

Thanksgivings in the Reign of Queen Anne :
an investigation of accountable opinion.

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations	3
A Note on the Text.....	3
Introduction.....	4
Chapter One: 1702 ‘Disappointing the Boundless Ambition of France’	23
Chapter Two:1704 to 1706 Blenheim to Ramillies.....	46
Chapter Three: 1707 “Vis Unita Fortior”	110
Chapter Four: 1708 to 1710 Oudenarde to Bouchain	136
Chapter Five: 1711-13	197
Chapter Six: The 1713 Peace	203
Conclusion	224
Appendix 1: A Specific Latitudinarian-Dissenter Controversy..	251
Appendix 2: Preachers by Year and Denomination.....	254
Appendix 3: Preacher Biographies	265
Bibliography	321
Primary Sources	321
Secondary Sources:	340

List of Abbreviations

B.I.H.R.	Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research
C.J.	Journal of the House of Common
D.N.B.	Dictionary of National Biography
E.H.R.	English Historical Review
H.M.C.	Historical Manuscripts Commission
H.O.P. 1690-1715	E. Cruickshanks, S. Handley, D. Hayton, eds., <i>The History of Parliament: The House of Commons, 1690–1715</i> (5 vols, Cambridge, 2002),
L.J.	Journal of the House of Lords

A Note on the Text

All dates are in Old Style, with the year beginning in January.

Original spelling in primary sources has been maintained in quotations.

Footnote references to thanksgiving sermons list preacher surname, year and page number. Where preachers share surnames, a first initial is used to distinguish. Where more than one thanksgiving took place in one year (*e.g.* 1706, 1709) the month and date of the ceremony are used. Full citations of the thanksgiving sermons are listed in the Primary Sources section of the Bibliography.

Introduction

On 5 November 1709, an Anglican parson, at the invitation of the newly-elected Lord Mayor of London, preached in St Paul's Cathedral, the seat of the Bishop of London and the mother church of the diocese of London. The occasion was the annual commemoration of 'double deliverance' from the Gunpowder Plot of 1605 and the safe arrival of William of Orange in 1688. The preacher, Henry Sacheverell, was vehement, indeed intemperate. One diarist noted: "instead of speaking to the day, [he] turn'd his discourse upon the Presbyterians."¹ The result was a political maelstrom. The sermon was later printed and sold in huge volumes. The preacher was impeached before Parliament, tried in Westminster Hall, with the Queen an occasional attendee, and found guilty by the House of Lords² in March 1710 of 'high crimes and misdemeanours.' The conviction led to the worst rioting London had known for a generation – the mob vented its fury by burning Dissenting chapels, Sacheverell was feted among the higher and lower sort, and the ministry, which had advocated his impeachment, was defeated by a landslide in the elections of October 1710. Over the next four years, in the name of strengthening the Established Church, the new ministry reversed almost every policy its predecessor had pursued. In particular, it brought the war of Spanish Succession to an end, and, in general, it endeavoured to reduce the liberties of dissenting Protestants.

Public thanksgivings were a prominent feature of the ceremonial and political life in England under Queen Anne. This thesis will discuss the texts and context in which the almost annual thanksgiving ceremonies required the nationwide delivery of sermons from churchmen – both established and tolerated – throughout the reign. It will analyse the content of published thanksgiving sermons to establish the spectrum of views on secular successes and to describe the changes of such views over the course of the reign.

It is a commonplace that the reign of Queen Anne was a period of deep party-political division over such matters of the relative power of the monarch and parliament in the running of affairs of state. Holmes, Speck and Horwitz³ among others have shown party allegiance was ideologically driven and subsumed – though did not extinguish – local loyalties, personal connections and social deference.

¹ Narcissus Luttrell, *A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs* (6 vols, Oxford, 1857), vi, p. 508.

² L.J. ,19, pp. 114,116, Among whom seven Anglican bishops found him guilty.

³ See G.S. Holmes, *British Politics in the Age of Anne* (London, 1967); W.A. Speck, *Tory and Whig: The Struggle in the Constituencies 1701-1715* (London, 1970); Henry Horwitz, *Revolution Politics: The Career of Daniel Finch Second Earl of Nottingham, 1647-1730* (Cambridge, 1968).

Holmes took a secular view of clerical controversies in Queen Anne's reign: "High and Low schools of thought sought quasi-theological justification for positions that were in essence more political than religious."⁴ Linda Colley's work, in particular, revived awareness of the continuing – though largely local rather than national – influence of the Tory party, throughout the eighteenth century.⁵ As well as rekindling interest in the marginalised Tory party of the early Hanoverian period, Colley encapsulated the importance of Protestantism to early modern British national identity: "Protestantism was the foundation that made the invention of Great Britain possible."⁶ The centrality of religion in the inculcation of social and political order at national level in the early modern era has been further described in works by J.C.D. Clark⁷; its importance at local level by Peter Earle and Peter Borsay⁸ and in specific reigns by Tony Claydon.⁹

It is also well established that the Church of England during this time was riven by disagreements about its place in society and its relationship with other Trinitarian Protestant organisations within the kingdom.¹⁰ Far from being welcomed as strengthening national Protestantism, the Toleration Act of 1689, the establishment of Presbyterianism as the official form of religion in Scotland, and the Act of Union of 1707 were seen by contemporaries as threats to the English Established Church. The former was perceived as undermining the Church of England by permitting other forms of Protestant Trinitarian worship, the latter by established a second, separate state church within the newly-established Britain. While this thesis will illustrate the unease concerning the Act of Union, some insight into the fears that the Toleration Act could usher in atheism under the guise of religious diversity is illustrated by Humphrey Prideaux's 1692 comment:¹¹

⁴ Holmes, *British Politics*, p. 28. This view is too restricted in describing a worldview which saw little distinction between the temporal and the secular. However, it is apt in relation to the thanksgiving sermons in that they focus on secular achievements.

⁵Linda Colley, *In Defiance of Oligarchy: The Tory Party 1714-60* (Cambridge, 1982).

⁶ Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837* (New Haven, 1992), p. 54.

⁷J.C.D. Clark, *English Society 1688-1832: Ideology, Social Structure and Political Practice During the Ancien Regime* (Cambridge, 1985); John Walsh, Colin Haydon, Stephen Taylor, eds., *The Church of England c.1689–c.1833 From Toleration to Tractarianism* (Cambridge, 1993).

⁸Peter Earle, *The Making of the English Middle Class Business, Society and Family Life in London, 1660–1730* (Oxford, 1989); Peter Borsay, *The English Urban Renaissance: Culture and Society in the Provincial Town 1660-1770* (Oxford, 1989).

⁹ Tim Harris, Paul Seaward and Mark Goldie, eds., *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England* (Oxford, 1990); Tony Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution* (Cambridge, 1996).

¹⁰ See G.V. Bennett, *The Tory Crisis in Church and State, 1688-1730: The Career of Francis Atterbury, Bishop of Rochester* (Oxford, 1975); White Kennett, *1660-1728, Bishop of Peterborough: Study in the Political and Ecclesiastical History of the Early Eighteenth Century* (London, 1957); J. Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689* (New Haven, 1991); G. Every, *The High Church Party, 1688-1718* (London, 1956).

¹¹ Prideaux published a thanksgiving sermon in 1702.

now such liberty is given to others, it cannot be avoided that everyone take to do what he pleases in matters of religion, it being too difficult a matter to distinguish between the absentees from church that go to conventicles and those that do not, that everyone now is free to do as he pleases.¹²

The view that there existed a providential contract between God and his faithful was widespread, and a significant portion of Anglican churchmen viewed the growth of dissent as an opening to irreligion, and consequent divine disfavour. In this respect, one might view the reign of Queen Anne as the final outworkings of the British Reformation rather than the beginning of an early modern secular society.¹³

While some historians¹⁴ have located the origins of High Church, Low Church divisions in ecclesiastical, liturgical and constitutional differences tracing their origins back to Archbishop Laud, G.V. Bennett locates the origin of the Established Church divisions in the reaction to the events of 1688. David Hayton deemed that Bennett: “rooted his interpretation firmly in social, economic and above all, political, realities,” and that the origin of the High Church reaction was the passage in 1689 of “a statutory religious toleration of Protestant dissenters.”¹⁵ William Gibson uses the example of William Talbot, the Whig-Latitudinarian bishop, to illustrate that while politico-religious controversies – occasional conformity, the convocation controversy, the Sacheverell trial – enforced a coherent division between High and Low Church, it was simultaneously possible for Talbot to embrace ecclesiological and doctrinal views associated with High Church, for example on the sacerdotal nature of priesthood.¹⁶ Mark Knights considers it:

viable to talk about the highly politicized debate about church-state relations as ‘politics’, a term that also embraces other forms of power struggle, and to consider it as part of ‘political culture’. Claims to freedom of conscience were political claims as much as theological ones, on the grounds that there was an intrinsic link between dissent and political sedition. In turn the Established Church was accused of exercising, or wanting to exercise, a form of political power, ‘priestcraft’ over the laity. Controversy over religion was

¹² H.M.C. *Fifth Report part 1* (London, 1876) p. 376. No radical high-churchman, Humphrey Prideaux was a supporter of the Revolution, and expressed mildly Whiggish views in his 1702 thanksgiving speech.

