works have, in many respects, illustrated the development of a 'British' press.

There is a similar body of work which has addressed the rapid expansion of print and news in Britain's colonies. Alongside Ian Steele's study mentioned above, Charles Clark's *Public Prints* explores the growth of newspapers in the eighteenth century. Clark illustrates the transatlantic development of newspapers and their role in transmitting British culture to the colonies.⁷ The importance of print is further developed in *The Colonial Book in the Atlantic World*, an excellent compilation detailing the importance of print, the growing appetite of colonists for the printed word, and the transatlantic nature of colonial print culture.⁸ David Shield's works on colonial 'Belles Lettres' have demonstrated the existence of a mixed print and manuscript culture in the colonies, showing that the open discussion of ideas was far

⁴ G. A. Cranfield, *The Development of the Provincial Newspaper, 1700-1760* (Oxford, 1962).

⁵ Mark Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation in Later-Stuart Britain: Partisanship and Political Culture* (Oxford, 2005).

⁶ Karin Bowie, *Scottish Public Opinion and the Anglo-Scottish Union 1699-1707* (Woodbridge, 2007).

⁷ Charles Clark, *The Public Prints: The Newspaper in Anglo-American Culture, 1665-1740* (Oxford, 1994).

⁸ Hugh Armory and David D. Hall, eds., *The Colonial Book in the Atlantic World* (Cambridge, 2000).

more complex than can be accounted for by a print culture alone.⁹ These studies have provided an excellent foundation for conceiving and understanding a more comprehensive transatlantic public sphere.

Additionally, there are a number of studies which explore the role of taverns and coffee houses as public spaces in Britain and the colonies. In addition to the studies of print, these works illustrate the role of public spaces as integral components of an increasingly active public sphere.¹⁰ By 1710, Boston, a town with a population of around 10,000 people, had over 81 people engaging in the inn and tavern business and by 1720 there were four well established coffee shops which served as important cultural and mercantile centres.¹¹ This is a fraction of London's population, yet there is broad agreement that just as in London, these public spaces often supported a flourishing print culture by stocking up on recent local prints for their clientele. They also served as a place where mariners might leave mail or hang up mail bags and were utilized as important centres of information exchange.¹² Although there is debate about the democratising effect these public spaces possessed, most scholars agree that they were an essential component of an increasingly active political public and contemporaries in the British colonies remarked on 'coffee-house news'.¹³ As in the British Isles, colonists effectively utilised these places as a source of news gathering and politicking. In 1714 Samuel Sewall, a Boston judge, noted having read the Schism Act in Thomas Selby's Crown Coffee House soon after a copy of the act

⁹ Shields, *Civil Tongues and Polite Letters*; Shields, *Oracles of Empire*.

¹⁰ Brian Cowan, *The Social Life of Coffee: The Emergence of the British Coffeehouse* (New Haven, 2005); Steve Pincus, "'Coffee Politicians Does Create," Coffeehouses and Restoration Political Culture,' in *The Journal of Modern History* 67 (1995), 807-834; David Conroy, *In Public Houses: Drink and the Revolution of Authority in Colonial Massachusetts* (Chapel Hill, 1995); Peter Thompson, *Rum Punch and Revolution: Taverngoing & Public Life in Eighteenth Century Philadelphia* (Philadelphia, 1999); Sharon Salinger, *Taverns and Drinking in Early America* (Baltimore, 2002).

¹¹ Carl Bridenbaugh, *Cities in the Wilderness: The First Century of Urban Life in America, 1625-1742* (New York, 1955), 265.

¹² *Ibid*, 266; Alison Olson, *Making the Empire Work*, 64,

¹³ Daniel Leeds, *The Second Part of the Mystry of Fox-Craft* (New York, 1705), 22.

arrived.¹⁴ Similarly, in 1698 Governor Bellomont of New York remarked upon ‘a paper which was very industriously dispersed’ and was left in ‘the coffy house in this town.’¹⁵ Regardless of whether these places preserved a traditional hierarchical culture or democratised cultures by bringing diverse patrons together, these public spaces undoubtedly provided a place for public engagement and contributed to the emergence of an informed and curious provincial public. The growth in the numbers of these public spaces coincided with the rapid growth of print in the colonies.

The developing print culture and growth in the number of public spaces in the colonies contributed to the emergence of a transatlantic public sphere. The public sphere is used here in its broadest, post-Habermasian sense. Although the value of the Habermasian model, which idealized the rationality and freedom of public discourse, is contested, if tempered it provides a useful framework for analysing the relationship between Jacobitism or anti-Jacobitism and public discourse in the British Atlantic World.¹⁶ The term ‘public sphere’ in its Habermasian sense became fashionable in scholarship in the 1990s. However, as Brian Cowan has shown, the ‘public sphere’ was under investigation prior to the 1989 coining of the term in a translated edition of Jurgen Habermas’s 1962 study. Cowan has demonstrated, studies of the ‘public sphere’ existed, especially in the works of Geoffrey Holmes, before historians began debating the value of the Habermasian construction of the term which was shackled with a Marxist idealism.¹⁷ If the public sphere is unencumbered by the need for a politically active rising bourgeois, an idealized rational discourse, or a specific date of emergence, it becomes a useful means of encapsulating the rising importance of

¹⁴ *Diary of Samuel Sewell*, Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, vol VII (Boston, 1882), 18.

¹⁵ *CSPC*, 27 April, 1698, item 317.

¹⁶ Jurgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, trans. Thomas Burger (Boston, 1989).

¹⁷ Brian Cowan, ‘Geoffrey Holmes and the Public Sphere: Augustan Historiography from the Post-Namierite to the Post-Habermasian’ in *Parliamentary History* 28 (2009), 166-78.

public opinion and action, the growth of a print culture – especially newspapers – and the role of public spaces such as coffee houses and taverns as places where the public and private intersected.

Numerous critiques of Habermas's public sphere have deconstructed or reinterpreted elements of his theory, yet have at the same time, reinforced the utility of the term and given it a more complex and nuanced meaning.¹⁸ Mark Knights has tempered the idealist impulses of the Habermasian model by noting that contemporaries, though engaging in misrepresentation, continued to believe that public discourse would point readers towards the truth.¹⁹ Studies of Jacobitism, while not engaging directly with the public sphere, have reminded us of the restrictions imposed on the public sphere, even after the lapse of the 1695 licensing act, through prosecution for sedition and libel.²⁰ Karin Bowie and Joad Raymond have argued regarding the Scottish public sphere that the mechanics of the expression of public opinion were different for each locale based on the differing institutions and disparate political cultures of individual states under investigation. Yet, despite their differences, these spheres were all influenced by London and necessarily functioned within a larger British sphere.²¹ This problem of different public spheres is exacerbated when looking at the British Atlantic. England, Scotland, Ireland, and each separate colony possessed a unique government and local political culture, yet overlap was inescapable. These component parts and disparate political cultures were tied by events, shared publications, and overlapping networks into a larger public

¹⁸ Bowie, *Scottish Public Opinion*; Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation*; Cowan, 'Geoffrey Holmes and the Public Sphere'; Peter Lake and Steven Pincus, eds. *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Manchester, 2007).

¹⁹ Mark Knights, 'How Rational was the Later Stuart Public Sphere,' in *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England*, eds., Peter Lake and Steven Pincus (Manchester, 2007), 252-267

²⁰ Monod, 'The Jacobite Press and English Censorship,' 125-142.

²¹ Bowie, *Scottish Public Opinion*, 7-11; Joad Raymond, 'The Newspaper, Public Opinion, and the Public Sphere,' in Raymond, *News Newspapers, and Society*, 131.

sphere. Scholars of the American colonies who have examined the public discourse and the public sphere have rightly shown that a colonial public sphere or public spheres in individual colonies in the early eighteenth century were most certainly less developed than their counterparts in England and Scotland.²² When grouped together, however, these individual public spheres both created and were enveloped within a complex Atlantic public sphere.

This literature has provided an excellent foundation and framework for understanding the communication of Jacobitism and anti-Jacobitism in the British Atlantic. The increasing amount of scholarship examining the disparate print cultures and public spheres has demonstrated the mechanics of political and religious discourse, and the integration of ideas into local societies. This allows for a more specific study of the communication of Jacobitism and anti-Jacobitism in a larger geographical context than England, Scotland, or Britain alone. This chapter explores the communication of Jacobitism and Jacobite culture throughout the British Atlantic World. This process is twofold. First, it examines how news *about* Jacobitism was transmitted and disseminated throughout the colonies. News about Jacobitism was a vital ingredient of the emergent public sphere as it was encapsulated in debates regarding foreign policy, religion, and political economy which were hallmarks of English public discourse. This news kept various colonists, including merchants, clergymen, and political officials, apprised of the threat the Jacobites posed to Britain. It also informed colonists about party divisions and the relationships between Jacobitism and the Church of England and the Tory party. We will see that the news or print culture was predominantly *anti-Jacobite*. This meant that it tended to exaggerate any extant Jacobite threat in Britain and to flag up with great anxiety any

²² Michael Warner, *The Letters of the Republic: Publication and the Public Sphere in Eighteenth Century America* (Cambridge MA, 1990); Christopher Grasso, *A Speaking Aristocracy: Transforming Discourse in Eighteenth Century Connecticut* (Chapel Hill, 1999).

Jacobitism evident in the colonies. In addition to frightening some colonists, this news also served a second purpose of encouraging identification with or against the Jacobites. For example, news about high church involvement with the Jacobites might encourage some colonists to associate high churchmen in the colonies with Jacobitism while simultaneously driving those very same high churchmen towards Jacobite sympathies as they engaged with transatlantic political and religious cultures. The news and information colonists received about Jacobitism shaped public opinion and individual attitudes towards Tories, high churchmen, and Jacobites. Colonial participation in local manifestations of British debates on party politics and religious beliefs, both of which possessed a potent infusion of Jacobitism drew them into a transatlantic public sphere. Finally, this chapter surveys how elements of Jacobite culture were communicated and practised in the British Atlantic public sphere. As demonstrated in previous chapters, there are examples in the colonies of printed Jacobite material and openly spoken disaffection. Furthermore, there are notable cases where disaffection is couched in veiled terms, thus giving Jacobite ideology or sentiment access to the nascent Atlantic public sphere.

The chapter begins with a brief examination of the communication of Jacobitism or Jacobite sympathies via the migration of people. This migration of Jacobites provides evidence of a potential audience knowledgeable about a Jacobite subculture. Moreover, the migration of Jacobites would have stoked extant fears of a transatlantic Jacobitism. Secondly, this chapter looks at the growth of print, newspapers, and an Atlantic public sphere in the colonies. Colonists were importing a larger number of British prints while also vastly increasing local print output. Thus, there was a growing exchange of material between the metropolis and the colonies as well as within and between the colonies themselves. The final section will briefly

show how Jacobites sought to exploit communications made available by the Atlantic public sphere within the constraints of censorship and the law of sedition.

This begs the question, what does communicating Jacobitism entail? At the outset, it must be noted that the communication of Jacobitism did not require a positive declaration of support for the Stuarts. Jacobite sympathies ranged from a nostalgic toast to open celebration of Stuart birthdays and anniversaries or declarations of their right to the throne. Equally Jacobite was a denial of the legitimacy of William or the Hanoverians. This denial might take the form of a refusal to pray for the King by name, a celebration of the Tory virtues of passive obedience and non-resistance, or even an outright declaration that George I was a usurper or had no right to the throne. Indeed, Jacobite participation in the public sphere was limited to a great extent as open sedition was censored or, after 1695, prosecuted as sedition or libel. Even a veiled Jacobitism was dangerous as Nathaniel Mist, the Jacobite printer, and others discovered.

Explicitly Jacobite ideas were largely excluded from participation in a 'free' and rational public sphere. In order to participate in the public sphere, Jacobites were necessarily forced to couch their beliefs and sentiments in more palatable and appropriate language, and even this only allowed access to the fringes of the public sphere. This exclusion from open participation in the public sphere necessitated the creation of a sub-culture in which ideas could be communicated to an audience literate in the language of sedition and sentiment.²³ In some respects, this created a 'counter public sphere' in which Jacobites self-consciously acted publicly yet set themselves apart from the larger public. This is exemplified by the use of material objects such as drinking glasses, art, and architecture, which demonstrated a loyalty to

²³ Monod, *Jacobitism*, 10.

the Stuarts and was intended to be understood by a select audience.²⁴ Yet despite the exclusion of explicit Jacobite sentiment and the creation of a counter public, many Jacobites sought to engage in public debate. While their core beliefs kept them on the fringes of a public sphere, because it was dangerous to discuss them openly, they entered into public discourse by veiling disaffection in acceptable terms. This was couched in language intended to avoid prosecution, which the Jacobites' relationship with the Tory party made possible, allowing Jacobite ideas and ideology entry into the wider public sphere. J.C.D. Clark argued that Jacobite assertions became possible...under a disguise of metaphor, allegory, and ambiguity.²⁵ Additionally, the inability of state authority to stamp out this veiled disaffection, despite repeated attempts, promoted continued Jacobite involvement in the public sphere.²⁶ One of the most notable examples of this problem is provided by the sermon, prosecution and trial of Henry Sacheverell. Sacheverell was impeached before the House of Lords because a sermon he preached on the 5 November was viewed as attacking the intellectual rationale for the revolution of 1688.²⁷ While the sermon itself was a celebration of Toryism, many Whigs rightly viewed the sermon as intended to undermine the Protestant succession. Sacheverell's light punishment demonstrates the success of his charade, but the furore arising from his sermon and trial shows the very real obstacles placed before Jacobites wanting to engage in public discourse.

Communicating Jacobitism, however, was not left only to those who sympathised with, or supported the Stuarts. Jacobitism, as a part of a transatlantic subculture, existed within the public sphere even if explicitly Jacobite ideology was not allowed a public airing. There was often little distinction to be made between

²⁴ Pittock, 'Treacherous Objects', 39-63.

²⁵ Clark, *English Society* (1985), 142.

²⁶ Cowan, *The Social Life of Coffee*, 209-222.

²⁷ Monod, *Jacobitism*, 147-148; Knights, 'How Rational was the Later Stuart Public Sphere,' 252-267.

news about Jacobitism and Jacobite propaganda. News about Jacobitism or the Jacobite rebellions might also effectively communicate Jacobite ideas and support as could anti-Jacobite polemics. It tied the colonies to the politics and culture of Britain. News, stories, and information about the Jacobites could encourage some to drift closer to sympathising with the Jacobites. For others, it exaggerated an extant, if minimal, threat. Yet even tracts or newspapers expressing anti-Jacobite sentiments might dimly reflect the existence of a Jacobite community. They were likely printed and employed by those antagonistic to the claims of the exiled Stuarts in order to combat a local Jacobite presence, thus making Jacobitism a shadowy element of a public sphere. Thus, the communication of Jacobitism in the British Atlantic public sphere is a helpful reminder that the Atlantic world was a dynamic space of cultural and ideological exchange. Therefore, the public sphere is crucial to understanding both the perception and reality of Jacobitism in the Atlantic world.

I

This chapter focuses the majority of its attention on the relationship between Jacobitism and print culture in the emerging Atlantic public sphere, but first it is necessary to briefly explore the existence of a potentially receptive audience. It is an inescapable fact that migration was a vitally important means of communicating Jacobitism throughout the Atlantic and an essential ingredient of the transmission of ideas and cultures. In fact, the most explicit manner in which Jacobitism was transferred around the Atlantic was the migration of Jacobites. Jacobites migrated to the colonies for a number of reasons. Hundreds of Jacobite prisoners were forced migrants as they were transported to the colonies in the years 1716 to 1746 following the failure of Jacobite risings in 1715, 1719, and 1745.²⁸ Communities from the

²⁸ Dobson, *Directory of Scots Banished to the American Plantations* (Baltimore, 2010).

Scottish Highlands with close ties to Jacobitism were relocated to colonial outposts in Georgia in the 1730s as a means of colonial defence.²⁹ Alison Games has reminded us that migration necessitates the movement of more than people. The people migrating transport cultural practices, ideologies, and religious beliefs.³⁰ This would be equally true for individual Jacobites or Jacobite communities who either through forced or voluntary migration settled in the British colonies.

Jacobite prisoners provide the most obvious example of Jacobite migration. Over 639 Jacobite prisoners were transported to the colonies after the failed rising of 1715. According to the records, 176 of the prisoners were sent to South Carolina while over 200 were sent to Virginia and Maryland. It is likely that many of the prisoners maintained their Jacobite beliefs. For example, John Dunbar, an unrepentant Jacobite prisoner sent to the colonies wrote to a correspondent in Scotland, 'I'm very farr from thinking that the almighty God will impute rebellion to my charge whatever other sins I'm guilty of'.³¹ Although many of the prisoners were sold as indentured servants, the purchasers had the right to free the servants so long as they were willing to put up bond for good behaviour.³² When freed (if they were lucky enough to be freed, or better yet, never sold for indenture) the Jacobite prisoners often sought out communities with shared beliefs. Edward Hunt provides a notable example of this integration. Hunt was one of the many Jacobite rebels captured after the battle of Preston in 1715. He was one of 96 rebels transported on the ship *Scipio*, which was originally bound for Antigua but instead sailed to Virginia. By 1720, only four years after being transported, Hunt was living in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania and

²⁹ Anthony Parker, *Scottish Highlanders in Colonial Georgia: The Recruitment, Emigration, and Settlement at Darien, 1735-1748* (Athens, GA, 1997).

³⁰ Alison Games, 'Migration', in *The British Atlantic World, 1600-1800*, ed by David Armitage and Michael Braddick (Basingstoke, 2006). The most provocative statement of this is David Hackett Fischer, *Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways in America* (Oxford, 1989).

³¹ NAS GD298/379/1, John Dunbar to Lord Grange, 26 June 1716.

³² Sankey, *Jacobite Prisoners of the 1715*, 59-75.

was a member of Christ Church, the local Anglican Church pastored by the high church minister John Vicary. As explained in chapter 2, the Christ Church vestry invited the nonjuror Richard Welton to serve as rector only two years later suggesting the existence of a community of high churchmen sympathetic to nonjurors and Jacobites. Hunt did not stay out of trouble for long, and was executed in 1720 for counterfeiting coins. But Vicary, his minister, wanted to give Hunt a proper burial and intended to raise a 'high church mob' to see it accomplished.³³ It is apparent that despite his participation in the rebellion of 1715, or perhaps because of his participation, Hunt was welcomed warmly into a high church culture fostered in Philadelphia. Thus, it is possible to connect Hunt to a larger community likely to be receptive to Jacobite, or at the very least, high church Tory propaganda. Although Hunt provides the best example, Sankey shows that numerous other prisoners were purchased by men in the colonies harbouring similar political opinions or by men with family connections to the prisoners.³⁴

There are other noteworthy examples of Jacobite migration. As mentioned in the previous chapter, a number of Scottish ministers educated in universities in Aberdeen which perpetuated Jacobite beliefs migrated to the colonies in search of employment and many of them settled in New York, New Jersey, and Rhode Island. Each pastored a church and as the leader of the church likely inculcated Jacobite sentiments to some of their congregation. Similarly, individual Jacobites who came from largely Jacobite families, such as Charles Carroll of Maryland or Alexander Skene of South Carolina, settled in the colonies and ensconced themselves within a friendly environment, whether that be Catholic or high church Anglican.³⁵

³³ For news about Hunt see *AWM*, 20 October, 1720, no 44 and 24 November, 1720, no 49. For the quote about the mob, see Wendel, 'Jacobitism Crushed', 58-65, 60.

³⁴ Sankey, *Jacobite Prisoners of the 1715*, 59-75.

³⁵ See chapter 2.

In addition to prisoners and clergymen, there were other small-scale communities of Jacobites that were established in the colonies. In Georgia in the 1730s, James Oglethorpe and the trustees of the Georgia colony recruited 163 Scots from families which were well represented in the 1715 rising and of which 13 had been transported as prisoners to South Carolina to settle on Georgia's border with Spanish Florida. The settlement, renamed Darien, served as a means of providing protection for the Carolina colonies from the Spanish colony of Florida but it clearly demonstrated the development of Jacobite communities in the British colonies.³⁶

Jacobites in Britain were aware of the possibility of extant communities of sympathisers in the colonies. Many Jacobites in Britain viewed Maryland as a potential haven, and they imagined that if they relocated to the colony, they would be among a sympathetic populace.³⁷ Thomas Brett, the nonjuring clergyman, considered moving to South Carolina as he thought it might be an amiable environment for a nonjuror, but he was dissuaded by a friend.³⁸ However, Brett's daughter and son-in-law did move to Charleston and wrote to Brett complaining that 'All our company are either Whigs or dissenters' and commented on the fact that they were 'to settle among the Bangorians', or supporters of the ideas of Benjamin Hoadly, the Bishop of Bangor, a champion of the Whig party. Nevertheless, she still hoped 'we shall find friends amongst those unfortunate gentlemen who were transported on the Preston Account'.³⁹ Her comment illustrates both knowledge of a potential community of Jacobites and the desire to settle amongst it.

The migration of Jacobites to the colonies allowed for the development of local Jacobite communities displaying the subcultural behaviours described by Monod

³⁶ Sankey, *Jacobite Prisoners of the 1714*, 73.

³⁷ *ibid*, 68.

³⁸ NAS CH12/15/109, Thomas Brett to Archibald Campbell, [c. 1723].

³⁹ Brian J. Enright, 'An Account of Charles Town in 1725' in *The South Carolina Historical Magazine* 61 (1960), 13-18, quote on p 14.

in England. The importance of Jacobitism in Britain and the existence of Jacobites in the colonies amplified fears of Jacobitism and made news and information about Jacobitism all the more important to colonists. This also provides a reminder that though it may have been predominantly whiggish, the public sphere was multi-faceted and included a Jacobite minority.

II

In addition to the migration of people, the early eighteenth century witnessed the increasing circulation of news and information. The development of posts and the printing of newspapers transformed Atlantic communications. Ian Steele has described newspapers as ‘the most powerful and extensive public communications innovation that developed within the English Atlantic’ in the early eighteenth century. Newspapers were a transformative vehicle of communication. The importation of British papers tied the provinces tightly to London and encouraged a consistent and reliable exchange of information undreamed of by prior generations. The role of the newspapers in creating a transatlantic public sphere was remarkable. The timely and largely accurate information about Jacobitism printed in the papers made certain that colonists were aware of the threats posed by the Jacobites which drew them into the Atlantic public sphere. This development can be seen in the contrast between the uncertainty of 1688 and the proliferation of news in 1722 regarding the Atterbury plot. The ability to transmit an accurate and consistent account of Atterbury’s Jacobite conspiracy in a timely manner contrasts greatly with the confusion created by the lack of reliable news following the revolution of 1688, which as Steele illustrates, was untimely, sporadic, and confused.⁴⁰

⁴⁰ Steele, *The English Atlantic*, 94-112.

Although not quick by modern standards, the distribution of news and information to and in the British Colonies was transformed over the almost forty year period from 1688 to 1727. Both the quality and speed of communications increased dramatically. Newspapers printed throughout the colonies or imported from Britain provided dependable and consistent information about British politics and European events to their readers. The papers encouraged colonial participation in a shared culture. The ‘public prints’, as Charles Clark has explained, engaged readers in a larger mental world in which readers saw European and London news through London eyes. Indeed, newspapers embodied and diffused inherited traditions and shared beliefs which created a coherent culture and a transatlantic public sphere.⁴¹ This included ideas about Jacobitism. News about Jacobite rebellions and conspiracies were prominent features in many news prints, connecting the populace of the colonies to ideas and events in Britain. Papers printed in Boston and Philadelphia, were distributed throughout Britain’s colonies, providing their readers with fresh information about Jacobite developments and in doing so, ensured an awareness of Jacobitism throughout the Atlantic world.

The first English language newspapers, or *courantos*, were imported from Amsterdam in the 1620s and these imports encouraged the publication of news in London.⁴² The news in these early prints focused primarily on events from abroad, but the government was wary of their influence and regulated their printing. The eruption of civil wars in the 1640s led to a breakdown in government regulation and an increase in news prints, but the commonwealth government of the 1650s reinstated regulatory measures. Following the restoration of the monarchy in 1660, the government of Charles II established a licensing system to oversee pre-publication

⁴¹ Clark, *The Public Prints*, 221.

⁴² Black, *The English Press*, 4.

censorship. Government censorship was fairly effective, excepting periods of major controversy such as the Exclusion crisis in 1679, until 1695 when the Licensing Act expired and Parliament was unable to agree on a new act. Soon after the lapse of the act, three newspapers, *The Flying Post*, *Post Boy*, and *Postman*, appeared in print and the first successful daily newspaper arrived on the scene in 1702.⁴³

The first colonial newspaper, titled *Public Occurrences, Both Foreign and Domestic*, was printed in Boston by Benjamin Harris in 1690. Although it was intended to be a regular digest of news, it was quickly suppressed by the local authorities because of Harris's ill-advised decision to print local news without the prior approval of the local government.⁴⁴ Harris's paper was premature in other ways. Private newspapers had yet to establish themselves in Britain and would not do so until after 1695. Harris's project proved no exception to the English norm, despite the disparities in the laws in the colonial context. The English Parliament allowed the lapse of the licencing act in England, resulting in the shift from pre-publication to post-publication censorship in 1695. After 1695, the publication of newspapers and other forms of print rapidly expanded in England. This in turn led to a dramatic increase in the amount and type of news and print available in Britain, much of which made its way to the colonies.

In 1704, John Campbell, the Boston postmaster, successfully launched the *Boston News-Letter*. Campbell's role as postmaster gave him a number of advantages in publishing a successful paper. First, he was granted quick access to an ever-increasing amount of news and papers coming off the boats in Boston's harbour. Second, he was able to distribute his paper using the recently developed postal routes without cost. New York and Boston were connected by postal routes as early as May

⁴³ *ibid*, 5-8.

⁴⁴ Clark, *Public Prints*, 57-59.

of 1693 and Pennsylvania was connected to New York soon after.⁴⁵ The new postal routes and a locally published newspaper demonstrate the hunger for fresh and reliable information. But as Charles Clark has argued the colonial development of a successful newspaper is best understood in the larger context of developments in the British Isles.⁴⁶ Campbell's *News-Letter* was one of the earliest provincial newspapers printed in the British Atlantic, preceded only by the English newspapers in, Norwich, Bristol, and possibly Exeter.⁴⁷ In Scotland, the Privy Council licensed the first regular newspaper, *The Edinburgh Gazette* in 1699, followed by the *Edinburgh Courant* in 1705.⁴⁸ By 1723, there were about 28 provincial English newspapers, four of which were printed in the colonies. This allowed for an increased level of public engagement in metropolitan events. Prior to publishing the *News-Letter*, Campbell had sent news to privileged correspondents by means of a manuscript newsletter, a practice common in England, Scotland, and other colonies.⁴⁹ Following its initial print in 1704, the *News-Letter* remained the only printed colonial newspaper until 1719 when both the *American Weekly Mercury* and the *Boston Gazette*, in Philadelphia and Boston respectively, began publication. A mere two years later, Boston, a provincial town with a population of around 10,000 people was home to a third newspaper, the *New-England Courant*, printed by James Franklin.

The publication of competing newspapers encouraged the dissemination of an increasing diversity of news. The London papers were incredibly partisan during the rage of party and this influenced colonial prints. Thomas Kidd has argued that

⁴⁵ Steele, *English Atlantic*, 123.

⁴⁶ Charles Clark, 'Periodicals and Politics: Part One: Early American Journalism: News and Opinion in the Popular Press,' in *A History of the Book in America vol 1: The Colonial Book in the Atlantic World* (Chapel Hill, 2010), 347-

⁴⁷ *ibid*, 352; Clark, *Public Prints*, 57.

⁴⁸ Steele, *English Atlantic*, 143-144.

⁴⁹ Clark, 'Periodicals and Politics', 352.

newspapers tied New England to a transatlantic Protestant interest.⁵⁰ Although there is evidence for his suggestion, the papers tied the colonies into a British Atlantic which was far more heterogeneous than a concept as general as the Protestant interest suggests. Newspapers and broadsides remarked upon important divisions among Protestants. For example, during the crisis caused by the Atterbury plot, the *New England Courant* printed a letter attacking its competitor the *News-Letter*'s untimely, anti-Catholic narrative concerning the Pope and requested that the *Courant* print an interesting article, previously printed in London's *Flying Post* detailing Atterbury's crimes; an attempt to focus the audience's attention on British politics and religious disputes rather than European Catholicism.⁵¹ Furthermore, the *New England Courant*, rather than focusing primarily on foreign news, gave a great deal of attention to domestic and local news, often directly related to British events, and encouraged reader participation by printing unsolicited letters to the author or printer of the paper.

The three Boston newspapers competed for both a local and regional audience. This is clearly evidenced by the advertisements printed in the papers as well as letters written directly to the papers. The *New England Courant* received letters from subscribers in Boston as well as the neighbouring town of Canterbury. The *Courant* printed advertisements for products and people in Boston, Marblehead, and Newport, Rhode Island, a town over seventy miles away from Boston.⁵² John Winthrop of New London, Connecticut noted that a number of people along the postal road from Boston through the Massachusetts hinterland were subscribers to the paper.⁵³ Moreover, certain subscribers would be likely to share the news, such as ministers who were interested in the local controversies related in the prints. In response to accusations of

⁵⁰ Kidd, *Protestant Interest*, 51-73.

⁵¹ *NEC*, 17 June 1723, no 98.

⁵² *NEC*, 24 June 1723, no. 99.

⁵³ Steele, *English Atlantic*, 122-123.

divisiveness, James Franklin mentioned in his *Courant* that several ministers ‘both in town and country constantly take the *Courant*, which I believe they wou’d not do, if they thought it publish’d on purpose to bring their Persons into Disesteem.’⁵⁴ The *American Weekly Mercury*, published by Andrew Bradford in Philadelphia, was intended for a much wider audience than its New England peers. Even the name of the paper suggests the scope of audience sought by Bradford. An advertisement in the first issue stated that subscriptions were available from Boston to Virginia indicating Bradford’s ambitious intentions.⁵⁵ In fact, although Bradford did not enjoy the inherent advantages of being a postmaster, such as free delivery, as John Campbell had, two of his subscription agents were, and this extended the geographical scope of his distribution dramatically.⁵⁶ By his third issue, Bradford was already advertising for a slave-owner in Virginia, suggesting a level of success for his ambitious distribution.⁵⁷ Within a few years, the paper was also printed and sold in New York by Bradford’s father, likewise a printer.⁵⁸

Accurate distribution figures for newspapers remain elusive but Campbell’s *News-Letter* had a print run of 200-300 each week in its earliest years.⁵⁹ Subscriptions do not reveal the entirety of a newspaper readership. The *New-England Courant* printed advertisements for the Crown Coffee House, suggesting a symbiotic relationship in which the coffee house would have subscribed to the paper and provided a public venue for discussion of the paper’s contents, thereby further increasing the number of persons engaging with the news. The same was true for

⁵⁴ *NEC*, 4 December, 1721, no 18.

⁵⁵ *AWM*, 22 December 1719, no 1.

⁵⁶ Clark, *Public Prints*, 105.

⁵⁷ *AWM*, 5 January 1720, no. 3.

⁵⁸ *AWM*, 9 June 1720, no. 25.

⁵⁹ Clark, ‘Periodicals and Politics’, 354.

Bradford's *American Weekly Mercury* which also printed advertisements which implied knowledge of local public spaces including the local coffee house.⁶⁰

In order to attract an audience, competing newspapers utilized a number of different London prints and regularly printed exact copies of articles from London papers. Articles were primarily drawn from Whig leaning papers such as the *Flying Post*, the *London Journal*, and *Political State*, allowing colonists a remarkable glimpse of British politics and an opportunity to interact in a transatlantic culture shaped by news and politics. The colonial prints do not exhibit the same clear Whig or Tory partisan divisions as were evident in London, and the *New England Courant* made a point to note that it was not designed as a 'Party paper.'⁶¹ The fact that articles were more regularly drawn from Whig papers suggests a general sympathy towards the Whig party, although the high church opinions of some of the *Courant's* Anglican authors suggests they likely sympathised with the politics of the British Tories.⁶² Despite the largely one sided perspective, the expanding number of London papers being used by colonial papers broadened engagement in the British political realm and expanded public debates. The greater diversity of news presented was caused, in part, by the increasing number of colonial papers. As the ubiquity of the papers increased, the diverse materials reached an ever widening audience.

Colonial newspapers regularly printed stories relating to Jacobitism, reflecting both the importance of Jacobitism in Britain as well as the desire for this sort of news in the colonies; a desire which showcased the integration of political cultures. From 1704 to 1719 there was only one colonial newspaper and as a result, important events during the reign of Anne such as the trial of Henry Sacheverell in 1710 and the

⁶⁰ AWM, 28 July 1720, no. 32.

⁶¹ NEC, 4 December, 1721, no 18.

⁶² David Sloan, 'The New England Courant: Voice of Anglicanism, The Role of Religion in Colonial Journalism,' in *American Journalism*, vol. 8, 1991, 108-14.

Jacobite rebellion of 1715 received less newspaper coverage than did later conspiracies or rebellions. The *News-Letter*, however, did provide its readers with a number of reports on the Jacobites in Britain. For example, in 1708, the paper reported in multiple issues on the attempted invasion of Scotland by the Jacobites and also provided its audience with reprints of addresses of loyalty to the Queen from a number of Scottish towns and presbyteries.⁶³ The paper also reported on the tensions building in the wake of the Tory election victories following Sacheverell's trial in 1710.⁶⁴ By reading about and participating in shared anxieties, colonists were acting within an Atlantic public sphere as provincial Britons and as such, were participating in elements of a predominantly Whig transatlantic political culture haunted by the spectre of the Jacobite threat. News about Jacobitism did not remain confined to the page, but also informed local street theatre. As early as 1702, anti-Jacobitism merged with the anti-Catholic Pope's day celebrations in Boston. The burning of effigies of the exiled Stuarts became a central component of the Pope's day celebration.⁶⁵

Newspapers and broadsides supported the appropriation of party language and partisanship in the colonies discussed in chapter 1. Following the failed rebellion of 1715, Benjamin Green, a printer in Boston, printed a copy of George I's 1716 speech to parliament decrying the Jacobite rebellion and its pernicious consequences.⁶⁶ Similarly, in 1715 Thomas Fleet reprinted a broadside, originally printed in London, instructing George's parliament to look into the treasons committed by the previous parliaments, including the payment and arming of Jacobite clans in Scotland and the preparation for the return of the Pretender.⁶⁷ Though couched in ambiguous terms,

⁶³ *BNL*, 7 June 1708, no 216; *BNL*, 14 June 1708, no. 217;

⁶⁴ *BNL*, 22 May 1710, no. 319; *BNL*, 27 December 1714, no 558.

⁶⁵ McConville, *The King's Three Faces*, 58-59.

⁶⁶ *His Majesty's Most Gracious Speech to Both Houses of Parliament* (Boston, 1716).

⁶⁷ *Instructions by the Citizens of London, to their Representatives for the Ensuing Parliament* (Boston, 1715).

this was clearly an attack on the Tory parliament in the last years of Anne's reign and reminded its readers of the Tories' open flirtations with Jacobitism. In 1716, a Boston paper printed an article on the Jacobite rebellion laying responsibility for the uprising at the feet of those who cried out the 'church in danger'. This paper reported on the outcome of the rebellion and equally important, the involvement of high ranking Tories such as Henry St. John, Lord Bolingbroke and the Duke of Ormonde, further implicating the Tory party. A broadside printed in Boston in 1715 titled *An Abstract of the French King's Will* noted the Jacobite activities of the exiled Tories Bolingbroke and Ormonde in France, again reinforcing the notion that the previous Tory parliament and ministry had been, and continued to be, treasonous.⁶⁸ Moreover, in a reprint of the King's speech, George I was noted as having said that the crying out of the Church in danger was the 'main artifice employed' in carrying out the rebellion.⁶⁹ Within another two months the paper explained in greater detail that what Tories meant when they claimed the Church was in danger was that the Church was to be governed by the Lutheran George I. In March 1716 it informed its readers that 'had we been at a loss before to know what the faction [Tories] meant by their noise of the Church's being in Danger, they have now explained it, and boldly told us, that 'tis the excluding of the Pretender and fixing King George upon the throne', a commentary easily accessible and relatable to many colonists.⁷⁰

Colonial officials parroted the King's speech, as seen in a speech by Robert Hunter, the Governor of New York. Later printed in the *News-Letter*, this praised King George's defeat of his rebellious subjects and reinforced the themes propounded in King George's speech. Hunter claimed that the rebels hid their disaffection in 'a pretended danger to the church' which 'created a real danger to the state,' clearly

⁶⁸ *An Abstract of the French King's Will* (Boston, 1715).

⁶⁹ *BNL*, 2 Jan 1716, no. 612.

⁷⁰ *BNL*, 26 March, 1716, no 624; for a fuller discussion of New York see chapter 5.

drawing transatlantic parallels, especially relatable to colonists in New Jersey and New York, where Hunter was locked in a struggle with a high church party. Hunter's speech also would have resonated with well-informed colonists in Boston like Cotton Mather, who was very aware that Hunter was 'encumbered by his enemies, who were all of the high church party.'⁷¹

Even after the 1715 rebellion, colonists continued to receive updates concerning Jacobite conspiracies. The Swedish plot of 1717 received mention in the papers with the *News-Letter* reporting that 'the Swedish envoy's papers were seized and it was discovered that there were thoughts of descending on Scotland.'⁷² The regularity of news stories commenting on serious conspiracies after the '15 reinforced Whiggish fears of a Stuart restoration for many Britons, including those across the Atlantic, reminding them that disaffection was often masked in high church Tory principles. The continued publication of news about the rebellions and conspiracies along with the reprinting of Hunter's speech, in addition to tying the colonists to Britain, also knit disparate colonial political cultures. The printing of these anti-Jacobite stories in the *News-Letter*, hints at a local interest in Hunter's speech and provides evidence of a Boston community eager to participate in a trans-colonial and transatlantic public sphere.

The emergence of a further three weekly newspapers by 1722 and the maturation of the press in Britain and the colonies meant that the Atterbury plot received a significantly increased and varied attention than had previous Jacobite conspiracies and rebellions. Information about a conspiracy against the crown began to filter into the colonies by October 1722. For example, on 11 October 1722 George I informed parliament of the discovery of a recent conspiracy designed to subvert his

⁷¹ *BNL*, 23 April 1716, no. 628; Cotton Mather to Governor Robert Hunter [c.1714], in *Selected Letters of Cotton Mather*, ed. by Kenneth Silverman (Baton Rouge, LA, 1971), 205.

⁷² *BNL*, 22 April 1717, no. 679.

government in favour of a 'popish pretender'. A print of his speech was available in London that same day. Within two days, the speech was being published in London newspapers, including the *London Gazette*, the official government paper.⁷³ Two months later a copy of the speech was available in Philadelphia's *American Weekly Mercury*. Not long after, *The New England Courant* reproduced the speech with the brief disclaimer that although the speech had already been published in Boston, it 'may perhaps be new to many of our Country Readers'.⁷⁴ Further south, although there was no locally printed newspaper, Francis Nicholson, the governor of South Carolina, had received news of the plot by early January 1723, if not sooner, from his correspondents in Boston who had forwarded copies of Boston's newspapers.⁷⁵ The papers were soon full of reports relating a number of different arrests and discoveries. The *American Weekly Mercury* reported on Jacobite conspirator Captain Kelly's arrest in London and by 1 November informed its readers of the arrest of Francis Atterbury, the Bishop of Rochester.⁷⁶ Similarly, the *News-Letter* testified to Atterbury's arrest and confinement in the Tower of London.⁷⁷

The huge variety of papers printed in London and imported into Boston also contributed to the diversity of news reports printed in the colonial papers. For example, the *News-Letter* printed a satire about Atterbury originally printed in London's *Flying Post*.⁷⁸ Both Philadelphia's *American Weekly Mercury* and Boston's *News-Letter* reprinted from the *London Journal* some of the 'British Cato's' lucubrations on the conspiracy.⁷⁹ The Cato publications were written by John Trenchard and Thomas Gordon, two staunch and outspoken Whigs. Bradford's

⁷³ *His Majesty's most Gracious Speech to both Houses of Parliament, on Thursday October 11, 1722.* (London, 1722).

