
The title of Clare Jackson’s new book, Restoration Scotland, 1660-1690, is deceptive. The work is not a survey, nor does it attempt to be one. It is, rather, a well-defined, closely-argued academic monograph. The title appears to be an editorial choice intended to give a small-market volume a broadened appeal. It is a pleasure, then, to discover that Restoration Scotland is not another chronologically-driven and fairly predictable account of the “killing times” and Presbyterian resistance. Jackson has attempted something far more important, illuminating, and unlikely: “the first full reconstruction of late seventeenth century Scottish intellectual culture” (1).

The first task for such a reconstruction is to demonstrate that there actually was a Scottish intellectual culture in the late seventeenth century. The period has been maligned by several historiographical schools: from Presbyterian apologists like Robert Wodrow to those who look ahead to 1707 and celebrate the transformative effect of the Union on Scotland, while denigrating the seventeenth century as a point of departure. The combined effect of these detractors has been an orthodoxy, “a perceived background of unremitting government oppression and widespread popular distress [that] rendered the very notion of Restoration Scottish intellectual culture a contradiction in terms” (4). Given such an orthodoxy, Jackson proclaims herself a revisionist, advancing a very different image of late seventeenth century Scots debate.

To construct this vision, Jackson has ventured beyond the corpus of traditional sources. Although political participation was severely restricted, Jackson finds that political interest nevertheless was widespread, and an informed, literate, Bible-quoting and argumentative people stood ready and willing to debate their leaders. This increased depth of discussion suggests that intellectual culture will be found outside the Privy Council and Parliament. Accordingly, Jackson’s sources embrace a range of innovative ma-
terial: “anonymous political memoranda, sermon notebooks, manuscript legal depositions, private correspondence, commonplace-book reflections, diary entries and bardic poetry” as well as “devotional writings, moral and natural philosophy, legal theory and imaginative literature” (216, 8). Surprisingly well represented here are the ideas of lawyers and the legal community, especially two successive Lord Advocates: the absolutist Sir George MacKenzie of Rosehaugh and his constitutionalist colleague Sir James Steuart of Goodtrees. Similarly surprising are some of the concepts Jackson assumes as a starting-point: “ecclesiastical erastianism and religious adiaphorism” along with political pagmatism. None of these are compatible with popular accounts of “the killing times,” which generally careen between nonconformist fanatics and order-obsessed martinets. Jackson’s revisionism, then, gives us what must be considered a more plausible seventeenth century.

If Restoration-era Scottish intellectual culture produced any points of general consensus, the first must be royalism. Indeed, Scottish national identity was inextricably bound up in Scotland’s ancient dynasty and monarchical tradition and the trauma of the mid-century wars and conquest only cemented loyalty to the Stuarts and the civil order that was restored with them. Beyond the near-universal maxim that identified the monarch as “the political authority to whom obligation was owed,” though, lay significant theoretical debate. Some—like MacKenzie—argued for absolutism as a bulwark against civil disorder. Others contested the crown’s supremacy to the law, while dismissing any suggestion that arguments for legal limits to kingly authority necessarily encouraged resistance. Still others referred to ancient precedent and asserted the contractual nature of the Scottish crown. Resistance theorists, thin on the ground in 1660, grew more vocal in the 1670s and 80s. When opposition did appear, it usually focused on Charles II’s Scottish Secretary and High Commissioner, John Maitland, Duke of Lauderdale. Charles and Lauderdale restrained potential opposition through infrequent Parliaments and skillful, if heavy-handed political management. In the absence of Parliaments, Charles II found it convenient to govern Scotland through Royal proclama-
tion, a legal if unpopular gambit that James II would employ with disastrous consequences.

Though her revisionist stance might disincline Jackson to treat the religious divide in the traditional way, any history of the period must address the issue of Episcopacy and Presbyterian non-conformity. Jackson shows how the restored bishops squandered their opportunity and failed to establish any Scriptural or popular mandate. The established Church remained, beloved only to the regime as a political device. Presbyterians were themselves divided between extremists who refused compliance and moderates who professed their discomfort with episcopacy while emphasizing their unswerving loyalty to the crown. More importantly, Jackson finds a convergence of moderates within and without the established Church who sought common ground and eschewed theological dispute as damaging to religion in general and thereby anti-Christian. This well-documented "latitudinarianism" is in contrast to the received accounts of the period but, once again, results in a more plausible past.

Surely the most important contribution of *Restoration Scotland* is an amended narrative of the Revolution in Scotland. Traditional accounts of 1688-89 have emphasized the passivity of Scots and the delayed reaction of Scottish institutions to events in England. Jackson, however, reveals vigorous debate swirling around James' flight and William's claim. Copious political literature emerged, "offering active ideological justifications of, as well as objections to, the sequence of revolutionary events in Scotland" (191). In March 1689 the traditions of Scottish royalism, contractual theory, and resistance collided in the Convention of Estates. An allegiance debate was carried out in print, independent of and different from its counterpart to the south. Some asserted that James had never sworn the Coronation Oath and was therefore never king of Scotland, others argued that through his illegal actions as king James forfeited his sovereignty. The Convention eventually settled on the former, and invited William and Mary to rule according to a distinctive set of conditions and a distinctive Scottish
James’ ace in the hole, the Bishops, were unable to save his regime or, in the end, their own.

Jackson’s conclusions are neatly summarized in her final section. Among these the discovery of a specifically Scottish allegiance debate and the substantial contribution of Scots lawyers to intellectual culture are perhaps most important. Also significant is the inclusion of ideas like “pragmatism” and “adiaphorist” to a period and a people that have for too long been given over to mischaracterizations. Lastly, Jackson criticizes the capacity and enthusiasm for British history to undermine the study of a uniquely Scottish political and intellectual culture; a culture that was not British and certainly not English. The Scottish Enlightenment did not spring, fully-formed, from the head of David Hume; it had antecedents and a foundation at least as deep as this most un-enlightened of periods.

Inclusive title notwithstanding, Jackson’s book will not reach the best-seller list. This, however, is not a measure of her success. She has illuminated a poorly-understood period, and replaced voiceless caricatures with thoughtful individuals. For this service as well as the laborious unearthing of a new range of sources, Restoration Scotland is an important and instructive work.


Kathleen Wellman’s Making Science Social: The Conferences of Théophraste Renaudot 1633-1642 traces the history of the seventeenth-century conferences led by Théophraste Renaudot to elucidate the characteristics of early seventeenth-century science, to show the connections between the conferences and the French Enlightenment, and to demonstrate the contributions that the conferences made to the development of the human and social sciences. Wellman recounts the biography of Théophraste Renaudot, the eccentric intellectual who led the conferences. A seventeenth-cen-