¹³ See W.M. Jacob, *Lay People and Religion in the Early Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 1-19.

¹⁴ For example: Mark Goldie, George Every.

¹⁵ D.W. Hayton, ‘The High Church Party in the Irish Convocation 1703-1712’, in Hermann J. Real and Helgard Stover-Leidig, eds., *Reading Swift: Papers from The First Münster Symposium on Jonathan Swift* (Munich, 1998), pp. 126-27.

¹⁶ William Gibson, ‘William Talbot and Church Parties 1688–1730’, *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, lviii, No. 1 (2007) pp. 26-48.

seldom solely about private belief, but also or mainly about public practice and the ideal relationship between civil and religious power.¹⁷

While not denying the validity of the various doctrinal and organisational differences within the Established Church, and between it and the various strands of dissent, the selection of this set of sermons allows us a view of various shades of opinion on topical political subjects which clearly alter through the reign. The fact that the Queen mandated the services to celebrate military and political accomplishments meant that preachers had to address these secular events, and in doing so allow a view of a particular dimension of the political culture. Dissenting preachers underlined both their loyalty and independence by holding services and publishing sermons in response to the proclamation. Mark Knights holds that the political influence of the clergy grew as a consequence of the Restoration, and he and Tony Claydon¹⁸ hold that the pulpit and sermon were a means of attempting to manipulate public choices and policies. The widespread involvement of the clergy in party politics, as political preachers and pamphleteers, also contributed to a constant intermingling of religious and political themes and vocabularies.

The thesis will take the following description as the basis of the overlap between High and Low Churchmen and Whig and Tory politicians.¹⁹ Typical High Church adherents emphasised the virtues of episcopacy and the traditions of the Church. High Church doctrine tended to the position that all rightful authority reflected God's providential rule of the world, and disobedience was sinful. On the other hand, they wished to see the State endorsing the goals of the church and churchmen commenting freely on politics. The typical Low Churchman in contrast, wished to see the Church to some extent controlled by the state. After 1688, Low Churchmen no longer viewed dissent as a threat to the Church of England, and hence did not view dissent as a pathway to papist rule. However, anti-Catholicism could lead Low Churchmen to suspicion of some the Church of England practices. Attempts should be made to persuade Dissenters to unite with the Church of England but, failing this desirable outcome, dissent should be tolerated in the spirit of moderation.

Tory views on society advocated the necessity of an alliance between the church and a divinely appointed sovereign, and in this found common cause with High Church clerics. Closely associated with a religious theory of kingship was a religious interpretation of human society and social obligation. With

¹⁷ Mark Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain: Partisanship and Political Culture* (Oxford, 2005), pp. 20-21.

¹⁸ Tony Claydon 'The sermon, the 'public sphere' and the political culture of late seventeenth century England' in Peter E. McCullough and Lori Anne Ferrell eds., *The English Sermon Revised: Religion, Literature and History, 1600-1750* (Manchester, 2000) pp. 235-63.

¹⁹ The following paragraphs are influenced by Pasi Ihalainen 'The political sermon in the Age of party strife, 1700-1720' in Peter McCullough, Hugh Adlington and Emma Rhatigan, eds., *The Early Modern Sermon* (Oxford, 2011), p. 497.

obedience to kings came reverence and submission to parsons and squires. From this view sprang Tory suspicion of religious dissent, considering it part of a breakdown of societal discipline leading inevitably to free thinking and atheism. Tories were similarly averse to political theories of popular government, with its echoes of Cromwellian republicanism.

Whigs by contrast were largely opposed to monarchy by divine right, seeking to hold the monarchy to limits prescribed by parliament, though Tory suspicions remained that Whigs, in general, harboured outright republican views. Whigs were more tolerant of religious dissent and received the support of Low Church clerics on this issue. Attitudes towards religious dissent thus continued to be a major source of division of the political elite into parties.

The changes in sermon content as the reign progressed can be interpreted as reflective of changes in political thinking and popular opinion during the Age of Anne.

Thanksgivings as Civic Pageantry

From the outset of her reign, the Queen sought to establish herself, by contrast to her predecessor and potential successor, as entirely English. Anne identified with Elizabeth I,²⁰ and upon her coronation explicitly invoked her forbearer's past glories both in the adoption of Elizabeth's motto '*Semper Eadem*' as well as in the conscious modelling of the thanksgiving ceremonies of her reign on that held by Elizabeth following the defeat of the Armada.

As Robert Bucholz has observed, the thanksgiving ceremonial "served to unite the queen, court, nobility, gentry, clergy, the military and 'the commonality' in a corporate celebration of her reign."²¹ The anxiety of the Lords with respect to seating, dress and transport for the first thanksgiving ceremony is outlined in the chapter describing the 1702 Thanksgiving for Vigo, and illustrates the importance in which they held the ceremony. ²² Over the course of the reign, the thanksgiving etiquette fell into a pattern with the Queen receiving the nobility at St James's, followed by a formal procession of great officers, the masters in chancery, the members of both houses, the foreign ministers and, finally, the Queen, her household, and their respective retinues who processed through cheering crowds from St James's to St Paul's.

²⁰ See Edward Gregg, *Queen Anne* (New Haven, 1980) p. 96.

²¹ R.O. Bucholz, 'Nothing but Ceremony: Queen Anne and the Limitations of Royal Ritual', *Journal of British Studies*, xxx (1991), pp. 297.

²² See below p.25 The remembrance of the Armada Thanksgiving .

As the reign progressed, clues to the waxing and waning of various careers can be gleaned from participation and prominence in the Queen's cavalcade, as exemplified by the presence of Viscount Townshend and the Duke of Hamilton at the Thanksgiving for the Union.²³ The procession took a number of hours to make its way from St James's along the Strand to Ludgate Hill, the route was usually thronged with spectators, and the Lord Mayor and corporation of London, who met the monarch at Temple Bar and ceremonially surrendered the city sword, enacted a further affirmation of loyalty.²⁴ The Queen progressed the rest of the way to St Paul's, wherein she was led to a specially constructed throne. She was preceded by the bearer of the sword of State, usually a senior member of the royal household, though on at least two occasions²⁵ the identity of the bearer was itself a symbolic political message.

Throughout the country similar, smaller thanksgiving ceremonies were mandated and celebrated with processions of civic leaders to local churches. Usually festivities would follow, sometimes sponsored by the local worthies,²⁶ which troubled some of the more upright preachers.

The Queen's ability to make use of pageantry for political purposes may also be witnessed by her absence from thanksgiving ceremonies from 1709 onwards. As the war became increasingly costly and unpopular, the Queen's absence from St Paul's – though ascribed variously to illness and the two-year mourning period following the death of her consort Prince George – served to distance her from, and lay open doubts about her commitment to the ministry's policy. In 1709, John Adams at St Paul's noted: "Never has so much Retirement so vast an Influence."²⁷ The Queen's ability to attend, and by doing so influence, various debates in the Lords, and to attend the Sacheverell trial in those years, casts doubt on any physical reason for her absence from the post-1708 thanksgivings.

²³ This is not meant to suggest that the Royal Household was itself a source of political power, which resided in the interface between the monarch and parliament. However, the perception of royal favour was useful momentum in the acquisition of political power. Harley's return to the ministry via the 'backstairs' is one such example, the frustratingly empty career of the Duke of Somerset is an opposite example of a royal favourite who wielded no influence in Parliament.

²⁴ In this, as in many aspects of Courtly ritual, the Queen was following tradition. Malcolm Smuts has referred to this process as 'ceremonial dialogue': Smuts, *Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England* (Philadelphia, 1987) p. 18.

²⁵ The Earl of Seafield in 1707 and the Duke of Leeds in 1710. Seafield had guided the Union legislation through the Scottish Parliament (see below, p.112); Leeds represented the court's decisive realignment with the Tories (see below, p. 187).

²⁶ In York in 1702 four hogsheads of punch were placed in each corner of the Cross, and given to the common people, "who drank the aforesaid Health's very cheerfully" (see below, p. 44) In Coventry, for the Blenheim (1704) thanksgiving, one local MP donated several hogsheads of strong beer for the great rejoicings which lasted the whole night (see below, p.50).

²⁷ John Adams, *A sermon preach'd at the cathedral-church of St Paul, before the Right Honourable Sir Samuel Garrard, Bar. Lord-Mayor of the City of London, and the Court of Aldermen* (London, 1709), p. 9.