⁷⁴ *NEC*, 11 February, 1723, no 80.

⁷⁵ Francis Nicholson to the Secretary, 11 January, 1722/23, SPG Series A, vol. xvi, 95-99.

⁷⁶ *AWM*, 11 October 1722, no. 148; *AWM*, 1 November 1722, no. 151.

⁷⁷ *BNL*, 29 October 1722, no 978.

⁷⁸ *BNL*, 16 May 1723, no. 1007.

Weekly Mercury went so far as to carry Cato's letters reflecting on the conspiracy for four consecutive weeks.⁷⁹ Colonists were also made privy to Atterbury's speech before the House of Lords during his trial for treason which was given seven consecutive weeks in Bradford's Philadelphia paper.⁸⁰

News reporting the reality of Jacobitism or activities of Jacobites was not restricted to British figures. Local Jacobites also received attention in the press. In Philadelphia in 1721, the *American Weekly Mercury* recounted a speech by a local Judge of the Admiralty given in judgement of 'two Persons, who were tried before him for Contempts against the King.'⁸¹ The long-winded speech related their crimes including denying the King's title to the crown and 'compassing his death'.⁸² One of the prisoners confessed and received a rather light punishment of standing 'under this court-house for the space of on hour on two Marked-Days, with one paper fixed on your Breast, and another on your back' marked with the words 'I stand here for speaking contemptuously against my sovereign Lord King George' and was fined twenty marks sterling. His stubborn compatriot refused to confess and was forced to stand 'in the pillory in this market-place, for the space of two hours on two market days' and after his time in the pillory he was to 'be tied to the tail of a cart and drawn round two of this city squares' and finally was to be whipped on his bare back with forty one lashes and imprisoned.⁸³ This clearly demonstrates the existence of local Jacobitism in the public sphere. Moreover, the publication of the seditious words and the sentencing, along with the public punishments illustrates the intent of authorities to discourage similar expressions of sedition. This suggests that authorities suspected the existence of a larger community sympathetic to Jacobitism. Equally important,

⁷⁹ *AMW*, 11 February 1723/4, no. 217.

⁸⁰ *AWM*, 10 October 1723, no 199; no 200, no 201, no 202, no 203, no 204, no 205.

⁸¹ *AWM*, 23 March, 1721, no 66, 1.

⁸² *ibid*, 1

⁸³ *ibid*, 3.

the punishments assigned provide reminders of the dangers faced by Jacobites who dared to openly express their views. Three weeks later, an abbreviated version of the judge's speech was printed in the *Boston News-Letter*, informing even more readers that Jacobitism and disdain for the Hanoverians was not isolated to the British mainland.⁸⁴ The transmission of this article from Philadelphia to Boston also demonstrates the fluidity and growth of the Atlantic public sphere.

Readers did not simply receive the news. Through prints, they could participate in debates concerning Jacobitism sparked by news reports. In some ways, partisan debates were encouraged by the colonial papers. For example, the *American Weekly Mercury* in Philadelphia devoted seven weeks to printing Francis Atterbury's speech during his trial for treason. It dedicated the following two weeks, to British Whig responses to the Bishop's speech, both taken from the *London Journal*. This provided readers an opportunity to engage in debates roiling Britain.⁸⁵ Similarly, a letter printed in the *American Weekly Mercury* in 1723, directly engaged with questions of loyalty when the author wrote 'as to the profession of loyalty, they are like those of friendship: what a multitude of them have our counties made in address to their sovereign...when rebellion has been their intention?'⁸⁶ The *New England Courant* printed a letter reflecting on the doctrines of passive obedience and non-resistance which contested that 'upon the whole, it is much to be desired, that that [High Church] Party who have appropriated all Loyalty to themselves, would take care to shew it in something besides words' and hoped they would 'practice according to the principles they profess and not pretend to believe that which in works they deny.'⁸⁷ In one of the most notable examples, the *American Weekly Mercury*

⁸⁴ *BNL*, 10 April, 1721, no 891.

⁸⁵ *AMW*, 10 December 1723, no 211, 17 December 1723, no 212.

⁸⁶ *AWM*, 17 March 1723/4, no. 221.

⁸⁷ *NEC*, 24 June 1723, no. 99.

advertised a discourse written by ‘Philobangor’ which attempted to harness public opinion by declaring itself printed on ‘behalf of the Laity of Pennsylvania’ against a minister who did not properly pray for the royal family in 1722. This demonstrates a keen colonial understanding of the recent religious debates dominated by Benjamin Hoadly, the Bishop of Bangor, who was viewed as a menace to the high church and Jacobites. It also illustrates that colonists were clearly engaging in a vibrant Atlantic public sphere by participating in transatlantic debates. Furthermore, that this pamphlet was written as a direct response to a sermon provides a helpful reminder that sermons were an integral part of the public sphere. In both cases, the minister and the author were keen to exploit the growing public sphere and find support amongst a broader audience.⁸⁸

As this advertisement suggests, broadsides and pamphlets, a staple of a British Atlantic print culture, played a key role in disseminating controversies beyond the readership of newspapers. David Shields has argued that broadsides and pamphlets often aired more controversial ideas because they were less tractable to government influence than serial publications like newspapers.⁸⁹ For example, Massachusetts authorities prosecuted James Franklin, printer of the *New England Courant*, for attacks against the clergy. They also attempted to impose pre-publication censorship, though Franklin avoided this by passing nominal control of the paper to his young brother Benjamin.⁹⁰

If this is true for controversial pamphlets printed in the colonies, it is all the more true for British imports. Reprints of controversial British pamphlets tied the colonists to metropolitan disputes. As chapter 6 demonstrates, the New England controversialist John Checkley’s publication in 1719 of Charles Leslie’s *The Religion*

⁸⁸ AWM, 8 November 1722, no 152.

⁸⁹ Shields, *Oracles of Empire*, 100.

⁹⁰ Clark, *Public Prints*, 123-140.

of *Jesus Christ the only True Religion* (1697), sparked a fierce debate about Jacobitism in Boston which lasted over five years and produced a number of pamphlets, countless newspaper articles, and vehemently antagonistic sermons despite attempts by the Massachusetts authorities to end the debates through prosecution. Similarly, a 1714 pamphlet by Richard Steele, (of *Tatler* and *Spectator* fame) titled *The Crisis; or, A Discourse Representing from the Most Authentick Records, the Just Causes of the Late Happy Revolution* which discussed the succession crisis and the ‘danger of a popish successor’, was reprinted in Philadelphia in 1725, no doubt as a response to the aggressive high church presence in the city.⁹¹

Residents of the colonies authored pamphlets intended to address local issues which were tied to transatlantic events. For instance, in 1724, terrified by the spectre of high church Anglicanism, an anonymous author in Boston printed an attack on Anglicans and Jacobites entitled *The Madness of the Jacobite Party*.⁹² The author used transatlantic events and ideas to great effect in his attack on a local high church party linked in his mind to a transatlantic Jacobite threat. Similarly an anonymous author identified only as ‘a lover of the present happy constitution’ printed in Boston in 1723, a pamphlet titled ‘*Gloria Britannorum*’. One scholar has argued that the pamphlet was written by a young local Boston man, which suggests a vibrant, inclusive public sphere.⁹³ The poem provided a celebration of George I’s government

Religious Truths in Purity shall shine,
Tho’ Rome in bloody league with *High-Church* join,
To root them out, they firm as Heaven remain,
whilst giddy Zealots spend their rage in vain,
Unable to answer *Hoadly*’s nervous strain.⁹⁴

⁹¹ Richard Steele, *The Crisis; or, A Discourse Representing from the Most Authentick Records, the Just Causes of the Late Happy Revolution* (Philadelphia, 1725).

⁹² Anonymous, *The Madness of the Jacobite Party, in Attempting to Set a Popish Pretender on the British Throne* (Boston, 1724).

⁹³ J.A. Leo Lemay, ‘Francis Knapp: A Red Herring in Colonial Poetry,’ in *The New England Quarterly* 39 (1966), 233-237.

⁹⁴ [Anonymous], *Gloria Britannorum: or The British Worthies* (Boston, 1723), 23.

Furthermore in an ‘ode on His Majesty’s [George I] coronation’ the poet wrote

How did the palace ring with Joy!
 Sad Omen to the Rival Boy [James III],
 And all the Tory crew,
 Tho’ forc’d some of ‘em to proclaim
 Great Brunswick’s Title and his Name,
 And swear Allegiance too.
 The self same Faction that before
 Had south th’ Impostor to Restore,
 And overturn the State;
 Now perjur’d and the publick Scorn,
 Yet serv’d his Triumph to adorn, Such was the Will of Fate.⁹⁵

As chapter 6 shows, the timing of the printing of this publication suggests that it was authored in part as a response to the growth of a high church party in Boston, thus providing a helpful reminder that local debates were all taking place within an Atlantic public sphere dominated by events in London.

Authors also consciously accepted the growth of public engagement and tried to harness or direct public opinion. Many of the pamphlets demonstrate a desire to engage with and involve the public. A number of the prints were addressed as ‘recommended as proper to be put in the hands of the Laity’ or written as a dialogue in which one of the characters is more plebeian so that a greater number of readers might sympathise with the argument.⁹⁶ David Shields has shown that Governor Robert Hunter’s satirical play *Androboros* reflects a keen understanding of the value of the printed word in shaping transatlantic disputes. Shields suggests that the actual date the satiric play was printed is unknown and argues that the date provided on the publication, 1 August, the day of Queen Anne’s death, is itself meant to be read as satire as it portrays the antagonist, the high church Tory Francis Nicholson, as the

⁹⁵ *ibid*, 26.

⁹⁶ Anonymous, *A Modest Proof of the Order and Government of the Church as Settled by Christ and His Apostles* (Boston, 1723); AWM, 8 November 1722, no 152; John Checkley, *Choice Dialogues between a Godly Minister and an Honest Countryman Concerning Election and Predestination* (Boston, 1720); For the helpful point about plebeian characters see, Shields, *Oracles of Empire*, 102.

walking dead, illustrating Hunter's understanding of the fall of the Tory party in the wake of Anne's death and George I's accession.⁹⁷

Almanacs too, were hugely popular. Prior to and concomitant with the growth and importance of newspapers, almanacs served as vehicles of information and entertainment.⁹⁸ In part because of their popularity, almanacs were pulled into the orbit of party politics and Jacobitism, especially during the reign of Anne.⁹⁹ Yet, despite their popularity, almanacs have not featured prominently in many discussions of the public sphere, nor have they been examined as part of a Jacobite subculture. Almanacs provided readers with information about politically meaningful dates, such as a monarch's birthday or 5 November (Gunpowder Plot and William of Orange's invasion). Most almanacs in the British Atlantic were decisively Whig in tone and sympathy, decrying popery and Jacobites and praising the Protestant succession. Many did not provide detailed commentary but they served as participatory voices in a larger public sphere by reinforcing certain contested holidays and histories. There were, however, notable exceptions to the Whig domination of almanacs. These propagated Tory principles and a thinly veiled Jacobitism by celebrating Tory holidays such as Restoration Day (29 May), the anniversary of the death of the 'royal martyr' Charles I (30 January), and wildly praising the firebrand cleric Henry Sacheverell.

In England in the early years of the eighteenth century, John Gadbury and George Parker, two prominent almanac authors in London, used their almanacs to serve Tory party interests.¹⁰⁰ Parker attacked Whigs and celebrated Tory holidays. In

⁹⁷ Shields, *Oracles of Empire*, 143; for the play see Robert Hunter, *Androboros: A biographical [sic] farce in three acts, viz. The senate, the consistory, and the apotheosis* (New York, 1714).

⁹⁸ Marion Barber Stowell, *Early American Almanacs: The Colonial Weekday Bible* (New York, 1977).

⁹⁹ Bernard Capp, *Astrology and the Popular Press: English Almanacs, 1500-1800* (London, 1979), 238-255.

¹⁰⁰ Capp, *Astrology and the Popular Press*, 240-243.

his *Ephemeris* of 1707, Parker celebrated January as the ‘month the Whigs have stained with such a blot’ and in a chronology noted Archbishop Laud’s sacrifice at the hands of ‘fanatic fury’ while refusing to mention 5 November. Parker also complained that his work had been censored by the Company of Stationers because he wanted to note the anniversary of the Rye House Plot.¹⁰¹ In his preface for his 1711 *Ephemeris*, Parker praised the Tories and celebrated the parliamentary victory of 1710 stating that 1710 was the reverse of 1641 and that designs against the Church had been defeated.¹⁰² He also exclaimed in verse ‘but all that love the church their party fly, honour the Queen, on her success rely, stand to our text, and proudly own we’re High.’¹⁰³ In this edition, he listed Sacheverell’s 5 November sermon as a public holiday along with the Gunpowder plot.¹⁰⁴

The blurred lines between high Tory and Jacobite and the Jacobite undertones in any celebration of Sacheverell are suggestive of Parker’s intentions. Contemporaries certainly suspected where he placed his loyalty. He was accused by contemporaries of disaffection, a claim he vehemently denied.¹⁰⁵ Even more suggestive was the response of some of Parker’s audience. There are handwritten notes on a copy of Parker’s *Ephemeris* of 1712, including an elegy to King James VII & II, and the ‘last dying prayer and words of John Matthews’, a printed executed for printing Jacobite propaganda. Furthermore, in a copy of his 1713 *Ephemeris* there is a handwritten query on the birth of James, the Old Pretender. The notes in both of

¹⁰¹ George Parker, *Parker's ephemeris for the year of our Lord 1707* (London, 1707), 8, 17, 3.

¹⁰² George Parker, *Parker's Ephemeris for the year of our Lord 1711* (London, 1711),

¹⁰³ *ibid*, 6.

¹⁰⁴ *ibid*, 20.

¹⁰⁵ George Parker, *Parker's Ephemeris for the year of our Lord 1707*, 3.

these almanacs suggest that Jacobites were a key demographic of Parker's audience.¹⁰⁶

Party divisions are significant because similar distinctions between Whig and Tory almanacs are evident in colonial prints. New England almanacs were very much Whiggish in tone and often copied their English counterparts. Samuel Clough, an almanacker in New England, borrowed from the prominent English Whig almanacker John Partridge.¹⁰⁷ No almanacs published in Boston from 1702 to 1722 mentioned the Tory holidays 30 January or 29 May. However, they did celebrate 5 November and, after 1714, commemorated and memorialized George I's birthday (28 May) and accession (1 August).¹⁰⁸ In light of the Gunpowder Plot and William of Orange's invasion, Daniel Travis in 1716 celebrated November as a 'month of deliverance and month of praise.'¹⁰⁹

Like Parker in London, Daniel Leeds, a prominent almanac author in New York, was the Tory counterpoint to a largely Whig dominated field. Leeds' almanacs were written specifically for an audience in the mid-Atlantic but he maintained that they would be useful from 'Newfound-Land to Carolina'.¹¹⁰ The scope of the audience for these almanacs is unknown but in 1707 Leeds mocks a competitor for

¹⁰⁶ George Parker, *Parker's Ephemeris for the year of our Lord 1712* (London, 1712); George Parker, *Parker's Ephemeris for the year of our Lord 1713* (London, 1713); Both copies are held at the British Library and are available through the electronic database *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*.

¹⁰⁷ Kidd, *Protestant Interest*, 74.

¹⁰⁸ For a representative selection of almanacs, see Samuel Clough, *The New-England almanack for the year of our Lord, MDCCII* (Boston, 1702); Samuel Clough, *The New-England, almanack for the year of our Lord, MDCCIII* (Boston, 1703); Samuel Clough, *Clough's farewell, 1708. An almanack for the year of our Lord (according to the common account) 1708* (Boston, 1708); Nathaniel Whittemore, *An almanack for the year of our Lord MDCCVI* (Boston, 1706); Daniel Travis, *An almanack of the coelestial motions for the year of the Christian epocha 1707* (Boston, 1707); Daniel Travis, *An almanack of the coelestial motions & aspects, for the year of the Christian aera, 1716* (Boston, 1716); Edmund Holyoke, *An almanack of the coelestial motions, aspects and eclipses, &c. for the year of the Christian aera, 1713* (Boston, 1713); Edmund Holyoke, *An almanack of the coelestial motions, aspects and eclipses, for the year of the Christian aera, 1715* (Boston, 1715); Thomas Paine, *An almanack of the coelestial motions, aspects and eclipses, &c. for the year of the Christian aera 1718* (Boston, 1718)

¹⁰⁹ Travis, *An almanack of the coelestial motions* (1716),

¹¹⁰ Daniel Leeds, *The American Almanack for the Year of Christian Account, 1705* (New York: 1705),

printing 5,000 but not selling a quarter of them, suggesting that a print run of 5,000 was not unusual.¹¹¹ Leeds authored almanacs from 1687 to 1714 and there is a steady intensification in Tory thought and high church views in his almanacs from 1705 to 1714. This is due primarily to his conversion from Quakerism in the early 1700s and his association with John Talbot, a high church and later nonjuring minister in New Jersey (see chapter 2). In his almanac of 1705, Leeds makes clear that because ‘the Church of England has made a good progress in these parts of America,’ his purpose for the almanac is, in part, to inform his readers of the practices and holidays of the Church of England.¹¹² He provides lengthy descriptions of the purposes and practices of the Church of England and festival days. He also commemorates 30 January as the day of King Charles I’s martyrdom and 29 May, demonstrating a hyper-loyalty common to high Tories and Jacobites. These are regular features in his almanacs but in 1710, Leeds mentions in his timeline the birth of the ‘pretended Prince of Wales’. Although on its face, this does not lend itself to a Tory or Jacobite celebration, the fact that Leeds mentions the date is significant. Not even Parker, the rabid English Tory, went so far as to mention the Pretender.¹¹³ Moreover, Leeds had mentioned that his almanac would include the birthdays of successive heirs to the British throne, which makes his mention of the ‘pretended’ prince all the more intriguing especially in light of the fact that Leeds had stated the same aim in previous almanacs without mentioning the pretender. Additionally, Leeds was a vestryman in the St. Mary Church, Burlington, pastored by John Talbot, who would later become a nonjuring bishop. At the very least, Leeds’s almanac served as a means of introducing a Tory

¹¹¹ Daniel Leeds, *The American Almanack for the Year of Christian Account, 1707* (New York: 1707), 2.

¹¹² Leeds, *The American Almanack 1705* (New York: 1705), 2.

¹¹³ Daniel Leeds, *The American Almanack for the Year of Christian Account, 1710* (New York, 1710), 10.

political calendar into colonial political discourse and provides a helpful reminder of the numerous discourses shaping the transatlantic public sphere.

Despite the rapid growth of newspapers and an expanding print culture, a large proportion of communication undoubtedly remained personal in nature. The transatlantic public sphere was fuelled in part by this private discourse. Cotton Mather, the eminent Congregationalist minister, was not satisfied receiving news only from the newspapers, which he called a 'thin sort of diet.'¹¹⁴ As chapter 6 demonstrates, Mather received regular updates about Jacobitism in Scotland and England from his correspondents, Robert Wodrow and John Maxwell. In 1710 he was surprised by the arrival of a Captain Wentworth who carried 'a large cargo of intelligence' including fresh information about Sacheverell's trial and the consequent high church mob riots and demonstrations in London. He quickly passed the information to a friend stressing the value of the news by remarking that he offered 'nothing that you may expect from our public News-Letter.'¹¹⁵ Benjamin Colman, a Presbyterian minister in Boston, also received valuable news from distant correspondents. In 1714, before the death of Queen Anne and the accession of George I, a friend wrote to Colman that 'the public affairs, here, look but darkly at present'. The friend was of the opinion that 'the number of those persons who wish well to the P-----er [pretender] are lately very much increased.'¹¹⁶ In 1715, the Massachusetts agent Jeremiah Dummer sent to Colman copies of the nonjuror polemicist Richard Welton's 'sermon & preface' about the altar piece which mocked the Whig cleric White Kennett.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁴ Cotton Mather to Stephen Sewall, 30 January 1706, in *Selected Letters*, 70.

¹¹⁵ Mather to Samuel Penhallow, 22 May 1710, in *Selected Letters*, 86.

¹¹⁶ Samuel Bannister to Colman, 15 February 1713/14, Colman Papers, MHS, microfilm.

¹¹⁷ Jeremiah Dummer to Colman, 15 Jan 1714/15, Colman Papers, MHS, microfilm. See chapter 2 for more on Welton and the altarpiece.

In addition to illustrating the transmission of news, the letters exemplify the expectation that information concerning debates about Jacobitism would be of great interest to provincial Britons in the colonies. The former governor of Nova Scotia, Samuel Vetch wrote to his father-in-law Robert Livingston of New York in 1714 that ‘I can say nothing as yet of my business I came over upon, the violence of partys taking up every bodys time here’. Vetch also made certain to enclose a number of public prints relating to party controversies.¹¹⁸ Similarly, a letter sent by James Heath, a Maryland merchant trading in London, to Elizabeth Bennett in Maryland in 1715 provided detailed information about the recent rebellion. Heath, a Catholic, noted that the ‘Lords Derwentwater and Widdrington’ had risen and that numerous other figures had been arrested in London. He also remarked upon the ‘contagious distemper’ which had disturbed the Tories after their proscription following George I’s accession but Heath was also concerned that he would be thought a ‘Whig Papist’ for wishing Catholics ‘at all times would sit down quiet.’¹¹⁹

Moreover, news about Jacobitism, although often transatlantic, also circulated throughout the colonies in the form of conversation. Conversation is an almost impossible source to recover. In 1725, following the controversy and accusations of Jacobitism stirred up by John Checkley (discussed in chapter 6), Anglican ministers in New England intended to meet in order to send an address of loyalty to King George I. Prior to the meeting, one of the ministers, George Pigot, engaged in a conversation with two of his fellow preachers who had been antagonistic to Checkley and his party. Pigot recorded the conversation as a dialogue in a letter to the Bishop of London providing us a rare glimpse of a conversation which may suggest other like

¹¹⁸ Samuel Vetch to Robert Livingston, 7 June 1714, Livingston Family Papers, microfilm, reel 3.

¹¹⁹ James Heath to Elizabeth Bennett, 18 October 1715, Maryland Historical Society, Tilghman-Lloyd Collections, MS 2001.

conversations taking place throughout the colonies. In the letter the author Pigot recorded the following dialogue:

M[ossom]: What do you intend to do at your convention?

P[igot]: We will agree on that when we come there. But however, I think it is our duty loyally to address his Majesty King George in a body...

H[arris]: It is a contrivance of you and your party!

P: I am no party man...

M: What have they been doing at the westward?

P: You will know better when you see Mr. Johnson [An SPG missionary to Connecticut]

H & M: Why, what is the matter?

P: Gentlemen; I do not question but that you know better than I; especially since the society [SPG] have withdrawn their pension from one of their missionaries.

H: Who is that?

P: As if you do not know. Mr. Talbot. [Accused of having been ordained as a nonjuring bishop]

H: What were they doing?

P: What you would call Jacobitism. Why, gentlemen, we must take care to act nothing against the King's supremacy.¹²⁰

One of the most notable features of this dialogue is the fact that it illustrates the verbal transmission of news over hundreds of miles. News of events in New York and New Jersey had travelled to Boston through a number of channels and was being discussed by interested parties. Not only was it being discussed, but the news had important

¹²⁰ George Pigot to the Bishop of London, [1725], *FP*, vol IV, 157-158.

ramifications for a group of clergymen in New England who had aligned themselves with a transatlantic Tory and high church interest and were contemplating a political act as a direct response to events. News of a nonjuring bishop in the colonies and accusations of disaffection against some New England clergymen drove them to send an address of loyalty to the King.¹²¹

The prominence of party language in the incipient Atlantic public sphere indicates the significance of Jacobitism as an item of public interest. Yet Jacobitism and party divisions did not remain for colonists solely in the realm of curiosities or interesting news. Although Jacobitism in Britain was on multiple occasions expressed openly in the form of rebellion or outspoken disaffection, it was in the interest of Jacobites to communicate and propagate their principles primarily through other more subtle means. Due to the inherent sedition of Jacobite beliefs or behaviours, the penalties for sedition, which was increasingly equated with treason, were severe and consequently, Jacobitism was not often given a public airing.¹²² The fact that Jacobite expressions were seditious negated much of their possible place in the public sphere. If Jacobite ideas could not be openly discussed in a rational-critical public sphere, Jacobite propaganda needed to be disseminated by other means. Symbols, phrases, and stories were appropriated by Jacobites in order to share messages and beliefs to fellow Jacobites.¹²³ This was equally true for those in the colonies. The governor of Maryland accused one official of ‘visiting none but men of his own stamp, and drinking “to the man that should have his mare again,” a phrase used here to signify

¹²¹ Address of most of the Clergy of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island, assembled in Newport, 21 July 1725, to George I, *FP*, vol iv, 161-162, ‘

¹²² Pittock, ‘Treacherous Objects,’ 40-44.

¹²³ Monod, *Jacobitism*, 15-92.

King James'. This provides a helpful example of, at the very least, the perception of associational language among Jacobites in the colonies.¹²⁴

Nevertheless, there was a tension between the existence of a Jacobite subculture and an evangelical desire to draw as many people into the fold as possible. Many Jacobite items, words, and symbols intended to be understood by a select audience might also serve the purpose of veiled propaganda and were intended for public consumption as Jacobites hoped to convert those who might not share the same political beliefs but could not do so in the context of an open debate. In Britain, Jacobite medals engraved with '*Reddite*' meaning to return, restore, or give back, served both as an associational item and a piece of propaganda as they were intended to be passed around.¹²⁵ There were explicit Jacobite images and motifs which served the Jacobites well by veiling disaffection and these motifs often avoided prosecution by maintaining a harmless secondary meaning. The Stuart symbol of the Oak was a common Jacobite motif but it might also refer to Charles I or Charles II. Illustrations of a restored oak might point the audience toward a future restoration of the exiled Stuarts or hearken back to the Restoration of Charles II in 1660. Similarly, Latinate poetry was often appropriated by Jacobites but was usually safe because it referenced a classical author. Themes of regeneration and virility were all arrogated by the Jacobites in order to communicate with each other and proselytise outwith their community.¹²⁶ The press, material culture, art, poetry, and architecture were all reflective of this communicative sub-culture. Therefore, Jacobitism existed both on the fringes of a legitimised public sphere and also as a counter public estranged from participation in the public sphere.

¹²⁴ *CSPC*, 1691, item 2706.

¹²⁵ Monod, *Jacobitism*, 75.

¹²⁶ Pittock, 'Treacherous Objects,' 52-53

The printing presses in Britain provided a constant source of Jacobite material. Broad­sides, pamphlets, and newspapers such as Charles Leslie's *Rehearsals* and Nathaniel Mist's *Weekly Journal* were Jacobite papers. According to Paul Monod, known Jacobite papers like Mist's spoke in a language which was easily decoded by those well versed in the motifs.¹²⁷ Mist's paper advocated passive obedience and non-resistance as a means of propagating the Jacobite ideology of legitimacy but he couched his disaffection in the well-worn terms favoured by high church Anglicans. Thus, when a colonial pamphlet or sermon celebrated these virtues, opponents rightly viewed it with suspicion and hostility. Additionally, colonists were not averse to employing other Jacobite cant as Daniel Leeds did in his 1710 almanac in which he noted the birth of the Pretender and celebrated in verse the 'Golden Age yet to come' by quoting Virgil's *Aeneid*. As Murray Pittock explained, the *Aeneid* 'became virtually a Jacobite document' due to the themes of restoration and exile.¹²⁸ Leeds writes 'from the hard Oak there shall, sweet Honey sweat forth and fall. The Sea shall then be quiet, no Ship shall range Abroad, her wares with others to exchange: Then every Land shall every thing produce, And then to plow the Earth they shall not use.'¹²⁹ Leeds' quotation incorporates a number of Jacobite themes including the Oak, regeneration, and virility while simultaneously celebrating the Christian religion and the Latinate tradition suggesting familiarity with a Jacobite subculture. Leeds's subtle use of Jacobite propaganda suggests a sophisticated understanding of Jacobite motifs. Yet Leeds's 1711 almanac contains what appears to be a virulently anti-Jacobite satire.¹³⁰ In his preface, Leeds states that he has 'presented you with the satirical

¹²⁷ Monod, *Jacobitism*, 28.

¹²⁸ Leeds, *The American Almanack, 1710*, 20; Murray Pittock, *The Invention of Scotland: The Stuart Myth and the Jacobite Identity, 1638 to the Present* (London, 1991), 58.

¹²⁹ Leeds, *The American Almanack, 1710*, 20.

¹³⁰ Daniel Leeds, *The American Almanack for the year of Christian account, 1711* (New York, 1711).

verses...upon the pretended Prince of Wales'¹³¹ However, given Leeds's connections to Talbot, it is possible that the anti-Jacobite rhetoric is simply a means of propagating information about Jacobitism. Similarly, the dissemination of Jacobite themes through sermons was commonly practised by preachers who veiled their disaffection in metaphor as was demonstrated by Welton's farewell sermon in Philadelphia discussed in the last chapter. This veiled language allowed Jacobite ideas entry, even if only on the fringes, into an increasingly expanding Atlantic public sphere.

Colonists directly engaged with Jacobitism and anti-Jacobite rhetoric through the exchange of information facilitated by an Atlantic public sphere. This emergent public sphere encouraged colonists to participate in transatlantic religious controversies and party political disputes associated with Jacobitism. The migration of Jacobites, either forced or voluntary reminds us that there were communities well-versed in and receptive to expressions of a Jacobite subculture. Furthermore, these Jacobites were integrated into communities which shared many of their sympathies. The existence of Jacobite communities and the friendly reception of Jacobites within communities increased fears of the threat posed by a transatlantic Jacobitism.

The emergence of newspapers further connected colonists to an Atlantic public sphere. Information about the increase and expression of Jacobitism in mainland Britain served to reinforce colonists' fears of the prevalence and significance of the Jacobite threat. In response to emerging local threats, colonists participated in religious and political debates as a means of combatting Jacobitism locally, but also in order to demonstrate loyalty to the Protestant succession. This emerging Atlantic public sphere did not create a homogenous, Whig, transatlantic

¹³¹ Leeds, *The American Almanack*, 1711, 1

political culture, but rather tied colonists to complex British political and religious debates. How this played out in individual colonies is the subject of part two.

Occasional Conformity in Miniature: Jacobitism and South Carolina, c 1702-1716

Jacobitism is rarely associated with the British colony of South Carolina. The few mentions of Jacobitism and the colony together in historical works are usually in reference to the importation of Jacobite convicts at the request of, and purchase by, Lieutenant Governor Robert Daniell in 1715-1716 as a means of enlisting manpower in the Yamassee war of 1715.¹ One major exception to this absence of associations of Jacobitism and South Carolina is Charles Petrie's rather bold and somewhat misleading claim that all of the clergy in South Carolina in 1715 were Jacobites or harboured Jacobite sympathies, a statement which although sympathetic to the sources overstates his argument.² There is a vast gulf between Petrie's sweeping claims and the majority of other works which all but ignore the potential significance of his assertions and his sources. There has been little attempt to adequately discuss the presence or significance of Jacobitism in the political or religious culture of the colony. This is unfortunate because Carolina provides an intriguing case study of the significance of the relationship between the religious roots of party politics and Jacobitism in the British Atlantic World. Although there were no Jacobite led or inspired revolts, party-inspired imperial appointments, religious developments, and colonial understandings of the British Atlantic political context and culture of Jacobitism helped shape and define a variety of local

¹ Sankey, *Jacobite Prisoners of the 1715*, 70-71.

² Petrie, *The Jacobite Movement*, 73.

political conflicts and religious debates. Jacobitism, as an important element of British culture, was a significant feature of South Carolina's social and political culture. As such, an examination of political and religious controversies infused with Jacobitism in South Carolina provides a fuller understanding of the development of a transatlantic political culture in an English province.

The history and practice of politics in the Carolinas was vastly different from the Mid-Atlantic colonies or New England, as were many of the transatlantic connections. South Carolina was a proprietary government. Therefore, the crown had little control over appointments. Proprietors, most of whom were located in England, had almost exclusive control over political appointments in the colony. Thus the political inclinations of the proprietors greatly impacted political life in the colonies. Also, early in the eighteenth century, South Carolina lacked the vibrant, local print culture which was coming to fruition in New England and the Mid-Atlantic colonies. In some respects this encouraged a more insular development, yet despite the absence of an indigenous print culture the colony was assimilated into a larger transatlantic political culture dominated by party political disputes imbued with Jacobitism.

In South Carolina, Jacobite sympathies and accusations of Jacobitism against the governors and Anglican clergymen reflect important elements of the larger contested language of party politics and religious disputes shared among Britons in the Atlantic world. Political upheaval caused by the imposition of Test Acts against dissenters was inherently tied to debates about Occasional conformity in England. Therefore, accusations of Jacobitism aimed at a Tory governor by dissenting Whig opponents during political debates dominated by transatlantic religious questions demonstrate both the

significance of Jacobitism and the growing importance of transatlantic political and religious connections between Britain and Carolina. Moreover, they illustrate within a specific locality a very important, but overlooked, aspect of an early British Atlantic culture. This chapter argues that the very presence of Jacobitism and anti-Jacobitism in the increasingly party informed political language of South Carolina, especially in debates surrounding the role of the Anglican Church, reveals an important aspect of a cultural cohesion with England, Scotland, and Ireland.

This chapter first examines the transatlantic context and background of South Carolina's religious and political controversies. Following that, it explains the political debates surrounding the passage of the Church Acts in South Carolina in the early eighteenth century in relation to party politics in Britain. It then explores how these debates were instrumental in the integration of South Carolina's political and religious culture into a larger British Atlantic culture shaped by Whig and Tory politics. Accusations of Jacobitism and Jacobite beliefs were integral to these developments and provide a compelling lens through which to view the development of a transatlantic political culture.

I

The colony of South Carolina in the late seventeenth and the early eighteenth century was a religiously diverse and severely fractured political polity. Charleston, the capital, was a hot bed of strife and political conflict. Arguments over the validity and legality of differing forms of religious worship divided the populace in Carolina and the Proprietors in London. A succession of governors, who sought both to further the aims of their patrons, the proprietors of the colony, and individual profit, came and went with a

rapidity that only aggravated existing conflicts, decreased stability, and increased the animosity that was prevalent in the era's politics. The rise of opposing factions in the late seventeenth century played a major role in destabilizing the government and the differing local factions were quite adept at working towards the removal of political opponents. There were no less than eleven different governors in the seventeen year period from 1685 through 1702, and many of them left office in disgrace after having unsuccessfully navigated Carolina's dangerous political waters. For many years, no single issue dominated the discourse or political landscape and the factions were divided over questions as diverse as religion, the trade with the Native Americans, and proprietary quitrents.³ Gideon Johnston, the Bishop of London's commissary in South Carolina from 1707 to 1715, demonstrated the depth and rancorous nature of the political conflicts when in 1708 he expressed his distaste for the people of South Carolina and caustically described them as 'the most factious and seditious people in the whole world.'⁴

This atmosphere of factional conflict has been explained variously as a result of the lack of proprietary control, a progressive march towards religious freedom, or even as an entrenching of the power of the local landed elites.⁵ A number of studies have noticed the importance of British party politics in South Carolina, especially in relation to the Church Acts. Robert Weir has shown that understanding the transatlantic context is essential for understanding local politics and John Brinsfield noted the strong connection between religious disputes and transatlantic politics.⁶ Brinsfield celebrated the role of

³ L.H. Roper, *Conceiving Carolina, Proprietors, Planters, and Plots, 1662-1729* (New York, 2004); Eugene Sirmans, *Colonial South Carolina: A Political History, 1663-1763* (Chapel Hill, 1966).

⁴ Gideon Johnston to the Bishop of Sarum, 20 September 1708, SPG Series A, vol III, 67.

⁵ Robert Weir, *Colonial South Carolina: A History* (Millwood, NY, 1983); John Brinsfield, *Religion and Politics in Colonial South Carolina* (Easley, SC, 1983); Roper, *Conceiving Carolina*.

⁶ Weir, *Colonial South Carolina*. 75-104; Brinsfield, *Religion and Politics in Colonial South Carolina*.

Daniel Defoe in the South Carolinian fight for religious liberty, arguing that Defoe helped save South Carolina from the encroaching tyranny of Anglican hegemony which set the stage for continued religious freedom in the colonial period.⁷ He further argued that Defoe's assistance in the dissenters victory in the fight to repeal the Test Act marked 'the last time in the eighteenth century that a major effort was made to disenfranchise a legislative body in an American colony by means of a religious test' and that the 'fight for political and religious liberty was won.'⁸ This teleological narrative of religious freedom, although providing a helpful reminder of the importance of religious disputes in the development of the colony, describes a predominantly exceptionalist or British Whig political culture. Yet we still know relatively little about the role of Toryism in South Carolina's political development in relation to British party politics. Even though Brinsfield draws important attention to transatlantic politics, he pursues a largely Whig interpretation, thus implying that it was solely the English Whig desire for freedom and religious liberty which impacted South Carolina. Brinsfield contrasts this against a weak and inconsistent, transatlantic Tory party which promoted the establishment of the Church of England and denied religious freedom.

The Whig interpretation downplays the significance of English party conflicts in an English colony, painting an incomplete picture of the transatlantic politics of South Carolina. Although they provide noteworthy instances of transatlantic politics, these works imply that the primary transatlantic exchanges and direction came from Whig archetypes like Defoe, John Locke, or the Earl of Shaftesbury, an early proprietor of the

⁷ John W. Brinsfield, 'Daniel Defoe: Writer, Statesman, and Advocate of Religious Liberty in South Carolina,' in *The South Carolina Historical Magazine* 76 (1973), 107-111; Brinsfield, *Religion and Politics in Colonial South Carolina*.

⁸ Brinsfield, 'Daniel Defoe', 111.

colony and author of the Fundamental Constitutions, and notes that they were primarily instrumental in promoting and developing a libertarian political culture in South Carolina.⁹ Despite these attempts to draw connections with individual politicians in London, including the proprietors, in much of the historiography there still appears to be an imagined isolation in which the people of Carolina were free to determine their own political destiny, based on the ideals of Shaftsbury and Defoe, outside of any other external imperial influence. Any apparently Tory influence is characterised as the meddling of British Tory magnates, putting ‘the best interest of the colony behind metropolitan political interests.’¹⁰ Robert Weir argued that in the early years of the Carolina colony, ‘imperial concerns drove local politics only intermittently’ and L. H. Roper believed that imperial interactions were little more than factious Carolinians using ‘transatlantic connections to local effect.’¹¹ Even studies examining the Anglican Church in the colonies assert that ‘partisans of the Proprietors’ sought to establish the Church.¹² While these statements are true to a degree, they unnecessarily moderate the viciousness of competing parties which spanned the British Atlantic and downplay the transatlantic implications of the ideological conflicts undergirding the rage of party. However, the largely Whig leaning interpretations do note the importance of British political luminaries in the development of Carolina’s politics and thereby suggest the importance of larger imperial or Atlantic party debates. By examining the transatlantic context of Defoe’s role in the controversy engendered by Carolina’s ‘Occasional Conformity in Miniature,’ they

⁹ John Brinsfield, *Religion and Politics in Colonial South Carolina*; Robert Weir, ‘Shaftsbury’s Darling’: British Settlement in The Carolinas at the Close of the Seventeenth Century,’ in the *Oxford History of the British Empire*, vol. 1, ed. by Nicholas Canny (Oxford: 1998).

¹⁰ Roper, *Conceiving Carolina*, 131.

¹¹ Robert Weir, ‘Shaftsbury’s Darling’, 385; Roper, *Conceiving Carolina*, 121.

¹² Bell, *Imperial Origins of the King’s Church*, 39.

do suggest, if not fully explain, the noteworthy relationship between Carolina's political culture, Jacobitism, and England's public sphere.

Roper's more recent and balanced examinations of South Carolina's politics have attempted to revise the insular approach by focusing a great deal more on imperial connections and realities. He successfully argues against the Whig interpretation of an anti-proprietary faction seeking purely local control and draws a great deal of attention to the role played by transatlantic connections between Carolina and English politics and politicians. His works point to some very important aspects of imperial interactions.¹³ Although he maintains a strong balance between local events and transatlantic political developments, he minimises transatlantic party interests at the expense of faction.

The political discourse and debates in South Carolina, and the specific language used in the local politics, underscore a much clearer contemporary participation in and understanding of English and Scottish politics than has previously been identified. Accurate understandings of Jacobitism, nonjuring, and Toryism amongst the populace in Carolina over a period from 1699 to 1716 indicate a great degree of political and cultural integration with the British Atlantic World. Moreover, responses to Jacobitism and nonjuring in Carolina illustrate the significance of Jacobitism throughout the British Atlantic World. An understanding of English political culture in the eighteenth century, which necessarily involves an appreciation of Jacobitism, allows a much fuller understanding of the political culture in South Carolina in the same period and illustrates the emergence of a much more cohesive British Atlantic World than previously imagined.

II

¹³ L.H. Roper, 'Conceiving and Anglo-American Proprietorship: Early South Carolina History in Perspective,' in *Constructing Early Modern Empires: Proprietary Ventures in the Atlantic World, 1500-1750*, edited by L.H. Roper and B. Van Ruymbeke (Leiden, 2007), 389-410.

In South Carolina, there was, in many instances, a definite lack of centralized control or direction from England. The Church of England, the Crown, and the proprietors all initially lacked the ability to effectively centralize power, though the Church and Crown increased their influence and control over time. Despite the lack of a strong central control, the influence of the proprietors on the development of the colony and the importance that political issues debated in London could have on the colony was remarkable. Because the proprietors were the source of authority for the colony, their political inclinations were instrumental in shaping the direction of the colony. However, the proprietors were not a politically homogenous group and the proprietary board included both Whigs and Tories. Indeed, partially because of the fact that the crown was not in direct control of the colony and partly because of the diversity of views among the proprietors, party politics and religious issues in England, both indirectly and directly influenced and shaped the political climate in Carolina in very important ways.

Numerous debates and events in South Carolina in the early eighteenth century illustrate the importance of ideas and parties which were closely related to Jacobitism. The rise of a high church Tory interest and the push for an Anglican establishment in South Carolina echoed events in England and Ireland. The rise and fall of Whig and Tory ministries in England affected the currency and success of accusations of Jacobitism in Carolina. The rage of party and the links between Jacobitism and the high church Tories shaped local conflicts and political culture as late as 1716. The reverberation of party politics and religious conflicts across the Atlantic created an atmosphere of party strife in Carolina and carried with it questions and arguments which were often interwoven with fears of Jacobitism.

Though there were a great number of controversial measures pursued in Carolina politics in the early eighteenth century, no single issue appears to have divided and antagonized the populace of South Carolina as much as that of the establishment of the Church of England. The South Carolina assembly passed church acts establishing the Church of England in the colony on 4 November 1704 and again in November 1706 after the first was vetoed and repealed by Queen Anne at the request of the Whig-dominated House of Lords. While the politics of the passage of the act has been explained before, certain areas of the ensuing debate have been under-examined. If one is to fully understand the importance of the acts and the resulting debates, it is necessary to begin not in Charleston, but London.

King William died in 1702 and was succeeded by his sister-in-law Anne. Anne, a staunch Anglican, was more sympathetic towards the high church position within the Church of England than William had been and during the latter years of William's and the early years of Anne's reign, questions about the role of the church in society became increasingly important in the political arena. The political position of the church and the potential danger of dissent still factored as major points of contention between the Tory and Whig parties.¹⁴ Fears of the spread of atheism, heresy and the growth of dissent in the wake of the Toleration Act of 1689 caused a general unease among high church Tories; an unease which lead them to rally around cries of the 'Church in Danger.' The determination of the high church Tories to protect the Church from dissent and the pervasive low church attitudes of the Whig Bishops, both of which in their minds assisted and encouraged the spread of atheism and heresy by weakening the established church, resulted in attempts in 1702, 1703, and 1704 to pass bills in Parliament against occasional

¹⁴ Holmes, *British Politics*; Harris, *Politics Under the Later Stuarts*.

conformity, the act of participating in communion in a Church of England once a year for the sole purpose of qualifying for office. High church Tories viewed dissenters as rebels in waiting and thought that the practice of occasional conformity was little more than a Trojan horse; a means of destroying the established Church of England and encouraging heresy and atheism.¹⁵ The high church Tories used controversial methods to force the passage of the act including tacking it on to an appropriations bill. The controversy created by debates about Occasional Conformity illustrates an important aspect of the wide philosophical divide between high church Toryism and the Whig party. The Tories believed that the Church and the state were interdependent and that dissent and schism in the Church would ultimately destroy both the Church and the state.¹⁶ The Tory impulse to strengthen the established church as a means of combating irreligion and possible dissenting sedition were not isolated to England. The established church in Ireland, likely in imitation of events in England, passed a Test Act in 1704 barring dissenters from qualifying for office.¹⁷ In many respects, the rancorous divisions caused by competing views regarding the relationship of the Anglican Church with the British state reverberated throughout the British Atlantic.

This high church Tory zeal manifested itself in an Atlantic context. As chapter two demonstrated high church beliefs were not isolated to England. Both Scotland and Ireland were beset with religious controversies which were increasingly influenced by English developments. South Carolina's religious controversies, therefore, fit comfortably within a larger Atlantic context. The colonies too, were impacted by high

¹⁵ Tim Harris, *Politics Under the Later Stuarts*, 152-153

¹⁶ John Flanagan, 'The Occasional Conformity Controversy: Ideology and Party Politics, 1697-1711,' in *The Journal of British Studies* 17 (1977), 38-62.

¹⁷ Hayton, *Ruling Ireland*, 186-208.

church zeal. This period of Anglican assertiveness also witnessed the rise of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. King William chartered the organization in 1701 and it continued to receive a great deal of support from the monarchy throughout the reign of Anne. This organization was instituted to provide ministers to the colonies in hopes of strengthening the Church of England presence in areas that could not afford or attract ministers of their own accord. Reports decrying the disorganized state of the Anglican Church in the colonies and a general sense of religious ignorance and apathy gave impetus to the society which received a great deal of support from an increasingly assertive Anglican establishment. George Keith, the society's first missionary, viewed the prominence of Quakerism and dissent as a dangerous trend which needed to be corrected and noted that South Carolina had a large percentage of dissenters.¹⁸ In order to combat the growth of religious sectarianism and promote the established church, the recently chartered SPG quickly became active proponents of Anglican worship in the Colonies, including South Carolina. Along with the primary exports of ministers and books, an assertive Anglicanism encouraged the importation of ideology as ministers often became very involved in colonial disputes regarding the Church. The first SPG missionary to South Carolina, Samuel Thomas, arrived in 1702. Soon officiating with the approval of Governor Nathaniel Johnson in the Parish of St. James, Goose Creek, Thomas would quickly draw the ire of Johnson's political opponents.

The SPG was not the only important component of a transatlantic high church; English politicians also played prominent roles. One of the more vocal leaders of the high

¹⁸ George Keith, *A journal of travels from New-Hampshire to Caratuck, On the Continent of North-America* (London: 1706).

church Tory movement to discourage dissent and strengthen the established Anglican Church was John, Lord Granville. Granville not only an influential English politician, he was Palatine of the South Carolina proprietors and a political ally of Daniel Finch, Earl of Nottingham, a leader of the Tory Party and one of the most vocal high Tories in England. As Palatine of the colony Granville served as a vital connection between the party politics of Britain and South Carolina. He possessed an enormous amount of influence over appointments in the colony and in 1702, appointed Sir Nathaniel Johnson as Governor of South Carolina. Johnson was a Jacobite who finally swore oaths of allegiance only after the accession of Anne and the death of James II & VII and only as a prerequisite to his appointment as Governor of Carolina. This was not Johnson's first appointment. Johnson began his political career as a Member of Parliament under Charles II and supported Charles during the Exclusion Crisis. He was appointed by James II & VII as governor of the Leeward Islands and in the uncertain period surrounding the revolution in 1688, he continued to support James throughout William of Orange's invasion. As chapter two noted, there were even accusations that Johnson planned to give the islands to the French as a means of supporting James II & VII's claim. After his removal from the position as governor of the Leeward Islands, Johnson moved to South Carolina and soon set his mind to becoming governor but his actions in his previous post would make this difficult. In the early 1690s the proprietors wrote to the governor Phillip Ludwell instructing him to keep an eye on Johnson despite the fact that it was unlikely he would gain another post under William III & II.¹⁹ Johnson's distinguished Tory pedigree was accompanied by a level of notoriety.²⁰

¹⁹ *CSPC*, 1693, item 269.

²⁰ *CSPC*, June 22, 1689; *CSPC*, June 10 1689; Roper, *Conceiving Carolina*, 58-60.

Johnson is, in many respects, representative of the rehabilitation and legitimization of Jacobitism during the reign of Anne. Johnson remained, after his resignation as the governor of the Leeward Islands, a lay nonjuror and a Jacobite until after the death of James II & VII, swearing the required oaths in 1702 as a prerequisite to his becoming Governor of Carolina.²¹ As a high church Tory and Jacobite, Johnson had resigned his post as governor of the Leeward Islands because of his fervent belief in the Anglican doctrines of passive obedience and non-resistance, and he shared many of the same political ideas and goals as his political benefactor Granville. Granville, who was no doubt very aware of Johnson's political leanings and his Jacobite past, likely encouraged him to establish the Church of England in South Carolina as part of a larger attempt to strengthen the Anglican Church throughout England's imperial possessions. Yet this push for establishment was now associated with a Jacobite governor.

Johnson's desire to establish the Anglican Church in Carolina coincided with a resurgence of high church Anglican and Tory strength in England. Aided by the Bishop of London and members of the SPG there was a push throughout the colonies to establish the Church of England and to counter the perceived growing strength of dissent. The desire to establish the Church of England in Carolina stemmed from the same reasoning behind the occasional conformity bills in England. Fears of the growth of dissent and complaints from Carolina of atheism, irreligion, and blasphemy were regular during the early eighteenth century.²² The Church was thought to be in danger from dissent throughout the British Atlantic. Dissent was strongly associated with factionalism and

²¹ *CSPC*, June 29, 1702, item 676.

²² Francis Le Jau to Secretary, 30 June, 1707, SPG Series A, vol III, 142; Gideon Johnston to the Bishop of Sarum, 20 September, 1708, SPG Series A, vol III, 97; Fredrick Dalcho, *An Historical Account of the Protestant Episcopal Church in South Carolina, From the First Settlement of the Province to the War of the Revolution*. (Charleston, S.C, 1820.), 41

republicanism and in the opinion of the High Tories like Granville and Johnson, only a strong presence of the established church could combat the challenges posed by dissent and schism.

Indeed, according to some Anglican clergymen in the colony, South Carolina was desperately in need of moral reform and guidance by the Church of England. Ignorance and immorality were rampant.²³ Endemic, abusive trading practices with the neighbouring Native American tribes were antagonizing local tribes and illegal trade with pirates was rife. Contemporary witnesses understood that these problems would have severe consequences if not properly addressed and hoped to remedy them through a variety of channels.²⁴ The Anglican offensive in the colonies began in 1703 when, in order to combat the rise of irreligion, the South Carolina assembly under the leadership of Governor Johnson passed an act for the 'effectual suppression of blasphemy and profaneness.'²⁵ This was the first Act passed by Johnson's government.²⁶ This act illustrates the imperial awakening experienced by the Church encouraged by a transatlantic Toryism and it also shows the determination of Johnson to make the welfare of the Church of England a priority of his administration. The act was modelled on a similar act passed in England further demonstrating the emergence of a transatlantic church in South Carolina.²⁷ This act was the first step towards a stronger Church presence and the first of many acts aimed at strengthening the Anglican Church in South Carolina. Politicians and clergy viewed moral reform as a necessity and in the opinions

²³ Samuel Thomas to Dr. Woodward, 29 January 1702/3, SPG series A, vol I, 83.

²⁴ Francis Le Jau to Sec, 20 October, 1709, SPG Series A, vol V, 133-140

²⁵ Dalcho, *An Historical Account* 41

²⁶ Nicholas Trott, *The Laws of the Province of South Carolina* (Charleston, 1736), 50.

²⁷ Dalcho, *An Historical Account*, 41.

of high church Tories such as Governor Johnson and Granville, moral reform would only come about through the support and leadership of a strong Anglican establishment.

During this period of the imperial assertion, growth, and consolidation of the Church in South Carolina, Governor Johnson, with the support, if not actual encouragement and direction of his patron Granville, succeeded in passing Test Acts in May, 1704 and an act establishing the Church of England in South Carolina in November, 1704.²⁸ The successful passage of these acts led to a period of intense debate over the role of the Church in the colony. Riots, accusations, and physical conflict became staples of the local political discourse.²⁹ The vitriol underlying this conflict led to some seemingly absurd accusations, including a story accusing an Anglican minister of christening a bear.³⁰ Although the story and charge may sound absurd, debates about whether the incident actually occurred appeared in letters over a period of at least three years.³¹ The story illustrates more than the susceptibility of dissenting South Carolinians to believe tales of the wickedness of early Anglican ministers. The inclination to believe stories of Anglican debauchery was common to critics of the established church and an instrumental aspect of anti-Anglican rhetoric. As such, it reflects a desire on the part of the dissenting party to undermine the foundations of the growing Anglican presence; a presence encouraged and facilitated by Atlantic networks including the recently chartered S.P.G.

²⁸ Trott, *Laws of South Carolina*, 105-106.

²⁹ Daniel Defoe, *Party-tyranny: or, An occasional bill in miniature; As now practised in Carolina humbly offered to the consideration of both Houses of Parliament*. (London: 1705), 15; Defoe, *The case of Protestant Dissenters in Carolina, shewing how a law to prevent occasional conformity there, has ended in the total subversion of the constitution in church and state. Recommended to the serious Consideration of all that are true Friends to our present Establishment*. (London, 1706), 7.

³⁰ John Wright to Robert Stevens, 10 September, 1707, SPG Series A, vol IV, xix.

³¹ *ibid*; Le Jau to Sec, , 19 February 1710, SPG series A, vol V, 203-209.

Other more serious accusations which were prevalent during the debates over establishment have gone largely unnoticed. These include sedition, faction, disaffection, non-juring, and Jacobitism. Strangely, these more significant accusations, which could have much more grave implications, have been relegated to the bin of absurdities and have become little more than anecdotal examples of rhetoric along with the story of the bear. Nevertheless, they too, help demonstrate the integration of South Carolina's political culture into British party politics. They also illustrate aspects of Jacobitism in the British Atlantic. Accusations of Jacobite intrigue aimed at Governor Johnson and his allies went unheeded by Tory proprietors in Britain. Moreover, Johnson was not the only Jacobite involved in South Carolina's political debates. One of Johnson's primary detractors was a former nonjuror. The nonjuring beliefs of clergymen provide further evidence of a dynamic transatlantic political culture.³² The rhetoric and language utilised in the arguments surrounding the Test and Establishment Acts is especially telling in exemplifying the assimilation of South Carolina into the larger world of the later Stuart period. The terms and accusations used in the debates place it firmly in a larger Atlantic and imperial context. This appropriation of party language and accusations of Jacobitism in South Carolina in the first decade of the eighteenth century demonstrates an early manifestation of the transatlantic nature of British party politics. The role of the Anglican Church and the proper place in society of those dissenting from the church were major issues in English politics. This religious controversy was the single most important issue dividing the Whig and Tory parties in England.³³ The debates surrounding the Occasional Conformity Acts in England were some of the most polarizing in the era and

³² Roper, *Conceiving Carolina*, 136; Dalcho, *An Historical Account*, 82.

³³ Holmes, *British Politics*, 13-81

contemporaries understood that the debates in South Carolina were extensions of English politics.³⁴ It is therefore not surprising that the debates in South Carolina were understood to reflect the politics of English Whig and Tory parties. What has for too long been viewed as a strong-arm tactic of a local faction is more accurately defined as an Atlantic extension of the political crises raging across the ocean in England.

III

Encouraged by a high church Tory palatine and a resurgent Anglican Church, Governor Johnson and his political allies passed the two divisive Church Acts in 1704: the Test Act in May and the Establishment Act in November. Aspects of the acts establishing the Church of England drew the ire of various constituencies in South Carolina. The Test Act prohibited anyone who did not conform to the Church of England and who refused to receive the sacrament of the Lord's Supper 'according to the rites and usage of the said Church' from serving in the assembly.³⁵ This was designed to mimic the Test Acts and the Occasional Conformity Acts in England proposed in 1702, 1703, and 1704.³⁶ More importantly, it assumed the successful passage of Occasional Conformity acts in England, suggesting knowledge of the English debates and a desire to conform to English law. It also demonstrates the difficulties caused by the time lag created by the vast expanse of the Atlantic Ocean.³⁷ Critics too, noticed the assumption underlying the passage of the acts and used pamphlets printed in London, to attack the bill because, after the failure of the English parliament to pass Acts banning Occasional

³⁴ Daniel Defoe, *Party-tyranny*; Daniel Defoe, *The case of Protestant Dissenters*.

³⁵ Dalcho, *An Historical Account*, 53.

³⁶ Daniel Defoe, *Party-tyranny*.

³⁷ *Copy of an Act Lately Passed in Carolina and Sent Over to be Confirmed Here by the Lord Granville*, BL, Add. Ms 61647, f. 89-92.

Conformity, the South Carolina law did not conform to English law as its authors had anticipated.³⁸

Responses to the passage of the acts demonstrate the complexity of a British Atlantic political culture. Opponents of the acts passed in Carolina utilised a number of connections with England to pursue redress and repeal of the new laws. Dissenters in Carolina, furious at the passage of the Act, clearly understood the transatlantic context of the debate and sent an agent, John Ashe to bring their complaints before the proprietors. Consequently, South Carolina's controversial church acts stirred up debates in London as well as Charleston, illustrating the significance of the Atlantic context. This transatlantic debate which facilitated the development of partisan party interests in Carolina. Ashe, the dissenters' agent, was the grandson of a member of the Long Parliament and the son of a Whig Member of Parliament active during the Exclusion Crisis, an impressive Whig pedigree.³⁹ The Whig interest in Carolina could also boast of allies among the proprietors. John Archdale, the Quaker, former governor of the colony and current proprietor, was a staunch Whig and supported the dissenting interest in the colony. .

Unfortunately for the dissenting interest, their agent Ashe died in London before he was able to properly present the complaints. Following Ashe's untimely death, the dissenting party in Carolina sent Joseph Boone to London to present their protests before the proprietors. Boone presented a petition noting the grievances of the dissenters to the board of Proprietors. Lord Granville, the Palatine, famously responded to Boone's petition, 'It [the Test Act] is a prudential act in me, and I will do as I see fit. I see no

³⁸ *ibid*; Defoe, *Party-tyranny*, 28.

³⁹ David McCord Wright, 'Mr. Ash – A Footnote in Constitutional History,' in *South Carolina Historical Magazine* 63 (1962), 227-231.

harm at all in this Bill and I am resolved to pass it.’⁴⁰ Granville was also reported to have said to John Archdale, a fellow proprietor who sided with the Whig party, that ‘you are of one opinion, and I am of another, and our lives may not be long enough to end the controversy. I am for this bill and this is the party that I will head and Countenance.’⁴¹ This attitude did not bode well for the future prospects of dissent in the colony.

After failing to find redress among the proprietors, Boone sought to bring the issue before Parliament in order to have the law repealed. In an anonymous pamphlet ‘humbly offer’d’ to both houses of Parliament’ titled *The Case of the Church of England in Carolina*, the author attempted to demonise the high church party in Carolina by tying them to Jacobitism. He informed his readers that Governor Johnson, the leader of the high church faction, had retired his government of the Leeward Islands because of his disaffection to the Revolution also reminding them that Johnson ‘lived privately as a Non-Juror until the death of King James.’⁴² He also noted that by disallowing Protestant dissenters to sit in the assembly, the high church faction would be able to seize total control because ‘there are but very few moderate Churchmen in the province’.⁴³

Boone also enlisted the aid of Daniel Defoe to make the case for the dissenters in Parliament and in the sphere of English public opinion. Boone’s timing was propitious. The Whigs had just won important parliamentary victories in in England 1705, based largely on their ability to disparage the high church Tories and their overzealous, anti-dissenter push for acts against Occasional Conformity.⁴⁴ Defoe and Boone allied in order

⁴⁰ Dalcho, *An Historical Account*, 54; Defoe, *The case of Protestant Dissenters*, 39.

⁴¹ Defoe, *Party Tyranny*, 27.

⁴² *The Case of the Church of England in Carolina*, [London, c. 1706], 2.

⁴³ *ibid*, 2.

⁴⁴ James Richards, *Party Propaganda under Queen Anne: The General Elections of 1702-1713* (Athens, GA, 1972); Speck, *Tory and Whig*, 98-109.

fight to have the South Carolina acts repealed but Defoe likely took a more prominent place in the alliance, at least in London, especially due in part to his recent participation in the previous Whig propaganda offensive. Defoe composed two pamphlets in support of Carolina's dissenters, published in 1705 and 1706, attacking the acts and making a plea to Parliament to save Carolina from high church tyranny and to promote toleration of dissent in the colony. While the desire for toleration may seem benign, the language used by Defoe was incredibly accusatory and infused with party rhetoric intended to provoke sympathy and to conjure up images of past persecutions and recent party machinations. Defoe clearly viewed South Carolina's politics in terms of transatlantic party interests. In his pamphlet titled '*Party Tyranny*' he argued that the 1704 Act was designed and instigated by an imperial 'faction' led by the Palatine Granville and that this faction was bent on imposing a 'high-church-tyranny'.⁴⁵ Additionally, he argued that the 'designs of the party [i.e. Tories]' behind the tacking and occasional conformity bills was civil and ecclesiastical tyranny and went on to claim that the party in Carolina were 'encouraged from the same expectation.'⁴⁶ Defoe clearly demarcated party interests according to religion. Using England's emerging public sphere to support a transatlantic Whig and dissenting interest, he reprinted a petition authored by John Ashe as an addendum to one of his pamphlets which insinuated that members of South Carolina's government favourable to the Tory interest were disloyal to the King and participated in secret trade with the French.⁴⁷ This notion that the Tory party was a party of Francophiles, especially following the 1703 passage of an Act of indemnity allowing former Jacobites to return to Britain, played on existing Whig and dissenting fears of a Catholic, Jacobite threat.

⁴⁵ Defoe, *The case of Protestant Dissenters*, 28; Defoe, *Party-tyranny*, 1.

⁴⁶ Defoe, *Party Tyranny*, 28.

⁴⁷ *ibid*, 73.

Though Ashe refrained from making specific accusations, the current governor Nathaniel Johnson's Jacobite past would have lent credibility to Ashe's representations.⁴⁸

The Whiggish political pamphlets written by Defoe and Boone were met in kind by a heated Tory response. In a printed defence of the Establishment Acts, authored by the proprietors who favoured the Acts and presented to the House of Lords in London, the authors made very clear their fears of unchecked dissent. The proprietors employed high church rhetoric, claiming that dissenters were attempting to get the 'Government of the Colony into their Hands'. They also argued that those 'fixing themselves to no one Communion cannot be denominated of either'; a deliberate echoing of arguments against occasional conformity in England designed to stir up English Tory sympathies by reminding them of the motivations underpinning recent debates in England.⁴⁹ They were also quick to discredit their opposition by claiming that whatever kindness towards the Church was pretended by Boone, the South Carolina agent, 'tis well known, he designs no kindness to her; but endeavours to shelter his bad designs under the shew of kindness, for no establishment of the Church or ministry in those parts can be acceptable to him.'⁵⁰ Unfortunately, the proprietors, led by Granville, also had to defend Governor Johnson from accusations of Jacobitism.

Dissenting opponents of the acts in Carolina also utilised extra-parliamentary means to discredit the acts garner sympathy for South Carolina's dissenters. In 1705, Archibald Stobo, a Scottish Presbyterian minister in Charleston, wrote to the moderator of a presbytery in Edinburgh, noting that 'the parliament being met in Dec. last, did make

⁴⁸ Roper, *Conceiving Carolina*, 102.

⁴⁹ Anon, *An account of the fair and impartial proceedings of the Lords proprietors, governour and council of the colony of South Carolina, in answer to the untrue suggestions, contained in the petition of Jos. Boon and others, and of a paper intituled, The case of the Church of England in Carolina*. (London: 1706), 2.

⁵⁰ *ibid*, 4.

an act against the Decenters to the Church of England'. He decried the passage of the act and commented that he hoped 'God in his wise providence shall soe rule the hearts as to make void and null the forsaid act.' He also remarked on the immediate, pernicious consequences of the act, noting that some of his parishioners were conforming to the Church of England for worldly gain and that the act would 'prove of fatal consequence to my indeavors.'⁵¹ Similarly, a number of Presbyterian dissenters in South Carolina petitioned the Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland to request help protesting the act.⁵² This, no doubt, was intended to create sympathy among Presbyterians in Scotland in order to further inflame a transatlantic dissenting Whig interest against the Church of England and the high church Tories.

The content, timing, and ideological ramifications of the debates, reflecting as they did on recent debates in Parliament, drew the attention of the House of Lords and even that of Queen Anne. The House of Lords voted the Acts unlawful and appointed a committee to write an address to the Queen with the intent to 'use the most effectual Methods to deliver the said Province from the arbitrary Oppressions under which it now lies, and to order the Authors thereof to be prosecuted according to Law.'⁵³ It is worth noting that the committee appointed to draft the address was dominated by members of the Whig Junto. In fact, this committee, as Brinsfield notes, sought to prosecute the South Carolina proprietors responsible for the act, although this was hampered by the Tory Simon Harcourt.⁵⁴ Although the committee was unsuccessful in its efforts to prosecute

⁵¹ Archibald Stobo to the Moderator of the Presbytery of Edinburgh, 10 September, 1705, NAS, CH1/2/24/2/3, 224-227.

⁵² LP, vol XVII, 105.

⁵³ 'House of Lords Journal Volume 18: 9 March 1706,' Journal of the House of Lords: volume 18: 1705-1709, British History Online, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=29452&strquery=carolina>, accessed 13 March 2013.

⁵⁴ Brinsfield, *Religion and Politics in Colonial South Carolina*, 30.

the authors of the acts, in June 1706, the Queen, on the advice of the House of Lords and the SPG, made null and void the Test Acts and the Establishment Acts passed by the Carolina Assembly in 1704.⁵⁵ The repeal of the acts and especially the support of the SPG for the repeal of the Acts have created misconceptions about the nature and purpose of the act. One recent account has claimed that ‘the plan for Establishment in Carolina had little to do with religion.’⁵⁶ This misinterprets Governor Johnson’s past and his personal devotion to the Anglican Church and diminishes the Atlantic context which included similar acts. It also misconstrues Granville’s desire to see the act passed and suggests that Granville was merely putting ‘the best interests of the Colony behind metropolitan political interests.’⁵⁷ Although this does in some ways accurately address the transatlantic nature of the debate, it misinterprets the importance of religion in the language and practice of party politics in the reign of Queen Anne. It also ignores the language of Jacobitism within that heated political discourse. Indeed, the involvement of the Whig Junto in the repeal of the act, following as it did on the heels of the Tories’ failed Occasional Conformity Acts in England, suggests that this public debate had consequences reaching far beyond South Carolina’s factional disputes.

The repeal in 1706 of the acts passed by the Carolina assembly in 1704 precipitated a new round of debate. Governor Johnson and his allies immediately began to work towards passing a new Establishment Act which would be acceptable to the Queen, the Church, and the Whig dominated House of Lords. Johnson and his allies succeeded in passing a new Act in November of 1706 which did not include the Test Acts

⁵⁵ *CSPC*, Order of the Queen in Council, June 10, 1706, item 366

⁵⁶ Roper, *Conceiving Carolina*, 130.

⁵⁷ *ibid*, 131.

barring dissenters from office.⁵⁸ Dissenters and their low church allies, flush with the recent victory of the repeal were caught unawares and lashed out, arguing that the new establishment acts, though less oppressive than those recently repealed, were destructive to the province and that they were being forced upon the populace by ‘profligate men’ who were ‘pretended to be of the Church of England’.⁵⁹ It was reported in Britain that the high church party in Carolina responded by utilising the Tory slogan of the church in danger. Abel Boyer, a Whig critic of the high church party in Britain and Carolina, complained that the high church Tories in Carolina had to unscrupulously draw supporters in to vote for the act by forcing some and by scaring others, warning them about the dangers the church was in from the dissenting party.⁶⁰ Questioning the sincerity of the beliefs of promoters of the church party was a common dissenting and Whig tactic and an important rhetorical element in Britain’s transatlantic political culture.⁶¹

One noteworthy aspect of the debates was the role played by Edward Marston. Marston, the Anglican minister of St. Philip parish, Charleston, reacted strongly against the Establishment Act passed in 1704 because it provided for a lay commission which held authority to dismiss wayward or negligent ministers. Marston’s outspoken resistance to the Act resulted in him being the first victim of the recently created lay commission. Due to his tendency to ‘foment continual quarrels’, he was brought before the assembly and deprived of his salary.⁶² Marston refused to participate in the

⁵⁸ Trott, *Laws of South Carolina*, 129-144.

⁵⁹ Robert Stevens to the Society, 21 February, 1705/6, SPG papers Series A, vol II CLVIII.

⁶⁰ Abel Boyer, *The Reign of Queen Anne, Digested into Annals: Year the Fifth* (London, 1707), Appendix number X, p, 93-97; see also ‘The deposition of Samuel Eveleigh of Charleston,’ BL, Add. Ms. 61647, f. 112.

⁶¹ Holmes, *British Politics*, 17.

⁶² Anon, *An account of the fair and impartial proceedings of the Lords proprietors*, 3 note *.

proceedings, claiming that the assembly had no right to regulate ecclesiastical affairs and that clergymen were responsible only to God. Marston's strong views concerning the divine right of clergymen should not be surprising in light of the fact that he was a confessed former nonjuror, having denied the oaths on William's accession, only later subscribing them during William's reign. He openly acknowledged his former nonjuring sympathies in a letter reprinted in Defoe's pamphlet. He even went so far as to request that the SPG send other '*quondam* nonjurors' with whom he was still acquainted.⁶³

Marston's opposition to the establishment of the Church is puzzling for many reasons but foremost among them is that it pits a clerical nonjuror against a lay nonjuror. Indeed, one interesting element of Marston's fight with the government was his previous support for Nathaniel Johnson. Shortly before Johnson became governor, Marston wrote to the SPG praising Johnson and expressing his hope that Johnson would accept the role as governor because the colony needed a strong supporter of the Church. He also despaired of ever seeing the Church established in the colony and divided into orderly parishes due to the strength of a vocal dissenting opposition.⁶⁴ Marston's break with Johnson requires explanation and previous attempts have fallen short, as Marston should have been sympathetic to Johnson's high church Tory initiatives. Marston's resistance to the acts has mistakenly led to the conclusion that the acts represented either a battle between high church and low church interests in the Colony or factional politics despite contemporary observations that 'the debates and contests, that are on foot here, are not between High and Low churchmen; but between the dissenters and the Church'.⁶⁵ The evidence, including Marston's conflicts with the lay commission, points to a more

⁶³ 'Letter from Marston to Society' in Defoe, *The case of Protestant Dissenters*, 61.

⁶⁴ Marston to Dr. Bray, 2 February, 1702/3, SPG papers series A, vol 1, LX.

⁶⁵ Gideon Johnston to the Bishop of Sarum, 20 September 1708, SPG Series A, vol III, 67.

nuanced battle between various high church ideologies and a second battle between Tories and a mainly dissenting Whig party which co-opted Marston's discontent.⁶⁶

Johnston, the Bishop of London's commissary, noted that the dissenters would never be content until they had brought about the 'downfall of this infant Church', suggesting a party division caused by religious concerns.⁶⁷

In light of Marston's vocal resistance to the high church party, John Woolverton argued that the Acts were designed to promote lay control in the Church, which is only partially accurate.⁶⁸ Although there are some seemingly low church attitudes present in the acts, the lay commission for example, these were all placed in the Act for very specific reasons, such as clerical discipline in the absence of a bishop or commissary, and were willingly removed when the issues were addressed by the proper authorities, but only after they drew the ire of Marston.⁶⁹ Governor Johnson, a devout high church Anglican, must have felt that the lack of any proper clerical authority necessitated the temporary establishment of lay commissions. Marston was clearly displeased with the Act but what distressed him the most was that the lay commissions would allow the government to remove him from his position as the minister to Carolina's largest Anglican Church. Marston's temperament and attitude towards the dissenters was creating a poor impression of an Anglican Church that Johnson was trying to rehabilitate in the colony. But it was not purely personal distress that worried Marston. He believed strongly in the divine sanction of his office and would aggressively combat any who tried to remove him.

⁶⁶ Woolverton, *Colonial Anglicanism*, 156-167.

⁶⁷ Gideon Johnston to the Bishop of Sarum, 20 September 1708, SPG Series A, vol III, 67.

⁶⁸ Woolverton, *Colonial Anglicanism*, 167.

⁶⁹ Anon, *An account of the fair and impartial proceedings of the Lords proprietors*, 2.

The most surprising feature of Marston's opposition to the acts is the many unlikely allies he acquired as a result of his struggle. As a high churchman and former non-juror, Marston was no friend of the dissenters or their Whig politics. In fact, according to his fellow Anglican minister Samuel Thomas, the majority of his sermons were invectives aimed at dissenters.⁷⁰ Yet, the dissenters were able to convince Marston to put aside his inherent distaste for dissent and work together in order to protest the act. In retrospect, it is not too surprising that the dissenters would encourage Marston in his opposition. His arguments against the establishment provided much needed assistance for the dissenters defeat the high church party, and as a member of the Church his own character (Marston, would be accused of Jacobitism and Catholic sympathies) would damage the entire Church party as well. The alliance with Marston would also allow the dissenters in Carolina a pretended unity of purpose with Anglicans. They could then claim that the aggrieved ministers of the newly established church (Marston) were supported by the dissenters and that the church party led by Johnson was destroying an established peace. Johnston noted this and complained to the Bishop of Sarum that the Dissenters intended to 'gain their point, according to that known maxim, *Divide & Impera*.'⁷¹ His complaint that those low church Anglicans who had opposed the Establishment Acts and continued to support Marston were 'half-faced Churchmen, who in reality are Dissenters, and who sometimes come to Church to be able to do us more mischief' clearly echoes high church concerns regarding the pernicious consequences of Occasional Conformity.⁷² Thomas too noted the strangeness of the Jacobite Marston

⁷⁰ Thomas to Society, 17 May, 1706, SPG Journals

⁷¹ Gideon Johnston to the Bishop of Sarum, 20 September 1708, SPG Series A, vol III, 67.

⁷² *ibid*.

working with the dissenters and claimed that the dissenters only supported Marston in order to promote ‘their interest and increase their numbers.’⁷³

Marston, seemingly either unaware of or indifferent to his usefulness to the dissenting interest in Carolina, saw Defoe reprint copies of his letters to the Bishop of London and the proprietors in an English tract intended to achieve the repeal of the acts.⁷⁴ His associations with his new-found dissenting allies were not pleasing at all to the government under Nathaniel Johnson who had used the powers granted him by the Acts to remove Marston from his position in Charleston. Clearly, Marston was at odds with Johnson and his allies and was not afraid to attack them for anything he viewed as a weakness. He accused the Anglican minister Samuel Thomas, a close ally of Governor Johnson, of neglecting his mission to the ‘Yamose’ Indians. He also reputedly compared the government under Johnson to the biblical rebels led by Korah.⁷⁵ A reference to the rebellion of Korah is notable because it ties Marston to a transatlantic nonjuring culture as Korah was a reference used by the leading nonjuror Charles Leslie.⁷⁶ Through the use of Korah, Marston is implying that Johnson is the one rebelling against both clerical and state authority. Marston’s use of Korah implied that that the lay commissions set up by Johnson’s government in the 1704 Establishment Acts represented rebellion against the divine right of clergy. Marston also seems to be suggesting that by setting up the

⁷³ Thomas to Society, 17 May, 1706, SPG Journals

⁷⁴ Defoe, *Case of the Protestant Dissenters*, 57-64.

⁷⁵ Defoe, *Case of the Protestant Dissenters*, 58; Dalcho, *An Historical Account*, 56; The biblical story can be found in Numbers, chapter 16. In the biblical story, Korah led a rebellion against Moses and Aaron, and attempted to institute a new clerical establishment without divine approval.

⁷⁶ Charles Leslie, *The new association. Part II. &c. With farther improvements* (London: [1702?]), 21-22; *idem*, *The case of the regale and of the pontificat stated. In a conference concerning the independency of the Church, upon any Power on Earth, in the Exercise of Her Purely Spiritual Power and Authority* (London: 1701), vii.

commission, Johnson is attacking the Church and is therefore abandoning God's appointed head of the church, James II & VII.⁷⁷

It would not be long before Johnson and Thomas retaliated against Marston's insinuations by attacking his motives and character. Thomas travelled back to London in 1705 and presented a defence of his actions before the S.P.G. In his own defence, he provided an account of Marston's character which was none too pleasant. Thomas accused Marston of continually boasting of his previous stance as a nonjuror. Thomas claimed, 'in the ship in which I came for Carolina,' Marston 'comenced very violent quarrels upon that head [the Revolution of 1688]' and that his 'constant applauding King James...the Jacobites and Papists, and his vile reflections upon King William' made some suspect that he was a Catholic. He added that Marston continued to take all opportunities to 'cry up the late King James and the Jacobites, whom he generally termed the honest men of England' and went on to say that Marston railed 'scandalously against King William, the Bishops and Parliament then in being'. Moreover he noted that Marston 'joyns with many of his sense in reproaching' the two archetypical Whigs Archbishop Tillotson and the Bishop of Salisbury. Thomas finished by stating that Marston was 'a violent Jacobite and a great enemy to the Government in Church and State as settled under King William'.⁷⁸ This estimation of Marston's character was later confirmed by Gideon Johnston, the Bishop of London's Commissary in South Carolina who claimed as late as 1710 that Marston was disaffected. He accused Marston of having a terrible temper and claimed that Marston had called his fellow clergymen 'a parcel of schismaticks and Intruders'. According to Johnston, Marston went so far as to condemn

⁷⁷ Marston, however, denied having used such a reference, though why his opponents would accuse him of it remains unclear. Defoe, *Case of the Protestant Dissenters*, 56.