Thanksgivings as Politico-Religious Services

Church-going was an important part of social as well as religious experience in eighteenth-century England. For Joseph Addison: “[a] Country-Fellow distinguishes himself as much in the Church-yard, as a Citizen [of London] does upon the [Stock Ex]Change; the whole Parish-Politicks being generally discuss’d in that Place either after Sermon or before the Bell rings.”²⁸ Jennifer Farooq’s work on preaching in London notes the concept of ‘sermon tasters’ – avid sermon hearers who sampled preaching at a number of different venues, including ones of different denominations. Farooq finds London the ideal place for such activity: “with its dozens of parish churches, chapels and meeting houses, the Chapel Royal at St James’s, St Paul’s and Westminster Abbey, the capital encompassed the most numerous and widest variety of preaching venues in the nation.”²⁹

Though also civic celebrations, thanksgivings were fundamentally religious occasions. Since the Restoration, there had been an obligation on the English people to attend services, which celebrated explicitly political events on three occasions during the year – on 30 of January, to atone for the martyrdom of Charles I, on 29 May to celebrate the Restoration of Charles II and on 5 November to celebrate the frustration of the Gunpowder Plot. By Queen Anne’s reign, the two former days had become associated with Tory themes and sympathies. The 5 November celebration, which commemorated William’s fortuitous arrival in Torbay on 4 November 1688, became associated with Whig themes and sympathies because the regime of William and Mary had sought to bolster its providential legitimacy by declaring the arrival as another escape from popery and arbitrary power.³⁰

The Williamite regime sought to extend its legitimacy by requiring the nation to participate in fasts and humiliations to win God’s favour, and consequent thanksgivings for victories achieved or

²⁸ Joseph Addison, *Spectator* 112, Monday, 9 Jul., 1711.

²⁹ Jennifer Farooq, *Preaching in Eighteenth-Century London* (London, 2013), pp. 20-25. Tasters who left diary notes of their sampling include Dudley Ryder, Richard Kary (a Lancashire doctor), William Bray and Dr Matthew Henry.

³⁰ One element which rendered Sacheverell’s 5 November sermon so shocking was its disregard for Whiggish sentiment. Another notable controversy was provoked by William Stephens, who preached before Parliament on 30 Jan. 1700, and caused outrage by omitting reference to Charles I’s execution, “a superfluous labour” and attempting to debunk the use of the anniversary “to flatter princes with notions of arbitrary power.” The Commons refused to vote their thanks to Stephens, or to ask him to print his sermon, and then voted that in future only deans or doctors of divinity should preach before them. For a discussion about the background to association of themed commemoration days with Tory/Whig political views, see James Caudle, ‘Measures of Allegiance, Sermon Culture and the Creation of a Public Discourse of Obedience and Resistance in Georgian Britain’ (Yale PhD thesis, 1996) pp. 241-261. For a discussion about how the contradictory Memorial Days coexisted, see Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution*, pp. 100-104.

calamities averted. During Queen Anne's reign, days of fasting and thanksgiving became almost annual events. The former were declared in spring, in anticipation of the campaigning season; the latter were obviously more dependent upon events. The thanksgiving ceremonies were a particular example of the power of the sovereign, aided by the ministry and the episcopate, to command³¹ religious observations of politico-military events by: "all our Loving Subjects, as they tender the favour of Almighty God, and upon pain of suffering such punishments as we may justly inflict on all such as shall Contemn or Neglect the performance of so Religious and Necessary Duty."³² The Queen's bishops and archbishops were given direction to "compose a form of prayer suitable to the occasion" and were enjoined to "take care for the timely dispersing thereof through their respective dioceses."³³ The form of prayer re-arranged the usual Office for Holy Days, suggesting psalms and lessons suitable to the occasion celebrated and inserting especially composed prayers for the day. For instance, at the Blenheim Thanksgiving, the form of prayer suggested psalms ranged from the triumphalist 47.3: "Thou has subdued the people under us: and the Nations under our feet," to the deferential 44.3: "For we got not the Victory thro' our own Sword: neither was it our own Arm that helped us." The suggested lessons directed the preacher towards the story of Deborah, the female leader of Israel, and her victories over the heathen foe, implemented by Barak, her loyal general. Providence and the Queen were invoked in specific prayers. The first, replacing the first collect, invoked God's "most gracious Providence, which hath so marvellously disappointed the presumption of our Enemies and given us a victory exceeding ... our very hopes and merits," before going on to "humbly pray thee, that we may, henceforth be to thee a faithful and obedient people ... A holy Nation, sensible of this thy goodness and zealous for thy honour, that thou mayst continue thy mercies towards us." In the second, God was asked to grant "our most gracious Sovereign a long and happy reign, prosper all her pious Designs and Endeavours, for the Good of the Church and the Nation, the Common Welfare of Europe and the Preservation of the Protestant Religion."³⁴

³¹ The nature of the imperative differed within the United Kingdoms, after 1707. Though proclaimed in Scotland after the union, Caudle comments: "Orthodox Calvinistic Presbyterian practice did not permit the keeping of calendrical feasts or fasts which were not demonstrably scriptural. Thus, the Scottish non-observance of the State Holidays was not a specific resistance to the Anglican commemoration of the events commemorated, but merely an extension of the principle by which they did not observe Good Friday or Christmas.": Caudle, *Measures of Allegiance*, p. 235.

³² *By the Queen, a proclamation, for a publick thanksgiving* (London, 1706). Though this was boilerplate language in most of Queen Anne's thanksgivings, it is evidence of expectation and a threat of compulsion.

³³ *By the Queen, a proclamation, for a publick thanksgiving* (London, 1708) 30 Dec. 1708.

³⁴ *A form of prayer and thanksgiving to almighty God: to be used on Thursday the seventh of September next... for the late glorious victory obtained over the French and Bavarians at Bleinheim...* (London, 1704).

Thanksgiving Sermons

In his overarching description of the British sermon, William Gibson finds that it was “unique in its creation and occupation of the public space.”³⁵ From the start of the English Reformation, pastoral ministry was reinterpreted as primarily a ministry of the word.³⁶ The godly preaching ministry was, as Patrick Collinson described: “a dominant and even normative model in the post-Reformation Church of England.”³⁷ One interpretation of the history of early modern preaching has been described in terms of a series of control measures designed to ‘tune the pulpits’ to help stem fears and stereotypes of intemperate preachers stirring the masses. Arnold Hunt confirms that Elizabeth’s government, after the Essex rebellion in January 1601, encouraged the use of sermons as political tools to advocate adherence to an ‘official line.’³⁸ In fact, recent scholarship has shown that the vast majority of early modern sermons operated within a set of utterly traditional assumptions about the necessity of government and the divine origin of political authority.³⁹ When the official proclamations, suggested psalms, specified readings and customised prayers are taken together, the thanksgiving ceremonies of Queen Anne’s reign can be seen as powerful instruments of state propaganda. Kevin Sharpe felt that the ceremonies: “helped to keep the monarchy – and Anne – at the centre of policy, politics and public discourse in the new circumstances of powerful parliaments, parties and public opinion.”⁴⁰ Indeed, by celebrating secular triumphs and illustrating these as the result of providential support for a righteous monarch and nation, Sharpe suggests the services “served to re-sacralize the monarchy ... In giving the Queen prominence and representing her in providential terms, the preachers also strengthened Anne’s claim to embody the nation.”⁴¹ While this is so, the published thanksgiving sermons demonstrated the divergence of opinion, which existed during the

³⁵ William Gibson, ‘The British Sermon, 1689-1901: Quantities, Performances, and Culture’, in Keith Francis and William Gibson, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the British Sermon 1689-1901* (Oxford, 2013) p. 3.

³⁶ James Rigney, ‘Sermons into print’ in Peter McCullough, Hugh Adlington, and Emma Rhatigan, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon* (Oxford, 2011) p. 199.

³⁷ Patrick Collinson, *From Cranmer to Sancroft: Essays on English Religion in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (London, 2006) p. 46.

³⁸ Arnold Hunt, ‘Tuning the pulpit: the religious context of the Essex Revolt’ in Ferrell and McCullough, eds., *English Sermon Revised* (Manchester University Press, 2000) pp. 86-114.

³⁹ Kevin Sharpe, *Politics and Ideas in Early Stuart England* (London, 1989) pp. 3-71.

⁴⁰ Kevin Sharpe, *Selling the Tudor Monarchy: Authority and Image in Sixteenth-Century England* (New Haven, 2009) p. 566.

⁴¹ Kevin Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule: The Restoration and Revolution Monarchy, 1660-1714* (New Haven, 2013) pp. 542-566. See also Andrew Lacey, *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr* (London, 2003) p. 15.

reign of Queen Anne about providence, the Queen, Protestantism and the war.⁴² It is the public expression of the range of opinion that this dissertation seeks to examine, through published sermons from official and tolerated sources – co-existing yet contradictory, changing and amplifying through the Queen’s reign. It will first be beneficial to briefly overview the sermon culture – publication processes and audience – in the reign of Queen Anne.

Mary Morrissey describes a significant change in the theory of preaching which occurred in the seventeenth century – the disappearance of a ‘charismatic’ theory of preaching and its replacement by a rational form of eloquence, which could achieve its persuasive effect as well through the written, as opposed to the spoken, word.⁴³ One very noticeable result of this change was that preachers began to deliver their sermons from a written text. In his *A Discourse of the Pastoral Care*,⁴⁴ Gilbert Burnet approved of this practice on the grounds that it made the delivery of sermons “more exact” and also made it easier for preachers to put their sermons into print, thus giving English readers: “many volumes of the best that are extant.” It entailed a change in style which he reckoned led some writers to conclude that the English genius for preaching was manifested in the written rather than the spoken word.

Scholars have written a number of articles studying eighteenth-century sermons preached at specific occasions, such as assize meetings or funerals,⁴⁵ before prominent audiences, such as Parliament,⁴⁶ or occasioned by current events, such as the 1715 Jacobite rebellion. Sermons have been discussed in terms of locality, performance, publication, audience, their contributions to conflict, to loyalty, to social order, as discourses on resistance and obedience. Nonetheless, the political context and content of occasional sermons during the reign of Queen Anne has not been analysed in detail.

Among the general studies of eighteenth-century preaching before 1760 are James Caudle’s PhD thesis ‘Measures of Allegiance,’ Pasi Ihalainen’s *Protestant Nations Redefined* and Jennifer Farooq’s *Preaching in Eighteenth-Century London*. Caudle’s study provides a valuable overview of many aspects

⁴² Warren Johnston makes the same point across a wider timescale in ‘Preaching, National Salvation, Victories, and Thanksgivings: 1689–1800’ in Francis and Gibson, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the British Sermon 1689-1901*, (Oxford, 2012) pp. 261-73.

⁴³ Mary Morrissey, ‘Scripture, style and persuasion in seventeenth century English theories of preaching’ *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, liii, No. 4 (2002) pp. 686-706.

⁴⁴ Gilbert Burnet, *A Discourse of the Pastoral Care* (London, 1692), p. 205.

⁴⁵ Randall McGowen, ‘“He Beareth not the Sword in Vain”; Religion and the Criminal Law in Eighteenth-Century England’ in *Eighteenth-Century Studies* xxi (1988) pp. 192-211; Ralph Houlbrooke, *Death Religion and the Family in England 1480-1750* (Oxford, 1998); Evert Jan Van Leeuwen, ‘Funeral Sermons and Graveyard Poetry: The Ecstasy of Death and Bodily Resurrection’ *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, xxxii (3) (2009) pp. 353-71.

⁴⁶ James Caudle, ‘Preaching in Parliament: Patronage, Publicity and Politics in Britain, 1701-60’ in Ferrell and McCoullough, eds., *English Sermon Revised*, pp. 235-63; Jeremy Gregory, ‘Preaching Anglicanism at St Paul’s, 1688-1800’, in Derek Keene, Arthur Burns, and Andrew Saint eds., *St Paul’s: The Cathedral Church of London, 604-2004* (New Haven, 2004), pp. 343-5.

of sermon culture and a detailed analysis of the ideas of obedience and resistance advocated by eighteenth-century preachers. Farooq focused on demonstrating the importance of sermons as a medium of national communication and as a political forum. Ihalainen's book provides a valuable comparison of public sermons in England, the Netherlands and Sweden, and offers a nuanced analysis of the developing rhetoric of nationhood between 1685 and 1772. Ihalainen argues that the clergy had a key role in redefining national identities, and he identifies some of the factors influencing the formation of a coherent national identity and examines the impact of the Enlightenment.

The public appetite for sermons long created a market in publication. Peter Blayney relates that in the autumn of 1607, the stationer Nathaniel Butter sent the manuscripts of two new books – one of them a sermon, the other a play – to the printer Nicholas Okes. The sermon, which had been preached at Paul's Cross, was sent straight to the press, while the play was put aside to wait its turn in the queue. The author of the sermon, John Pelling, never published anything else, though his sermons evidently found appreciative readers, as one surviving copy is annotated: "a very good sermon you have a very good judgement." The play happened to be the first edition of *King Lear*.⁴⁷ James Caudle estimates that the number of sermons printed during the eighteenth century exceeded that of pamphlets and works of fiction combined. On average, he estimates, three sermons a week were published throughout the eighteenth century, giving 15,000 published sermons. By contrast, only 9,000 political pamphlets were published during the same period. William Gibson notes that some preachers made considerable amounts of money from their work, including Laurence Sterne, who made more from his sermons than from *Tristram Shandy*.⁴⁸ In a society where religion still truly mattered, sermons, often marketed like pamphlets, were read with great interest.⁴⁹

Sermons as Accountable Opinion

In recent years, sermons have been subject to increased historical interest, perhaps initially an offshoot of an investigation of the 'public sphere,' of the spread of knowledge and of public opinion.⁵⁰ William Gibson found that the published sermon was disproportionately weighted towards the occasional sermon

⁴⁷ P.W.M. Blayney, *The Texts of King Lear and their Origins: Nicholas Oakes and the First Quarto* (Cambridge, 1982), p. 81.

⁴⁸ Francis and Gibson, 'British Sermon 1689-1901', p. 19.

⁴⁹ For background on sermon printing as a profitable profession see Tony Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution*, p. 87; William Gibson, *The Church of England 1688-1832: Unity and Accord* (London, 2001) p. 161

⁵⁰ This thesis will not rehearse the almost theological controversies surrounding Jurgen Habermas's *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* (Boston, MA., 1989) save to acknowledge its impact on the way historians view and review the early modern period. Kevin Sharpe's *Reading Revolutions* and Mark Knight's *Representation and Misrepresentation* are very informative in this area.

and its authors tended to be the clerical and political elite, positioned at the cutting edge of theological and cultural observation.⁵¹ Arnold Hunt felt that preachers regarded print as more suited to the purposes of doctrinal instruction than moral exhortation. It was also more open to detailed scrutiny and potentially more vulnerable to hostile criticism.⁵² Some bishops, like John Sharp and Edmund Gibson, routinely invited clergy to bring their sermons to them, so that they could be checked.⁵³ Keith Francis noted that:

Occasional sermons reveal the specific concerns of the churches and preachers and their responses to events and trends. What the faithful were expected to think or believe about such occasions and events are contained in their pages. Consequently, they are a valuable window into the minds of the British people. Different from the political speech or polemical tract, the occasional sermon came closest to the desired popular religious response to events.⁵⁴

William Gibson further found that publication was especially important to Dissenters as a means of maintaining their separate identity and the distribution of Dissenting sermons a method of counteracting their physical and numerical isolation within England.⁵⁵ Dissenter publication may have had some impact on Church of England clergy – in his defence of Dr Richard Willis’s depiction of Dissenters as Ephraim, to the Established Church’s ‘Judah,’ the Reverend Joseph Williamson, Rector in Leathley, Yorkshire, estimated that the Church of England “makes three parts in four”⁵⁶ of the nation, a significant underestimation of the greater than ninety per cent estimated by modern scholarship.⁵⁷

Apart from the serious notion of spreading the ‘good news,’ aspirant Anglican clergy were also motivated to publish by requests from patrons, from congregations and out of ambition for career advancement – Caudle offers the phrase ‘publish or languish.’⁵⁸ Local gentry could be the source of livings. Clerics who sought preferment needed to provide reasons for advancement along the path towards a royal chaplaincy or a London lectureship and thus needed to attract the attention of powerful clerics or

⁵¹ Francis and Gibson, ‘British Sermon 1689-1901’ p. 9.

⁵² Hunt’s observations were of the early seventeenth century, but the point holds: Arnold Hunt, *The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and their Audiences 1590-1640* (Cambridge, 2010), p. 12.

⁵³ Norman Sykes, *Edmund Gibson* (Oxford, 1926) p. 145.

⁵⁴ Keith Francis, ‘Sermon and Studies: Major issue and future directions’ in Francis and Gibson eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the British Sermon 1689-1901*, p. 38.

⁵⁵ Ibid. p. 21. For perception of dissenter numbers, see below p. 249.

⁵⁶ Joseph Williamson, *A Vindication of the Thanksgiving-Sermon of the Reverend Dr. Willis, Dean of Lincoln; from the Reflections of a Late Pamphlet; Entitled a Review of the Case of Ephraim and Judah; and Its Application to the Church of England and the Dissenters. By Joseph Williamson, A. B. Presbyter of the Church of England* (London, 1705), p.11.

⁵⁷ See Appendix 1 for details of the 1705 controversy. For estimate of relative proportions of Anglican adherents see Barry Coward, *The Stuart Age* (London, 1980) p. 465.