⁷⁸ Thomas to Society, May 17, 1706.

all the revolution clergy as rebels, particularly the Bishop of London, 'whom he calls a murderer and perjur'd person on the score of the revolution'.⁷⁹

Thomas's accusations against Marston reveal an instinctive political defence but they also demonstrate a shrewd political motive. By pushing Marston to the fringes of political society Thomas was demonstrating his own moderation and also the political moderation of his patrons and allies. This was a conscious political manoeuvre which was designed to locate Thomas and Governor Johnson in a more moderate political context, which after the fall of the high church Tories and the rise of the Whig Junto in 1705 would have been much more politically acceptable. Distancing themselves from Jacobitism and high church Toryism, they deflected accusations aimed at them and associated their political opponents with those more extreme ideas, effectively positioning themselves as moderate Tories. The accusations of Johnson and Thomas against Marston were effective and Marston never regained his position in the church in Charleston. The accusations also aided in the success of the Church Act of 1706 by shifting the focus away from the debates about the act and towards the suspicious character of Marston.

These accusations of Jacobitism in South Carolina were not merely a means of discrediting enemies nor were they simply a favourite accusation of political enemies. It was a very focused and direct use of a term which was understood to carry great weight throughout the British Atlantic especially in relation to emerging party differences. This is exemplified by the manner in which Samuel Thomas and Gideon Johnston used it in reference to Edward Marston. It is further illustrated by the 1708 arrest of Thomas Nairne, an ally of Marston and a vocal opponent of Governor Johnson. Although after

⁷⁹ Gideon Johnston to the Secretary, 5 July, 1710, SPG series A, vol V, 371-430.

1706 much of the party political manoeuvring concerning the Church Acts was no longer playing such a prominent role in the politics of Carolina, the party division stirred up by the rancorous debates still existed and were affected by transatlantic party shifts. Nairne was arrested by Johnson's order for high treason for having allegedly said 'the Prince of Wales was King James' son' and the 'Right Heir to the Crown.'⁸⁰ As the introduction noted, Nairne, confined to prison, protested his innocence. Coming on the heels of the Anglo-Scottish Union, the failed Jacobite invasion of 1708, and the rise of the virulently anti-Jacobite Whig Junto, accusations against Nairne were likely to have been more successful. Nairne, a Scot, was possibly unhappy with the Union of 1707 which might explain his seditious expression, yet even support of Marston, a nonjuror and accused Jacobite, would have been enough to lend credence to the assertion. In fact, Nairne's defence is weak enough that it is probable he was guilty of having said seditious words.⁸¹ Johnson, himself having been accused of Jacobitism, knew full well the currency of credible accusations of Jacobitism and successfully employed them to combat and destroy his political opponents. He also understood the value of having political allies in England. Regardless of whether the accusations were merited, they again demonstrate the importance of transatlantic party realities.

Nairne also understood the significance of transatlantic politics and the value of securing influential patrons. Through letters from the Carolina agent Joseph Boone, Nairne noted he had learned of the 'noble character' and Whig attitudes of Charles Spencer, the Earl of Sunderland. More importantly, he also understood that the Earl was employed in the Whig ministry as the Secretary of State for the Southern Division and

⁸⁰ *CSPC*, Thomas Nairne to the [Earl of Sunderland] July 28, 1709, item 662.

⁸¹ J.D. Alsop, 'Thomas Nairne and the 'Boston Gazette no. 216' of 1707,' in *Southern Studies* 22 (1983), 209-211.

therefore had a great deal of influence in the politics and appointments of the colonies. Nairne wrote to Sunderland in hopes that the earl could protect him from the worst abuses of Governor Johnson.⁸² In fact, Nairne defended himself by claiming that Governor Johnson was the true Jacobite. Accusing a high church Tory of Jacobitism would likely not have been especially effective under the administration of Nottingham or the proprietorship of Granville but Johnson's patron Granville's had died in 1707 leaving him exposed to the new Whig leaning proprietors. Also, with Sunderland's appointment as Secretary of State, charges of Jacobitism against a high church Tory governor who had used his authority to pass a divisive act establishing the Church of England carried a great deal more weight. Ironically, it was Johnson's accusation against and arrest of Nairne that would lead to his own political end. Johnson's Jacobite past and his high church Tory politics did not endear him to new administration under the Whig Junto in England. Thus Nairne's accusations gave the Whigs in England reason enough to remove Johnson from his post. This political reversal is significant because it further demonstrates the transatlantic nature of politics of Carolina. It also illustrates the continued relevance of the evolving significance of Jacobitism in transatlantic politics and how the transatlantic ramifications of political decisions made on both sides of the Atlantic changed the context in which party language could either thrive or wither. The conflict over establishment and the relational dynamics it created are notable not simply because they reflect the language and politics of England but also because they demonstrate the complex interactions between local political conflicts and a larger dynamic British Atlantic political culture.

⁸² *CSPC*, Thomas Nairne to the [Earl of Sunderland] July 28, 1709, item 662.

Despite Johnson's removal as governor in 1709 and the Whig supremacy in Westminster, the acts passed in 1706 establishing the Anglican Church in South Carolina remained in force. In fact, the establishment of the Church led to a substantial increase in attendance at Anglican churches over the next twenty five years.⁸³ Dissenting ministers continued to complain that parishioners were going over to the Church of England.⁸⁴ Moreover, conflicts continued to arise between dissenters and the established church, often mirroring conflicts in Britain. For instance, in 1710 two 'restless and factious' Scottish Presbyterian ministers called the Church of England a 'scandalous church' and authored a covenant requiring their parishioners to never attend an Anglican Church, reflecting the religious tensions still roiling Britain.⁸⁵

The successful establishment of the Anglican Church in South Carolina, the continued support of the British based SPG, and transatlantic denominational conflict all contributed to create a foundation for a high church culture in the colony; a culture further encouraged by the successes of the Tory party in 1710. During the ten years following the passage of Carolina's church acts in 1706, a number of the missionaries sent to the colony to serve in the newly established parishes tended to sympathise with the high church Tory party and were swept up in the high church zeal which predominated during the reign of Anne. They also participated in elements of Toryism and Tory political culture which looked suspiciously like Jacobitism. A number of clergymen were accused of disaffection and Jacobitism during the heyday of party rivalry. In 1716, after news of the Jacobite rebellion had reached Carolina, a group of Anglican

⁸³ Thomas J. Little, 'The Origins of Southern Evangelicalism: Revivalism in South Carolina, 1700-1740, in *Church History* 75 (2006), 768-808, see especially pages 778-779.

⁸⁴ James Squire to the General Assembly, 1715, NAS CH1/2/35, 189-194.

⁸⁵ Johnston to Secretary, 1710, SPG series A, volume V, 371-430; Le Jau to SPG, 1707, Series series A, vol III, 254-258.

clergymen and people in Charleston were noted ‘drinking the health of the Duke of Ormonde.’ Their low church critic, Ebenezer Taylor confronted them, telling them that ‘Ormonde was a traitor and a rebel against King George,’ though this seemed to avail him little other than alienating him from his fellow clergymen, who he claimed did not like him because they ‘can’t discourse so freely of some things and drink some healths with such freedom and pleasure’ in his presence.⁸⁶

This high church Tory and Jacobite culture persisted into the 1720s. The daughter of the nonjuror Thomas Brett, herself an ardent lay nonjuror, moved to South Carolina and was ‘mighty pleased with the people she is amongst.’⁸⁷ Despite complaining that the majority of the population were Whigs, she commented to her father in 1723 ‘the hearts of the people are as we could wish, for they are loyal to the last degree and the governour fired seventeen guns on his majesty’s birthday and the gentlemen over their punch and the ladies over their tea table equally drank to his majesty’s [James III & VIII] long life and prosperous reign.’ She also noted that ‘the minister here is a very honest man’ also commenting on the fact that the minister was ‘a Scotsman’ who had ‘promised us all the assistance he can give us.’⁸⁸

Transatlantic manifestations of Whig and Tory party divisions were the primary cause of the debates surrounding and the passage of the act establishing the Anglican Church in South Carolina in the early eighteenth century. The appointment of a high church Tory governor by a partisan Tory proprietor indicates a concerted effort to promote high church Toryism throughout the British Atlantic. That the establishment acts and the debates their passage created both clearly replicated events in England and

⁸⁶ Ebenezer Taylor to the Bishop of London, 18 April, 1716, SPG Series A, vol XI, 163-205.

⁸⁷ Thomas Brett to Archibald Campbell, 12 September 1724, NAS CH12/15/109, 172-176.

⁸⁸ Thomas Brett to Archibald Campbell, 12 September 1724, NAS CH12/15/109, 172-176.

Ireland and suggests a colonial political culture well versed in British politics. This Tory push in South Carolina prompted the creation of transatlantic partisan interests in the colony. These transatlantic party interests encouraged South Carolinians, Englishmen, and Scots to participate in a transatlantic exchange of ideas facilitated by Britain's emerging public sphere. The emerging party divisions and the increasing participation in an emerging Atlantic public sphere during a time of intense party strife dominated by the Stuart threat necessarily sparked accusations of Jacobitism. This was in part because Governor Johnson, the high church Tory responsible for passing the acts, was a Jacobite. Similarly, Edward Marston, one of the most vocal critics of the acts was a nonjuror and a Jacobite. These accusations were not without foundation, yet the characters involved and their respective positions reflect the changing realities and rehabilitation of Jacobitism in the early eighteenth century.

Although party rivalries in South Carolina cooled after the debates surrounding the passage of the establishment acts subsided, religious disputes continued to encourage party affiliation. Moreover, the establishment of the Church of England and the high church Tory ascendancy in Britain from 1710 to 1714 fostered a culture friendly to high church and Jacobite interests, though how prevalent Jacobite sympathies were in South Carolina will have to be the focus of another study.

‘An Echo to that on the Other Side’: Jacobitism and the Mid-Atlantic, c.
1710-1717

Robert Hunter sailed to New York City in 1710 in order to begin his tenure as the governor of the British Colonies of New York and New Jersey. Hunter had hopes of an easy government pursuing the interests of Queen Anne but factions and vicious transatlantic party rivalries were alive and well in the colonies and not isolated to Westminster and Grub Street. The early years of Hunter's governance (1710-1719) was a time of increasing dynastic uncertainty and witnessed a series of seismic political changes including the death of Queen Anne, the Hanoverian succession, and the Jacobite rebellion of 1715. That Hunter successfully survived the political morass of two colonies, each possessing their own unique political issues made all the more uncertain by the vagaries of an adolescent imperial structure influenced by the rage of party, is a tribute to Hunter's political acumen. But an examination of the period surrounding Hunter's government provides more than a tribute to or biographical description of a single man. It encapsulates elements of Whig and Tory British party conflicts, religious controversies, and the integration of an Atlantic public sphere. Thus, the period of Hunter's tenure as governor provides a compelling example of the transatlantic nature of party politics, communications, and the currency of Jacobitism in the British Atlantic World surrounding the contentious final years of Queen Anne's reign.

New York and New Jersey both had a long history of violent factional strife. In 1689 amidst uncertainties regarding the success of William of Orange's recent invasion

of England, and the problematically slow receipt of news, Jacob Leisler seized the government of New York out of the hands of Francis Nicholson, the Lieutenant Governor. Leisler attributed his actions to a desire to support Protestant monarchs William and Mary and save the colony from popery and tyranny, but his subsequent decisions as acting governor and persecution of those who disagreed with his actions created turmoil in the colony. The disruptions caused by Leisler's seizure of the government following the revolution in 1688 and downfall and eventual execution created violent divisions throughout the region.¹ As successive governors rose and fell in relation to party politics in Britain, so to the power of the various parties or factions stirred up by Leisler and encouraged by the governors waxed and waned. Scholars interested in the practice of politics of the period have primarily understood and discussed the various political disputes in terms of local faction.² Accordingly, both New York and New Jersey are described as having had their own primary factions: Leislerians and anti-Leislerians and the proprietary and anti-proprietary party respectively. Faction and local disputes have been used to explain almost every aspect of political disagreement including larger imperial concerns such as trade, taxes, and issues concerning the development and establishment of the Church of England. It is undeniable that local issues galvanized the populace into factions or parties, especially from 1689-1702, but it is a mistake to jump to the conclusion the local factions were static beyond that period and only appropriated imperial issues simply for local gain.

¹ Lovejoy, *The Glorious Revolution in America*; Patricia Bonomi, *A Factious People: Politics and Society in Colonial New York* (New York, 1971).; David William Voorhees, 'The 'Fervent Zeale' of Jacob Leisler,' in *The William and Mary Quarterly* 51 (1994), 447-472; David William Voorhees, "'to assert our Right before it be quite lost': The Leisler Rebellion in the Delaware River Valley, *Pennsylvania History* 64 (1997), 5-27.

² Brendan McConville, *These Daring Disturbers of the Public Peace: The Struggle for Property and Power in Early New Jersey* (Ithica, NY, 1999); Bonomi, *A Factious People*.

There have been some attempts to break away from the fixation with local faction and more fully explore the complexity and diversity in the politics of the Mid-Atlantic colonies. John Runcie's study of Anglo-American politics comes closest to describing the complexity of the regional politics in a study of colonial New York when he described it as a three dimensional; the three dimensions being local politics, English politics, and the third dimension of 'Anglo-American politics'.³ This is a helpful idea that serves to illustrate aspects of an emerging and increasingly complex Atlantic political system. The practice of politics of the mid-Atlantic may well have been local, but the transatlantic political cultures in which politics operated were not. Recent works examining the region from an Atlantic or Imperial perspective have further outlined the primacy of the transatlantic nature of political appointments and political cultures.⁴

Historians studying the practice of politics in the region have tended to divide New York and New Jersey to the detriment of a fuller regional appreciation of transatlantic politics and religious controversies.⁵ In part, this arises from a focus on political opposition within the local assemblies.⁶ The over-emphasis of the significance of factional disputes in the assemblies diminishes the importance of the Anglican Church and transatlantic party controversies across the colonies.⁷ These two mid-Atlantic colonies did each possess separate assemblies and councils, but they also shared a royal governor from 1702. So although there were notable variations in local political disputes,

³ Runcie, 'The Problem of Anglo-American Politics, 191-217.

⁴ Patricia Bonomi, *The Lord Cornbury Scandal: The Politics of Reputation in British America* (Chapel Hill, 1998); Webb, *Marlborough's America*, 291-329.

⁵ For a notable exception, see Voorhees, "to assert our Right", 5-27.

⁶ This is especially noticeable in older studies which celebrate the rise of the assembly as the growth of democracy. See Donald Kemmerer, *The Path to Freedom: The Struggle for Self-Government in Colonial New Jersey, 1703-1776* (Princeton, 1940); Bonomi, *A Factious People*.

⁷ Pomfret, *Colonial New Jersey: A History* (New York, 1973); Michael G. Kammen, *Colonial New York: A History* (New York, 1975); Bonomi, *A Factious People*, 56-102; Mary Lou Lustig, *Privilege and Prerogative: New York's Provincial Elite, 1710 – 1776* (London, 1995), 18-32.

a shared governor served to draw political opposition groups into a larger trans-colonial opposition, especially where it concerned transatlantic issues such as the role of the Anglican Church. If the politics in the colonies are divorced from a British political culture and ideology, then all that is left as an explanation is faction. Additionally, where scholars have understood and addressed the Atlantic implications of politics they have rarely understood the politics of the church to be regional in addition to transatlantic. For example, studies of the Anglican Church in New York and New Jersey, though often demonstrating some limited interaction among the clergy in the two neighbouring colonies continue to assume that because each colony had its own assembly, there must be a natural division in the politics practiced by the New York and New Jersey clergy.⁸ Recent works have stressed elements of the mid-Atlantic region's integration into the larger British Atlantic Empire, yet there remains ample opportunity for further studies.⁹

Jacobitism provides a compelling foundation for a case study examining the integration of the mid-Atlantic into party driven political culture and the religious controversies of Britain's Atlantic world. With a focus on local faction, accusations of loyalty to the Stuarts, nonjuring, or outright Jacobitism are understood as little more than petty expressions of local antipathy. But if, as has been previously demonstrated, Jacobitism was an integral part of a transatlantic political, religious, and print culture, then these seemingly petty accusations are far more than thoughtless mudslinging. Accusations and expressions of Jacobitism in the mid-Atlantic not only point towards the significance and currency of Jacobitism in the British Atlantic, they also demonstrate the integration of the colonial region into a British Atlantic political culture.

⁸ Nelson R. Burr, *The Anglican Church in New Jersey* (Philadelphia: The Church Historical Society, 1954).

⁹ Webb, *Marlborough's America*.

Governor Hunter's troubled relationship with the clergymen and high church members of the Church of England in New York and New Jersey provides a perfect illustration of the complexity of imperial politics and the prevalence of a shared ideologies and political culture. Hunter's interactions with a regional and transatlantic Anglican Church also help to shift understandings of Jacobitism in the colonies away from petty accusations and illustrate a transatlantic understanding of the significance of Jacobitism and party politics in the British Atlantic World. While some scholars have mentioned Hunter's defence of 'Revolution Principles', his opposition to the 'Jacobite party,' or have noticed the accusations of Jacobitism made against his opponents, no one has yet fully explained the purpose, implications, or effectiveness of his accusations.¹⁰ It appears as though most historians have assumed that the accusations were simply political mudslinging but this underestimates and misinterprets Hunter's antagonism towards an aggressive high Tory Anglicanism in a period where the politics of the high church Tories were intimately linked to Jacobitism. Hunter's stormy relationship with the Church party in the two colonies was defined by the opposition he encountered, the evolving transatlantic political culture, and his understanding of the transatlantic nature of the Jacobite threat. Although a significant period of Hunter's government was to a large degree defined by his Whig politics, his apparent antagonism towards the church, and the increasingly unified response of the regional church party, the party divisions and the resulting accusations of Jacobitism cannot be entirely divorced from the context of mid-Atlantic politics.

¹⁰ Webb, *Marlborough's America*, 261; Lustig, *Robert Hunter*, 129-130; , Alison G. Olson, 'Governor Robert Hunter and the Anglican Church in New York,' in *Statesmen, Scholars, and Merchants: Essays in Eighteenth Century History Presented to Dame Lucy Sutherland*, ed. By Anne Whiteman, J.S. Bromley, and P.G.M. Dickson (Oxford, 1973), 44-64, see especially 59-60.

Interestingly, Church historians have not examined the implications of accusations or expressions of Jacobitism, largely disregarding the fact that a large number of the accusations were directed at prominent clergymen and church laymen. Historians have been happy to note that there were accusations of Jacobitism or that there were nonjuring clergymen, but there is yet no adequate explanation of the foundations or the implications of the accusations.¹¹ Although historians of the Church of England are far more likely to acknowledge the transatlantic and regional nature of the Anglican Church, they have often fared little better in their attempts to explain the involvement of the Anglican Church in political disputes in the Mid-Atlantic. Some scholars studying colonial church history have correctly argued that Hunter's tenure as governor of the two mid-Atlantic colonies was largely shaped by ecclesiastical concerns, but have explained the involvement of the Church in the politics of the colonies as little more than an accident of circumstance.¹² Still others have argued that a politicized established church was a political club to be wielded by colonial governors interested in creating a court party or aligning themselves with an institution known for supporting executive prerogative.¹³ Some scholars dismiss clerical opposition to Governor Hunter as the result of petty personal divisions while others argue that rather than acting consciously and shaping the direction of the debate, clergymen were tools of existing factions.¹⁴ The Church and the churchmen are not understood within the parameters of a transatlantic

¹¹ George Morgan Hills, *A History of the Church in Burlington, New Jersey: Comprising the Facts and Incidents of Nearly Two-Hundred Years, From Original, Contemporaneous Sources* (W.S. Sharpt Print Co, 1885); Edgare Pennington, *Apostle of New Jersey: John Talbot, 1645-1727* (Church Historical Society, 1938); Woolverton, *Colonial Anglicanism*.

¹² Pomfret, *Colonial New Jersey*, Olson, 'Governor Robert Hunter and the Anglican Church', 44-64.

¹³ Pomfret, *Colonial New Jersey*, 123-138.

¹⁴ Mary Lou Lustig, *Robert Hunter, 1666-1734: A New York Augustan Statesman* (Syracuse, 1983); Pomfret, *Colonial New Jersey*, 123-138.

party context and as a result, previous explanations cannot sufficiently explain why the Anglican Church was such an instrumental element in the political culture of the mid-Atlantic in the last years of the reign of Queen Anne. While some historians have placed the political practice of members the Anglican Church in a larger transatlantic political framework, there is little attention given to a transatlantic political culture in the region.¹⁵ A regional church interest, supported by a high church party in Britain, played a vital role in shaping political language and disputes, and highlights the development of transatlantic Whig and Tory party interests.

I

The Anglican Church did not enjoy a very auspicious start in the Mid-Atlantic colonies. The majority of the population of West Jersey and Pennsylvania were Quakers and the ethnic diversity of New York encouraged a diversity of religious beliefs.¹⁶ The Church did not enjoy the benefits of establishment in either New York or New Jersey. Amongst all the diversity of religious beliefs, the Church was only able to ensure the support of a minority of the population and was often unable to supply ministers for all of the parishes. For example, on and off in the early part of the 1690s there was only one Anglican minister in New Jersey and he had been dismissed from his post as chaplain in New York due to his suspected Jacobite sympathies.¹⁷

There was, however, a growing Anglican presence in the mid-Atlantic in the late seventeenth century. For instance, Governor Benjamin Fletcher (1692-1698), a Tory

¹⁵ Olson, 'Governor Robert Hunter and the Anglican Church', 44-64, Lustig, *Robert Hunter*, 130-132.

¹⁶ Ned Landsman, 'Roots, Routes, and Rootedness: Diversity, Migration, and Toleration in Mid-Atlantic Pluralism,' in *Early American Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal* 2 (2004), 267-309; Ned Landsman, *Crossroads of Empire: The Middle Colonies in British North America* (Baltimore, 2010); Joyce Goodfried, *Before the Melting Pot: Society and Culture in Colonial New York City, 1664-1730* (Princeton, 1992).

¹⁷ Burr, *The Anglican Church in New Jersey*, 14.

appointee, encouraged the fledgling Church and supported the establishment of Trinity Church in New York City. He also pushed through a Ministry Act in 1693. This act ambiguously provided for Protestant ministers in four counties and was interpreted by Fletcher and subsequent Tory governors as having established the Church in the four counties.¹⁸ Although the church presence was growing and was receiving support from the government, only a minority of colonists were members of the Church of England. This is partly due to the episcopal structure of the Church which inhibited missional growth in the absence of a resident Bishop. Yet the influence of the Church in New York far outweighed its numerical significance partly because the political influence of the Church was deeply rooted in the party political divisions in Britain and as a result in the mid-Atlantic.

Party politics in England soon negatively influenced the growth of the Anglican Church in the mid-Atlantic and brought the period of official government support for the Church under Fletcher to an abrupt end. After the Whigs came to power following the discovery of a Jacobite plot against William II in London in 1696, they replaced many of the previous Tory appointees, Fletcher included. Fletcher's replacement was Richard Coote, Lord Bellomont, a Whig appointed by a friendly Whig ministry in Westminster. While he was serving as governor from 1698-1701, Bellomont allied himself with Fletcher's former opponents and acted against what the Church in New York considered its interests by promoting the interests of dissent and attacking William Vesey, the minister of Trinity Church in New York City. After having briefly enjoyed the support of the government, local church leaders were not going to quietly surrender their recently

¹⁸ Thomas E. Carney, 'A Tradition to Live By: New York Religious History, 1624-1740,' *New York History* 85 (2004), 301-330

acquired privileges. Vesey preached against Bellomont and was instrumental in galvanizing support for Bellomont's removal. Bellomont died before his removal could be effected but the method of his removal made little difference to his opponents. Under the administrations of Fletcher and Bellomont, the church grew in numbers and prominence though it remained a minor player.

Thus, it is impossible to fully separate the emergence, growth, and influence of the Anglican Church in British politics from political developments in the colonies of New York and New Jersey. Leading clergymen in both New York and New Jersey worked together with the assistance of supporters in Britain to secure the future of the Anglican Church in the mid-Atlantic region. Despite the fact that a minority of the population in the Mid-Atlantic were members of the established Church, the Church possessed a disproportionate level of influence and power. Many of the most prominent men in the region, including Daniel Cox in New Jersey and Caleb Heathcote in New York, were members of the Church and had close relationships with clergymen and a vested interest in the political advantages enjoyed by members of the Church.

It was not until the early eighteenth century that the Anglican Church began to rise to a position of prominence within the colonies. The accession of Queen Anne, a strong supporter of the Anglican Church, in 1702 had lasting imperial consequences. Anne's support for the Church of England was made manifest in the appointment of the high church Tory Edward Hyde, Lord Cornbury, as the first person appointed to serve as governor of both New York and the new royal colony of New Jersey simultaneously. As a cousin of Queen Anne and a zealous promoter of high church interests, he was warmly supported by members of the Anglican Church in the colonies he governed. He also

received a great deal of support from the SPG and was a member of the organization. During Cornbury's administration (1702-1709), the Church enjoyed a period of rapid growth and strong official support. The SPG, which was chartered in 1701, sent missionaries to New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania during the administration of Cornbury to help support and encourage the growth of the Church in the region. In fact, Cornbury warmly welcomed the first SPG missionary, George Keith, the Quaker turned Anglican. During Cornbury's administration the missionary work of Keith and his assistant John Talbot (the later nonjuring bishop) and the prospect of incoming ministers encouraged fledgling congregations to erect church buildings. At least six churches were built or refurbished throughout the region.¹⁹ In addition to ministers and churches, Cornbury pushed through policies favourable to Anglican interests including forcing an Anglican minister on a largely dissenting Church in the town of Jamaica on Long Island.

Although Cornbury was a strong supporter of the Church, it would not have grown so rapidly without the work and beliefs of the clergymen sent to the region. The years encompassed by Cornbury's administration in New York and New Jersey witnessed the battle over occasional conformity in Westminster, Ireland, and South Carolina. These years also saw the Union of Scotland and England which further antagonized an already beleaguered Anglican Church by allowing the establishment of Presbyterianism in Scotland. Many of the clergymen sent to the mid-Atlantic were Scots Episcopalians unable to secure work in Scotland who were ordained into the Church of England and sent out as missionaries. During this period of a high church ascendancy throughout Britain and its colonies, it is little wonder that clergymen in the Mid-Atlantic

¹⁹ Burr, *The Anglican Church in New Jersey*, 489-526.

found encouragement in the writings of Charles Leslie and other churchmen whose attacks on Quakers and moderate churchmen resonated in a region dominated by Quakers and other dissenters. John Talbot often complimented Leslie's works in letters to friends and requested that some be sent that they might be used as resources for the conversion of Quakers.²⁰ But it was not only clergymen and governors who supported an ideological high church Anglicanism. In 1705, Daniel Leeds, one of Talbot's parishioners and a Quaker converted by George Keith, penned and published a tract which excoriated Quakers and mocked George Fox, the celebrated Quaker leader. In the tract, the author Leeds echoed Leslie and argued that the Quaker principle of the inner light was the same as the 'Heathen Deists'. Leeds praised Leslie as the author of anti-Quaker tract 'the Snake in the Grass.'²¹ Leeds also used his almanacs as an evangelistic tool by introducing the politically charged Anglican holidays celebrated by the Church in his calendar, including important Anglican political anniversaries such as 29 May (Restoration Day) and 30 January (Execution of Charles I).²² With congregations placed in the midst of so many dissenters in a period where many in the Church of England felt as though the Church was under assault from dissent and atheism, it is little wonder then that many clergymen in the region tended to subscribe to and encourage high church opinions, a trait which often led them into various political troubles.

Indeed, moderation on the part of some clergymen was often in short supply. Talbot received many letters from the SPG counselling moderation in his temper and his zeal against the Quakers. In fact, in one letter, the Secretary of the SPG voiced his

²⁰ John Talbot to George Keith, 14 February, 1707, SPG series A, 173.

²¹ Daniel Leeds, *The Great Mystery of Fox-Craft Discovered and the Quaker Plainness & Sincerity Demonstrated* (New York, 1705), 7, 14.

²² Daniel Leeds, *The American Almanack for the Year of Christian Account, 1705* (New York: 1705)

concerns that Talbot had called the toleration of dissent ‘Amersterdamnable.’²³ Talbot’s comment came perilously close to sedition by questioning and attacking revolution principles and almost resulted in his dismissal from the society. But Talbot’s views were not out of place in the period under discussion. The prevalence of high church attitudes among the SPG in Britain meant Talbot’s potentially seditious comments remained unpunished. Certainly, it was not simply the society’s generous spirit that allowed Talbot to remain in their service but, according to one critic, ‘Providence’ and the abundance of those full of a ‘warm spirit’ in Britain which prompted the society to let him remain.²⁴

Cornbury’s unceasing encouragement for the Anglican Church throughout his tenure as governor rallied the members and clergy of the Church, and this Tory affiliated church party served as his primary support throughout his administration. This set the precedent that opposition to his policies was opposition to and oppression of the Church. His support for the Church so endeared him in certain circles, that many missionaries, ministers, and laymen remained loyal to him even after his removal from office in 1708 by the Whig ministry in Westminster. The church wardens and vestry of Burlington later lamented ‘How happy were our churches under the administration of the Earl of Clarendon [Cornbury]...to whom we never applied in vain for anything that might promote its interest.’²⁵

The unification of New York and New Jersey under the administration of a single crown appointed governor served also to direct the focus of the interests of the Church towards a single executive, though specific acts and policies regarding the Church in each

²³ Secretary to Talbot, Lambeth Palace Papers, vol. XII, 239, 251

²⁴ Secretary to Talbot, Lambeth Palace Papers, vol. XII, 239, 251

²⁵ Churchwardens and Vestry of Burlington, 25 March 1714, SPG series A, vol IX, 92.

²⁵ Burr, *The Anglican Church in New Jersey*, 282-285.

colony remained different. One notable example of the growing cooperation and shared interests of the clergy in the region was the regular calling of conventions of the clergy, usually called by the governor. Clergymen from Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York and New England all attended at different times. At these conventions clergymen met to discuss various issues including the state of the Church and the need for a resident Bishop. They also used the conventions to support one another by setting up rotations to serve congregations without settled ministers. There were at least eight different conventions of clergymen between the years 1702-1713.²⁶ This cooperation helped foster a sense of unity of purpose among the clergy and their parishioners. This would later serve many of them in their opposition to Hunter's Whig oriented policies.

Not everyone was so fond of Cornbury or his administration. Opposition parties despised his policies and his manner of governing. As long as he had secure Tory backing in Westminster, it was unlikely that his political opponents in the colonies would successfully bring about his removal, though this did not discourage them from trying. If his opponents could undermine his character and government among his supporters in Westminster, then they could more successfully petition for a suitable replacement. As Patricia Bonomi has shown, the use of transatlantic slander was nothing new in the politics of the mid-Atlantic but it reached a fever pitch under Cornbury.²⁷ Having been introduced to the importance of party conflicts during the governments of Fletcher and Bellomont, colonists were aware of the implications of party divisions in England and used slander in ways designed to appeal to party sensibilities. Slander, therefore, took on

²⁶ Thomas Halliday to Secretary, 23 August, 1714, SPG Series A, vol IX, 153-155, Burr, *The Anglican Church in New Jersey* 282-285.

²⁷ For an excellent look at the use of slander in transatlantic politics, see Patricia Bonomi, *The Lord Cornbury Scandal: The Politics of Reputation in British America* (Chapel Hill, 1998).

personal and political connotations. Transatlantic party interests, cultivated since the Revolution of 1688 solidified during Cornbury's administration. The interests of the Church in the colonies of New York and New Jersey were increasingly aligned with the high church Tory party in Britain and the diverse dissenting and low church interest was growing ever closer to the Whig party. After Cornbury's removal and return to England, he remained a vital contact for the region's high church party in England. The churchmen also appealed to the SPG and the Bishop of London. While the high church party drew support from the Tories and the Church, the Whig governors and their supporters were primarily dependent on the good will of the ministry in power. As discussed in chapter one, an unfriendly ministry could cripple a colonial governor. Slander, complaints, and gossip, therefore, were most effectively employed in terms of the prevailing party politics and this would prove especially true for the period of Hunter's administration.

II

When Governor Hunter arrived in New York in 1710, he was forced into a political battleground in which the battle lines were firmly drawn within transatlantic party terms. The weapons employed were slander and transatlantic political manoeuvring. Unfortunately for Hunter, in between the period of his appointment and his arrival in the colony, the Whig ministry in Westminster was brought down by the popular Tory backlash following the mismanagement of the Sacheverell affair. A resurgent Tory party in Britain did not bode well for a new governor who owed his appointment to the patronage of the Duke of Marlborough and the previous Whig ministry. Hunter was placed in a very difficult situation. Hunter's political inclinations were sympathetic to the

Whig party of his patrons the Marlborough and the Earl of Stair. Although he was a member of both the Anglican Church and the SPG, Hunter was a low church Whig. He initially attempted to remain neutral, but the period of intense party conflict in both church and state did not allow for prevarication. Some scholars have assumed that his Anglicanism and membership in the SPG would have made him friendly with the Church party in the colonies but Hunter was a low church Anglican who converted in 1707 from Scottish Presbyterianism in order that he might accept the role of Lt. Governor of Virginia.²⁸ This conversion of necessity made him deeply suspect in the eyes of those with high church sympathies. He was seen as little better than an occasional conformist. As a result his zeal for the church was in question. Not only was Hunter a Whig and a former Scottish Presbyterian sympathetic to dissenters, the majority of the population he governed in both New York and New Jersey were dissenters and represented powerful interests in the colonies.

Despite his early attempts to avoid conflict with the high church party, Hunter outraged the high church party by asking the SPG to moderate their missionaries' fervour. He noted that the church party treated him as though he 'declared for fanaticks against the church' and he complained to the Secretary of the society that the Church of England was 'not without her fantaticks,' a description unlikely to endear him to high churchmen.²⁹ Hunter's first major misstep concerning the Church took place in 1711. In that year, the SPG missionary to Jamaica, New York William Urquhart died. The SPG in London promptly appointed Thomas Poyer to replace Urquhart. Before Poyer could

²⁸ Lustig, *Robert Hunter*, 40; Thomas E. Carney, 'A Tradition to Live By: New York Religious History, 1624-1740,' *New York History* 85 (2004), 301-330, specifically 325.

²⁹ Hunter to Society, 21 March 1710, SPG series C, Box 1, item 7.

assume his new post, the dissenting majority in the town forcibly took control of the church building and the largely dissenting or low church vestry denied Poyer his salary. Poyer appealed to Hunter and the SPG, but although the SPG was sympathetic to Poyer's plight, Hunter was not willing to alienate a large number of dissenters in order to support one Anglican missionary. Nor was he enthusiastic about pushing the interests of the Anglican Church outside of what he considered the bounds of New York law. Instead, he attempted to remain neutral either, not understanding or not caring that neutrality was next to impossible during the rage of party. Rather than arbitrarily using his executive power, he encouraged Poyer to bring the case to court. Poyer, however, distrusted the justices, who were dissenters appointed by Hunter, and also disliked his chances of winning a court case. He did not wish to set an unwanted precedent regarding the legal position of ministers in relation to the vestries.³⁰ Hunter's decided lack of enthusiasm for supporting a displaced Anglican minister did not encourage a strong relationship between Hunter and the high church party. Even the Bishop of London commented on Hunter's 'false step in the beginning'.³¹ Poyer's appeal to the SPG proved more successful and the SPG appealed to the Queen on Poyer's behalf and the Queen acted in favour of Poyer.³² This episode demonstrated to the high church party that they, not Hunter, had the backing of the SPG. More importantly the SPG and the church had the active support of the Queen. The support of the SPG and the Queen was instrumental in strengthening the interests of high church party in the colonies.

³⁰ Thomas Poyer to Governor Hunter, 30 Jan, 1711/12, in *Documents relative to the colonial history of the state of New-York procured in Holland, England, and France by John Romeyn Brodhead*, ed. by F.B. O'Callaghan, 15 vols (Albany, NY, 1853), vol V, 327, hereafter cited as *NY Docs*; 'Address from the Clergy of New York to His Excellency Robert Hunter', in *NY Docs*, vol V, 325

³¹ Bishop of London to the Society, 5 June 1713, SPG Series C, Box 14, item 35.

³² 'Address from the Clergy of New York to His Excellency Robert Hunter', in *NY Docs*, vol V, 325

While Poyer's predicament was unfolding in New York, members of the Church in New Jersey were occupied by their own struggles against Hunter. In 1711, the assembly, the majority of whom were Quakers, tried to push through a bill allowing Quakers to make an affirmation instead of swearing an oath in order to serve on Juries. Churchmen in the province, including Daniel Coxe and Daniel Leeds, were afraid that allowing Quakers to serve without an oath would endanger the colony. They feared that if given too much power in government the Quakers, their enemies, would be 'empowered by a law to destroy our religion, lives, libertys, reputations and estates at their pleasure.'³³ Although the Quakers were able to secure a majority in the assembly through elections, they were often unable to secure the passage of acts favourable to their party because the Governor's council, controlled by high churchmen previously appointed by Cornbury, were opposed to the Quakers. In fact some of Hunter's most prominent opponents on the New Jersey Council were parishioners in Talbot's church in Burlington. The councillors, including Daniel Coxe, Hugh Huddy and William Hall, refused to allow the act and their obstinate opposition to this and other acts forced Hunter to seek their removal. This did not endear Hunter to the high church party who supported the councillors' defence of the church. The six men Hunter sought to replace were all active churchmen and many served as churchwardens and vestrymen in various Anglican parishes. Their removal from the council taking place so soon after Poyer's problems in New York again stoked the fears of the clergy and members of the church party who believed that Hunter was intentionally trying to replace churchmen with dissenters or

³³ *CSPC*, Address of the Minister, Churchwardens and Vestry of the Church of St. Mary's in Burlington to the Queen, July 30, 1711, item 58i.

churchmen of weaker convictions in order to cripple the power and influence of the church.

The Poyer case, which remained unresolved as late as 1714, solidified the high church opposition to Hunter. It also increased high church suspicions regarding Hunter's religious sympathies. In a representation against Hunter written in 1712 and titled *The state of the case of the Church in New York and New Jersey*, Jacob Henderson, a SPG missionary who officiated in Pennsylvania and New Jersey, argued that far from being neutral, the actions against Poyer were encouraged and countenanced by Hunter who had promoted dissenters to positions of influence, such as the New Jersey Council, from which they refused to do justice to the church.³⁴ Henderson saw Hunter's actions, or lack thereof in Poyer's case, as malicious and purposeful. He also saw Hunter's actions as having regional consequences. Henderson understood that the state of the church was legally different in each colony but that it was in danger throughout the region because of the governor's role as executive of both colonies. But according to Henderson it was not only Hunter who was to blame. Henderson also described Lewis Morris, one of Hunter's most prominent supporters in both New York and New Jersey as 'a professed churchman' who 'calls the service of the Church of England pageantry.'³⁵ By questioning the sincerity of Morris's Anglicanism and, therefore, his support of the Church, Henderson was equating him with moderate 'false brethren' who were the bogeymen of high church sermons in Britain. Fears for the future of the Anglican Church were prevalent and some of the clergy of New York, though not all as adamant concerning Hunter's motives as

³⁴ Jacob Henderson, 'The State of the Case of the Church in New York and New Jersey' in *NY Docs*, vol. V, 334-5

³⁵ Henderson, 'The State of the Case of the Church in New York and New Jersey', *NY Docs*, vol. V, 355

Henderson, petitioned Hunter on Poyer's behalf. Their address expressed their fear that the same ill treatment might set a precedent and encourage further attacks against the established church.³⁶ The problems encountered by Poyer and the New Jersey councilmen led the high churchmen to increasingly view dissenters as 'enemies' of the Church of England with Hunter at their head.³⁷ Several ministers wrote to the high church champion Francis Nicholson complaining that 'Presbyterian violence has been countenanced against the church...' They deliberately attacked the dissenters but importantly, they also equated Hunter's Presbyterian background with questionable sympathies.³⁸ Poyer's predicament and the precarious position of the New Jersey councilmen stressed among the churchmen in the region the necessity of strong political friends and more importantly the need for keeping dissenters out of positions of political influence. It also demonstrated the benefit of a governor who strongly supported the church.