⁵⁸ Caudle, ‘Measures of Allegiance’ pp. 114-116, 126-130.

politicians. Publication was a method of notifying the outside world of one's existence in backwater towns and one's readiness to serve in more favourable circumstances. Keith Francis has noted that clerics "published sermons in order to add to the corpus of their work and advance their careers and reputations ... Publishing sermons was one way to be noticed ... [preachers became] well known for the number of sermons they published."⁵⁹ This was not without its dangers, however, and as will be seen both from silences within sermons⁶⁰ and effective self-censorship by non-publication,⁶¹ a certain amount of tacking to catch favourable political winds was practised. As James Gardiner, subdean at Lincoln Cathedral commented in 1713: "there is scarce a petty Office in any Parish to be disposed of, but it is made a Party-Cause... Men wholly build their Hopes and Pretences upon the Merits and Strength of Whig or Tory, and succeed accordingly."⁶²

To avoid languishing in physical or rhetorical obscurity, the preacher had to be convincing and forceful and this could involve a foray into the controversial. However, on occasion, overly stinging invective could provoke official wrath. On 26 February 1707 (Ash Wednesday), Francis Higgins⁶³ preached a highly offensive sermon at the Chapel Royal that suggested the Church was in danger from Whigs. After casting Whigs as the enemies of the Church and the monarchy, Higgins alleged that, in both ecclesiastical and secular guises, they had done little to stem the tide of heresy and atheism in England.⁶⁴ Higgins was arrested on 28 February 1707 for preaching sedition. After the government decided not to proceed against him,⁶⁵ Higgins had the sermon printed, along with a postscript purporting to be a dialogue between himself and Archbishop Tenison. In it Higgins defended his actions against Tenison's urgings to moderate his preaching. The postscript attracted the attention of the Irish parliament, and in August the Irish Lords found that the postscript was: "false, slanderous, and seditious Libel, designed to vilify a most Reverent Prelate in England,"⁶⁶ and ordered the postscript to be burned by the common hangman in

⁵⁹ Francis 'Sermons: Themes and Developments', p. 41.

⁶⁰ For example, the Tory silence concerning William.

⁶¹ For example, the absence of sermons from Milbourne and Loveling during the years of increasing Whig influence

⁶² James Gardiner, *The duty of peace amongst the members of the same state, civil or ecclesiastical, impartially laid down and recommended ...* (London, 1713) p. 11. As son of the bishop of Lincoln he was less reliant on the patronage of strangers, in 1702 he had been preferred subdean by his father. W. M. Jacob, 'Gardiner, James (d. 1732)', *Oxford DNB* [accessed 7 Mar. 2016].

⁶³ A prebendary of Christ Church Dublin. Higgins had published a thanksgiving sermon in 1705. Later in the decade, he acquired the sobriquet 'the Irish Sacheverell': D.W. Hayton, 'Higgins, Francis (1669/70–1728)' *Oxford DNB*, [accessed 7 Mar. 2016].

⁶⁴ Francis Higgins, *A sermon Preached at the Royal Chappel at White-Hall, on Ash Wednesday, Feb 26th 1706/7* (London, 1708); Clyve Jones, Geoffrey Holmes, eds., *The London diaries of William Nicolson, Bishop of Carlisle, 1702-1718* (Oxford, 1985) p. 421.

⁶⁵ The debate within the ministry about prepublication persuasion, or post publication prosecution is well illustrated in Alex W. Barber, 'Censorship, Salvation and the Preaching of Francis Higgins: A Reconsideration of High Church Politics and Theology in the Early 18th Century', *Parliamentary History*, xxxiii (2014) pp. 114-39.

⁶⁶ Abel Boyer, *The History of the Life and Reign of Queen Anne* (London, 1722) p. 290.

Dublin.⁶⁷ In 1706, William Stephens⁶⁸ appeared before the Queen's Bench charged with libel for a pamphlet in reply to the 'Memorial of the State of England' in which he criticised Harley and the Duke of Marlborough. He was sentenced on 6 May to stand in the pillory, but the Duchess of Marlborough intervened with the Queen and the sentence was commuted.

However, the treatment of Higgins, Sacheverell and Stephens was not the norm, and, in fact, publication opened preachers up to criticisms by their congregation, readers and peers of their knowledge and style, as well as their opinion. Humphrey Prideaux, Dean of Norwich, gleefully noted the purported habit of his former rival Benjamin Woodroffe, Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, of recycling material for his sermons.⁶⁹ In Charles Bean's case, the 'calumnies' put about by his Oxford auditory – admittedly a more excitable congregation than most – forced him into publication of his 1707 Thanksgiving sermon, to vindicate himself against charges of aspersion "the Queen and Her Wise Administration" and showing "too slight a Zeal for our Established Church."⁷⁰ Jean Armand Dubourdiou's preface to his December 1706 Thanksgiving sermon ran to twenty-six pages in which he enumerates and responds to criticisms of his (forty-two page) sermon voiced by his Huguenot community.

By examining the published sermons of the thanksgiving services mandated by the Queen and the ministry, this thesis proposes to illustrate the partisanship exhibited by the various churchmen – even while they remained within the bounds that provocative contemporaries such as Sacheverell and Hoadly flouted. The thesis will argue that published sermons in the era represented 'accountable opinion' and as such were constrained in their partisanship in ways which the typically anonymous pamphlet was not. Arguably, the sermons were more influential and more reflective of the changing strands of contemporary public opinion. Robert Walpole, speaking at Sacheverell's impeachment, gave an insight into a contemporary view on the relative influence of pamphlets and sermons:

when only pamphlets and common Libels are matters of complaint, when none but Mercenary Scribblers, and the Hackney Pens of a discontented Party are employ'd to vent their Malice, 'tis fit to leave them to the common course of the Law and to the ordinary Proceedings of the Courts below...but when the Trumpet is sounded in *Sion*, when the Pulpit takes up Cudgels.... [when] factious and Seditious Discourses are become

⁶⁷C.E. Doble, ed., *Remarks and Collections of Thomas Hearne* (8 vols, Oxford, 1885-1921) ii, p. 33; Luttrell, *Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs*, vi. p. 200.

⁶⁸ Stephens published a thanksgiving sermon in Dec 1706, and in 1700 had provoked fury in the House of Commons by preaching a 30 Jan. sermon which ignored Charles I.

⁶⁹E.M. Thompson, ed., *Letters of Humphrey Prideaux, sometime dean of Norwich, to John Ellis, sometime under-secretary of state, 1674-1722* (London, 1875), pp. 7,8.

⁷⁰ Charles Bean, *A Sermon Preach'd before the University of Oxford, on the First of May, 1707...* (London, 1707).

the constant Entertainments of some Congregations, the Commons cannot but think it high time to put a stop to this growing Evil.⁷¹

Given the context Walpole's expression is unsurprising. However, his colleagues' actions – Sunderland and Godolphin's attempts at prosecution, Harley's life-long attempts at persuasion – combined with the ministry's proclamation of the duty of thanksgiving services make the sermons preached on those occasions an interesting exposition of a part of the political sphere. For all the self-serving motives laid at the door of the preachers, they were accountable for their views, with their attendant biases, flaws and errors, in a way which contemporary pamphlets – whose authors were hidden, whose motives were obscure, whose opinions were perhaps purchased by those currently in power – were not.⁷³ At a minimum, these sermons provide a valuable source for the study of contemporary opinion and provide an insight into political belief.⁷⁴

Trevelyan, in his magisterial history of Queen Anne's reign, says of the Sacheverell spark, and consequent conflagration: “[t]he change in national opinion in 1709 was very real below the surface, but it was not apparent ... Before the Sacheverell trial, it found no adequate voice in literature, journalism or public speech.”⁷⁵ This thesis will argue that the opinions which found incendiary voice in Sacheverell – war weariness, distrust of dissent, suspicion of the Ministry and war profiteers – were evident in at least one discernible strand of published thanksgiving sermons in the years leading up to 1709.

Methodology

As a significant amount of the argument of this thesis rests on the identification of views which can vary across the High/Low Church, Whig/Tory spectrum, it is useful to attempt to locate the views the preacher may have held independently of his sermon. The method used is to analyse the sermons given by clerics of known allegiance to identify contemporary themes and opinions. Using this as a grounding, themes and opinions expressed in thanksgiving sermons given by clergymen of whom little is known are explored in order to determine if the sermon broadly supports a Whig or Tory position.

⁷¹ Jacob Tonson, *The Tryal of Dr. Henry Sacheverell, Before the House of Peers, for High Crimes and Misdemeanors, Etc.* (London, 1710) pp. 60, 61. Godolphin too lamented ‘the insolences of the clergy’ H.M.C. *Bath*, Mss, i (London, 1904) pp. 63, 76, 152.

⁷³ J.A. Downie, *Robert Harley and the Press: Propaganda and Public Opinion in the age of Swift and Defoe* (Cambridge, 1979).

⁷⁴ Caudle, ‘Preaching in Parliament’.

⁷⁵ G.M. Trevelyan, *England under Queen Anne* (3 vols., London, 1930-4) iii, p. 62.

The 192 thanksgiving sermons available for study were delivered by 149 individual clerics, of whom nineteen were bishops either during or after Queen Anne's reign. Thirteen of the nineteen bishops were members of the English or British House of Lords (the other six were bishops of the Church of Ireland) and their participation in the partisan controversies of the day is a matter of record. Of the thirteen bishops, five⁷⁶ were in position on Anne's accession and, with the exception of the flexible Bishop Trelawny, were Whigs. Four⁷⁷ were elevated during her reign – two Whigs and two Tories – and four⁷⁸ Whigs were elevated in the subsequent reign. Of the five Church of Ireland Bishops, the appointment of two⁷⁹ predated the Queen's reign, Wharton's chaplain Ralph Lambert was raised during the reign and three⁸⁰ – with English Whig pedigrees – were translated to Ireland after the reign.

Fifty-five of the preachers (including the nineteen bishops) have entries in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. From their entries it is possible, in most cases, to ascertain partisan loyalties of Anglican clerics by their participation in the controversies of the day – Tory controversialists such as Hugh Todd, Luke Milbourne, Francis Higgins, George Stanhope, Richard Fiddes and William Sherlock, and Whig figures such as John Edwards, Thomas Pyle, William Stephens, and Humphrey Prideaux. There were some tenuous inferences in the Oxford DNB: William Elstob, a historian of the Anglo-Saxon period, was linked to the High Church by association through his Oxford faculty colleagues, while John Adams was identified as a Tory through his patron Viscount Harcourt, but both were subsequently confirmed as Tory leaning by the contents of their respective sermons.⁸¹

Ten of the fifty-five preachers with Oxford DNB entries were Dissenters, and despite the characterisation of the “Inflexible stiffness of Sectaries”⁸² who “differ more from one another, than some

⁷⁶ Burnet, Hough, Talbot, Trelawny, Fowler. Trelawny's 1702 sermon was a statement of High Church orthodoxy at a time of Tory resurgence. Through the reign Trelawny, though maintaining High Church connections, proved sufficiently flexible to satisfy the needs of Godolphin in his manoeuvres to win the co-operation of the Whigs in parliament.

⁷⁷ Hooper (1703 Tory), Fleetwood (1708 Whig), Manningham (1709, Tory) Trimmell (1709 Whig).

⁷⁸ Chandler (1717, Whig), Francis Hare (1727), White Kennett (1718), Willis (1714). All had been participants in the 'Age of Parties', and their elevations were, to a greater or lesser extent, influenced by their loyalty to Whig principles during Anne's reign.

⁷⁹ William King (Dublin), Edward Smyth (Down and Connor). Both had experience of the Jacobite regime in Ireland and, as we shall see, mixed a visceral aversion to Dissent with an admiration of William as liberator. This is not a combination common in the sermons of their English/British counterparts (see below p.51).

⁸⁰ Hoadly (Armagh, 1727); Hort (Ferns and Leighlin, 1721); Hutchinson (Down and Connor 1720).

⁸¹ In only one case – that of George Stanhope – does analysis of the sermons lead to a conclusion differing from the Oxford DNB, which identifies Stanhope as a High Church, October Club Tory – though it does allow he had friendships with low churchmen. The reading of his sermons presented here shows a more nuanced preacher, recognisably Tory though even-handed and far short of the fulminations of Atterbury, Milbourne, Trapp or Morse.

⁸² Charles Williams, 1707, p. 4.

of them do from us [Church of England],”⁸³ all but one maintain a coherent tone.⁸⁴ So in the case of thirty-seven per cent – almost two in five – of the preachers, it is possible to get some indication of their views on issues of the day, prior to reading their sermons.

Chaplaincy provides a more tenuous suggestion as to a preacher’s allegiance⁸⁵ because chaplaincy could also be advantageous to the cleric. Ralph Lambert and Josiah Hort, both chaplains to the Earl of Wharton, followed him to Ireland during his term as Lord Lieutenant and were elevated as bishops of the Church of Ireland. On the basis that it would be unusual for a chaplain to go against the political viewpoint of his patron, it is possible to infer partisanship on the part of the chaplain from the loyalties of the patron. Thus, Richard West (sermon delivered June 1706) and John Hoadly (1708) are listed on their sermons as chaplains of Gilbert Burnet and, at first glance, can be inferred to be Whig leaning; Deuel Pead was chaplain to the Whig Duke of Newcastle, Charles Bean to the Whig (later Tory) Earl of Peterborough. Some intriguing chaplaincies were illuminated by these sermons – William Needham (1702) had been chaplain to Archbishop Sancroft before he became a non-juror and maintained contact thereafter, so Needham’s 1702 sermon to Convocation has a particular frisson, Nathaniel Hough (1704) and Richard Collins (1707) were chaplains to the Countess Fauconberg, Oliver Cromwell’s daughter.

In some cases, it is possible to doubt whether the patron was aware of their chaplain’s opinions – Richard Holland listed himself as chaplain to the Duke of Richmond, one of Charles II’s natural sons, who proved flexible in terms of religious affiliation, while no less than four preachers list themselves as chaplains to the Duke of Marlborough. Norman Sykes quotes Lord Poulett in a 1760 letter to the Duke of Newcastle, naming two Divines who: “I find.... on the register as my chaplains, who are both strangers to me.”⁸⁶ He further enquired of the Duke if either “be still living,” as he would like to confer the chaplaincy on someone else. In two further cases a mismatch between the politics of the patron and the political tone of the sermon was detected – Thomas Wise (December 1706) gave what could be considered quite a Whiggish sermon,⁸⁷ though he was chaplain to the Tory Duke of Ormonde; William Perse (June 1706) was chaplain to the moderate Tory Earl of Pembroke, though his sermon on the occasion could also be considered mildly Whiggish. In the end, no positive conclusions for the viewpoint of any preacher were drawn based upon chaplaincy alone.

⁸³ Chandler, 1707, p. 24.

⁸⁴ It is necessary to consult the works of Wilson and Ivimey to get a sense of the differing affiliations among the Dissenting community. Joseph Ivimey, *A History of the English Baptists* (4 vols, London, 1811-30).

⁸⁵ Chaplains to the Queen are not included in this paragraph. Those chosen were a number of high profile preachers. In general, these preachers have Oxford DNB entries.

⁸⁶ Norman Sykes, *Church and State in England in the XVIIIth Century* (Cambridge, 1934) p. 170.

⁸⁷ The sermon praises William, disparages those who complained at the expense of the war, and welcomes the forthcoming Union with Scotland.

The dedication of a preacher's published sermon can be a statement of either an acknowledgement of or a desire for patronage or of some political intent. As an example of the latter, in his 1702 Thanksgiving sermon to the Prussian congregation at Savoy Palace, J.J. Caesar's dedication was to the congregation "not Natives, yet Faithful Subjects."⁸⁸ In 1713, Joseph Harrison dedicated his sermon to the "true sons of the Church and Sincere Lovers of Peace... in the parish of Cirencester," which, in the circumstances of the day, was a statement of support for the Tory Ministry and policy.

In some instances,⁸⁹ dedications were to the local mayor and aldermen, which rather muddles the tracing of partisanship. At the other end of the scale, some dedications to national figures – the Duke⁹⁰ and Duchess⁹¹ of Marlborough, the Countess of Sunderland⁹² – may be efforts to attract the attention of the powerful rather than a specific agreement with policies. Where dedications are to bishops, there is usually a patronage rather than an ideological link – John Wilder, a Fellow of Pembroke College, Oxford, whose sermon of June 1706 is mildly Tory in content,⁹³ dedicated his sermon to the Whiggish John Hall, Bishop of Bristol, and, perhaps more tellingly in this case, Master of Pembroke College. William Elstob dedicated his 1704 sermon to William Nicolson, Bishop of Carlisle,⁹⁴ to whom Elstob was chaplain at the time. Both Edward Arwaker (December 1706) and Philip Stubbs (1713) dedicated their sermons to their local bishops. In all these cases, no conclusion of partisanship has been drawn from the sermons' dedication.

More revealing perhaps, was a dedication to a local Member of Parliament: Richard Holland dedicated his 1702 sermon to Sir Robert Burdett, Tory MP for Warwickshire;⁹⁵ John Catlyn dedicated his June 1706 sermon to Sir Thomas Powell, Tory MP for Monmouth; and Josiah Hort (later Church of Ireland Archbishop of Tuam) dedicated his December 1706 Sermon to Richard Hampden, Whig MP for Wendover. Perhaps the most astutely timed dedication was by Thomas Swift, cousin of Jonathan, who dedicated his 1710 Thanksgiving sermon to Robert Harley, at a time when the Tories were returning to

⁸⁸ The Dedication of the 1704 Thanksgiving was, more conventionally, to Baron Spanheim, "Ambassador of the Most Potent King of Prussia."

⁸⁹ Loveling (1704), Pearson (1704).

⁹⁰ Addison (1704), Bromesgrove (1704), Stephens (1708), Woodroffe (Jun. 1706).

⁹¹ Brady (1704), Milbourne (1704), Fleming (Jun. 1706).

⁹² John Dubourdieu (1704), Norris (1704).

⁹³ Wilder's political leanings may be inferred from the manner in which the sermon refers to the Queen's interaction with God and her care for the Established Church.

⁹⁴ At the time both Elstob and Nicolson were Tories, while Nicolson changed position during the reign under attack from the High Church Atterbury.

⁹⁵ Holland was Burdett's chaplain.

power. Unfortunately, Thomas Swift's career did not advance beyond the rectory of Puttenham, which had been presented to him through Sir William Temple's influence on the Whig, Lord Somers in 1694.⁹⁶

It has been possible to put together biographical information on a further thirty-two preachers from various sources – contemporary pamphlets, biographies, local histories. Significant biographical information – such as Benjamin Loveling's pamphlet disputes with the Banbury Quakers, the fact that Surrey schoolmaster Alexander Jephson was a refugee from the Jacobite regime in Ireland, Thomas Knaggs's departure from All-Hallows Newcastle following: "an argument with Dr Atherton, a strong passive obedience man, [which] got himself many potent enemies," Ralph Lambert's allegiance to the Earl of Wharton⁹⁷ – all serve to give some indication of the preacher's viewpoint in contemporary disputes. Sources of information on each preacher are given in Appendix 3: Preacher Biographies. The additional information increases the number of preachers about whom it is possible to form a view of their political partisanship from fifty-five to eighty-seven. This means that an indication of the preacher's viewpoint, independent of reading their sermons, is possible in the case of fifty-eight per cent of the clerics who published thanksgiving sermons.