Hunter well understood the difficult situation he was in. Any move which would encourage clerical opposition was not in his best interests politically, especially because the clergy and church had the backing of the SPG and access to the ear of the Queen. It was also unlikely that an unfriendly Tory administration would take much heed of Hunter's explanations. Hunter vented his frustrations concerning his political position to the Council of Trade and Plantations, arguing in 1713 that 'that if clandestine representations [...] should gaine credit and countenance at home, the Governour whoever he be, must have a very uneasy time of it, who knowing nothing of his

³⁶ 'Address of the Clergy to Governor Hunter,' in *NY docs*, vol V, 325

³⁷ Poyer to the Secretary, 10 June 1714, SPG series A, vol IX, 122.

³⁸ Several Ministers to General Nicholson, 11 May, 1714, SPG series A, vol. IX, 208.

accusation or accusers and liveing remote from his equall and just judges, suffers in his reputation and perhaps in his fortunes without a remedy.’³⁹ But explaining his difficulties to an unfriendly ministry would not solve his problems nor make his opponents less aggressive. As a result, Hunter began to employ the same ‘clandestine’ methods in hopes that he might discredit his opponents.

Opposition to Hunter in the colonies was coming primarily from the high church party and he wrote to inform the SPG about the nonjuring principles held by some of their ministers. He explained that Henderson and Talbot, two of his primary opponents, both omitted prayers for ‘victory over Her Majesties enemies’ when preaching at Talbot’s church. Although Talbot’s parishioners claimed that they were unhappy when Henderson omitted the prayer, the congregation allowed it from Talbot because they were ‘long acquainted with Mr. Talbot’s exemplary life they were willing to bear with his scruples’.⁴⁰ Hunter hoped that by demonstrating the questionable principles of certain SPG ministers to the Society, he could undermine the SPG’s support for the high church party in the colonies. He also wrote to a friend complaining that certain clergymen were ‘disturbing the peace in Jersey’ hoping to further undermine support of the ministers.⁴¹ Unfortunately for Hunter, the strength of his opponents in the colonies and their supporters in London rendered his accusations unsuccessful at the time, but they did lay the foundation for future successful complaints. Moreover, these complaints demonstrate his growing frustration with expressions of a transatlantic high church or Jacobite ideology.

³⁹ *CSPC*, Hunter to CTP, 14 March 1713, item 293.

⁴⁰ Hunter to the Secretary, 11 February, 1711, *NY Docs*, vol V, 316.

⁴¹ *CSPC*, Hunter to Popple, 11 May, 1713, item 338.

Hunter had misled himself into thinking that his high church opposition was isolated to individual clergymen. Although Hunter's initial complaints were directed against individuals, he quickly realized that the opposition was not isolated to individual clergymen. Before the Poyer case Hunter had not fully realized that there was a coalition of clergymen and laymen determined to oppose any perceived attacks against the Anglican Church. He admitted as much when he complained in 1712 that he had 'flattered' himself that he 'had gained the good will and affection of the clergy in those parts...'⁴² After the opposition he encountered in New Jersey and New York regarding Poyer and the New Jersey Councilmen, his self-deception was dispelled and he complained to the Bishop of London that 'the best guarded conduct is not superior to the malice of designing men.'⁴³ Hunter and his low church and dissenting allies realized that high church interests were quickly galvanizing into an opposition party under the leadership of William Vesey. Vesey's role is significant because both he and his father had been accused of Jacobitism in the 1690s. Vesey was said to have voiced his disaffection by referring to King William as a 'Dutch King' or saying 'their King won't live always'. His father was sentenced to stand in the pillory 'for uttering desperate words against His Majesty.'⁴⁴ Hunter's close associate Lewis Morris had reached the conclusion in 1712 that 'Mr. Vesey begins to set up a party' and in a letter to the Bishop of London, Hunter accused some of the clergy of 'faction' and 'blind zeal.'⁴⁵ As Hunter and his allies increasingly viewed their opponents as a unified church party, they also began to associate them with a larger transatlantic high church political culture.

⁴² Hunter to the Bishop of London, March 1, 1712. *NY Docs* vol V, p 310.

⁴³ Hunter to the Bishop of London, March 1, 1712. *NY Docs* vol V, p 310.

⁴⁴ *CSPC*, 1699, item 387; *CSPC*, 1698, item 675.

⁴⁵ Col. Lewis Morris to John Chamberlayne, Feb 20 1711/12 *NY Docs*, vol V, 318; Hunter to the Bishop of London, March 1, 1712. *NY Docs* vol V, 310.

As a result of Hunter's perceived continued antagonism towards the Church, opposition to Hunter's policies was becoming increasingly hostile. After Hunter secured the dismissal in New Jersey of the high church members from the council in 1712, the assembly and the newly constituted council, just as the churchmen feared, passed an act which would allow Quakers to make an affirmation rather than take an oath. The act also allowed Quakers to serve on Juries. In a region where Quakers and dissenters were the majority, this act terrified those high church Anglicans who had previously held positions of authority as they viewed Hunter's policies as creating a Whig oligarchy which would undermine the precarious position of the Anglican Church in the colony. The members of the high church party believed that the act would 'defeat all those good designs...and ruin our infant church.'⁴⁶ In a letter complaining about Hunter's handling of the desecration of Trinity Church in New York (discussed below), the churchwardens and vestry in Burlington, New Jersey wrote to the Queen requesting that as 'God's image and immediate representative' she would support the church against the dangers posed if 'Quakers are made rulers and guardians of the Church.'⁴⁷ Hunter refused to view this act as a danger to the church and increasingly saw the zeal of the churchmen as dangerous. He complained to the SPG of the 'disorders' caused by some of the missionaries and was dismayed by the fact that if 'we but interpose with some advice we are enemies to the church.'⁴⁸ Hunter remained dumbfounded by the deep animosities held against him despite the ideological differences regarding the position of the Church in the colonies.

⁴⁶ Churchwardens and Vestry of Burlington, 25 March 1714, SPG series A, vol IX, 92.

⁴⁷ Churchwardens and Vestry of St. Mary's Burlington to the Queen, [n.d. c. 1714], SPG series A, vol IX, 199-202.

⁴⁸ Hunter to the Secretary, 10 May 1714, SPG series A, vol IX, 105-106.

Hunter's relationship with the high church party continued to deteriorate throughout the reign of Anne. Relations were so strained that even the most random of events could cause conflict. In early 1714, Trinity Church, the church supplied by Vesey, was broken into and vandalized. In addition to destruction and theft, the vandals covered Vesey's clerical robes in 'ordure' or as Vesey delicately put it, they were 'beskirted and bedaub'd with what I must not name!'⁴⁹ Interestingly, this was a fairly common form of protest against an assertive Anglicanism and similar events occurred in Massachusetts and South Carolina in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.⁵⁰ Churchmen throughout the region were furious at the affront and demanded that Hunter find and punish those responsible. Hunter did not act quickly enough for their tastes and some began to suspect that not only was Hunter unsympathetic, he was involved.⁵¹

But the churchmen were not the only party levelling accusations. Hunter made use of the emerging print culture in the colonies to embarrass and harass his opponents. Hunter authored a satirical play, likely printed in 1714 as a means of disparaging his detractors. Throughout the play, Hunter demonstrated a keen awareness of transatlantic political realities. Hunter mocked the notion that the Anglican Church was in any danger and implied that the desecration of Trinity Church was done by churchmen intentionally so that they might have an excuse to cry out 'the church in danger'.⁵² Although Hunter may have overstated his case when he implied that the churchmen had purposefully vandalized Trinity Church, he was absolutely correct in his assumptions that it would

⁴⁹ To the Honourable Gentlemen of Her Majesty's Council for the Province of New York, 14 February 1714, SPG Series A, vol IX, 191.

⁵⁰ Susan Juster, 'Heretics, Blasphemers, and Sabbath Breakers: The Prosecution of Religious Crime in Early America,' in *The First Prejudice: Religious Tolerance and Intolerance in Early America*, ed. by Chris Beneke and Christopher Grenda (Philadelphia, 2011), 123-142.

⁵¹ Lustig, *Robert Hunter*, 116.

⁵² Hunter, *Androboros*, 9-11.

further increase the feeling among the high church clergy that the church was in danger. This was true not just in New York. The churchwardens and vestry of the church in Burlington in New Jersey sent a letter to the Queen complaining of the affront to the Church, demonstrating a strong unity of purpose among the high church party.⁵³

Amidst the local manifestations of religious controversies and the consequences of the imperial Tory ascendancy, imperial politics further turned against Hunter. In 1712, Hunter suffered a major political setback when Francis Nicholson was appointed by the Tory ministry in London to supervise and inspect certain aspects of the imperial administration and the compliance of governors in the colonies.⁵⁴ This commission to supervise the activities of the governors in the colonies as well as the role of Governor of Nova Scotia provided Nicholson an inordinate amount of influence and power. This was clearly a Tory attempt to exert greater control over the colonies. The political parties in the Mid-Atlantic viewed Nicholson's appointment very differently. Both the high church party and Hunter saw Nicholson's position as an affront to Hunter's authority. The church party understood this affront to be a blessing noting in an address to the Queen the 'extraordinary mark of your Majesty's affections in ... authorising his excellency Gen. Francis Nicholson to inspect into and represent the affairs of Church and State here.'⁵⁵ The high church party clearly viewed Nicholson as an ally and began to work with him in hopes that he might replace Hunter as governor of New York and New Jersey.

Certainly, Nicholson's appointment was a direct threat to the Whig appointees in the colonies. In fact, as chapter one demonstrated the years 1713 to 1714 looked like the

⁵³ Churchwardens and Vestry of St. Mary's Burlington to the Queen, [n.d. c. 1714], SPG series A, vol IX, 199-202.

⁵⁴ *CSPC*, 14 October 1712, item 97.

⁵⁵ Address of Churchwardens and Vestry of Trinity Church to the Queen, 11 May 1714, SPG series A, vol IX, 181-185.

beginnings of a purge of Whig appointees and their replacement by Tory supporters.

Samuel Vetch, the governor of Nova Scotia and son-in-law of Robert Livingston, an ally of Hunter in New York, had been removed from his position as governor of Nova Scotia to make way for Nicholson. Both Vetch and Hunter, having developed poor relations with the Tory ministry, distrusted Nicholson's intentions and believed that he intended to report any failings to the Tory ministry so that they might easily remove them from their posts. Vetch's proximity to and interaction with Nicholson in Boston allowed him to see and report aspects of Nicholson's character and behaviour to Livingston and Hunter.

Vetch wrote to Livingston 'I doubt not you know that G.[eneral] N.[icholson] is no friend to your governor and will do all that he can to expose him and his management' and suggested that Livingston send 'what you think proper to communicate to your governor.'⁵⁶ He also claimed that Nicholson was a 'violent enemy of Govr. Hunter's and will endeavor to separate you from his interest.'⁵⁷ This news, communicated to Hunter by Livingston, undoubtedly increased Hunter's misgivings regarding Nicholson.

Nicholson was not acting alone. The high church party represented by Vesey and Talbot wrote often to Nicholson detailing their sufferings at the hands of Hunter's government. They complained about the various offenses and sought Nicholson's intervention. Vesey and Talbot were confident that with the influence of Nicholson, they could outmanoeuvre Hunter and secure his removal, after which Nicholson would take his place. Working together, Talbot, Vesey, and Nicholson agreed that Vesey would sail for England and present the complaints of the high church party before the Board of

⁵⁶ Samuel Vetch to Robert Livingston, 25 January 1714, Livingston Family Papers, microfilm, reel 3. See also, Margaret Vetch to Robert Livingston, 3 May 1714, Livingston Family Papers, microfilm, reel 3.

⁵⁷ Samuel Vetch to Robert Livingston, 27 January 1714, Livingston Family Papers, microfilm, reel 3.

Trade and the SPG. Hunter suspected that his opponents were conspiring against him and knew that Vesey had gone to ‘cry out Fire, and Church at all hazards.’ and was later able to prove it after intercepting some letters sent by Talbot which outlined his hopes that Nicholson would replace Hunter.⁵⁸

Before the high church party and its agent Vesey were able to secure Hunter’s removal, the vagaries of British party politics would destroy their hopes. On 1 August 1714, Queen Anne died and was succeeded by George I of Hanover. Hunter received the news in October of the same year and immediately understood the good fortune the fates had blessed him with. On 18 October Hunter proclaimed the King in New York and noticed amidst the ‘universal transport,’ some ‘awkward half-huzzahs,’ suggestive of Jacobite and Tory discontent.⁵⁹

Hunter was able to utilize an extensive network of high-ranking correspondents, including John Dalrymple, the 2nd Earl of Stair, James Graham, the Duke of Montrose, and Joseph Addison, in order to secure his position and discredit his opponents. The same day as he proclaimed the King, he wrote to his friend and patron, the Earl of Stair, explaining that Nicholson’s appointments under the Tory administration had encouraged ‘two or three of the clergy, and those profest Jacobites to flye in my face’ and explained that he would take ‘noe provocation or any notice of their seditious conduct, lest they should occasion to crye the Church here as they had done elsewhere’. Hunter not only vilified his enemies but asked Stair to mention him to Lord Sunderland, Lord Somers, or any other Whig ministers who he knew would likely rise to positions of prominence with

⁵⁸ *CSPC*, Governor Hunter to William Popple, 9 November 1715, item 663; *CSPC*, Hunter to the Council of Trade and Plantations, 13 August 1715, 569.

⁵⁹ *CSPC*, Hunter to Popple, 18 October 1714, item 68.

the Hanoverian succession.⁶⁰ He also sought help from the Duke of Montrose, a Scottish Whig who was a strong supporter of the Hanoverian succession.⁶¹ Similarly, he wrote to his friend Joseph Addison of the joy that ‘the friendship and esteem I have ever had for you’ gave him but more importantly of the ‘delightful prospect your [Addison] promotion gave me of honest as well as able men being taken into the administration.’⁶² Moreover, he now understood that heated party divisions had divided former friends, commenting to Addison that ‘your old acquaintance of the Tale of a Tub [Swift] who it seems had power with the ruined faction was not pleased to interpose in my favour.’⁶³

But Hunter’s accusations written to his correspondents in Britain were not simply an attempt to disparage his opponents in the minds of Whigs in Westminster. As his complaints above demonstrate, Hunter, like many of his Whig contemporaries, saw a Tory/Jacobite conspiracy in the larger workings transatlantic Tory politics. As early as November 1714, one month after the news of George I’s accession to the throne, Hunter wrote that ‘all things are quite and easey since H.M. accession to ye crown’ and he orchestrated a loyal responses from officials in New York including an address to the King reflecting on the ‘fatal consequences which must have attended the success of a Pretender.’⁶⁴ The alliance of Nicholson, Vesey and Talbot with the Tories in Britain at a time when many in the Tory party were firmly attached to a Stuart Restoration was immediately damaging, but it also implicated them in a larger presumed conspiracy.

Talbot’s nonjuring sympathies lent immediate credence to Hunter’s theory that there was

⁶⁰ *CSPC*, Hunter to the Earl of Stair, 18 October 1714, item 645ii.

⁶¹ NAS, GD220/5/1895, Robert Hunter to the Duke of Montrose, 20 December 1714.

⁶² BL, Egerton Mss, 1971, f. 15

⁶³ *ibid.*

⁶⁴ *CSPC*, Hunter to the Council of Trade and Plantations 8 November 1714, item 83; *CSPC*, Address of the Justices of the Peace, Sheriff, and Grand Jurors of the City and County of New York at Quarter Sessions to the King, 2 November 1714, item 83i.

a larger Tory/Jacobite scheme afoot. This is further illustrated by an address from the Grand Jury of New York, likely drafted by Hunter's ally Lewis Morris, and sent to Hunter in 1715. In it the Grand Jury proclaimed

We are in no fears of a Pretender from abroad, whilst a truely Protestant King acting by advice of a truely Protestant Ministry guides the helm, and as a deliverance particular to this Province, we think ourselves rescued from a mischief contrived with that craft and subtilty by which he who presides over all evil usually directs his Agents. For however false those complaints were, which were carry'd home against yr. Excellency, yet so were they timed that with reason we fear'd the event. But Heaven interposed, and those who digged the pit, we hope, are themselves fallen therein.⁶⁵

The reference to a 'truly Protestant Ministry' is not simply an innocent statement of praise. It is an attack on the previous Tory ministry in Britain that had entertained the previous complaints sent by Hunter's antagonists and had often sided with the high church party in New York and New Jersey. The address directly connects the complaints against the governor to larger transatlantic fears of the imperial interests of the pretender and his allies.

The accession of George I and the appointment of a Whig ministry initially set Hunter's mind at ease concerning his future as governor and it also allowed him to make use of an emerging regional print culture to disparage his political antagonists and celebrate the Protestant monarchy. His satirical play *Andorboros* was written and printed following the death of Anne. The play celebrated the demise of the Tory party following Anne's death.⁶⁶ He also oversaw the printing of his speeches to the New York General Assembly extolling the accession of George I. In 1715 Hunter claimed that he had 'waited with some impatience for this meeting' where the assembly might express 'the joy of their Hearts for this happy and Peaceable accession to the Crown.' He also

⁶⁵ CSPC, Address from the Grand Jury of New York to Governor Hunter, 29 September 1715, item 629vii.

⁶⁶ Hunter, *Andorboros*.

condemned those who were responsible for bringing ‘all that is Dear, Religious or Civil’ into the ‘utmost Danger.’⁶⁷

Hunter understood how precarious his position had been with an unfriendly ministry at home. He had worried greatly, prior to news of the Hanoverian succession, about the prospects of Vesey’s trip to London to bring complaints before the Board of Trade and S.P.G. With the news of the Hanoverian succession he was confident that Vesey’s trip would yield few results. In August 1715 he wrote happily that ‘the plot, in all other of its parts soe well concerted happen’d to be deficient in ye point of time and season.’⁶⁸ The timely intervention of fate simultaneously secured Hunter’s position and dashed the hopes of his high church opponents. He now rightly assumed his government was safe from the plots of Vesey, Talbot, and Nicholson and the larger transatlantic scheming of the Tory party in Westminster and he was quickly on the offensive in hopes of decisively ending any high church opposition to his government.

The associations of the high church opposition with Bolingbroke, the exiled former secretary of state, Nicholson, and the Tory party, in addition to the nonjuring sympathies of some of the most vocal clergymen in the colonies, connected them to a larger Tory/Jacobite culture of sedition and Hunter was quick to make the most of these associations. In April 1715, Hunter wrote to a friend explaining that Talbot ‘has incorporated the Jacobites in ye Jerseys in the name of a Church in order to sanctify his sedition and insolence to the Government.’ He stated in the same letter that the ‘noisy fool Coxes [Daniel Coxe], has betrayed the publick service so avowedly that I verily

⁶⁷ [Robert Hunter], *His Excellency's Speech to the General Assembly of New York* (New York, 1715), 1.

⁶⁸ *CSPC*, Hunter to Council of Trade and Plantation, 13 August 1715, item 569

believ'd he had orders from home to do so.'⁶⁹ Hunter's primary opponents in New Jersey were all influential members of Talbot's church and he outlined the connections between Talbot's nonjuring and the political opposition he encountered. But as the accusation against Coxe illustrates, Hunter was also clearly locating the politics of the mid-Atlantic within a larger imperial framework and understood the opposition he encountered to be no different than the opposition in Britain.

Hunter's accusations of Jacobitism against Talbot and his congregation reached London by June 1715 while Vesey was still in the city after unsuccessfully bringing his complaints. Jacobitism was a very serious charge and was not to be taken lightly. The Council of Trade and Plantations wrote to the Bishop of London informing him that some of the missionaries were being accused of Jacobitism.⁷⁰ Hunter assumed that his accusations would temper the zeal of his opponents but he did not anticipate that the high church party in the mid-Atlantic still possessed a few allies in Britain. After receiving notice of the complaints, the Bishop of London responded to the accusations against Talbot by appointing Vesey his commissary with orders to investigate the charges against Talbot and his congregation.

Hunter was indignant when he discovered that Vesey, in his mind one of the conspirators, was given authority over the clergy in the region as well as the task of investigating the charges against Talbot. His disgust was made all the more potently clear when Vesey 'enter'd New York in triumph like his friend Sacheverel'.⁷¹ He sarcastically wrote 'I hope his Lordpp has also constituted Talbott his Commissary for

⁶⁹ *CSPC*, Hunter to Popple, 9 April 1715, item 337.

⁷⁰ Commissioners to the Bishop of London, 24 June 1715, SPG series A vol X, 170.

⁷¹ *CSPC*, Hunter to Popple, 9 November 1715, item 663

the Jerseys'.⁷² He knew that Vesey's appointment was a result of the 'Bishop's spleen' which he had hoped was 'long ago forgot' but knowing the reason did not make Vesey's appointment sit any easier.⁷³ Hunter now sought to undermine the authority of the new commissary by accusing him of being a 'sower Jacobite' and he complained to the Council of Trade and Plantations that 'Since there is a happy issue put to ye confusion at home, it is to little purpose to propagate what was by the meanes of that man rais'd here, which cannot be his Lordps [The Bishop of London] intention tho' it may have that effect.'⁷⁴

Hunter's insinuations and outright accusations had resulted in a frustratingly small amount of change in his circumstances despite the friendly ministry. Although the new Whig ministry was more favourable to him than the previous had been, his enemies in the colonies continued to exasperate him. Certainly it looked as though his accusations had been completely ineffective if not counter-productive. Vesey was now a commissary appointed to inquire into the other accusations and Talbot and Vesey continued to conspire with Nicholson, holding fast to their hopes of replacing Hunter. Hunter's only offensive had accomplished very little because in the absence of rebellion or active conspiracy, accusations of Jacobitism, though still very serious were very difficult to prove. Without proof of seditious activity it remained simply a verbal sparring match vocal defence against charges of Jacobitism was just as plausible as an unsupported accusation. Members of Talbot's church wrote to the SPG in order to defend themselves and their parson against charges they considered 'intirely false.'⁷⁵ Jeremiah Basse, a

⁷² *CSPC*, Hunter to Popple 10 October 1715, item 645.

⁷³ *CSPC*, Hunter to Popple 9 Nov 1715, item 663.

⁷⁴ *ibid*; *CSPC*, Hunter to the Council of Trade and Plantations, 13 August 1715, item 569.

⁷⁵ Jeremiah Basse to the Society, 6 October 1715, SPG series A, vol XI, 257-260.

member of Talbot's church defended himself and his fellow parishioners by arguing that he could not 'see any ground for so base a scandal unless it be our early and constant zeal for the church against the prevailing heresy of Quakerism.'⁷⁶ The church wardens and vestry of Talbot's church defended themselves and Talbot by explaining that in the twelve years they had listened to Talbot they had never heard him say anything that 'might tend towards encouraging sedition.'⁷⁷ In the absence of any direct proof of involvement in a conspiracy, their denial of Jacobitism was a strong enough defence against Hunter's complaints.

In September of 1715, events in Scotland dramatically altered Hunter's circumstances. When the Earl of Mar raised the standard of James Stuart, the Old Pretender, in Braemar, Scotland, there were no longer only fears of a conspiracy, there was a large-scale open rebellion. The rebellion was quickly crushed in Britain, nevertheless the rebellion amplified transatlantic fears of the Pretender and accusations of Jacobitism gained greater currency. In April 1716, after receiving news of the Pretender's defeat and flight, Hunter addressed the New Jersey assembly entreating them to do their duty to the King. It is remarkable how Hunter framed his explanation of their duty in his speech. In the speech Hunter equated duty with obedience and argued that obedience was all the more necessary at 'a time when that unreasonable and damnable spirit of fraction [faction] at home cloathed with a pretended danger to the church has created a real danger to the state and has disturbed the government of the best prince that ever filled the throne.' He continued by explaining to the assembly that the new King George had 'well nigh confounded all the devices and Hellish endeavours of his restless

⁷⁶ Jeremiah Basse to the Society, 6 October 1715, SPG series A, vol XI, 257-260.

⁷⁷ Vestry of the Church of Burlington to the Society [1715], SPG series A, vol XI, 300.

and rebellious subjects.’⁷⁸ His speech was both a celebration of George’s victory but also was a direct attack on those in the region that had been crying out the church in danger. In Hunter’s mind, crying out the church in danger was simply a Tory means of masking Jacobitism and sedition. Interestingly, Hunter also equated sedition against the colonial government with sedition against the crown. In his mind, colonial sedition was no different than sedition in Britain and was therefore Jacobitism. After years of frustration caused by high church opponents, this connection between the cries of the church in danger and sedition was exactly what Hunter needed to destroy his high church political opponents.

In a similar speech to the Assembly of New York printed in June 1716, he expounded on similar themes in which he claimed that the 1715-16 Jacobite rebellion had been a ‘desperate attempt’ supported by ‘unnatural subjects.’⁷⁹ Hunter intended this celebration of the Hanoverian succession and the defeat of the Jacobites to further marginalize his Tory or Jacobite opponents by associating them with the party responsible for the uncertainty regarding the succession in 1714 and, ultimately, the Jacobite rebellion. When he stated his belief that George I ‘has not a province where fewer look a squint on his rightful title and righteous cause; for I think not one has ventured to speak,’ he was not stating a fact, he seeking to link himself and the colony he governed to the ascendant Whig ministry and celebrate the transatlantic defeat of the Tory party.⁸⁰

⁷⁸ Hunter’s Speech to the assembly, in *Documents relating to the colonial history of the State of New Jersey*, vol XIV (New Jersey Historical Society, 1880), 8, hereafter cited as *NJA*.

⁷⁹ [Robert Hunter], *His Excellencys Speech to the General Assembly of his Majesty’s Colony of New York* (New York, 1716.), 1.

⁸⁰ *ibid*, 1.

Soon after receiving news of the defeat of the Jacobites, Hunter sent word to the Board of Trade that Vesey had ‘acknowledged his errors and promised to behave better in the future’.⁸¹ It appears as though the rebellion in Scotland had spooked Vesey who understood that high church opposition to Hunter had just become very dangerous. In contrast, Talbot and his parishioners refused to submit and the ‘furious zeal of Talbot’ continued to inflame ‘the lower rank of people’ in New Jersey.⁸² Hunter attributed the trouble caused by Coxe and Talbot to their high church sympathies and argued that their continuing disturbances were only possible because Quakers were not allowed to serve on juries, itself a result of their crying out the church in danger. He argued that ‘the Quakers, who are the only friends of the present establishment in the country where he lives (thanks to the Rev. Mr. Talbot)...are not capable by the laws of serving on Petty Juries in criminal cases’ therefore it was proving difficult to galvanise a dissenting opposition to help stamp out high church sedition.⁸³

Not long after, Hunter and the Council in New Jersey stumbled upon a means of attacking their high church opponents. In May 1716, they discovered that Talbot ‘a presbiter or pretended presbiter of the Church of England had not then taken the oaths’ and argued that a ‘spirit of division and faction industriously raised...has endangered the publick peace.’ They further argued that Talbot’s ‘leaving out petitions and prayers in the liturgy as he did not like or approve’ had turned his congregation against the civil authority and encouraged them to fly in the face of the lawful authority and concluded that Talbot was ‘one of the chief stirrers up and promoters and encouragers of that

⁸¹ *CSPC*, Hunter to Council of Trade and Plantations, 30 April 1716, item 133.

⁸² *ibid.*

⁸³ *ibid.*

sedition and dangerous humour.’ Accordingly, they sent the sheriff of the county out to force Talbot to subscribe to the oaths of abjuration and instructed the sheriff that if Talbot refused, he was to immediately ‘forbear to exercise his ministerial function of preaching.’⁸⁴ Later that month, Hunter and the council also accused Daniel Coxe and ten others of being ‘disaffected to his majesties person and government and confederating and conspiring against the same’ and ordered their arrest.⁸⁵

Rather than taking the oaths, Talbot fled to the neighbouring colony of Pennsylvania with Coxe, Hunter’s primary opponent in the New Jersey assembly. Fleeing indicated guilt and Hunter quickly understood the importance of this victory. He was also aware that the rebellion and the Tory association with Jacobitism had strengthened his position and undermined that of his opponents. He demonstrated a keen understanding of the situation in a letter to his friend William Popple, noting that Talbot and Coxe would go over and apply to the House of Commons in Westminster since they ‘cannot apply with the king, the ministers, the lords. Ha Ha Ha.’⁸⁶ Fleeing to Pennsylvania did not save Talbot from accusations. The governor of Pennsylvania wrote to the SPG that Talbot was disaffected and refused to subscribe to the oath of allegiance to King George and ‘the other usual oaths’. He also accused him ‘speaking disrespectfully of the House of Hanover and not praying for the King.’⁸⁷

Early in the next year, Talbot decided to make his peace with Hunter. He brought forward information about a ‘hellish contrivance’ and informed Hunter that some in his party were plotting to pull or burn down a Quaker meeting house and Quaker dwelling

⁸⁴ Council of New Jersey, 21 May 1716, *NJA*, vol XIV, 16-17.

⁸⁵ Council of New Jersey, 25 May 1716, *NJA*, vol XIV, 25; Council of New Jersey, 2 June 1716, *NJA*, vol XIV, 29-32.

⁸⁶ *CSPC*, Hunter to Popple, 8 June 1716, item 195.

⁸⁷ Coll. Gookin to the Secretary, 7 January 1716/17, SPG series A, vol XII, 185.

houses in New Jersey. Details of the plot are a bit thin primarily because it never came to fruition. It was intended to have taken place at some point in 1716 and Hunter believed that it was supposed to coincide with the meeting of the assembly. He claimed that only 'the hand of Providence' saved the assembly from meeting in Burlington at that time.⁸⁸ According to George Willocks, Talbot claimed that he was able to convince his party not to follow through with the act even though they promised him that if he were arrested, they would tear down the jail to help him escape.⁸⁹ According to Hunter, Talbot seemed 'very penitent' and 'squeamish' about the plot and Willocks stated that after Talbot informed them of the plot he was determined to avoid politics.⁹⁰

This plot to burn down the Quaker meeting house is interesting for a number of reasons. First, it illustrates a continuation of high church antipathy towards Hunter and the Quakers in the region. Second, and perhaps most importantly, it is very similar to anti-Whig and anti-Hanoverian protest in Britain. The riots and protests which occurred in Britain were directed at dissenters and Whigs, and during many of the riots dissenting meeting houses were torn down and destroyed.⁹¹ Both of these further confirmed in Hunter's mind the seditious attitudes of his political opponents. Hunter was rightly convinced that this plot was tied to a transatlantic Toryism and Jacobitism. He had often accused Talbot and Vesey of Jacobitism and nonjuring and he had accused Coxe and others in the party of disaffection but now he was willing to accuse him of acting out of sympathy for the interests of the Pretender. After receiving knowledge of the planned assault against the Quakers, Hunter wrote to his agent that he had evidence that Coxe had

⁸⁸ Hunter to the Lords of Trade, 13 Feb 1717, in *NJA*, 273-276.

⁸⁹ Hunter to the Lords of Trade, 13 Feb 1717, in *NJA*, 273-276; 'Deposition of George Willocks, Relating to the Conversations had with the Rev. John Talbot,' in *NJA*, 301-303.

⁹⁰ 'Deposition of George Willocks,' in *NJA*, 301-303.

⁹¹ Monod, *Jacobitism*, 185-194.

spoken 'long before the Pretender's landing, that he was at the head of 50,000 men in Scotland' implying that Coxe was well informed as to the Pretender's movements. He also accused him of stating 'the Whig lords will never be quiet till twenty of their heads are struck off' and of carrying a 'testimonial of his great moderation and affection to the Protestant Succession, signed by some who are just as moderate and as well affected....,' a caustic comment implying the continued existence of a group of disaffected individuals.⁹² Although the riot and tumult envisioned by the plot never occurred, the plotting itself was enough for Hunter to heap further evidence of sedition and hints of Jacobitism on the plotters, especially the leaders of the party suspected in the plots.

By the next year Hunter was firmly in control of both the New York and New Jersey assemblies and the influence of the regional high church party was essentially countered. Many in the party had submitted to Hunter and asked for a pardon, especially after knowledge of the high church plot in New Jersey had been discovered.⁹³ The leadership of a high church party by Talbot and Vesey was ended. Vesey, after having been indicted for disturbing the public peace, had wisely submitted following the Jacobite rebellion in 1715 knowing that continued opposition was increasingly dangerous'.⁹⁴ Talbot was subdued only after the threat of arrest and the possibility of riots and assault. The discovery of the plot to burn down the Quaker meeting house had further implicated the party as disaffected to the government and caused further division. By the beginning of 1717 Hunter could write to his friends in Britain that 'the Jerseys which about a year ago was the most tumultuous, is at present one of the most quiet and best satisfied of his

⁹² Hunter to Ambrose Phillips, 27 July 1717 in *NJA*, 323-324.

⁹³ Hunter to Popple, 24 May 1717, in *NJA*, 297-300.

⁹⁴ Webb, *Marlborough's America*, 325.

Majestys provinces.⁹⁵ More importantly, he was able to utilise his friendly relationship with Joseph Addison and the vibrant British print culture to further disparage his opponents. At Hunter's request, Addison presented an address of the Grand Jurors of New York to the King in person. The address, which was later printed in London's *Daily Courant*, noted that

This whole province is heartily and sincerely well affected to your government, and that if there be any of a different opinion amongst us, they are so insignificant and contemptible as to their fortunes and understandings that is will never be in their power to give your Majesty's well affected subjects the least uneasiness.⁹⁶

Hunter's battle and eventual victory over the high church party in the mid-Atlantic colonies is illustrative of the significance of Whig and Tory party politics, religious controversies, and Jacobitism in the early eighteenth century transatlantic British political culture. It demonstrates in a number of ways the transatlantic nature of many of the political and religious divisions in Britain and by doing so it illustrates the significance of Jacobitism and the currency of anti-Jacobitism in the British Atlantic World. Hunter did not see himself simply as a governor of colony or participating in the local factional politics of individual colonies. He was an active participant in a much larger transatlantic conflict against high church Toryism, nonjuring, and Jacobitism. In the middle of 1717 Hunter explained that

The Militia is in very good order ever since Mr. Cox and his associates were turned out of it, it was not indeed safe in their hands who had for the last years of H.M. reign rung the peal of the Churches danger, under the auspicious influence of the nonjuring Mr. Talbot, lowder than ever it had been rung in England, and indeed their whole conduct was but an *echo to that on the other side*...⁹⁷

⁹⁵ Governor Hunter to the Lords of Trade, 13 February 1717, *NJA*, 273-274.

⁹⁶ *Daily Courant*, 28 September 1717, 4974.

⁹⁷ Hunter to Ambrose Phillips, 27 July 1717, *NJA*, 323-324. Emphasis mine.

Hunter clearly saw the defeat of the high church party in the mid-Atlantic colonies as a victory in the larger transatlantic battle against a conspicuously seditious element of high church Toryism. His regional political battle was not simply a colonial conflict; it was an important part of a larger British conflict against the interests of the Pretender and his numerous supporters.

Accusations of Jacobitism were, in this instance, more than petty personal attacks. The political culture of the mid-Atlantic was firmly rooted in a British Atlantic World. The divisive, factional politics of the mid-Atlantic, though in many respects local, cannot be understood without an understanding of the growth of a transatlantic high church party rooted in a resurgent high church ideology which prospered under the Tories during the reign of Anne. The growing high church presence in the region was dominated by John Talbot, the later nonjuring bishop, who was instrumental in building churches and encouraging expressions of high church Toryism such as Daniel Leeds's almanacs. Moreover, with the support of Tory governors such as Cornbury, Talbot and Vesey were able to galvanise a regional high church party. After 1710, this party increasingly developed transatlantic ties with high church Tories in Britain. As a result, they participated in elements of high church Toryism which after 1710 looked suspiciously of Jacobitism.

Thus, the shared political and religious connections resulted in disputes over the role of the established church and dissent in the mid-Atlantic. These debates were driven by disagreements between the Whig governor Robert Hunter and opposing high church Tory interests, interests rightly associated with nonjuring and Jacobitism. The informal alliances of the high church party in the mid-Atlantic colonies with high church Tories in

Britain fairly or unfairly associated them with a suspected Tory/Jacobite conspiracy, realised in the rising of 1715-16, which resulted in the political defeat of the high church interests in the mid-Atlantic by the end of 1716. Just as the Hanoverian accession, the Tory proscription, and the Jacobite rebellion in 1715 dashed the immediate hopes of the Tories and Jacobites in Britain, the consequences of these events reverberated across the Atlantic and ended the hopes of the high church interest in the mid-Atlantic.

‘Now the Mask is Taken Off’: Jacobitism and New England, c. 1702-1727

Jacobitism and New England make seemingly strange historiographical bedfellows, though this need not be the case. The caricatures of a dour Puritan and a tartan clad highland Catholic Jacobite bear little resemblance to modern historical understandings of either group. This chapter argues that Jacobitism, as an integral facet of the cultural totality of Britain, was a fundamental element of religious controversies and the transatlantic political culture of colonial New England from 1702 to 1727. In many respects the controversies concerning Jacobitism in New England, reflect the nature of Jacobitism and anti-Jacobitism in the British Atlantic World. In New England, as in England and Scotland, Jacobitism was an integral element of overlapping local and transatlantic political cultures. Imperial wars, controversies involving the Church of England, and the integration of Atlantic communications all created in New England an environment in which Jacobite sympathies or antipathy towards Jacobitism could be expressed in a colonial context. Accusations of Jacobitism levelled by Congregationalists at their political or religious antagonists indicate their perception of local manifestations of the changing face of Jacobitism, from a French Catholic threat to nonjuring and high church Toryism. Debates about passive obedience in New England arguably exemplify colonial expressions of an evolving transatlantic British political culture shaped by struggles between Whigs and a conspicuously Jacobite Tory party.

Accusations and controversies regarding Jacobitism appear in numerous Boston pamphlets and newspapers, especially between the years 1716 to 1727. Yet scholarly understandings of the meaning and significance of these references in an Atlantic context remains underdeveloped. Studies of John Checkley and Timothy Cutler, prominent recipients of accusations of Jacobitism in Boston, have illustrated the importance of religious controversies which were likely impacted by a transatlantic cultural understanding of Jacobitism.¹ There are a number of compelling recent works showing the integration of the colonies into a British imperial political culture. Both Owen Stanwood and Thomas Kidd have argued that a shared Protestantism brought the colonies, especially New England, into imperial conflicts and strengthened the Anglo-American bond after the 1688-89 revolutions. Following William's accession, colonial participation in imperial wars with France, the Nine Years Wars (1689-1697) and Queen Anne's War (1702-1713), helped bridge the cultural divide created by vastly different religious establishments.² Other scholars have insisted that British monarchical political culture was instrumental in creating a focal point for a common social system.³

As chapter three has shown colonial newspapers, print culture, and the role of taverns and coffee houses were integral means through which colonists connected to British political culture, a trend especially evident in New England.⁴ The dissemination of news through newspapers allowed for increased awareness of and participation in

¹ Thomas C. Reeves, 'John Checkley and the Emergence of the Episcopal Church in New England', in *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 34 (1965), 349-360

² Stanwood, *The Empire Reformed*; Stanwood, 'The Protestant Moment: Antippery, the Revolution of 1688-1689, and the Making of and Anglo-American Empire,' in the *Journal of British Studies* 46 (2007), 481-508; Kidd, *The Protestant Interest*; Richard Johnson, *Adjustment to Empire: The New England Colonies, 1675-1715* (Leicester University Press, 1981); Bruce Tucker, 'The Reinvention of New England, 1691-1770,' in *The New England Quarterly* 59 (1986), 315-340.