⁹⁶ E.W. Brayley, *A topographical history of Surrey* (London, 1841) p. 242.

⁹⁷ Irvin Ehrenpreis, *Swift: the Man, his Works and the Age* (3 vols, London, 1962) iii, pp. 171-2, 718-21.

Chapter One: 1702 ‘Disappointing the Boundless Ambition of France’

In the late summer of 1702, the Duke of Ormonde led up to 16,000 troops on an Anglo-Dutch expedition to capture the port of Cadiz in Spain. William III had reluctantly agreed to invasion plans mooted by Prince George of Hesse-Darmstadt, on behalf of the Holy Roman Emperor. Possession of Cadiz would give the Anglo-Dutch a base from which to operate in the region, and possibly a landing in Spain might initiate a revolution similar to the one, which brought William to power in England. Paul Methuen, the English envoy to Portugal, worked assiduously to use the show of force to induce the Portuguese court to renounce their treaty with the French and to switch sides.

The attempt on Cadiz failed due to excessive caution and issues of co-ordination among the various commanders. The army had landed miles from Cadiz itself, and while capturing various towns – La Rota, Port St Mary – had engaged in looting and sacrilege. Outmanoeuvred by the eventual Spanish military reaction, the forces were evacuated two weeks later. The French and Spanish made much of the depredations visited upon the captured towns, news of which infuriated Prince George, whose hopes of a public acclamation of the Habsburg candidate for the Spanish throne evaporated in the violence.

On the voyage back to England, Admiral Rooke, the naval commander, was informed that a Spanish fleet, laden with silver and spices from Spain’s American colonies had avoided its usual landing port at Cadiz, and was sheltering, with a strong French naval escort, in the northern Spanish port of Vigo. The port was attacked and all the French and Spanish vessels were captured or sunk, ensuring that both countries’ naval abilities were severely limited. The amount of silver taken in the captured vessels became a topic of fevered speculation. In fact, it appears that on landing the Spanish had removed most of the silver, and most of the captured cargo consisted of goods belonging to traders of various nationalities, some of whom were Dutch and English, who were breaking a wartime embargo.

On 3 November, the Queen issued a proclamation for a public thanksgiving, to be held nine days later in St Paul’s and on 3 December throughout the “Kingdom of England, the Dominion of Wales and Town of Berwick upon Tweed.” It praised the “Great Goodness and Mercy of Almighty God” in protecting the realm and “disappointing the boundless ambition of France.”¹ On the advice of her Privy Council, the Queen not only praised the achievements at Vigo but also: “the territorial gains in the Low Countries, the great success of the Allies in Germany and Italy, the considerable successes in the West

¹*By the Queen, a proclamation for a public thanksgiving... Anne R..., 3rd November 1702* (London, 1702).

Indies.” The clergy were directed to compose prayers suitable for the occasion; and Her Majesty’s loving subjects were enjoined to religiously observe the day of thanksgiving: “upon pain of suffering such punishments as We may justly inflict on all such as shall contemn [sic] or neglect the performance of so religious and necessary a duty.”

There were significant differences from thanksgiving proclamations in William and Mary’s reign. Most obviously, there was a difference in fact. William’s limited military achievements had constrained the blessings for which he could give thanks – “the reduction of Ireland to obedience”²; “the protection of His majesties royal person from the many and great dangers of the war”³; “having put a stop to the rage and fury of the enemy”⁴; “our happy deliverance from the said barbarous and villainous conspiracy against our royal person”⁵; “the conclusion of peace between His Majesty... and the said French King.”⁶ Even the thanksgiving for the victory in 1692 at La Hogue – the decisive naval victory of the reign – had been delayed, and therefore subdued, awaiting a land-based victory in that year.⁷

There was a significant difference in tone. In William’s thanksgivings, which came at the end of campaigning seasons, each proclamation dourly referred to the pre-season’s days of fasting and humiliation and all but one – the thanksgiving for the peace of Ryswick – made baleful mention of William’s “Open and Secret enemies.” The words were reflexive, the mood dark, blessings were tragedies avoided – God has “brought him back safely” [1693] from the “great dangers of War,” His Majesty has “been preserved,” the proclamations invoked God’s protection “from great and manifold dangers” [1691], from “wicked machinations” [1691]. Anne’s proclamation dispensed with all such references and proclaimed that the multiple successes and blessings: “hath rendered our Trade at Sea secure, beyond what could be expected in the time of war,” and “made the beginning of our Reign happy and prosperous to Our Self and Our People.”

There was a difference in spectacle, demonstrated by the location chosen for the thanksgiving. William had heard his end-of-campaign thanksgiving sermons in his Chapel Royal, accompanied by courtiers, but separate from the Lords and Commons who held their own services.⁸ Anne was to use the

² *By the King and Queen a proclamation for a publick thanksgiving...* 22 Oct. 1691.

³ *By the King and Queen a proclamation for a publick thanksgiving ...* 2 Nov. 1693.

⁴ *By the King and Queen a proclamation for a publick thanksgiving...* 15 Nov. 1694.

⁵ *By the King a proclamation for a publick thanksgiving...* 12 Mar. 1696.

⁶ *By the King a proclamation for a publick thanksgiving...* 17 Nov. 1697.

⁷ Richard Doebner, ed., *Memoirs of Mary, queen of England (1689-1693): together with her letters and those of Kings James II and William III. to the Electress, Sophia of Hanover* (Leipzig, 1886) p. 51; *By the King and Queen a proclamation for a publick thanksgiving ...* 20 Oct. 1692.

⁸ Donald Burrows, *Handel and the English Chapel Royal* (Oxford, 2005) pp. 24-41; Tony Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 100-110.

occasion to bring monarch, court, parliament and mayoralty under one roof. The ‘entirely English’ new sovereign was to emulate the Elizabethan thanksgiving for salvation from the Armada. On 4 November, Secretary of State Sir Charles Hedges informed the House of Commons that: “for the greater Solemnity of that Day, Her Majesty will be pleased to go to Saint Paul’s Church, as has been accustomed in former Times.”⁹ Accustomed was perhaps an exaggeration – Lord Clarendon, Queen Anne’s non-juring uncle, was looking forward to “a good old ceremony, but hath scarce bin performed in the memory of man.”¹⁰

The location was sufficiently novel to cause concern among the Lords and Commons who would process through the streets to St Paul’s. The remembrance of the Armada Thanksgiving was uppermost in the Lords’ thoughts – they summoned the Dean of St Paul’s, Dr William Sherlock, and quizzed him about the order of procession in Queen Elizabeth’s time.¹¹ On being told by the Earl of Nottingham that the Queen “did not think it fit to go in her robes,” they debated doing the same, however the opportunity for public display overcame them and they voted to process to St Paul’s in their robes; their one concession to humility was to order: “that no Lord of this House shall go to St Paul’s with more than two horses to his coach.” In the event the Queen, attended: “habited in Purple, wearing her Collar and George, in her body coach drawn by eight horses.”¹²

The seating arrangements for the Queen Anne’s great day was a concern for both Houses of Parliament. On 7 December, the Commons, interrupting their consideration of the Occasional Conformity Bill, deputed three of its members to go to St Paul’s to confer with the Surveyor of Her Majesties works, Sir Christopher Wren. Three days earlier, the Queen had considerably sent Wren to wait on the Lords. He was ordered to ensure “that convenient Places be provided in St Paul’s Church, on the Day of Thanksgiving, for Eighty Lords, not to be mixed with others”;¹³ in the end the Commons were seated in the stalls and upper galleries, the Lords had seating specially created to mimic the House of Lords, with Her Majesty on a special ‘chair of State.’¹⁴

On the day of thanksgiving, the Commons, led by their speaker Robert Harley, set out for St Paul’s at 9am. The Lords left an hour later, the *Post Boy* deferentially noting the compromises made by the nobility: “the House of Peers, in their Robes, their Coaches drawn only by two Horses each ... and

⁹*C.J.*, xiv, p. 14.

¹⁰ Clarendon to [the Duchess of Beaufort], 5 Nov. 1702 in HMC, *Beaufort Mss*, p. 95.

¹¹ HMC, *Manuscripts of the House of Lords (1702-1704)* ii, 102: “House was informed that the Dean of St Paul’s was without, and that there was a book of the procession in Queen Elizabeth’s time. Dr. Sherlock was called in.”

¹² Abel Boyer, *The History of Queen Anne, digested into Annals, year the first* (11 vols, London, 1703) i, p. 142. The terms refer to the sovereign’s coronation robes; the George is a large gold representation of St George slaying a dragon.