³ McConville, *The King's Three Faces*; Richard Bushman, *King and People in Provincial Massachusetts* (Chapel Hill, 1985).

⁴ Conroy, *In Public Houses*; Clark, *The Public Prints*; Steele, *The English Atlantic*.

debates arising from metropolitan concerns. Similarly, extensive work on the religiosity of New England suggests the likely significance of the association of Jacobitism with high church Anglicanism, especially in light of the increasing cosmopolitanism of New England's colonial leaders.⁵ Yet scholarship examining religious disputes in Boston has tended to focus on the issue of an American episcopacy.⁶ Older studies, such as Carl Bridenbaugh's *Mitre and Sceptre*, tended to view the expansion of Anglicanism in New England as an imperial conspiracy and treat accusations of Jacobitism as little more than slander.⁷ Wrenched out of the Atlantic context, accusations of Jacobitism in New England usually appear as unfounded pejorative terms or 'incantations.'⁸

More recently, in *The Language of Liberty*, Jonathan Clark recognizes the prevalence of fears of the 'Jacobite menace' in the New England colonies. Nevertheless for Clark those fears remain a peripheral aspect of anti-Anglicanism and anti-Catholicism, a mere 'rhetorical hysteria.'⁹ In a recent work exploring the religious impetus for Puritan integration into the larger British polity, Thomas Kidd has examined the 'imagined' Jacobite threat and argued that it was only a perception which played 'an essential role in constructing the Protestant interest's identity.'¹⁰ Kidd supposes the absence of 'real' Jacobites, and therefore the absence of actual Jacobitism, but despite the numerous strengths of his argument, Kidd never defines what a real Jacobite is and as a result, a

⁵ Perry Miller, *The New England Mind: From Colony to Province* (Cambridge, MA, 1953); Michael J. Crawford, *Seasons of Grace: Colonial New England's Revival Tradition in Its British Context* (Oxford, 1991); Kidd, *The Protestant Interest*; Stephen Foster, *The Long Argument: English Puritanism and the shaping of New England culture, 1570-1700* (Chapel Hill, 1991); Lawrence R. Jannuzzi, 'And Let All the People Say Amen': Priests, Presbyters, and the Arminian Uprising in Massachusetts, 1717-1724,' in *Historical Journal of Massachusetts* 27, 1-27.

⁶ Bridenbaugh, *Mitre and Sceptre*; Bell, *A War of Religion*.

⁷ Bridenbaugh, *Mitre and Sceptre*, xiii, 74.

⁸ William Hogue, 'The Religious Conspiracy Theory of the American Revolution: Anglican Motive,' in *Church History* 45 (1976), 277-292.

⁹ Clark, *The Language of Liberty*, 255.

¹⁰ Kidd, *The Protestant Interest*, 116-117.

complex and nuanced Jacobite culture as described by Paul Monod is eschewed in favour of a more familiar Catholic caricature.¹¹ More importantly, Kidd isolates New England from a larger colonial framework and thus misses the important context of the Atlantic world.

Although in New England accusations of Jacobitism after the revolution of 1688-1689 tended to be linked to accusations of popery, the years from 1702 to 1727 bear witness to a subtle shift in the accusations towards nonjuring and Toryism, demonstrating how an increasingly reliable communication network allowed New Englanders to update their understanding of the evolving Jacobite threat in response to mainland political shifts. The reception of information from Britain was a necessary ingredient in this change. Personal letters from correspondents in Britain supplied local leaders with news from abroad. But Boston also had a burgeoning print culture in the early eighteenth-century. The influx and dissemination of British news allowed the population of Boston to participate in an expanding transatlantic print and political culture. A trend for the development of provincial newspapers in England reached across the Atlantic to Boston with the establishment in 1704 of the *Boston News-Letter*, Boston's first newspaper.¹² By 1721, Boston, a town with a population of approximately 10,000 was served by three local newspapers providing an abundance of foreign and local news. This news, further disseminated through private letters, pamphlets, broadsides, coffee houses, and sermons, kept locals apprised of the continued threat posed by the Jacobites and allowed them to participate in local versions of transatlantic debates.

¹¹ Monod, *Jacobitism*, 6-8.

¹² Steele, *The English Atlantic*, 149-158

Interest in news about Jacobites and their suspected counterparts, nonjurors and high church Tories was driven partly by antipathy to the growth of what Jeremy Gregory has shown was a popular and indigenous Anglicanism in New England. This indigenous Anglicanism grew rapidly after the grant of a new charter in 1692 which forced toleration of Anglican worship.¹³ The steady increase of Anglicanism included a colonial analogue of the high church party. This posed problems for converts to Anglicanism in New England because the ideology of Jacobitism was rooted in the beliefs of nonjurors and was associated with the resurgent high church in England and nonjurant Episcopalians in Scotland. Pamphlet and pulpit debates about the Anglican doctrines of passive obedience and non-resistance and questions about the validity of baptism or ordination outwith an Episcopal communion took place in England during Anne's reign and erupted in New England in 1719. The association of high church doctrines with Jacobitism meant that these debates were not simply theological. Ecclesiastical politics had repercussions which reflected on the Hanoverian succession. If lay baptism or dissenting ordination was invalid, as many high churchmen and nonjurors claimed, then all dissenters outside of an episcopal church, were not legitimately Christians. Therefore, it could be argued that the Lutheran Hanoverians lacked a proper Christian initiation and were essentially dissenters and incapable of serving as the head of the Anglican Church.¹⁴ These debates were manifested in numerous pamphlets which illustrate the extension of mainland debates about religion that were suffused with Jacobite implications for New England.

The rise of a native high church interest, which in England was often indistinguishable from Jacobitism, brought a cultural Jacobitism to Boston's doorstep.

¹³ Jeremy Gregory, 'Refashioning Puritan New England: The Church of England in British North America, c. 1680-1770,' in *Transactions of the RHS* 20 (2010), 85-112.

¹⁴ Bennett, *The Tory Crisis in Church and State*, 151.

This is not to imply that a handful of Boston Jacobites or Jacobite sympathisers would topple the government. Rather, it suggests that New England was susceptible to the waxing and waning of Tory and Jacobite sympathies within a transatlantic political culture. Integrated into a British Atlantic community through newspapers, imperial conflicts, and ecclesiastical politics, the people of Boston and New England were exposed to more than an 'imagined' threat as they participated in controversies associated with Jacobitism which spanned the Atlantic.

In order to demonstrate the significance of Jacobitism and anti-Jacobitism in New England, this chapter first examines the impact of an emerging effective transatlantic communications network on perceptions of Jacobitism in New England during the reign of Anne. Anne's reign bore witness to the rise of party politics rooted in religious divisions and colonists were pulled into the orbit of British party conflicts. These party conflicts were inseparable from religious divisions and news of party strife was communicated to colonists through an incipient transatlantic public sphere. Secondly, it explores the consequences of the growth of the Anglican Church in New England in relation to developing perceptions of Jacobitism. The Church of England was riven by factious parties which were inseparable from party divisions and these divisions reverberated across the Atlantic and were reflected in colonial discourse. Finally, it demonstrates the presence of, and reactions against, overt expressions of Jacobitism evident in the print controversies stirred up by the high church controversialist, John Checkley.

Scholarship on the revolutions of 1688-89 and the dissolution of the Dominion of New England amply demonstrates the prevalence of anti-Catholicism in New England responses to the revolution.¹⁵ During King William's reign (1688-1702), Jacobitism in New England was associated almost entirely with the Catholic beliefs of the Stuarts.¹⁶ As Jacobitism evolved in England, these changes were replicated in the British Atlantic World. Queen Anne was far more supportive of the Anglican establishment than her predecessor. During the reign of this Stuart Queen the resurgent high church became increasingly associated with the politics of the succession and many Anglican Tories were drawn to Jacobitism, especially in the later years of Anne's reign. As Paul Monod and others have shown, during the Tory ascendancy of 1710 to 1714 high church Anglicanism, Toryism, and Jacobitism were becoming indistinguishable.¹⁷

In the early years of the eighteenth century there was an increasing awareness in New England of the threats posed by the Jacobitism of high church Anglicans, Scottish Episcopalians, and nonjurors. As well as the fear of an assertive high church Anglicanism, New England Congregationalists also feared the consequences of Anne's encouragement of Scottish Episcopalians who they rightly believed to be Jacobite.¹⁸ Many in New England saw parallels between the Congregational establishment in New England and the Presbyterian establishment in Scotland.¹⁹ This affected the manner in which they contextualized Jacobitism. For example, following proposals for toleration of

¹⁵ Lovejoy, *The Glorious Revolution in America*, 235-251; Stanwood, *The Empire Reformed*.

¹⁶ Benjamin Bird, *The Jacobites Catechism* (Boston, 1692), 1, 6; John Palmer, *An impartial account of the state of New England, or, The late government there, vindicated in answer to the Declaration which the faction set forth when they overturned that government* (London, 1690).

¹⁷ Monod, *Jacobitism*, 145-154; Daniel Szechi, *Jacobitism and Tory Politics*, 59-68; Knights, 'Introduction: The View From 1710' in, 1-15; Speck, 'The Current State of Sacheverell Scholarship', 16-27; Cowan, 'The Spin Doctor', 28-46.

¹⁸ Bowie, *Scottish Public Opinion*, 36-39; Lenman, 'The Scottish Episcopal Clergy', 36-48.

¹⁹ Colin Kidd, 'Religious Realignment Between the Restoration and the Union,' in *A Union For Empire: Political Thought and the Union of 1707*, ed. by John Robertson (Cambridge, 1995), 145-168;

Episcopalian worship in Scotland in 1703, the *Boston News-Letter* reprinted an article from a London newspaper arguing that ‘Jacobites and Papists’ were pursuing religious liberty for Episcopalians in Scotland in order to keep up divisions in the country.²⁰ The New England Puritan divine Cotton Mather remarked in 1704 in a letter to an acquaintance that ‘another storm is begun; God knows how it will terminate. The Prince of Wales has a strong party in Scotland; the highlands and the high church are for him...and mischief is hatching there; there is breeding a whirlwind out of the North.’²¹ Reports about an attempted Jacobite landing on the east coast of Scotland in 1708 filtered into Boston causing further worry about Jacobitism. The *Boston News-Letter* kept the New England populace apprised of the increasing dangers of the growing strength of the Episcopalians in Scotland and the attempts of the Jacobites. The paper published numerous Scottish Presbyterian addresses of loyalty to Queen Anne following the failed rebellion of 1708.²² This bolstered a sense of fraternity among Puritan New Englanders and their Scottish Presbyterian brethren but it also reminded them of the recurring threat posed by the Jacobites and informed their understandings of Jacobitism.

The threat of a local assertive Anglicanism became all the more pronounced as high church Anglicanism continued to prosper in Britain in the later years of Anne’s reign. Events in Britain continued to impact attitudes in Boston. Reports of the riots and the pulling down of dissenting meeting houses in England during the trial of the Anglican firebrand, Henry Sacheverell, were printed in the *News-Letter* in 1710. These reports

²⁰ *BNL*, 24 April, 1704; For a discussion of the Scottish debates in 1703 see Bowie, *Scottish Public Opinion*, 36-39.

²¹ Cotton Mather to Michael Wigglesworth, 17 April 1704, in *Selected Letters*, 68.

²² *BNL*, 7 June 1708, no. 216; *BNL*, 14 June 1708, no. 217; *BNL*, 29 November 1708, no. 241.

blamed the nonjurors for the commotion and destruction.²³ When high church Tories in Britain, encouraged by popular unrest caused by the Sacheverell trials, won a substantial parliamentary victory and established a Tory ministry in 1710-1714, Congregationalist concerns about Tory hegemony were fanned by the news that the majority Tory parliament had passed the Toleration Act of 1712, forcing the toleration of Episcopalian worship in Scotland. These developments led Cotton Mather to express his fears that the Church of England was 'disturbing and distracting the church of Christ' and that 'it is likely to be a dreadful time not only in Gr. Britain, but here also.'²⁴

Cotton Mather received valuable information from his Scottish Presbyterian correspondent, the minister Robert Wodrow of Eastwood parish near Glasgow. In his correspondence with Wodrow, Mather actively sought information about the condition of religion in Scotland, especially after Wodrow's 1713 comment on the state of religious unrest in Scotland that 'the flame is rising so high that 'the bush' is like to be 'consumed.'²⁵ Wodrow regretfully informed Mather that the toleration of Episcopalian worship 'encouraged the French and Jacobite interest' in Scotland.²⁶ He also warned that only the disbursement of money from London maintained peace with the numerous disaffected clans.²⁷ Mather's response revealed his view that New England was experiencing the same advances of the 'daughter of Babylon [episcopacy] that was encroaching upon Scotland.'²⁸ Wodrow replied to Mather's eschatological concerns by

²³ *BNL*, 29 May 1710, no. 319.

²⁴ William Manierre, ed., *The Diary of Cotton Mather D.D., F.R.S., 1712* (Charlottesville VA, 1964), 14-15; *ibid*, 26.

²⁵ Wodrow to Cotton Mather, January 23, 1713, in *The Correspondence of the Rev. Robert Wodrow, minister of Eastwood, and Author of the History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland*, vol 1, ed. by Thomas McRie (3 vols, Edinburgh, 1842), 388, hereafter cited as *Wodrow*.

²⁶ Wodrow to Cotton Mather, January 23, 1713, in *Wodrow*, i, 390.

²⁷ Wodrow to Cotton Mather, December 15, 1713, in *ibid*, 534

²⁸ Cotton Mather to Wodrow, August 21, 1713, in *ibid*, 530.

arguing that the loss of Scottish sovereignty in the Union of 1707 had been ‘wisely ordered’ by God for the ‘carrying on his own designs at present by our Popish and disaffected party’ which might ‘prepare matters for the bringing in of the Pretender among us’ in order to discipline the Scottish Kirk. Indeed, he observed, ‘matters seem [to be] ripening very fast for an attempt of this nature.’²⁹ In 1714 the *Boston News-Letter* reprinted a letter from the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland to the Queen which argued that the toleration was leading to the spread of episcopal worship and reminded the Queen that Episcopalians in Scotland were disaffected to the Protestant succession.³⁰

Similarly, the low church advocate and Dean of Peterborough, White Kennett, corresponded with the latitudinarian Benjamin Colman, a prominent Presbyterian minister in Boston, on the implications of Sacheverell affair. Kennett noted that ‘the spirit of Dissention and faction, nay, infatuation has raged horribly’ and that ‘under this delirious Cant, the poor souls were prepared to cry out *The Church, The Church,*’ and to ‘idolize a seditious, not to say ignorant Doctor [Sacheverell].’ According to Kennett the nonjurors and high churchmen were smoothing the way for the return of ‘a Popish Pretender.’³¹ This was all taking place under the cover of nonjuring arguments concerning ‘divine and hereditary rights,’ ‘Sacerdotal absolution,’ and also ‘the invalidity of Baptism out of episcopal communion.’³²

Despite their personal antipathy and past disagreements, both Colman and Mather recognized the danger, not of popery but Jacobitism, as suggested by the doctrine and

²⁹Wodrow to Cotton Mather, December 15, 1713, in *ibid*, 534.

³⁰*BNL*, 27 December 1714, no. 558.

³¹White Kennett to Benjamin Colman, Ebenezer Turell, *The Life and Character of the Reverend Benjamin Colman, D.D.: Late Pastor of a Church in Boston, New England* (Boston, 1749), 131.

³²Turell, *Colman*, 131.

behaviours of high church Anglicans, nonjurant Anglicans, and Scottish Episcopalians. Nor was it only a distant Jacobite threat which loomed. The reality of colonial Jacobitism did not escape the notice of some in New England. Governor Hunter of New York and New Jersey (1710-1719) was in a struggle with a 'Jacobite' party led by high church clergymen eager to 'cry out Fire, and Church at all hazards' during the later years of Anne's reign.³³ Cotton Mather's correspondence reveals his knowledge of this high church party and his understanding that he had to be circumspect in his correspondence with Hunter because it would be a 'disadvantage to Gov. Hunter' and enrage Hunter's Jacobite opponents if they knew he was corresponding with someone of Mather's 'well-known circumstances.'³⁴ Mather also identified a 'Jacobite' high church party in Pennsylvania, remarking in 1718 that 'the better people, at Pennsylvania fly to me, that I would serve them' by combatting 'great mischiefs from the Jacobite party among them.'³⁵

Correspondence and newspaper reports demonstrate awareness in New England of a high church threat, perceived as 'Jacobite', in England, Scotland and nearby colonies. They also demonstrate the increasingly instrumental position afforded to Jacobitism within a British political culture. The growing sense that Scottish Episcopalians, Anglicans, Tories and Jacobites were inseparable, and were to be found in the colonies, heightened the fears of many Congregationalists concerning the ever present danger of Jacobitism. Wodrow regularly remarked upon the growth and spread of Popery and Jacobitism in Scotland and stated in 1714 that 'things are very near a crisis, and the Lord

³³ *CSPC*, Governor Hunter to William Popple, Nov 9, 1715, item 663.

³⁴ Cotton Mather to Governor Robert Hunter [c.1714], in *Selected Letters*, 147.

³⁵ *Diary of Cotton Mather* (2 vols.), ii, 326.

must appear, otherwise we and all the Reformed Churches will be swallowed up.³⁶

Mather suggested that the population of New England was ‘not without our share in the fears which arise from the condition to which it [the 1713 peace of Utrecht] has restored and advanced the grand enemies of our holy religion,’ and he complained that ‘attempts to propagate the Church of England in these colonies are often renewed by a sort of people, whose characters you are no stranger to.’ Mather would not have hesitated to second Wodrow’s assertion that the enemies included the ‘Episcopal Jacobite clergy.’³⁷ Mather did not differentiate between Scottish Episcopalians and the Church of England. In his mind, they were all Jacobites. The potential danger of tolerating Anglicans in New England was made abundantly clear when word reached Mather early in 1716 that the ‘tolerated prelatial party’ in Scotland had ‘joined Mar in rebellion’.³⁸

As the death of Anne inched ever closer in 1714, any uncertainty regarding the future security of the Hanoverian succession was laid at the feet of the high church Anglican Tories and Scottish Episcopalians. In these circumstances, this association between Jacobitism and high church Tories in England and their Scottish co-religionists became so pronounced that Jacobitism was perceived as the very real, and very dangerous, consequence of an assertive high church Anglicanism, supported by the Stuart queen. The rise of a Jacobite threat in the reign of Anne had been significant enough for enough for Mather to remark that 1 August 1714, the day of Queen Anne’s death and George I’s accession, had triggered ‘a greater revolution than November 26 years ago.’³⁹ When open Jacobite rebellion soon followed George I’s accession in Scotland and

³⁶Wodrow to Cotton Mather, May 22, 1714, in *Wodrow*, i, 560.

³⁷Cotton Mather to Wodrow, March 17, 1714, in *Wodrow*, i, 626; Wodrow to Cotton Mather, December 11, 1714, *ibid.*, 629.

³⁸Wodrow to Mather, Feb 1716, in *Wodrow*, ii, 154.

³⁹Mather to Timothy Woodbridge, 20 January 1715, in *Selected Letters*, 168.

England, Mather and others in New England would have recognized these rebellions as the physical manifestation of an already extant sympathy.

II

News of the Jacobite rebellion, which erupted in September 1715, reached Boston in October of that year.⁴⁰ Wildly inaccurate reports trickled in slowly, feeding fears and uncertainties. Numerous high church Anglicans, Tories, and Scottish Episcopalians participated in the rebellion which reinforced in the minds of many in New England, the problematic relationship between these groups and Jacobitism. In January 1716 the *News-Letter* reported George I's speech to Parliament of October 1715, which blamed high church Anglicanism for 'endeavoring to persuade my people that the Church of England is in danger under my government.' This, he stated, had been 'the main artifice employed in carrying out this wicked and traitorous design.'⁴¹ This reinforced the notion that high Anglicans like Sacheverell were responsible for the rebellion. This sentiment can also be seen in thanksgiving sermons preached in New England in response to news of the defeat of the rebellion in 1716.⁴² New England commentators also blamed the Tories. Benjamin Colman, a popular Boston minister, invoked traditional tropes of Catholic Jacobitism in portraying describing the failure of the rebellion as a providential defeat of popery and tyranny, equating it with the Gunpowder plot, the Spanish Armada and other Protestant victories.⁴³ But Colman was more concerned by those Tory counsellors who neglected their 'Royal Oath' and 'cover'd treacheries and perfidy' in the

⁴⁰ *BNL*, 31 October, 1715, no. 602.

⁴¹ *BNL*, 2 January 1715, no. 612.

⁴² Increase Mather, *Two discourses shewing, I. That the Lords ears are open to the prayers of the righteous. II. The dignity & duty of aged servants of the Lord* (Boston, 1716), 44; Benjamin Colman, *A Thanksgiving Sermon for the Suppression of the Late Vile and Traiterous Rebellion in Great Britain* (Boston: 1716)

⁴³ Colman, *A Thanksgiving Sermon* (Boston: 1716), 13-15.

‘last scene of the late reign.’⁴⁴ Colman linked the Tories and Jacobites together by arguing that the rebellions began with ‘a stupid faction mindless of God’s wonders’ which led to ‘murmuring first and mutiny and then rising in arms against God and his anointed.’⁴⁵

Leading Tories, including Henry St. John, Lord Bolingbroke, the Duke of Ormonde, and the Earl of Mar were implicated in the Jacobite rebellion. In January of 1716 the *News-Letter* informed its audience that these and numerous other prominent Tories had been involved in Jacobite plotting,⁴⁶ It also reminded its readers that

The rebels are come to a greater height of insolence than could be expected; but when we consider the principal instruments of that rebellion, and compare their present management with their carriage during the time of the late ministry, we may see what they all along aimed at. A toleration obtained to who were known to be enemies to the Protestant Succession and all pains taken to encourage Jacobitism, tho not avowedly, but *now the mask is taken off*.⁴⁷

The idea that Jacobitism could be masked under the guise of high church zeal reflects the blurred boundaries between high church zeal and disaffection to George I. This notion of masking Jacobitism was reinforced by the reprint of an address of the Lord Mayor and commissioners of London to the King which claimed: ‘As the Mask of Faction is taken off... We see *Non-Resisting Rebels, Passive-Obedience Rioters, Abjuring Jacobites and Frenchify’d Englishmen*.’⁴⁸ This idea of hidden Jacobitism was further expounded upon by Increase Mather who tied together information from Wodrow’s letters with news published in the local paper. In 1716 he published a sermon arguing that it was unbridled arrogance for an ‘ungrateful generation’ not to be ‘thankful to God, for so great a favour

⁴⁴ *ibid.* 10, 14.

⁴⁵ *ibid.* 26.

⁴⁶ *BNL*, 2 January 1715, no. 612.

⁴⁷ *BNL*, 30 January 1716, no 615.

⁴⁸ *To the King’s Most Excellent Majesty, The Humble Address of the Lord Mayor of London, and the rest of Your Majesty’s Commissioners of Lieutenancy for Your City of London* (Boston: 1715).

of heaven, to a sinful nation' to be rescued from 'treacherous ministers' of state and a 'wicked sort of men who assume and arrogate to themselves the name of the church, but are enemies to the true church of Christ.'⁴⁹ The high church Tory participation in the Sacheverell riots of 1710, which saw the destruction of the 'houses in which the Lord's servants used to worship him,' and the rebellion of 1715, solidified in the mind of the New England Congregationalists the inseparable ties between high church Anglicanism, Tories, and Jacobitism. This fed further the anxieties harboured by Congregationalists about the potential consequences of a successful Jacobite rebellion and the successful encroachment of Anglicanism.⁵⁰ Ultimately, in the mind of Mather and other anxious Congregationalists, Jacobite success would end with a high church Anglican ascendancy which would precipitate the destruction of dissenting meeting houses and the dismantling of the Independent establishment.

After the rebellions in 1715, reports and letters further confirmed the suspicion that Anglicans and Scottish Episcopalians were thoroughly disaffected to the Hanoverian dynasty. As a consequence, the Church of England in the New England colonies, which was now associated with disaffection to George I, became the target of vitriolic Congregationalist animosity. If a Jacobite rebellion was understood to be the ultimate physical manifestation of principles propagated by the Church of England, then Congregationalism must be protected at all costs from the advance of Anglicanism in New England. Ministers believed that falling away from Congregationalism to the Church of England would lead to disaffection, murmuring, and ultimately to rebellion.

⁴⁹ Increase Mather, *Two Discourses Shewing*, 44.

⁵⁰ *ibid.*, 44.

There is little doubt that Cotton Mather agreed with the sentiments of Wodrow, that the Tories, Anglicans, and Scots Episcopalians were ‘builders of Babylon.’⁵¹

The association of Anglicans with Jacobitism was contrasted with the devoted loyalty of the Congregationalists in New England to the Protestant succession. In 1717 Ebenezer Pemberton, minister of Boston’s Old South Church, argued that ‘there is not one minister or single person known in their [the Congregationalist] communion but what are full of duty, zeal and affection to the succession of the crown in the illustrious Protestant house of Hanover.’⁵² With his published sermon, Pemberton sought to bolster existing notions of loyalty to George I among his co-religionists and also to remind readers that this affectionate loyalty was not true for all communions. Benjamin Colman lamented the spirit of ‘parties and factions’ and informed his audience that ‘The venerable name of religion and the Church is made a sham-pretence for the worst of villanies,’ and included in his list of ‘villanies’ perjury, disloyalty, rebellion, and treason against the King. He also explicitly decried the fact that members of the Church of England participated in the late rebellion despite having taken oaths of abjuration.⁵³

Sermons, like Pemberton’s and Colman’s, published after the 1715-16 rebellion, demonstrated a common and growing assumption that disaffection was not only prevalent, but firmly rooted in both the Church of England and the Scottish Episcopal Church. Congregationalists in New England were increasingly fearful of and had little time for, as Wodrow named them, the ‘high-flyers’ who were ‘papists at heart’ and a ‘reproach upon

⁵¹Wodrow to Cotton Mather, December, 11, 1714, *Wodrow*, i, 628.

⁵² Ebenezer Pemberton, *A brief account of the state of the province of the Massachusetts-Bay in New-England, civil and ecclesiastical* (Boston, 1717).

⁵³ Benjamin Colman, *A brief enquiry into the reasons why the people of God have been wont to bring into their penitential confessions, the sins of their fathers and ancestors, in times long since past*, (Boston, 1716), 29-31.

the reformation.⁵⁴ New England Congregationalists continued to associate Jacobitism with the Catholic beliefs of the exiled Stuarts and this would remain an important aspect of anti-Jacobite rhetoric; but Catholicism was no longer the primary trope associated with Jacobitism. Congregationalists in New England were also increasingly aware of the connections between the Church of England, the Scottish Episcopal Church, and Toryism and the ways in which the Union of 1707 had facilitated these connections.⁵⁵ Anti-Jacobite rhetoric became more sophisticated, and the Congregationalists began to target in their attacks all aspects of the transatlantic Jacobite political culture.

In the first few years following the rebellion, reports continued to reach Boston detailing accounts of the activities of the Stuarts and their adherents, reminding those in New England that the Jacobite threat had not passed. Wodrow informed the Mathers that the clemency of the government following the defeat of the rebels in 1716 only served to encourage the ‘restless enemies’ who were seeking to ‘raise new disturbances.’⁵⁶ The continued restlessness of the Jacobites was further acknowledged when newspapers in Boston reported the failure of the invasion attempt of 1719. Congregational ministers disseminated news in sermons, reminding their parishioners of God’s providential deliveries from Jacobite aggression. They reminded their auditors that in addition to Mar’s open rebellion of 1715, they had been saved in 1715 from Tory ministers who first had attempted to invite in the ‘Old Pretender’ in order to bypass the Hanoverian succession.⁵⁷ Ministers also made sure to inform their audiences that such scheming was

⁵⁴Wodrow to Cotton Mather, February 18, 1716, *Wodrow*, ii, 153.

⁵⁵ Alasdair Raffe, ‘Presbyterians and Episcopalians: The Formation of Confessional Cultures in Scotland, 1660–1715,’ *English Historical Review* 125 (2010), 570–98; Hayton, ‘Traces of Party Politics,’ 74–99.

⁵⁶Wodrow to Mather, 8 July 1717, *Wodrow*, ii, 282; Wodrow to Mather 22 Aug 1716, *ibid*, 208.

⁵⁷ Cotton Mather, *An History of Seasonable Interpositions; Specifically Relating to the Twice Memorable Fifth of November* (Boston, 1719), 21–27.

still taking place. In a 1719 sermon that Cotton Mather himself identified as ‘whiggish’, Mather preached against ‘new plotters’, including those that objected to subscribing the oaths of abjuration which rejected the Stuarts’ right to the throne. Mather made no distinction between potential Jacobites and nonjurors at home and those abroad and made nonjurancy the primary means by which Jacobitism could be identified.⁵⁸

III

After 1715, the Church of England in New England experienced steady growth; so much so that in 1722, the congregation of King’s Chapel had grown large enough that it became necessary to build a second Anglican church in Boston. Though the number of churches and communicants remained small, the influence of the Church of England was becoming more pronounced. The SPG was supporting a growing number of Anglican ministers in the region. By 1725, one Anglican minister in Boston stated that ‘this great town [Boston] swarms with them [churchmen]’ and noted that local Anglicans were pursuing two of the four Assembly seats in Boston.⁵⁹ Though Anglicans remained a numerical minority, the numbers belied their expanding influence. Many of the parishioners of King’s Chapel in Boston were prominent members of society. These included Thomas Selby, the owner and proprietor of The Crown Coffee House, the most popular coffee house in the city, and James Franklin, a local printer. Numerous merchant captains were also members.⁶⁰ The Church of England also catered to merchants and sailors from Britain. Benjamin Colman complained about the disconcerting fact that

⁵⁸ For the reference to whiggish see Cotton Mather to John Winthrop, 19 January 1719, in *Selected Letters*, 300; Mather, *An History of Seasonable Interpositions*, 21-23.

⁵⁹ Timothy Cutler to Zachary Grey, 2 April 1725, in *John Nichols, Illustrations of the Literary History of the Eighteenth Century Consisting of Authentic Memoirs and Original Letters of Eminent Persons*, vol. IV (London, 1818), 269.

⁶⁰ Henry Wilder Foote, *Annals of Kings Chapel: From the Puritan Age of New England to the Present Day* (Boston, 1882), 239-265.

‘gentlemen of Scotland, that are not inhabitants here go off strangely to the Church of England.’ He also noticed that ‘the gay houses of entertainment, Custom-house officers, etc., are mostly of the Church of England here.’⁶¹ The rapid growth and prominence of the Church of England allowed for the emergence of a high church Anglican culture in the region. There are numerous references, both from Anglicans and Congregationalists, in the years 1720-1724 to highflyers and the high church or Jacobite party in Boston.⁶² One local low church critic maintained that the defection from the Protestant interest could be ascribed to ‘Scotch Highlanders and other strangers, who flocking over into this country in great numbers have fomented divisions and propagated their seditious principles’ demonstrating the pervasive sense that these transatlantic connections were fostering disaffection in New England.⁶³

Nothing better illustrates the emergence of, and controversy surrounding, a New England high church culture than the debates stirred up by John Checkley, a native of Boston and a high church Anglican layman. Checkley was educated at Oxford (a Jacobite stronghold) sometime between 1700 and 1710, a period of intense religious controversy, and returned to Boston sometime before 1713 where he opened a bookshop.⁶⁴ He also happened to be a fearless advocate of the Church of England. Having witnessed the debates surrounding the Church of England in the first decade of the eighteenth century and aware that the high church was experiencing a resurgence in

⁶¹ Colman to Wodrow 27 June 1725, cited in ‘Some unpublished letters of Benjamin Colman, 1717-1725,’ ed. by Niel Caplan, in *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society* 77 (1965), 101-143, quote on pg. 137.

⁶² Colman to Wodrow, 26 May 1724, in *ibid*, 134; Mr. Mossom to the Bishop of London, 17 December, 1724, *FP*, vol. 4, 142.

⁶³ Henry Harris to the Bishop of London, 22 June 1724, *FP*, 117-121.

⁶⁴ Edmund Slafter, *John Checkley; Or the Evolution of Religious Tolerance in Massachusetts Bay*, 2 vols. (Boston, 1897),

response to the Bangorian controversy⁶⁵, in 1719, Checkley underwrote the publication and sale of a reprint of Charles Leslie's attack against deists *The Religion of Jesus Christ the only True Religion* (1697). Appended to the work was a letter from St. Ignatius of Antioch, an early church father, which argued for the necessity of episcopal government in the church.⁶⁶ Checkley viewed himself as a Bostonian Sacheverell and intentionally provoked his opponents in hopes of galvanizing a high church response. Checkley's publication of the work of a notorious nonjuror on the heels of the failed Jacobite conspiracy of 1719 rekindled local fears of Jacobitism. Charles Leslie was one of the most notorious nonjuring polemicists and an unrepentant supporter of the exiled Stuarts. An assertive high church Anglicanism rooted in the works of Leslie was fraught with implications and many in New England responded quickly.

In December of the same year, the General Assembly of Massachusetts, in response to the Jacobite conspiracy in 1719 and Checkley's publication, enacted a law giving authority to justices of the peace to tender the oaths of allegiance and abjuration to anyone suspected of disaffection to the George I. Two Justices of the Peace requested that Checkley take the required oaths. He refused. Checkley was forced to appear in court where he publicly refused to take the oaths and was fined six pounds. He also was required to put up 100 pounds in sureties, which, despite his open disaffection, some of his fellow Anglicans helped him supply.⁶⁷ It is necessary to note that nonjuring was Jacobitism by default. By refusing the oaths, Checkley was tacitly acknowledging the

⁶⁵ For the Bangorian controversy, see Andrew Starkie, *The Church of England and the Bangorian Controversy, 1716-1721* (Woodbridge, 2007).

⁶⁶ Charles Leslie, *The religion of Jesus Christ the only True Religion, or, A Short and Easie Method with the Deists* (Boston: 1719).

⁶⁷ Slafter, *John Checkley*. ii, 39.

exiled Stuarts' right to the throne. Consequently, the fact that he received assistance from fellow Anglicans suggests that they were not entirely repulsed by his overt disaffection.

Checkley's nonjuring is not at all surprising given his extreme high church opinions. His numerous correspondents included prominent high churchmen and nonjurors in England, including Zachary Grey and Robert Moss, the dean of Ely.⁶⁸ In a letter written 30 January 1720, Checkley wrote that he planned to close up his shop so that he might better remember the death of the 'royal martyr' Charles I, executed in 1649. He also connected New England Congregationalists to the English Civil War when he complained that 'there are too, too many who defend the horrid Regicides and glory in their being of their King-killing, hellish principles.'⁶⁹ His refusal to swear the oaths of abjuration and allegiance was a principled stand rooted in the doctrines and culture of the Church of England. By refusing the oaths he was conforming to the Congregationalist caricature of a seditious high church Tory, but he was a firm believer in high church Anglicanism and would continue to advocate its doctrines in New England.

Checkley's publication of Leslie's work was the first shot of a vigorous pamphlet war that encapsulates the nature of Jacobitism in New England. Following his initial publication, Checkley anonymously published a tract titled *Choice Dialogues between a Godly Minister and an Honest Countryman* which ridiculed the doctrine of Predestination, a doctrine subscribed to by New England Congregationalists.⁷⁰ Although there was nothing inherently Jacobite in what Checkley wrote his work intentionally mimicked the dialogues found in Charles Leslie's newspaper, *Rehearsal*. His opponents noticed the

⁶⁸ Slafter, *John Checkley*, ii, 158-182.

⁶⁹ John Checkley to John Read, 30 January, 1720, in Slafter, *John Checkley*, ii, 173-174.

⁷⁰ John Checkley, *Choice Dialogues between a Godly Minister and an Honest Countryman Concerning Election and Predestination*. (Boston, 1720).

similarities and explicitly complained that 'M' Lesley's rehearsals and other works falling into this man's hands, they work'd so powerfully upon his distempered brain that he was very impatient till he had communicated his discoveries to the rest of mankind'.⁷¹

The most notable response to Checkley's *Dialogues* came from Thomas Walter, a Congregational minister in Roxbury and nephew of Cotton Mather. In 1720 he anonymously published *A Choice Dialogue between John Faustus a Conjurer, and Jack Tory His Friend* under the pseudonym 'Christopher Whigg'.⁷² This tract shows that the debate launched by Checkley was firmly rooted in terms defined by British political culture. In his response, Walter politicizes important aspects of Checkley's theological argument. Even within his title, he unambiguously lampoons the Tory party. The character 'Jack Tory' cleverly brings Tory and Jack, shorthand for both Jacobite and John, together and associates him with Faustus, the devil.⁷³ Additionally, he signs his preface as 'Christopher Whigg'.⁷⁴ Christopher means Christ-bearer, which when conjoined to Whigg leaves no doubt as to which political party God favours. This distinction between the Tory and the Whig is given even greater weight by accusations made in the preface. Walter informed his readers that Charles Leslie, the 'reverend and labourious' original author of Checkley's dialogues, was a 'Jacobite clergyman, who, I dare vouch has served the Pretender ten years, where he has served the flock of Christ one.'⁷⁵ This reminded the audience that Checkley's tract was not simply a dialogue concerning predestination; a work parroting Leslie also carried serious political undertones.

⁷¹ Henry Harris to the Bishop of London, 22 June 1724, *FP*, vol. 4, 117-121; Thomas Walter, *A Choice Dialogue Between John Faustus a Conjurer, and Jack Tory his Friend*. (Boston, 1720).

⁷² Thomas Walter, *A Choice Dialogue Between John Faustus a Conjurer, and Jack Tory his Friend*. (Boston, 1720), 21.

⁷³ For examples of the use of Jack for Jacobites see *CSPC* item 769, vol. 20; Monod, *Jacobitism*, 226, 228; Holmes, *British Politics*, 17-18.

⁷⁴ Walter, *A Choice Dialogue*, xxi.

⁷⁵ *ibid*, ii-iii

Walter drew the connections for his readers between Checkley's work and the politics of high church Toryism and Jacobitism in one devastating attack. He also demonstrated a keen understanding of the politics of religion when he makes sport of the Tory propensity to cry out the church in danger.⁷⁶ But the end of Walter's piece leaves his audience little doubt as to the implications of Checkley's work. His Jack Tory character exclaims that

The next touch shall be a vindication of Jacobus Tertius et Octavus, together with the adjustment of the monarchies of Europe, a Resurrection of the King of Sweden, and a formal invitation of the Czar of Muscovy, to make a visit to the British Dominions; and essay to put the King of Spain upon his Legs again, and either Rout or Drown the Dutch. These are great and noble Subjects much upon my heart...⁷⁷

Walter does not limit his character to propagating foreign support of the Jacobites. He also aims to 'invite Lesly over to New-England; and send out an hue-in-cry after Marr, Oxford, Ormond and Bolingbroke, and we'll set the World to Rights.'⁷⁸ In Walter's mind, Jacobitism was not a distant or perceived threat. The politics of Toryism and Jacobitism understood as inherent in Anglicanism, threatened New England as well as Great Britain.

Although Walter's vitriol in 1720 was primarily directed at Checkley, it is likely that he was also responding to the existence of Jacobitism in neighbouring colonies and the continuing growth of a native high church party in the city. Jacobitism was certainly extant in Pennsylvania and in 1721 the *Boston News-Letter* reported that two men in Philadelphia had recently been pilloried for denying the King's right to the throne and calling him a usurper and had likely been encouraged by a 'senseless high flying' Church

⁷⁶ *ibid.* 22.

⁷⁷ *ibid.* 30

⁷⁸ *ibid.* 30.

of England minister.⁷⁹ Additionally, within three years, Richard Welton, the notorious English nonjuror, was officiating in Philadelphia's Anglican church after having been appointed by the vestry, suggesting that Jacobitism was not isolated to the two men prosecuted. This news further reinforced the notion that high flying Anglican doctrines bred disaffection.

The import of the growing confidence of an Anglican party in Boston is seen in a controversy over inoculation for smallpox that erupted in 1721. In that year smallpox ravaged the town of Boston. As early as 1714, Cotton Mather had read in the Royal Society's transactions an article discussing the merits of inoculation.⁸⁰ When smallpox broke out in the city Mather advocated this untested method. This potentially dangerous method met fervent opposition from local physicians including William Douglass, the only university educated physician practicing in Boston. Leading supporters of the practice of inoculation included prominent congregational ministers like Benjamin Colman, and a local physician, Zabdiel Boylston.

Public objections to the practice of inoculation were voiced primarily by a group of Anglicans in Boston. Lacking an outlet to propagate their views, they decided to publish a newspaper with the help of a local printer, James Franklin. The *New England Courant*, born out of the inoculation controversy, became, as one scholar has argued, the 'voice of Anglicanism' in Boston.⁸¹ Certainly, the nonjuring Checkley and many of his fellow Anglicans at King's Chapel were heavily involved in writing many of the paper's

⁷⁹ *BNL*, 10 April, 1721, no. 891. For the reference to the minister see Wendal, 'Jacobitism Crushed, 58-65, 59.

⁸⁰ Miller, *The New England Mind*, 347-358

⁸¹ David Sloan, 'The New England Courant: Voice of Anglicanism, The Role of Religion in Colonial Journalism,' in *American Journalism*, 8 (1991), 108-14.

controversial pieces which lampooned the Congregationalist majority.⁸² Leading members of the congregational clergy understood the implications of the emergence of the paper and argued that it was the voice of a 'hell-fire club'. Checkley's involvement resulted in charges that the club was led by a nonjuror. The fact that Checkley's fellow Anglicans continued to work with him demonstrates some sympathy for his views.

Moreover, Boston's newspapers were reporting that London's presses 'begin to grow warm with the dispute about inoculation.' The newspapers also reprinted a story from London noting that the 'High Church' was against inoculation so it became a 'party controversy among us.'⁸³ Thus, the fact that a 'highflying party' was contesting inoculation in Boston gains greater importance when the politicised smallpox debate is linked to larger transatlantic events as it was by Benjamin Colman, who asserted that 'the High Church I find rave at it [inoculation] in London as they did here. I suppose because the princess [princess of Wales] passed well thro' it.'⁸⁴ It also provided a basis for Cotton Mather's belief that the opposition to the small pox inoculation was led by a 'jacobite or highflying party counting themselves bound in duty to their party to decry it.'⁸⁵ Colman and Mather connected the high church Checkley and his party in Boston to a high church party in Britain thoroughly tainted with Jacobitism. By doing so, even the smallpox controversy became enveloped in the larger fears concerning Jacobitism. Colman and the rest were participating in an actively evolving transatlantic political culture dominated by a continuing Jacobite threat. The emergence of a high church party in New England which was understood to be ideologically connected to elements of

⁸² Sloan, 'The New England Courant,' 108-141; Clark, *Public Prints*, 127.

⁸³ *NEC*, 5 Nov 1722, no 66.

⁸⁴ 23 Nov 1722, in 'Some unpublished letters of Benjamin Colman,' p. 127.

⁸⁵ Mather to James Jurin, 21 May 1723, in *Selected Letters*, p. 361.

Jacobitism in Britain further knit the disparate political cultures of New England and Britain together in an increasingly Atlantic system.

IV

New England rarely lacked for controversy, and shortly after the debates concerning inoculation subsided, the region was again aghast at the spectre of the emergent high church. In September 1722, amidst the continued controversy surrounding Checkley's publications and the recent emergence of the *New England Courant*, Timothy Cutler, the rector of Yale College, two Yale tutors, and four neighbouring ministers renounced their adherence to congregationalism and declared themselves for the Anglican Church. The conversions spoke of the belief that Episcopal ordination was necessary and that the absence of this invalidated a minister's work, sending shockwaves through New England. This implied that the entire Congregational establishment in New England was invalid. The *News-Letter* and the *Courant* were quick to report the incident and letters quickly came pouring in denouncing Cutler and his associates. The *News-Letter* reported that Cutler had claimed that there is no salvation outside of the Church of England, echoing Checkley's earlier arguments.⁸⁶ Cutler's statements were a major affront to Congregational sensibilities, but more importantly the idea of the invalidity of dissenting ordination was traditionally an important nonjuring position. James Wetmore, Samuel Johnson and Daniel Brown, three of the ministers who declared themselves with Cutler, penned a brief vindication of Cutler for the Anglican leaning *New England Courant*. In it they argued that they are treated as though to 'have declared in favour of the Church of England, had been as bad as to have declared for Popery or something

⁸⁶ *BNL*, 15 Oct 1722, no. 976.

worse.’⁸⁷ Three of the converts sailed to England to receive episcopal ordination in November. Their timing could not have been worse.

In September, news began to filter into Boston informing the population of the discovery in Britain of another major Jacobite conspiracy. Francis Atterbury, the Anglican Bishop of Rochester, was suspected of plotting to restore the exiled Stuart monarch, James III & VIII, or the Old Pretender. Over the next few months, newspapers in Boston continued to provide further information regarding the Jacobite plotting in Britain. Early in 1723, the *News-Letter* and the *New England Courant* each published a speech by King George regarding the recent discovery of a plot against his crown detailing the ‘dangerous conspiracy’ in favour of a ‘Popish Pretender.’⁸⁸ Within weeks, further details arrived and newspapers were reporting that the main actor in the conspiracy was none other than the Bishop of Rochester.⁸⁹ News that a high church Anglican Bishop was at the centre of the conspiracy did not surprise those in New England who had long associated the high church Tories with Jacobitism. In fact, many relished the information. The fact that a Bishop of the Church of England who had sworn the oath abjuring the exiled Stuarts would still conspire for their restoration confirmed in the minds of New England Congregationalists that not even jurant Anglicans could be fully trusted. This blatant reminder that members of the Church of England, as well as nonjurors and papists, were plotting a Stuart restoration resonated with a populace shaken by the recent conversions. In 1723, the *News-Letter* reprinted a satirical letter, originally printed in London’s *Flying Post*, authored by a ‘Father Francis’ and written to James III & VIII on behalf of ‘all the papists, and perjured Protestants in Great Britain, in behalf of

⁸⁷ *NEC*, 5 November, 1722, no. 66.

⁸⁸ *NEC*, 11 February, 1723, no. 80; *BNL*, 14 January 1723, no. 989.

⁸⁹ *NEC*, 25 to February, 1723, no 82.

themselves and those of their brethren.’ The author asserted that ‘by principle and inclination we are so firmly attach’d to your highness’ and proudly boasted that ‘we have, ‘tis true, many of us, frequently, and in a solemn manner Abjured you and all your Rights or Pretensions to these Dominions.’⁹⁰ Additionally, in 1722 the anonymous British tract, *A Letter to the Clergy of the Church of England*, was reprinted in Boston. The pamphlet defended the government’s arrest of Atterbury and called on preachers to condemn the recent conspiracy arguing that silence ‘was almost to Rebel against not only the State but our Religion too’ and included a section written explicitly for clergymen who hoped for a Stuart restoration reminding readers that Jacobitism was rampant even within the established church.⁹¹

It did not take long for some in New England to notice a connection between Checkley’s publications, the conversions at Yale, and the recent conspiracy against the crown. An excellent example of this is a poem printed in the *New England Courant* which made this connection abundantly clear.⁹² In it the author writes

but if the Mother Church, her new sons now lurch,
and of them be very shy,
Lest they to the High Church fly,
and to the Pretender make a free surrender:
Pray you turn no more,
Lest at the last you turn so far and fast
as to court the Whore.⁹³

He continues later in the poem to say

But perhaps in the Tower he [Cutler] may find

⁹⁰ *BNL*, 16 May 1723, no 1007.

⁹¹ Anonymous, *A Letter to the Clergy of the Church of England: On Occasion of the Commitment of the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Rochester to the Tower of London* (London: Reprinted at Boston, 1722). 13.

⁹² This poem is exceedingly interesting because it represents a citizen’s understanding of the situation. Additionally, allows a brief glimpse of the role of the newspapers as the *Courant* clearly mocks the poem and does not subscribe to the author’s opinion.

⁹³ *NEC*, 11 March, 1723, no. 84.

Great Gentlemen that to him be very kind:
 To see such New-England sons, how will they rejoice
 If on the Block the Ax hath not spoil'd their voice
 But our Male-Contents another step very high,
 They may to the Pretender and the High Church fly.⁹⁴

High profile conversions during a period of Jacobite conspiracy had brought the Jacobite threat home to Boston. But the author of the poem was not only interested in connecting Cutler and the others to the Atterbury plot; he also linked the conversions at Yale to Checkley's early publications. The author encouraged his audience to 'pray to God the dividing devil for to restrain, and not to send his servant Cheklie into New Haven again.'⁹⁵ Checkley's outspoken advocacy of high church principles, as well as his nonjuring, lent credence to the notion that his nefarious and seditious influence was responsible for the conversions. A later pamphlet, referring either to Cutler or Checkley, complained about those who were 'debauching' the 'unthinking youth.'⁹⁶ The large number of malicious reports being spread regarding the disaffection of the Yale converts forced Samuel Myles, the Rector of King's Chapel in Boston, to write to the Bishop of London 'to take away suspicion of their being disaffected to the government.'⁹⁷

Amidst the bad press of an untimely Jacobite conspiracy and voluminous accusations that his works promoted Jacobitism, Checkley remained undeterred. He relished his participation in a larger high church or Jacobite political culture and viewed controversy as the most effective way to gain converts. In 1723 he published and sold a new edition of Charles Leslie's *Short and Easie Method with the Deists*.⁹⁸ This occasioned various responses both in print and in law including prosecution for seditious

⁹⁴ *ibid.*, 2.

⁹⁵ *ibid.*, 2.

⁹⁶ Anonymous, *The Madness of the Jacobite Party, in Attempting to Set a Popish Pretender on the British Throne* (Boston, 1724). i.

⁹⁷ Samuel Myles to the Bishop of London, 1 November, 1722, *FP* vol. IV, 81.

⁹⁸ Charles Leslie, *A Short and Easie Method with the Deists*, eighth ed. (London, 1723).

libel for which he faced trial in 1724. Even more significant was Checkley's anonymous publication in 1723 of an attack on the Congregational churches, *A Modest Proof of the Order and Government of the Church as Settled by Christ and His Apostles* originally published in London in 1705.⁹⁹ This publication was in some measure a response to events in Yale. In the two weeks from 27 May to 10 June, Checkley advertised *A Modest Proof* which directly attacked the legitimacy of Presbyterian ordination.¹⁰⁰ The audacity of this work can hardly be overstated. Not only did Checkley advertise his new work during a significant period of the Jacobite calendar, which included Restoration day (May 29), and more specifically, the birthday of the pretender James III & VIII (June 10), within five pages of his *A Modest Proof* he was trumpeting the Jacobite tinged virtues of passive obedience and non-resistance.¹⁰¹ The fact that Checkley advertised this publication on such important days in the Jacobite calendar strongly suggests the tenor of his political sympathies. Because Checkley was the most vocal proponent of the Church of England in Boston, his politics reflected on the whole of his denomination.

This was met with a barrage of biting replies directed against Checkley and his fellow Anglicans. Newspapers continued to play a vital role in the debate. For example the *New England Courant*, which by 1723 was an open forum for differing views, printed a letter and an article reminding its readers of the recent plot against the crown and Atterbury's recent imprisonment and banishment.¹⁰² Also, two weeks after Checkley's publication was advertised, the *Courant* printed an anonymous letter written by 'a true

⁹⁹ Anonymous, *A Modest Proof of the Order and Government of the Church as Settled by Christ and His Apostles* (Boston, 1723).

¹⁰⁰ For the advertisements see *NEC* 27 May 1723, no 95; *NEC*, 3 June 1723, no 96; *NEC*, 10 June 1723, no 97.

¹⁰¹ Checkley, *A Modest Proof*, 5.

¹⁰² *NEC*, 17 June 1723, no. 98.

lover of Passive Obedience and Non Resistance' which attacked Checkley's explanation of the doctrines. This letter sought to explain that the doctrines had been wrongly practiced by their 'pretended patrons,' the high churchmen and nonjurors. It reminded the Boston populace that nonjuring and high church supporters of these doctrines had plagued the nation with 'plots and conspiracies' and sarcastically asserted that 'pure Passive Obedience' had so influenced its adherents that 'after they had taken the Oaths to the Powers in being' they took up arms against the government in 1715. The author continued saying 'if I should attempt to speak of the carriage of such persons in the present reign, time would fail me to enumerate the many Rebellions, Plots, and Conspiracies which have been hatch'd, carried on and supported by those who have been the greatest sticklers for these doctrines.' He also complained that the 'nation at this time feels the fatal effects of the passive obedience and non-resistance which consist only in pretences.'¹⁰³ In fact, the hypocrisy inherent in propounding these doctrines while conspiring against the crown continued to plague Anglican proponents of the doctrines as the Atterbury plot had so recently demonstrated. In response to local events, the *Boston News-Letter* printed one of Cato's letters, originally written in England by John Trenchard and Thomas Gordon, two staunch Whigs. The paper, after complaining that 'there having lately been great endeavors used by a sort of people (formerly unknown to this and other provinces of New England) to debauch the minds of unheeding youth, as to their religion...' thought it wise to publish 'two of the celebrated British CATO's lucubrations' lampooning the high church party and their nonjuring allies.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰³ *NEC*, 24 June 1723, no. 99

¹⁰⁴ *BNL*, 12 March 1724, no. 1050.

Alongside the newspapers, clerical opponents of Checkley continued to attack him through pamphlets and sermons. Thomas Walter, the minister who had written the devastatingly satirical reply to Checkley's dialogues, responded in 1724 to Checkley's more recent works by stating 'let us make the onset, and try if we can't beat out the little pert Jacobite, from his fancied secure retreat and oblige him to make a surrender of his false apostolical episcopacy.'¹⁰⁵ However, Walter's response was far more informed than this accusation might suggest. Walter understood arguments in favour of episcopacy were a bastion of high church and nonjuring doctrine. He accused Checkley of promoting a union with the Gallican Church in France, which was supported by nonjurors as a means of legitimating a Stuart restoration. For support, he quoted Benjamin Hoadly, the low church Bishop of Bangor, loathed by advocates of the high church, and sure to antagonize Checkley.¹⁰⁶

Walter was not the only minister to respond to Checkley. Edward Wigglesworth, the president of Harvard, penned a reply to Checkley entitled *Sober Remarks* which castigated his promotion of passive obedience and non-resistance if they were, as he suspected, intended to undermine the protestant succession in the House of Hanover. Wigglesworth argued that these were essentially code words for the Jacobite interest and that the majority of members in the Church of England would agree with him, 'unless Occasional Perjury is much more practiced by some sorts of persons than ever

¹⁰⁵ Thomas Walter, *An Essay Upon that Paradox, Infallibility may Sometimes Mistake. or, A Reply to A Discourse Concerning Episcopacy, Said in a Late Pamphlet to be Beyond the Possibility of a Reply. To Which is Prefixed, Some Remarks Upon said Pamphlet, Entitled, A Discourse Shewing, who is a True Pastor of the Church of Christ. As also Remarks upon St. Ignatius's Epistle to the Trallians* (Boston:1724), 12.

¹⁰⁶ *ibid*, 64; For the high church support for Gallicanism, see George Every, *The High Church Party, 1688-1718* (London, 1956), 70

Occasional Conformity was by others.’¹⁰⁷ Wigglesworth clearly believed, and reminded his audience, that not even Anglicans willing to take the oaths should be fully trusted.

The strongest attack against Checkley, anonymously published in 1724, was titled *The Madness of the Jacobite Party*.¹⁰⁸ According to the author, the publication was timely because ‘faction runs high in our nation and so many restless spirits would conspire its ruin.’ In his view, the concurrent timing of the Atterbury plot, the Yale conversions, and Checkley’s publications were no accident. The author saw clearly the dangers and stated that the reason for publication was to combat

some among ourselves, who, (being zealous sticklers for Hereditary Right, have entertained too pompous ideas of imperial greatness) are laboring by all possible means to corrupt and debauch the minds of Men (and of our own unthinking youth especially) by infusing into them the most absurd notions of Government and loyalty, as well as of religion.¹⁰⁹

He makes no distinction between Jacobites at home in New England or those in Great Britain. Moreover, he appealed not just to those already inclined towards his point of view, but also reminded his Anglican opponents of the inevitable consequences of their doctrines. They might naively suppose that they are protecting or fighting for the established Church, but if a ‘popish Pretender’ is put on the throne, ‘episcopal see’s will soon be filled with Romish Bishops’ and the Anglican Church would suffer most of all.¹¹⁰ The author’s appeal is in some respects a clarion call trying to unite all Protestants against the Stuarts, but he also sent out a rallying cry to the Congregationalists arguing

you, who have been all along Traduced and Cursed, as men of Anti-Monarchical principles, levelers, enemies to kings, and Kingly government, by your malicious adversaries; you I say, may boldly challenge them to ‘oblige you with the names

¹⁰⁷ Edward Wigglesworth, *Sober remarks on a book lately re-printed at Boston, entituled, A modest proof of the order and government settled by Christ and his apostles in the church. In a letter to a friend.*, 2nd ed. (Boston, 1724), 17.

¹⁰⁸ Anonymous, *The Madness of the Jacobite Party*.

¹⁰⁹ *ibid.*, i.

¹¹⁰ *ibid.*, 6.

of Presbyterian ministers...presbyterian soldiers, or mobs that appeared or acted in any of the late horrid rebellions!’

Of course, these responses did not deter Checkley from issuing a strong retort. During 1724, prior to being tried for seditious libel, he authored and published a reply to his numerous detractors.¹¹¹ Knowing he had pricked a nerve, he praised his own influence and argued that his opponents ‘offer themselves evidences of its not being so contemptible a piece as they would represent it; since with all the efforts of intemperate malice, they fly from every quarter to his and spit their venom on it.’¹¹² Checkley primarily argued for the necessity of episcopacy but, in comments interspersed throughout, he could not help but belittle his opponents. He responded to his detractors with common high church accusations including ‘enthusiasm’ and that ‘schism and sedition are near a-kin.’ Arguing that ‘presbytery was hardly any where ever established, but on the ruins of Kings or Kingdoms’, Checkley reminded his readers of the chaos of the English Civil Wars, arguing that one of his detractors was possessed with one of the ‘Furies of Forty One.’¹¹³

Checkley’s latest publication would not remain unanswered long. Jonathan Dickinson, who had replied to *A Modest Proof*, made another attempt to humble Checkley and expose the Jacobitism which he believed was inherent in his arguments.¹¹⁴ In his *Remarks upon the Postscript to the Defence*, Dickinson again reminded his readers of the seditious principles linked to Checkley’s party. He asserted that Checkley is of the ‘High-Church party’ and informed his audience that ‘we have a Tory to deal with.’ But if his readers were still unsure of what this implied, he was quick to inform them of the

¹¹¹ John Checkley, *A Defence of a Book Lately reprinted at Boston, Entitled A Modest Proof of the Order and Government Settled by Christ and His Apostles in the Church* (Boston, 1724).

¹¹² *ibid.*, 53.

¹¹³ *ibid.*, 4, 40.

¹¹⁴ Jonathan Dickinson, *Remarks upon the Postscript to the Defence* (Boston, 1724).

dangers posed by fervent high church beliefs. He questioned whether it was wrong to ‘call the doctrines of Passive Obedience and Non Resistance, (as proposed in the Modest Proof, without any limitations) Jacobite principles? Be pleased Sir, to read the trial of your late Brother Dr. Sacheveril...’¹¹⁵ This connected Checkley directly to the Jacobite high church cleric Sacheverell, which once again associated the high church with closet Jacobitism and reminded the audience of the transatlantic nature of the threat. Furthermore, Dickinson asserted that ‘all the rebellions and seditions that have been raised’ during the reign of King George had ‘their rise from that doctrine as unlimitedly proposed in the Modest Proof.’¹¹⁶

Nor was Checkley the only example of an Anglican promoting crypto-Jacobite in New England ideas at this time. As chapter two noted, a minister in New Haven, Connecticut had noted that the two nonjuring bishops, Welton and Talbot, had been sent to the colonies and were actively spreading propaganda. Moreover, one occasional auditor of the Yale convert Timothy Cutler, rector of Christ’s Church in Boston, complained that he should ‘preach more on true conversion...and not so much on Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance’ and noted that he should pray in the ‘little prayer before the sermon for King George and the Royal Family.’¹¹⁷ Despite open disaffection or extreme high church views, Checkley and Cutler continued to receive support from the vestries and churchwardens of the two Anglican churches in Boston suggesting, at the very least, support for high church doctrines which would have smacked of a thinly veiled disaffection. Furthermore, the vestry of King’s Chapel, allies of Checkley,

¹¹⁵ *ibid.*, 4.

¹¹⁶ *ibid.*, 4.

¹¹⁷ Timothy Cutler to Zachary Grey, 7 May 1726, in Nichols, *Illustrations of the Literary History*, vol. IV, 279.

censured Henry Harris the low church assistant rector of King's Chapel, who after seeing some of Checkley's publications 'thought it his duty to animadvert in a sermon upon tenets of such a pernicious tendency.'¹¹⁸ This led Harris to complain that the 'Jacobite party' was 'enraged' against him and David Mossom, a supporter of Harris and the Anglican minister of a neighbouring town complained about the 'flaming zeal' of Checkley and the 'party which abets him.'¹¹⁹

V

Amidst the extended exchange of caustic pamphlets, in March of 1724, the Massachusetts government brought charges against Checkley for publishing a seditious work filled with 'insinuations against his Majesty's rightful and lawful authority.'¹²⁰ One of Checkley's critics gleefully wrote that the lieutenant governor, William Dummer, by prosecuting Checkley had 'employed his authority and influence' in protecting the Church against 'open enemies and pretended friends, from nonjurors and Jacobites.'¹²¹ The accusations of sedition referred specifically to his selling in 1723 of Leslie's *A Short and Easie Method*. In May of the same year, before he was brought to trial, Checkley decided to take the necessary oaths of abjuration and allegiance, which he had refused five years prior.¹²² Even fellow Anglicans suspected that he had taken the oaths in order to avoid the 'impending penalties' and not out of any newfound loyalties¹²³ In July of 1724, Checkley went to trial for the publication which was accused of questioning the right of George I to the throne. He was found guilty but was allowed to appeal and

¹¹⁸ Henry Harris to the Bishop of London, 22 June 1724, *FP*, vol. 4, 117-121

¹¹⁹ Henry Harris to the Bishop of London, 22 June 1724, *FP*, vol. 4, 117-121; David Mossom to the Bishop of London, 17 December 1724, *FP*, vol. 4, 142.

¹²⁰ Slafter, *John Checkley*, i, 56.

¹²¹ Henry Harris to the Bishop of London, 22 June 1724, *FP*, vol. 4, 117-121.

¹²² Slafter, *John Checkley*, i 58.

¹²³ Henry Harris to the Bishop of London, 22 June 1724, *FP*, vol. 4, 117-121.

appeared before the Superior Court in November. This court found him guilty of libel but innocent of sedition and he was fined fifty pounds and forced to put up one hundred pounds in sureties.¹²⁴ Throughout the debates and despite his nonjuring, Checkley was supported by many of his fellow Anglicans, who assisted him by acting as legal counsel and helping him pay his fines and sureties.

Checkley's controversial works had stirred up such division in the colony both among Congregationalists and low church Anglicans in Boston that the Bishop of London was forced involve himself in order to settle the dispute. Both Benjamin Colman and Henry Harris, the assistant rector at King's Chapel, had written to contacts in Britain complaining of Checkley's aggressive attempts at proselytizing. Colman wrote to the staunchly latitudinarian Whig Bishop White Kennet, while Harris wrote directly to the Bishop of London informing him that Checkley had actively promoted the idea of the invalidity of dissenters' baptism which had been a nonjuring position during the reign of Anne.¹²⁵ The Whig bishops were especially sensitive to complaints of this nature following the high church disturbances caused by the Atterbury plot and trial. The Bishop of London addressed the complaints and wrote to Samuel Myles, the rector of King's Chapel, that he would consider any missionary propagating the argument of invalid dissenting baptism to be an 'enemy of the Church of England and the Protestant succession' and would 'deal with him accordingly.'¹²⁶ The prosecution of Checkley and the letter from the Bishop of London effectively put an end to the controversies propagated by the high church interest in New England. The high church party continued

¹²⁴ Slafter, *John Checkley*, i, 74.

¹²⁵ Harris to the Bishop of London, 22 June 1724, *FP*, vol 4, 117-121.

¹²⁶ Bishop of London to Samuel Myles, 21 September, 1724. *FP*, vol 4, 132.

to strive for pre-eminence in the affairs of King's Chapel but apart from a few minor instances, the public debates had subsided.

The twenty five years following the accession of Anne witnessed the growth of a remarkable interest regarding Jacobitism in New England. The on-going Jacobite threat in Britain was an integral aspect of a transatlantic political culture and, consequently, it affected the manner in which the people of New England responded to the local presence of Jacobitism. Although the immediate danger posed by an assertive Anglicanism in New England was not the eruption of a local Jacobite rebellion, fears that the steady growth of a high church party in the Church of England might eventually result in widespread disaffection towards the Hanoverian dynasty and a failure to uphold the protestant succession in lieu of a Stuart restoration, reminiscent of the ambivalence of many Anglicans in England towards the succession, were widespread. In Boston, the battle against the encroachment of a high church Anglican ideology was a battle against a transatlantic Jacobitism.

Newspapers, pamphlets, sermons, and letters illustrate the subtle evolution of religious and political ideas held by New England Congregationalists and their responses to the Jacobite threat. But the debates also demonstrate that those fears were rooted in local realities. The rise of a high church Anglicanism may not seem a credible Jacobite threat in the same manner as the rebellions of 1715 and 1745, but for Congregationalists the presence of crypto-Jacobite principles in New England associated with a high church party symbolised the first step towards disaffection to the protestant succession. As such, they were not responding to a distant British Jacobite menace. They were responding to the meaningful expression of a transatlantic cultural Jacobitism in their locality.

Conclusion

Over the past forty years, studies of Jacobitism have reshaped our understandings of late Stuart Britain. The persistence and penetration of Jacobite sympathies throughout British society illustrates a severe ideological divide in Britain in the early eighteenth century. This divide manifested itself in the partisan politics of the rage of party and religious disputes, both of which contributed to an increasingly vibrant Atlantic public sphere. Jacobitism was an enduring subculture, popular as well as elite, present in Scotland, England, Ireland, and the colonies. This subculture was ultimately rooted in disaffection to the Revolution settlement, and centred on high church and nonjuring ideas of divine right, passive obedience, non-resistance, and hereditary succession. The penetration of Jacobitism throughout all levels of society created a population hungry for the partisan prints made available within an emerging public sphere. Yet historians studying the British Atlantic colonies have yet to incorporate this new work into established narratives. Wrenched out of an Atlantic context well informed by recent advances in British history, accusations or expressions of Jacobitism make little sense and can appear as aberrations rather than signalling a transatlantic cultural continuity. Moreover, historians of colonial British America have contented themselves with simplistic portraits of highland, Catholic Jacobites or have regarded Jacobitism as a uniquely British phenomenon with minor transatlantic effects but no transatlantic analogues. Consequently, they have given little thought to Jacobitism as a transatlantic ideology or as a defining feature of a British political culture. This makes the evidence of accusations and prosecutions appear

isolated and fitful. However, a reinterpretation of the existing evidence in a larger Atlantic context illustrates aspects of a shared culture.

This thesis has demonstrated the existence and significance of Jacobitism in the British Atlantic World from 1688-1727 as part of a dynamic and multi-faceted transatlantic political culture. Even outwith the numerous rebellions and plots, Jacobitism persisted as an integral element of British political culture (England, Scotland, Ireland and the colonies) from 1688 throughout the eighteenth century. This was a period fraught with religious controversies and party driven political tensions which reverberated not just throughout England, Scotland, Ireland but also the numerous British Atlantic colonies.

British party politics were inherently connected to Jacobitism. Jacobites in England were often indistinguishable from high church Tories. Seditious words, riots, and the celebrations of Henry Sacheverell in England were all inflected with a mixture of high church Toryism and Jacobitism, a trend also observable in Britain's colonies. Moreover, Queen Anne passed an act of indemnity in 1703 allowing former Jacobite exiles the opportunity to integrate back into British political life. The returning Jacobites were almost exclusively Tories. This created an Jacobite wing of the Tory party, further impacting the political direction of the Tories. For example in 1714, due in large part to the intransigence of the Jacobite Tories, Harley's moderation was eschewed in favour of Bolingbroke's single party government, partly as a means of securing the return of 'James III & VIII'. Perhaps more importantly, the Jacobite wing of the Tory party created a (legitimate) perception throughout the British Atlantic that the Tory party was friendly to Jacobites and therefore, inseparable from Jacobitism.

The rage of party was a defining feature of British politics in the Age of Anne. As such, British colonists were forced to participate within the larger orbit of Whig and Tory politics. The appointment of governors was, in large part, a party affair. This encouraged the integration of British colonists into the rage of party. Chapter 1 showed how Tory opponents of Whig governors cultivated alliances among high church Tories in Britain, creating fears among Whigs of a transatlantic Jacobitism. These fears were further reinforced by the 1710-1714 Tory ministry's lacklustre response to complaints of Jacobitism in the colonies and the appointment of former Jacobites. A Jacobite-friendly Tory party does not mean that all high church Tories in the colonies were Jacobites, but nor were fears of Tory Jacobites a mere image or perception. Thus, transatlantic political controversies were inherently coloured by fears or hopes of a Jacobite restoration.

Religious controversies and political party divisions were inseparable. Many of the most prominent political fissures in England and Scotland were caused by a heady blend of politics and religion. Debates about occasional conformity in England and the toleration of Episcopalian worship in Scotland were inseparable from Whig and Tory party politics. High church Anglicans were essentially the clerical wing of the Tory party. Thus the politics of religion was a major source of controversy reflecting on the succession. Chapter 2 showed how these controversies were transplanted to the colonies by zealous Anglican ministers and parishioners, who though in the colonies, continued to participate in transatlantic debates. Moreover, the controversies were inherently linked to Jacobitism. The attempt to impose a Test Act in South Carolina was instigated by the high church Tory Jacobite Nathaniel Johnson, while religious controversies in the mid-

Atlantic were inflamed by John Talbot, a high church clergyman who would later accept ordination as a nonjuring Bishop.

Religious controversies were often rooted in or influenced by questions about the royal succession and the legitimacy of the Revolution settlement. The Revolution of 1688 fractured the English and Scottish churches, creating deep and lasting clerical and societal divisions. The accession of William and Mary drove a small but influential group of English clergy and laymen into the arms of the exiled Stuarts. An even more profound rupture occurred in Scotland creating a pool of men and women disaffected to the new monarchs and unwilling to swear oaths of allegiance. Nonjurors were inherently Jacobite, whether they openly canvassed Stuart restoration or not. These nonjurors provided and trumpeted the intellectual foundations for Jacobitism, including hereditary right, passive obedience and non-resistance; ideas which persisted among high churchmen throughout the eighteenth century. Thus the existence of nonjuring bishops in the colonies, intentionally sent by nonjurors in England, suggests transatlantic impact of the nonjuring movement.

Colonists were further integrated into British party politics and religious controversies via the emergence of a vibrant transatlantic public sphere. Colonists were kept apprised of the relationship between Jacobitism and political and religious controversies through the importation and reprinting of British newspapers and pamphlets. Furthermore, the maturation of indigenous print cultures in a number of colonies encouraged colonists to participate in these controversies as provincial Britons. The introduction of a contested political calendar by the Tory almanacker Daniel Leeds serves as a notable example. The migration of Jacobites and their settlement in local

communities reminded British colonists that the Jacobite threat was not merely imagined or distant but real and local. The settlement of Jacobites in the colonies also suggests the existence of an audience literate in elements of a Jacobite subculture. Therefore, seditious words, nonjuring, expressions of high church Toryism, and expressions of anti-Jacobitism need to be understood in terms of a transatlantic political and religious culture, and not only as isolated colonial examples of a British phenomenon.

Thus, when political and religious debates about occasional conformity and passive obedience erupted in South Carolina and New England respectively, or controversies between a Whig governor and an emergent high church Anglican party in the mid-Atlantic colonies resulted in accusations of Jacobitism or Toryism, Jacobitism or anti-Jacobitism became prominent features of the religious and political discourse. Colonists were not responding to a distant, British threat. They were reacting against what they understood to be a transatlantic Jacobitism. Thus, when these events and accusations are viewed and understood within the context of a British Atlantic World containing a transatlantic Jacobite subculture inextricably linked to high church Toryism, the fears and accusations become far more culturally significant.

Although expressions of Jacobitism in the colonies in the thirty-nine years following the Revolution of 1688 were often analogous to their counterparts in Britain, it would be a mistake to assume that the fate of Jacobitism and its persistence in British society were identical in the colonies. The practice of politics in many colonies was different than Westminster. The party driven political appointments of colonial officials which had done so much to encourage colonial participation in Whig and Tory party politics, effectively ended after the Tory proscription in 1715. This, in turn, discouraged

the continued growth of a budding Tory interest in many colonies. Though the Tory party persisted as a viable political movement in Britain¹, and it retained its close association with Jacobitism, the Tories' inability to secure power in Westminster allowed for Whig dominance of colonial appointments for the next forty-five years. Though Tories continued to exert influence in the colonies at least until 1722, the Atterbury plot and the resulting collapse of the Tory party was especially profound in the colonies. The aftermath of the Atterbury plot effectively sealed the fate of the Tory party and Jacobites in Britain for another generation. This resulted in decades of Whig hegemony in the colonies not possible in Britain. This effectually rendered Toryism in the colonies (in contrast to Britain) impotent after 1727. Further study might establish the existence of a continued transatlantic Jacobite subculture though many of the structural elements supporting the persistence of Jacobitism were in decline in the wake of the consequences of the Tory collapse after 1722.

This argument reinforces existing arguments positing the 'Anglicization' of Britain's colonies in the eighteenth century arguing that Jacobitism and anti-Jacobitism demonstrate the integrative influence of Britain's rage of party. Yet 'Anglicization' was incredibly complex and was the consequence not of an English Atlantic, but a British Atlantic. This necessarily included elements of Jacobitism and Toryism. Jacobitism and anti-Jacobitism persisted in political and religious discourses throughout the eighteenth century in the British Atlantic colonies. However, the colonies demonstrated an increasingly Whiggish understanding of the Jacobite threat through the eighteenth century. As the significance of the Jacobite threat declined, anti-Jacobitism gradually

¹ Colley, *In Defiance of Oligarchy*; Cruickshanks, *Political Untouchables*.

assumed a very different character than that exhibited in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Studies exploring the impact of the Jacobite rebellion of 1745 have demonstrated a profoundly Whiggish and loyalist response mixed with xenophobic anti-Scottish rhetoric.² Similar anti-Jacobite rhetoric and anti-Scottish rhetoric was employed by colonists against Lord Bute in the 1760s.³

What then are we ultimately to make of Jacobitism in the British Atlantic World in the Age of Anne? The conclusions of this study are far-reaching and myriad though two remain preeminent. It has, first and foremost, demonstrated that Jacobitism was an important aspect of the British Atlantic World for over thirty years following the Revolution of 1688 and in many respects, an integral aspect of a complex, dynamic, and multi-faceted process of 'Briticisation'. It should no longer be possible to ignore Jacobites in the colonies as some sort of cultural aberration. Although it is true that Jacobites were not actively plotting colonial rebellions or participating in transatlantic conspiracies to restore the exiled Stuarts, Jacobitism was part and parcel of a transatlantic British culture because it was a dominant feature of British political and religious discourse throughout the first half of the eighteenth century.

Secondly, the significance of Jacobitism in the British colonies suggests the vibrancy of political and religious exchanges in the British Atlantic World. As we increasingly appreciate the complexity and cultural depth of 'Anglicization' in Britain's Atlantic colonies, it becomes necessary to broaden our understanding of Britain to include the British Atlantic World. In recent years, historians of colonial America have made admirable advances by conceiving of the colonies in as part of an Atlantic world

² Hawkins, 'Imperial '45, 24-47; Plank, *Rebellion and Savagery*, 77-100.

³ McConville, *The King's Three Faces*, 264-266.

and incorporating scholarship examining the British Isles in order to revise traditional Whig narratives. British historians might also be well served by taking an Atlantic turn and envisioning the colonies as an integral part of early modern Britain. Thus, this thesis serves both as a call to British historians to think of their projects in larger terms and as an appeal to imperial and colonial historians to more actively embrace and engage with the diversity evident in British historical scholarship.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Manuscript Sources

National Archives of Scotland

Church Papers

NAS CH1/2/24/2/3

NAS CH1/2/35

Duke of Montrose Papers

GD220/5/253

GD220/5/1895

GD220/5/330

GD220/5/577

GD220/5/1910

GD220/5/455

GD220/6/1754

Episcopal Chest Papers

CH12/15/109

CH12/12/209

Miscellaneous Ecclesiastical Papers

CH8/196

Other

GD298/379

British Library

Add Mss 61647

Add Ms 36125

Egerton Mss 1971

Other manuscript collections consulted

Fulham Papers Colonial, Lambeth Palace Library (microfilm)

Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, Lambeth Palace Library (microfilm)

American material in the archives of the USPG, 1635-1812, Rhodes House Library (microfilm)

MS 2001, Lloyd Papers 1658-1910, Tilghman-Lloyd Collections, Maryland Historical Society (microfilm).

Benjamin Colman papers, 1641-1806, Massachusetts Historical Society (microfilm)

Livingston Family Papers, 1630-1901, Franklin D. Roosevelt Presidential Library (microfilm)

Printed Primary Sources

Archives of Maryland, Proceedings of the Council of Maryland, 1696/7-1698, vol 23, ed. by William Hand Brown (Baltimore, MD: Maryland Historical Society, 1903)

Archives of Maryland, Proceedings of the Council of Maryland, 1698-1731, vol 25, ed. by William Hand Brown, (Baltimore MD: Maryland Historical Society, 1905)

Archives of Maryland, Proceedings and Acts of the General Assembly of Maryland, April 26, 1715-August 10, 1716, vol. 30, ed. by William Hand Brown, (Baltimore, MD: Maryland Historical Society 1910)

Calendar of State Papers Colonial, America and West Indies, eds. W. Noel Sainsbury, J.W. Fortescue, and Cecil Headlam, 45 vols, (1860-1969)

Diary of Samuel Sewell, Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, vol VII (Boston, 1882)

Documents Relating to the Colonial History of the State of New Jersey, vol XIV (New Jersey Historical Society, 1880)

Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New-York procured in Holland, England, and France by John Romeyn Brodhead, vol 5, ed. by F.B. O'Callaghan, 15 vols (Albany, NY: Weed-Parsons, 1853)

Historical Collections Relating to the American Colonial Church, ed. William Stevens Perry, vol. 2 (New York: AMS Press, 1969)

Selected Letters of Cotton Mather, ed. Kenneth Silverman (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 1974)

The Correspondence of the Rev. Robert Wodrow, minister of Eastwood, and Author of the History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, ed. by Thomas McRie, 3 vols. (Edinburgh, 1842)

The Diary of Cotton Mather D.D., F.R.S., 1712, ed., William Manierre (Charlottesville VA, 1964)

The Life and Character of the Reverend Benjamin Colman, D.D.: Late Pastor of a Church in Boston, New England, ed. Ebenezer Turell (Boston, 1749)

The Papers of William Penn, ed. By Richard Dunn and Mary Maples Dunn *et. al.*, vol. III, 1685-1700 (University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986)

Printed Pamphlets and Newspapers

American Weekly Mercury

Boston News Letter

New England Courant

Daily Courant

[Anonymous], *An Abstract of the French King's Will* (Boston, 1715)

[Anonymous], *An account of the fair and impartial proceedings of the Lords proprietors, governour and council of the colony of South Carolina, in answer to the untrue suggestions, contained in the petition of Jos. Boon and others, and of a paper intituled, The case of the Church of England in Carolina* (London: 1706)

[Anonymous], *A Letter to the Clergy of the Church of England: On Occasion of the Commitment of the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Rochester to the Tower of London*, (London: Reprinted at Boston 1722)

[Anonymous], *A Modest Proof of the Order and Government of the Church as Settled by Christ and His Apostles* (Boston, 1723)

Bird, Benjamin, *The Jacobites Catechism*, (Boston, 1692), 1, 6; John Palmer, *An impartial account of the state of New England, or, The late government there, vindicated in answer to the Declaration which the faction set forth when they overturned that government* (London, 1690)

- Boyer, Abel, *The Reign of Queen Anne, Digested into Annals: Year the Fifth* (London, 1707)
- Checkley, John, *A Defence of a Book Lately reprinted at Boston, Entitled A Modest Proof of the Order and Government Settled by Christ and His Apostles in the Church* (Boston, 1724)
- [Checkley, John], *Choice Dialogues between a Godly Minister and an Honest Countryman Concerning Election and Predestination* (Boston, 1720)
- Clough, Samuel, *The New-England almanack for the year of our Lord, MDCCII* (Boston, 1702)
- Clough, Samuel, *The New-England, almanack for the year of our Lord, MDCCIII* (Boston, 1703)
- Clough, Samuel, *Clough's farewell, 1708. An almanack for the year of our Lord, (according to the common account) 1708* (Boston, 1708)
- Colman, Benjamin, *A brief enquiry into the reasons why the people of God have been wont to bring into their penitential confessions, the sins of their fathers and ancestors, in times long since past* (Boston, 1716)
- Colman, Benjamin, *A Thanksgiving Sermon for the Suppression of the Late Vile and Traiterous Rebellion in Great Britain* (Boston: 1716)
- Defoe, Daniel, *Party-tyranny: or, An occasional bill in miniature; As now practised in Carolina humbly offered to the consideration of both Houses of Parliament* (London: 1705)
- Defoe, Daniel, *The case of Protestant Dissenters in Carolina, shewing how a law to prevent occasional conformity there, has ended in the total subversion of the constitution in church and state. Recommended to the serious Consideration of all that are true Friends to our present Establishment* (London, 1706)
- Dickinson, Jonathan, *Remarks upon the Postscript to the Defence* (Boston, 1724)
- [Anonymous], *Gloria Britannorum: or The British Worthies* (Boston, 1723)
- [Gordon, William], *A Representation of the Miserable State of Barbadoes* (London, 1719),
- Gordon, William, *A Sermon Preached before the Governor and Council, & General Assembly of the Island of Barbadoes* (London, 1719)
- [King George I]. *His Majesty's most Gracious Speech to both Houses of Parliament, on Thursday October 11, 1722* (London, 1722)
- His Majesty's Most Gracious Speech to Both Houses of Parliament* (Boston, 1716)

- Holyoke, Edmund, *An almanack of the coelestial motions, aspects and eclipses, &c. for the year of the Christian aera, 1713* (Boston, 1713)
- Holyoke, Edmund, *An almanack of the coelestial motions, aspects and eclipses, for the year of the Christian aera, 1715* (Boston, 1715)
- Hunter, Robert, *Androboros: A biographical [sic] farce in three acts, viz. The senate, the consistory, and the apotheosis* (New York, 1714)
- Hunter, Robert, *His Excellencys Speech to the General Assembly of New York* (New York, 1715)
- [Anonymous], *Instructions by the Citizens of London, to their Representatives for the Ensuing Parliament* (Boston, 1715)
- Keith, George, *A journal of travels from New-Hampshire to Caratuck, On the Continent of North-America* (London: 1706)
- Leeds, Daniel, *The American Almanack for the Year of Christian Account, 1705* (New York: 1705)
- Leeds, Daniel, *The American Almanack for the Year of Christian Account, 1705* (New York: 1705)
- Leeds, Daniel, *The American Almanack for the Year of Christian Account, 1707* (New York: 1707)
- Leeds, Daniel, *The American Almanack for the Year of Christian Account, 1710* (New York, 1710)
- Leeds, Daniel, *The American Almanack for the Year of Christian Account, 1711* (New York, 1711)
- Leeds, Daniel, *The Great Mistery of Fox-Craft Discovered and the Quaker Plainness & Sincerity Demonstrated* (New York, 1705)
- Leeds, Daniel, *The Second Part of the Mystry of Fox-Craft* (New York, 1705)
- Leslie, Charles, *A Short and Easie Method with the Deists*, eighth ed. (London, 1723)
- Leslie, Charles, *The case of the regale and of the pontificat stated. In a conference concerning the independency of the Church, upon any Power on Earth, in the Exercise of Her Purely Spiritual Power and Authority* (London: 1701)
- Leslie, Charles, *The new association. Part II. &c. With farther improvements* (London: [1702?])
- Leslie, Charles, *The religion of Jesus Christ the only true religion, or, A short and easie method with the deists* (Boston: 1719)

- Mather, Cotton, *An History of Seasonable Interpositions; Specifically Relating to the Twice Memorable Fifth of November* (Boston, 1719)
- Mather, Increase, *Two discourses shewing, I. That the Lords ears are open to the prayers of the righteous. II. The dignity & duty of aged servants of the Lord* (Boston, 1716)
- Paine, Thomas, *An almanack of the coelestial motions, aspects and eclipses, &c. for the year of the Christian aera 1718* (Boston, 1718)
- Parker, George, *Parker's ephemeris for the year of our Lord 1707* (London, 1707)
- Parker, George, *Parker's Ephemeris for the year of our Lord 1711* (London, 1711)
- Parker, George, *Parker's Ephemeris for the year of our Lord 1712* (London, 1712)
- Parker, George, *Parker's Ephemeris for the year of our Lord 1713* (London, 1713)
- Pemberton, Ebenezer, *A brief account of the state of the province of the Massachusetts-Bay in New-England, civil and ecclesiastical* (Boston, 1717)
- Steele, Richard, *The Crisis; or, A Discourse Representing from the Most Authentick Records, the Just Causes of the Late Happy Revolution* (Philadelphia, 1725)
- [Anonymous], *The Case of the Church of England in Carolina* [London, c. 1706]
- [Anonymous], *The Madness of the Jacobite Party, in Attempting to Set a Popish Pretender on the British Throne* (Boston, 1724)
- The Report of the Committee of the Honble House of Commons: Appointed to inspect the examinations given in by Dominick Langton, clerck, Formerly a Fryar in this Kingdom* (Cork Hill, 1711)
- To the King's Most Excellent Majesty, The Humble Address of the Lord Mayor of London, and the rest of Your Majesty's Commissioners of Lieutenancy for Your City of London* (Boston: 1715)
- Travis, Daniel, *An almanack of the coelestial motions for the year of the Christian epocha 1707* (Boston, 1707)
- Travis, Daniel, *An almanack of the coelestial motions & aspects, for the year of the Christian aera, 1716* (Boston, 1716)
- Trott, Nicholas, *The Laws of the Province of South Carolina* (Charleston, South Carolina: 1736)
- Walter, Thomas, *A Choice Dialogue Between John Faustus a Conjuror, and Jack Tory his Friend.* (Boston, 1720)

Walter, Thomas, *An Essay Upon that Paradox, Infallibility may Sometimes Mistake. or, A Reply to A Discourse Concerning Episcopacy, Said in a Late Pamphlet to be Beyond the Possibility of a Reply. To Which is Prefixed, Some Remarks Upon said Pamphlet, Entitled, A Discourse Shewing, who is a True Pastor of the Church of Christ. As also Remarks upon St. Ignatius's Epistle to the Trallians* (Boston, 1724)

Whittemore, Nathaniel, *An almanack for the year of our Lord MDCCVI* (Boston, 1706)

Wigglesworth, Edward, *Sober remarks on a book lately re-printed at Boston, entituled, A modest proof of the order and government settled by Christ and his apostles in the church. In a letter to a friend.*, 2nd ed. (Boston, 1724)

[Welton, Richard], *The Clergy's Tears: or, a Cry Against Persecution. Humbly offered in a letter to the Bishop of London, in our Present great Distress and Danger* (London, 1715)

[Welton, Richard], *The Whole Tryal and Examination of Dr. Welton, Rector of White-Chapel and the Church-Wardens, on Monday Last, in the Bishop of London's court* (London, 1714)

[Welton, Richard], *The Certain Comforts of God the Holy Ghost, &c, Preached at the Episcopal Church in Philadelphia* (Philadelphia, 1726)

Secondary Works

'Some unpublished letters of Benjamin Colman, 1717-1725,' ed. by Niel Caplan, in *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, 77 (1965), 101-143

Alsop, J.D., 'Thomas Nairne and the 'Boston Gazette no. 216' of 1707,' in *Southern Studies*, 22 (1983), 209-211

Armitage, David, and Braddick, Michael eds., *The British Atlantic World, 1500-1800* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002)

Armitage, David, 'Greater Britain: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis?' in *The American Historical Review*, 104, (1999), 427-445

Armitage, David, 'The American Revolution in Atlantic Perspective,' in *The Oxford Handbook of the Atlantic World, c. 1450-1850*, ed. by Nicholas Canny and Phillip Morgan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 516-532

Armory, Hugh and Hall, David D., eds., *The Colonial Book in the Atlantic World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)

Bailyn, Bernard, *Atlantic History: Concept and Contours* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005)

- Bailyn, Bernard, *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1967)
- Bell, James, *A War of Religion: Dissenters, Anglicans and the American Revolution* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008)
- Bell, James, *The Imperial Origins of the King's Church in Early America, 1607-1783* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004)
- Beneke, Chris and Grenda, Christopher eds., *The First Prejudice: Religious Tolerance and Intolerance in Early America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011)
- Beneke, Chris, *Beyond Toleration: The Religious Origins of American Pluralism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006)
- Bennett, G.V., *Tory Crisis in Church and State, 1688-1730: The Career of Francis Atterbury, Bishop of Rochester* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975)
- Bennett, G.V., *White Kennett: Bishop of Peterborough, A Study in the Political and Ecclesiastical History of the Early Eighteenth Century* (London: Church Historical Society, 1957)
- Bennett, J. Harry, 'The S.P.G. and Barbadian Politics, 1710-1720,' in *The Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, 20 (Jan, 1951), 190-206
- Black, Jeremy ed., *Britain in the Age of Walpole* (London: St. Martin's Press, 1984)
- Black, Jeremy, *British Foreign Policy in the Age of Walpole* (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1985), 138-159
- Black, Jeremy, *The English press, 1621-1861* (London: Sutton Publishing, 2001)
- Bonomi, Patricia, *A Factious People: Politics and Society in Colonial New York* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1971)
- Bonomi, Patricia, *The Lord Cornbury Scandal: The Politics of Reputation in British America* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1998)
- Bonomi, Patricia, *Under the Cope of Heaven: Religion, Society, and Politics in Colonial America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986)
- Bowie, Karin, *Scottish Public Opinion and the Anglo-Scottish Union 1699-1707* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2007)
- Breen, T.H., 'An Empire of Goods: The Anglicization of Colonial America, 1690-1776,' in *The Journal of British Studies*, 25 (1986), 467-499.
- Brewer, John, *Pleasures of the Imagination, English Culture in the Eighteenth Century* (London: Routledge Press, 1997)

- Brewer, John, *Sinews of Power: War, Money, and the English State, 1677-1783* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988)
- Bridenbaugh, Carl, *Cities in the Wilderness: The First Century of Urban Life in America, 1625-1742* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955)
- Bridenbaugh, Carl, *Mitre and Scepter: Transatlantic Faiths, Ideas, Personalities, and Politics, 1689-1775* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962)
- Brinsfield, John W., 'Daniel Defoe: Writer, Statesman, and Advocate of Religious Liberty in South Carolina,' in *The South Carolina Historical Magazine*, 76 (1973), 107-111
- Brinsfield, John, *Religion and Politics in Colonial South Carolina*, (Easley, SC: The Southern Historical Press, 1983)
- Broxap, Henry, *The Later Non-Jurors* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1924)
- Brydon, George McClaren, *Virginia's Mother Church and the Political Conditions Under which it Grew* (Richmond, VA: Virginia Historical Society, 1947)
- Buranelli, Vincent, *The King and the Quaker: A Study of William Penn and James II* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1962)
- Burnard, Trevor, 'The British Atlantic', in *Atlantic History: A Critical Appraisal*, eds Jack P. Greene and Phillip Morgan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009)
- Burr, Nelson R., *The Anglican Church in New Jersey* (Philadelphia: The Church Historical Society, 1954)
- Bushman, Richard, *King and People in Provincial Massachusetts* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985)
- Butler, Jon, *Awash in a Sea of Faith: Christianizing the American People* (Harvard University Press, 1990)
- Butterfield, Herbert, *The Whig Interpretation of History* (London: G. Bell and Sons, 1931)
- Canny, Nicholas and Morgan, Phillip eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the Atlantic World, c. 1450-1850* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011)
- Capp, Bernard, *Astrology and the Popular Press: English Almanacs, 1500-1800* (London: Faber and Faber, 1979)
- Carney, Thomas E., 'A Tradition to Live By: New York Religious History, 1624-1740,' *New York History*, 85 (2004), 301-330

- Chaplin, Joyce, 'The British Atlantic,' in *The Oxford Handbook of the Atlantic World, c. 1450-1850*, ed. by Nicolas Canny and Phillip Morgan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 219-234
- Clark, Charles, 'Periodicals and Politics: Part One: Early American Journalism: News and Opinion in the Popular Press,' in *A History of the Book in America vol 1: The Colonial Book in the Atlantic World* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010)
- Clark, Charles, *The Public Prints: The Newspaper in Anglo-American Culture, 1665-1740* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994)
- Clark, J.C.D., *English Society, 1660-1832, Religion, Ideology, and Politics During the Ancien Regime*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)
- Clark, J.C.D., *Revolutions and Rebellions: State and Society in England in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986)
- Clark, J.C.D., *The Language of Liberty, 1660-1832: Political Discourse and the Social Dynamics in the Anglo-American World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)
- Clarke, Tristram, 'Nurseries of Sedition'?: The Episcopal Congregations After the Revolution of 1689,' in *After Columba, After Calvin: Religious Communities in North-East Scotland*, ed. By James Porter (Aberdeen, 1999), 61-69
- Claydon, Tony and McBride, Ian, eds. *Protestantism and National Identity, c. 1650-1850* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998)
- Claydon, Tony, *William III and the Godly Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996)
- Colley, Linda, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837*, 2nd ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press: 2005)
- Colley, Linda, *In Defiance of Oligarchy, 1714-1760* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982)
- Conroy, David, *In Public Houses: Drink and the Revolution of Authority in Colonial Massachusetts* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995)
- Corp, Edward, ed., *The Stuart Court in Rome: The legacy of Exile* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing CO., 2003)
- Cowan, Brian, 'Geoffrey Holmes and the Public Sphere: Augustan Historiography from the Post-Namierite to the Post-Habermasian' in *Parliamentary History*, 28 (2009), 166-78

- Cowan, Brian, 'The Spin Doctor: Sacheverell's Trial Speech and Political Performance in a Divided Society', in *Parliamentary History*, 31 (2012), 28-46
- Cowan, Brian, *The Social Life of Coffee: The Emergence of the British Coffeehouse* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005)
- Cranfield, G. A., *The Development of the Provincial Newspaper, 1700-1760* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962)
- Crawford, Michael J., *Seasons of Grace: Colonial New England's Revival Tradition in Its British Context* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991)
- Cruickshanks, Eveline, 'Religion and Royal Succession: The Rage of Party', in *Britain in the First Age of Party, 1680-1750: Essays Presented to Geoffrey Holmes*, ed. by Clyde Jones (London: Hambledon Press, 1987), 19-44
- Cruickshanks, Eveline, ed. *By Force of Default: The Revolution of 1688-1689* (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1989).
- Cruickshanks, Eveline, ed. *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1759* (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1982)
- Cruickshanks, Eveline, *Political Untouchables: The Tories and the '45* (New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, Inc., 1979)
- Cruickshanks, Eveline, *The Glorious Revolution* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000)
- Dalcho, Fredrick, *An Historical Account of the Protestant Episcopal Church in South Carolina, From the First Settlement of the Province to the War of the Revolution* (Charleston, S.C.: E. Thayer, 1820)
- Dickinson, H.T., *Liberty and Property: Political Ideology in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (New York: Holmes and Meier Publishers, 1977)
- Dickinson, H.T., *Bolingbroke* (London: Constable, 1970)
- Dobson, David, *Directory of Scots Banished to the American Plantations, 1650-1775*, 2nd ed. (Baltimore, MD: Clearfield, 2010)
- David Dobson, *Scottish Emigration to Colonial America* (University of Georgia Press, 1994)
- Dobson, David, *Scots on the Chesapeake, 1607-1830* (Baltimore, MD: Genealogical Publishing, 1992)
- Duffy, Christopher, *The '45* (London: Cassell Military, 2003)

- Dunn, Richard, 'The Glorious Revolution and America,' in *The Oxford History of the British Empire, vol 1, The Origins of Empire: British Overseas Enterprise to the Close of the Seventeenth Century*, ed. by Nicholas Canny (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 445-466
- Every, George, *The High Church Party, 1688-1718* (London: The Church Historical Society, 1956)
- Fischer, David Hackett, *Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways in America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989)
- Flanagan, John, 'The Occasional Conformity Controversy: Ideology and Party Politics, 1697-1711,' in *The Journal of British Studies*, 17 (1977), 38-62
- Foote, Henry Wilder, *Annals of Kings Chapel: From the Puritan Age of New England to the Present Day* (Boston, 1882)
- Foster, Stephen, *The Long Argument: English Puritanism and the shaping of New England culture, 1570-1700* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991)
- Fritz, Paul, *The English Ministers and Jacobitism Between the Rebellions of 1715 and 1745* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975)
- Fry, Michael, *The Scottish Empire* (East Lothian: Tuckwell Press, 2001)
- Games, Alison, 'Migration', in *The British Atlantic World, 1600-1800*, ed by David Armitage and Michael Braddick (Basingstoke, 2006)
- Geiter, Mary, 'William Penn and Jacobitism: A Smoking Gun?' in *Historical Research*, 73 (2000), 213-219
- Gibson, William, *The Church of England 1688-1832: Unity and Accord* (London: Routledge, 2001)
- Glasson, Travis, *Mastering Christianity: Missionary Anglicanism and Slavery in the Atlantic World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012)
- Glickman, Gabriel, *The English Catholic Community, 1688-1745: Politics, Culture, and Ideology* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2009)
- Goldie, Mark, 'The Nonjurors, Episcopacy, and the Origins of the Convocation Controversy', in *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1759* ed by Eveline Cruickshanks (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1982), 15-35
- Goodfried, Joyce, *Before the Melting Pot: Society and Culture in Colonial New York City, 1664-1730* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992)

- Gould, Eliga H., 'Revolution and Counter Revolution,' in *The British Atlantic World, 1500-1800*, ed. by David Armitage and Michael Braddick (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002)
- Grasso, Christopher, *A Speaking Aristocracy: Transforming Discourse in Eighteenth Century Connecticut* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999)
- Greene, Jack P., 'Empire and Identity from the Glorious Revolution to the America Revolution,' in *Oxford History of the British Empire*, vol 2, ed. by P.J. Marshall (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 208-230
- Greene, Jack P. and Morgan Phillip, *Atlantic History: A Critical Appraisal* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009)
- Greene, Jack P., *Peripheries and Center: Constitutional Development in the Extended Politics of the British Empire and the United States* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1986)
- Gregory, Jeremy, 'Refashioning Puritan New England: The Church of England in British North America, c. 1680-1770,' in *Transactions of the RHS*, 20 (2010), 85-112
- Gregory, Jeremy, 'Transatlantic Anglican Networks, c. 1680-c.1770: Transplanting, Translating and Transforming the Church of England,' in *International Religious Networks*, ed. by Jeremy Gregory and Hugh McLeod (Woodbridge: Ecclesiastical History Society, 2012)
- Habermas, Jurgen, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere, An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, trans. Thomas Burger (Boston: MIT Press, 1989)
- Hardy, Beatriz Betancourt, 'A Papist in a Protestant Age: The Case of Richard Bennett, 1667-1749,' in *The Journal of Southern History*, 60 (1994), 203-228
- Harris, Bob, *Politics and the Rise of the Press: Britain and France, 1620-1800* (London, Routledge, 1997)
- Harris, Tim, *Politics Under the Later Stuarts: Party Conflict in a Divided Society, 1660-1715* (London: Longman, 1993)
- Harris, Tim, *Revolution: The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720* (London: Penguin Books, 2007)
- Hayton, D.W., 'Irish Tories and Victims of Whig Persecution: Sacheverell Fever by Proxy,' in *Parliamentary History*, 31 (2012), 80-98
- Hayton, David, 'Traces of Party Politics in Early Eighteenth-Century Scottish Elections,' in *Parliamentary History*, 16 (1996), 74-99

- Hayton, David, *Ruling Ireland, 1685-1742: Politics, Politicians, and Parties* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2004)
- Hill, Christopher, *The Century of Revolution, 1603-1714*, 2nd ed. (London: Routledge, 1980)
- Hill, Christopher, *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English Revolution* (London: Maurice Temple Smith Ltd., 1972)
- Hills, George Morgan, *A History of the Church in Burlington, New Jersey: Comprising the Facts and Incidents of Nearly Two-Hundred Years, From Original, Contemporaneous Sources* (Trenton, NJ: W.S. Sharpt Print Co, 1885)
- Hoffman, Ronald, *Princes of Ireland, Planters of Maryland: A Carroll Saga, 1500-1782* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000)
- Hogue, William, 'The Religious Conspiracy Theory of the American Revolution: Anglican Motive,' in *Church History*, 45 (1976), 277-292
- Holmes, Geoffrey, *British Politics in the Age of Anne*, revised ed., (London: The Hambledon Press, 1987)
- Holmes, Geoffrey, *The Making of a Great Power: Late Stuart and Early Georgian Britain, 1660-1722* (London: Longman Group, 1993)
- Holmes, Geoffrey, *The Trial of Dr. Sacheverell* (London: Eyre Methuen, 1973)
- Hoppit, Julian, *A Land of Liberty?: England 1689-1727* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000)
- Ihalainen, Pasi, 'Preaching in an Age of Party Strife, 1700-1720: Contributions to the Conflict,' in *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, ed. by Peter McCullough, Hugh Adlington, and Emma Rhatigan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 495-513
- Jannuzzi, Lawrence R., 'And Let All the People Say Amen': Priests, Presbyters, and the Arminian Uprising in Massachusetts, 1717-1724,' in *Historical Journal of Massachusetts*, 27 (1999), 1-27.
- Johnson, Richard, *Adjustment to Empire: The New England Colonies, 1675-1715* (Leister: Leister University Press, 1981), 136-182.
- Juster, Susan, 'Heretics, Blasphemers, and Sabbath Breakers: The Prosecution of Religious Crime in Early America,' in *The First Prejudice: Religious Tolerance and Intolerance in Early America*, ed. by Chris Beneke and Christopher Grenda (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011).
- Kammen, Michael G., *Colonial New York: A History* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1975)

- Keith, Charles P., 'Sir William Keith', in *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, XII (1888), 1-33
- Kemmerer, Donald, *The Path to Freedom: The Struggle for Self-Government in Colonial New Jersey, 1703-1776* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1940)
- Kenyon, John, *The History Men: The Historical Profession in England since the Renaissance*, 2nd ed. (London: Weidenfield and Nicolson, Ltd, 1993)
- Kidd, Colin, 'Religious Realignment Between the Restoration and the Union,' in *A Union For Empire: Political Thought and the Union of 1707*, ed. by John Robertson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 145-168
- Kidd, Thomas S., *The Protestant Interest: New England After Puritanism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004)
- Knights, Mark, 'How Rational was the Later Stuart Public Sphere,' in *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England*, eds., Peter Lake and Steven Pincus (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), 252-267
- Knights, Mark, 'Introduction: The View From 1710' in *Parliamentary History*, 31 (2012), 1-15
- Knights, Mark, *Representation and Misrepresentation in Later-Stuart Britain: Partisanship and Political Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005)
- Knights, Mark, 'The Tory Interpretation of History in the Rage of Parties,' in *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, 68 (2005), 353-373
- Lake, Peter and Pincus, Steven, eds. *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007)
- Landsman, Ned, 'Roots, Routes, and Rootedness: Diversity, Migration, and Toleration in Mid-Atlantic Pluralism,' in *Early American Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 2 (2004), 267-309
- Landsman, Ned, *Crossroads of Empire: The Middle Colonies in British North America* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2010)
- Landsman, Ned, *From Colonials to Provincials: American Thought and Culture, 1680-1760* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1997)
- Langford, Paul, *A Polite and Commercial People: England 1727-1783* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992)
- Lemay, J.A. Leo, 'Francis Knapp: A Red Herring in Colonial Poetry,' in *The New England Quarterly*, 39 (1966), 233-237

- Lenman, Bruce, 'The Scottish Episcopal Clergy' in *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1759*, ed. Eveline Cruickshanks (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1982), 36-48
- Lenman, Bruce, *The Jacobite Risings in Britain, 1689-1746* (New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers Inc., 1980)
- Little, Thomas J., 'The Origins of Southern Evangelicalism: Revivalism in South Carolina, 1700-1740, in *Church History*, 75 (2006), 768-808
- Lovejoy, David, *The Glorious Revolution in America* (New York: Harper & Row, 1972)
- Lustig, Mary Lou, *Privilege and Prerogative: New York's Provincial Elite, 1710 – 1776* (London: Associated University Presses, 1995)
- Lustig, Mary Lou, *Robert Hunter, 1666-1734: A New York Augustan Statesman* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1983)
- Macinnes, Allen, 'Jacobitism in Scotland: Episodic Cause or National Movement?', in *The Scottish Historical Review*, 86 (2007), 225-252
- MacKenzie, John M., 'Irish, Scottish, Welsh, and English Worlds? A Four-Nation Approach to the History of the British Empire,' in *History Compass*, 6 (2008), 1244-1263.
- McConville, Brendan, *The King's Three Faces: The Rise and Fall of Royal America, 1688-1776* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2006)
- McConville, Brendan, *These Daring Disturbers of the Public Peace: The Struggle for Property and Power in Early New Jersey* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1999)
- McLynn, Frank, *Crime and Punishment in Eighteenth Century England* (London: Routledge Press, 1989)
- McLynn, Frank, *France and the Jacobite Rising of 1745* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1981).
- Miller, Perry, *The New England Mind: From Colony to Province* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1953)
- Monod, Paul, *Jacobitism and the English People, 1688-1788* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989)
- Monod, Paul, 'Dangerous Merchandize: Smuggling, Jacobitism, and Commercial Culture in Southeast England, 1690-1760, in *Journal of British Studies*, 30 (1991), 150-182

- Monod, Paul, 'Pierre's White Hat: Theatre, Jacobitism and Popular Protest in London, 1689-1760,' in *By Force or Default?: The Revolution of 1688-89*, ed. Eveline Cruickshanks (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1989), 159-189
- Monod, Paul, 'The Jacobite Press and English Censorship, 1689-1695', in *The Stuart Court in Exile, and the Jacobites* (London: Hambledon Press, 1995), 125-142
- Monod, Paul, Pittock Murray, and Szechi Daniel, ed., *Loyalty and Identity: Jacobites at Home and Abroad* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010)
- Murdoch, Steve, 'Tilting at Windmills: The Order del Toboso as a Jacobite Social Network,' in *Loyalty and Identity: Jacobites at Home and Abroad*, ed. By Paul Monod, Murray Pittock, and Daniel Szechi (Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2010)
- Murdoch, Steve, *Network North: Scottish Kin, Commercial and Covert Associations in Northern Europe, 1603-1746* (Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, 2006), 313-348;
- Namier, Sir Lewis, *The Structure of Politics at the Accession of George III*, 2nd ed (London: Palgrave Macmillan: 1957)
- Nelson, John, *A Blessed Company: Parishes, Parsons, and Parishioners in Anglican Virginia, 1690-1776* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001)
- Nichols, John, *Illustrations of the Literary History of the Eighteenth Century Consisting of Authentic Memoirs and Original Letters of Eminent Persons*, vol. IV (London: Nichols, Son, & Bentley, 1818)
- Nicholson, Eirwen, 'Revirescit': The exilic origins of the Stuart oak motif', in *The Stuart Court in Rome: The Legacy of Exile*, ed, Edward Corp (Basingstoke, 2003), 25-48
- O'Ciardha, Eamon, *Ireland and the Jacobite Cause, 1685-1766: A Fatal Attachment* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2002)
- O'Connor, Thomas, ed., *The Irish in Europe, 1580-1815* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2001)
- Olson, Alison G., 'Governor Robert Hunter and the Anglican Church in New York,' in *Statesmen, Scholars, and Merchants: Essays in Eighteenth Century History Presented to Dame Lucy Sutherland*, ed. By Anne Whiteman, J.S. Bromley, and P.G.M. Dickson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973)
- Olson, Alison Gilbert and Brown Richard Maxwell, ed., *Anglo-American Political Relations, 1675-1775* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1970)
- Olson, Alison Gilbert, *Anglo-American Politics, 1660-1775: The Relationship Between Parties in England and Colonial America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973)

- Olson, Alison Gilbert, *Making the Empire Work: London and American Interest Groups, 1690-1790* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992)
- Parker, Anthony, *Scottish Highlanders in Colonial Georgia: The Recruitment, Emigration, and Settlement at Darien, 1735-1748* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1997)
- Pennington, Edgare, *Apostle of New Jersey: John Talbot, 1645-1727* (Trenton, NJ: Church Historical Society, 1938)
- Pestana, Carla Gardina, *Protestant Empire: Religion and the Making of the British Atlantic World* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009)
- Petrie, Sir Charles, *The Jacobite Movement: The First Phase, 1688-1715* (New York: Macmillan, 1948)
- Pincus, Steve, 'Coffee Politicians Does Create,' Coffeehouses and Restoration Political Culture,' in *The Journal of Modern History*, 67 (1995), 807-834
- Pincus, Steve, 'Addison's Empire: Whig Conceptions of Empire in the Early 18th Century,' in *Parliamentary History*, 31 (2012), 99-117
- Pincus, Steve, 'Rethinking Mercantilism: Political Economy, the British Empire, and the Atlantic World in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries,' in *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 69 (2012), 3-34
- Pittock, Murray, 'Treacherous Objects: Towards a Theory of Jacobite Material Culture,' in *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 34 (2011), 39-63
- Pittock, Murray, *Jacobitism* (London: St. Martin's Press, 1998)
- Pittock, Murray, *The Myth of the Jacobite Clans: The Jacobite Army in 1745*, 2nd edition (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009)
- Plank, Geoffrey, *An Unsettled Conquest: The British Campaign Against Acadia* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001)
- Plank, Geoffrey, *Rebellion and Savagery: The Jacobite Rising of 1745 and the British Empire* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006)
- Plumb, J.H., *The Growth of Political Stability, 1675-1725* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1967)
- Pocock, J.G.A., 'British History: A Plea for a New Subject,' in *The Journal of Modern History*, 47 (1975), 601-621
- Pomfret, John, *Colonial New Jersey: A History* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1973)

- Purcell, Richard J., 'Irish Colonists in Colonial Maryland' in *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review*, 23 (1934) 279-294
- Raffe, Alisdair, 'Presbyterians and Episcopalians: the Formation of Confessional Cultures in Scotland, 1660-1715,' *English Historical Review*, 125 (2010), 570-598
- Raymond, Joad, *News Newspapers, and Society in Early Modern Britain* (London: Frank Cass, 1999)
- Reeves, Thomas C., 'John Checkley and the Emergence of the Episcopal Church in New England', in *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, 34 (1965), 349-360
- Rhoden, Nancy, *Revolutionary Anglicanism: the Colonial Church of England Clergy during the American Revolution* (Basingstoke, Macmillan Press, 1999)
- Richards, James, *Party Propaganda under Queen Anne: The General Elections of 1702-1713* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1972)
- Rogers, Nicholas, *Crowds, Culture, and Politics in Georgian Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998)
- Roper, L.H., 'Conceiving and Anglo-American Proprietorship: Early South Carolina History in Perspective,' in *Constructing Early Modern Empires: Proprietary Ventures in the Atlantic World, 1500-1750*, edited by L.H. Roper and B. Van Ruymbeke (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill NV, 2007), 389-410
- Roper, L.H., *Conceiving Carolina, Proprietors, Planters, and Plots, 1662-1729* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004)
- Runcie, John D., 'The Problem of Anglo American Politics in Bellomont's New York', *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 26 (1969), 191-217
- Salinger, Sharon, *Tavern and Drinking in Early America* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002)
- Sankey, Mararet, *Jacobite Prisoners of the 1715 Rebellion: Preventing and Punishing Insurrection in Early Hanoverian Britain* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Co., 2005)
- Shields, David S., *Civil Tongues and Polite Letters in British America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997)
- Shields, David S., *Oracles of Empire: Poetry, Politics, and Commerce in British America, 1690-1750* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990)
- Sirmans, Eugene, *Colonial South Carolina: A Political History, 1663-1763* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1966)

- Slafter, Edmund, *John Checkley; Or the Evolution of Religious Tolerance in Massachusetts Bay*, 2 vols. (Boston: The Prince Society, 1897)
- Sloan, David, 'The New England Courant: Voice of Anglicanism, The Role of Religion in Colonial Journalism,' in *American Journalism*, 8 (1991), 108-14
- Smith, S.D., *Slavery, Family, and Gentry Capitalism in the British Atlantic: The World of the Lascelles, 1648-1834* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006)
- Sowerby, Scott, 'Opposition to Anti-Popery in Restoration England,' in *Journal of British Studies*, 51 (2012), 26-49
- Spaeth, Donald, *The Church in an Age of Danger: Parsons and Parishioners, 1660-1740* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)
- Speck, W.A., 'The Current State of Sacheverell Scholarship,' in *Parliamentary History*, 31 (2012), 16-27
- Speck, *The Birth of Britain: A New Nation, 1701-1710* (Oxford: Blackwell Press, 1994)
- Speck, W.A., *Tory and Whig: The Struggle in the Constituencies, 1701-1715* (London: Macmillan, 1970)
- Stanwood, Owen, 'Catholics, Protestants, and the Clash of Civilizations in Early America,' in *The First Prejudice: Religious Tolerance and Intolerance in Early America*, eds. Chris Beneke and Christopher Grenda (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011), 218-240
- Stanwood, Owen, 'The Protestant Moment: Antipopery, the Revolution of 1688-1689, and the Making of an Anglo-American Empire,' in the *Journal of British Studies*, 46 (July 2007), 481-508
- Stanwood, Owen, *The Empire Reformed: English America in the Age of the Glorious Revolution* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011)
- Starkie, Andrew, *The Church of England and the Bangorian Controversy, 1716-1721* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007)
- Steele, Ian K., 'The Anointed, the Appointed, and the Elected: Governance of the British Empire, 1689-1784', in *The Oxford History of the British Empire, vol II, The Eighteenth Century*, ed. by P. J. Marshall (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 105-127
- Steele, Ian K., *Politics of Colonial Policy: The Board of Trade in Colonial Administration, 1696-1720* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968)
- Steele, Ian K., *The English Atlantic, 1675-1740: An Exploration of Communication and Community* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986)

- Stowell, Marion Barber, *Early American Almanacs: The Colonial Weekday Bible* (New York: Burt Franklin, 1977)
- Szechi, Daniel, *1715: The Great Jacobite Rebellion* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006)
- Szechi, Daniel, *George Lockhart of Carnwath, 1689-1727: A Study in Jacobitism* (East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 2002)
- Szechi, Daniel, *Jacobitism and Tory Politics, 1710-1714* (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1984)
- Szechi, Daniel, *The Jacobites: Britain and Europe, 1688-1788* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994)
- Tapsell, Grant, ed., *The Later Stuart Church, 1660-1714*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013)
- The History of Parliament: The House of Commons, 1715-1754*, ed., Romney Sedgwick, 2 volumes (London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1970)
- Thompson, E.P., *Whigs and Hunters: The Origins of the Black Act* (New York: Penguin Books, 1975)
- Thompson, Peter, *Rum Punch and Revolution: Taverngoing & Public Life in Eighteenth Century Philadelphia* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999)
- Trevelyan, G.M., *England Under Queen Anne: The Peace and the Protestant Succession* (London: Fontana Library, 1965)
- Trevelyan, G.M., *England Under the Stuarts: The Political, Constitutional, and Social History of England in the Seventeenth Century*, 2nd ed. (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1960)
- Trevelyan, G.M., *The English Revolution, 1688-1689* (London: Taylor & Francis, 1938)
- Trevelyan, G.M., *England Under Queen Anne: Ramillies and the Union with Scotland* (London: Fontana Library, 1965)
- Tucker, Bruce, 'The Reinvention of New England, 1691-1770,' in *The New England Quarterly*, 59 (1986), 315-340
- Vallance, Edward, *The Glorious Revolution: 1688: Britain's Fight for Liberty* (London: Abacus, 2007)

- Voorhees, David William, ‘to assert our Right before it be quite lost’,: The Leisler Rebellion in the Delaware River Valley, *Pennsylvania History*, 64 (1997), 5-27
- Voorhees, David William, ‘The ‘Fervent Zeale’ of Jacob Leisler,’ in *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 51 (1994), 447-472
- Waller, George, *Samuel Vetch, Colonial Enterpriser* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1960)
- Walsh, John, Hayton, David, and Taylor Stephen eds., *The Church of England c.1689-1833, From Toleration to Tractarianism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993)
- Warner, Michael, *The Letters of the Republic: Publication and the Public Sphere in Eighteenth Century America* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990)
- Webb, Stephen Saunders, *Marlborough’s America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013)
- Weir, Robert, ‘‘Shaftsbury’s Darling’: British Settlement in The Carolinas at the Close of the Seventeenth Century,’ in the *Oxford History of the British Empire*, vol. 1, ed. by Nicholas Canny (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998)
- Weir, Robert, *Colonial South Carolina: A History* (Millwood, NY: KTO Press, 1983)
- Wendel, Thomas, ‘Jacobitism Crushed: An Episode Concerning Loyalty and Justice in Colonial Pennsylvania,’ in *Pennsylvania History*, 40 (1973), 58-65
- Wills, Rebecca, *The Jacobites and Russia, 1715-1750* (East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 2002)
- Woolverton, John, *Colonial Anglicanism in North America* (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1976)
- Wright, David McCord, ‘Mr. Ash – A Footnote in Constitutional History,’ in *South Carolina Historical Magazine*, 63 (1962), 227-231

Unpublished Theses

- Murrin, John M. ‘Anglicizing and American Colony: The Transformation of Provincial Massachusetts’ (Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, Yale University, 1966)

Websites

- Bell, James, *Colonial American Clergy of the Church of England Database*, Jamesbbell.com