¹³ *L.J.*, 17, p. 160.

¹⁴ *English Post with News Foreign and Domestick*, 325, 6-9 Nov. 1702.

being come to the Area or open Space, in the Body of the Choir, which was exactly like the House of Peers ... they placed themselves, as if sitting in the House of Lords.”¹⁵ Anne set out from St James’s about noon. She travelled: “in a coach drawn by 8 horses, the Yeomen of the Guard marching about the Coach, and my Lord Rivers’ troop of Horse Guards before and behind.”¹⁶ The streets were lined: “by the Blue and Green Regiments of Trained Bands and her Majesty’s Foot-Guards, and a Regiment of Foot Guards and another of Horse-Grenadiers.”¹⁷ The public was enthusiastic to see the sovereign. “The Numerous Spectators, thro’ which Her Majesty passed, demonstrated their extraordinary satisfaction by Shouts and Acclamations,”¹⁸ ... “the Balconies hanging with Tapistry [sic], and crowded with Spectators, who made loud Acclamations of, Long live Queen Anne.”¹⁹

The mood in the Queen’s carriage may have been somewhat frostier. Anne was accompanied by her influential Groom of the Stole, Sarah, Countess of Marlborough and Sarah’s daughter, Lady Harriet Godolphin. The Countess had commented tartly that: “the sea-fight as hardly a victory” and viewed the joint celebration as a slight on her husband’s services.²⁰ Marlborough was delayed in the Netherlands. Within two weeks, Anne was to placate the Marlboroughs by granting him the title of Duke and requesting Parliament to grant him £5,000 per annum. For Rochester and the High Tories, this generosity was too reminiscent of William’s grant to his favourites, and in the coming months, they led parliamentary agitation, which blocked the grant.

The Duke of Ormonde travelled in one of Her Majesties coaches (“drawn by six horses” noted the status-conscious *Post Boy*) and “being known to the People, they were not wanting to declare their high Esteem of his Grace’s Conduct and Valour in the late Renowned Action at Vigo,”²¹ ... “whom the people Huzza’d all the way.”²² The *Flying Post* noted that: “His Grace expressed his Gratitude by bowing to the People with so much gravity, as bespoke him above being too much elevated by popular Applause.”²³

¹⁵ *Post Boy* (1695), 1171, 12-14 Nov. 1702. The *Post Boy* was a pro-Tory newspaper, edited by Abel Roper.

¹⁶ *Daily Courant*, 181, Saturday, 14 Nov. Richard Savage, Earl Rivers, had played an important role in the army’s defection to William in Nov. 1688. In 1706-1708, he was one of three British commanders of expeditionary forces in Spain. The confusion in roles contributed to ineffectual campaigning. Encouraged by Harley, he was one of many commanders who led the disparagement of Marlborough in 1710-11: John B. Hattendorf, ‘Savage, Richard, fourth Earl Rivers (c.1654–1712)’, *Oxford DNB* [accessed 29 Mar. 2016].

¹⁷ *Post Boy* (1695), 1171, 12-14 Nov. 1702.

¹⁸ *English Post with News Foreign and Domestick*, 11-13 Nov. 1702.

¹⁹ *Post Boy*, 1171, 12-14 Nov. 1702.

²⁰ H.L. Snyder, ed., *The Marlborough-Godolphin Correspondence* (3 vols, Oxford, 1975) i, 148 n.3.

²¹ *English Post with News Foreign and Domestick*, 327, 11-13 Nov. 1702.

²² *Post Boy* (1695), 1171, 12-14 Nov. 1702.

²³ *Flying Post or The Post Master*, 1174, 12-14 Nov. 1702.

The studied emulation of Elizabeth's Armada Thanksgiving continued at Temple Bar, the traditional western-most extent of the City of London on the road to Westminster.

[The] Right Honourable Lord Mayor, Sir Samuel Dashwood, and Court of Aldermen, with the Sheriffs, in their Formalities, met the Queen on Horseback, when his Lordship alighting from his horse, presented Her Majesty with the City Sword on his Knees, which she was graciously pleased to return him: After which his Lordship mounted, and carried the Sword bare-headed all the way before the Queen's coach.²⁴

The Queen received the sword as symbolic authority over the City and in exchange, she conferred on the Lord Mayor symbolic authority to act on her behalf during her visit.²⁵ No more than in Elizabeth's era, Anne used public displays of a monarch's authority as a negotiation between monarch and subjects meant to achieve a political equilibrium.²⁶ Three weeks previously, Anne had taken care to knight the Lord Mayor's younger brother, the Whig MP and government financier Francis Dashwood,²⁷ as well as Gilbert Heathcoat, Whig Alderman of London, MP and director of the Bank of England and the goldsmith-financier Richard Hoare.²⁸ The ceremony took place in the Guildhall during the feast following the Lord Mayor's inauguration.²⁹

As the procession made its way past Ludgate, it passed an inscription in Latin affixed to the gate, which proclaimed Anne and her illustrious consort, and her no less illustrious heroes, the Duke of Ormonde, the Earl of Marlborough and Sir George Rooke. The second half of the inscription, a doggerel verse in English, praised 'Anna' for following in 'Eliza's' footsteps in threatening both France and Spain.³⁰ The assembled Lords received Her Majesty at the west gate of the Church and returned to their places. As Her Majesty alighted from her coach, on signal, the guns of the Tower of London and St James's Park thundered; Her Majesty advanced up to the choir, the Duke of Ormonde carrying the Sword of State. The Queen's spirits were perhaps lifted by the occasion, she walked between the Lord

²⁴ *Post Boy* (1695), 1171, 12-14 Nov. 1702.

²⁵ A.F. Marotti and S.W. May, 'Two Lost Ballads of the Armada Thanksgiving Celebration' in *English Literary Renaissance*, xli (Winter 2011) pp. 31-63.

²⁶ The point is Kevin Sharpe's: Sharpe, *Selling the Tudor Monarchy: Authority and Image in Sixteenth-Century England* (New Haven, 2009), p. 7.

²⁷ Francis Dashwood was counted a Whig by Sunderland and others, though his older brother Samuel was a Tory. The fluidity of party demarcation, sibling rivalry and the commercial opportunities available by keeping in with those in power may explain Francis' political leanings: H.O.P. 1690-1715, iii, pp. 843-4.

²⁸ Both Heathcote and Hoare would become future Lord Mayors. Heathcote, a Whig, would be elected in 1710, Hoare, a Tory, in 1712.

²⁹ *London Gazette*, 29 Oct.-2 Nov. 2, 1702.

³⁰ *Flying Post or The Post Master*, 12-14 Nov. 1702.

Chamberlain³¹ and the Duke of Somerset, without, as the *Daily Courant* noted: “being supported by either of them.”³²

Sir Jonathan Trelawny, Bishop of Exeter, had been chosen to deliver the sermon. A baronet as well as a bishop, he had mustered and led troops for James in the Monmouth Rebellion. He was blunt, energetic and sometimes profane, a strict diocesan disciplinarian disparagingly referred to as “a spiritual dragoon.”³³ One of the seven bishops who had resisted Anne’s father, Trelawny’s royalist background had informed his reluctant acceptance of the revolution: “we thought ourselves obliged to accept the deliverance brought us.”³⁴ Eventually pragmatism had led him to take the oaths of fealty to William and Mary.³⁵ Upon Queen Anne’s accession, Trelawny’s High Church credentials reasserted themselves – he was a supporter of Atterbury and the Lower House of Convocation and antagonistic to Bishop Burnet and the Williamite bishops.

Trelawny’s sermon was a statement of High Tory orthodoxy. He lost little time in welcoming the Houses of Parliament to the cathedral – he noted an old saying that Kings and Queens of England were in their true glory when at the head of their Parliament but surely: “never more so than in such Parliamentary appearance in the House of God.”³⁶ He welcomed the Queen’s stated resolve: “to strengthen and support the Establishment of our Religion.” Trelawny lamented the murder of “the best of kings” – Charles I – and delighted in the happy restoration of his son, but neglected any mention of the Revolution or the part played by the Calvinist William in the deliverance of the nation. To further mortify Whigs present, he noted that: “all the wise nations of Christendom have founded the obligation of their Obedience to Government upon the Command of God, and not upon the meer [sic] force of a Contract between those who are Govern’d and the Governors.”

At St Paul’s, the service being done, the Te Deum sung,³⁷ the Queen, the great officers, the Lords and Commons took their leave. The public mood, in general, was light:

³¹ Edward Villiers, 1st Earl of Jersey.

³² *Daily Courant*, 14 Nov. 1702. Anne’s physical frailty was well known; at her coronation, she had been unable to walk to the Abbey, as was customary, instead she was carried to Westminster in an elbow chair. In the Abbey she had stumbled when approaching the anointing altar.

³³ Agnes Strickland and Elizabeth Strickland, *The lives of the seven bishops committed to the Tower in 1688* (London, 1866), p. 389 “I do not swear as a bishop, when I swear it is as Sir Jonathan Trelawny, a country gentleman and baronet.”

³⁴ Andrew M. Coleby, ‘Trelawny, Sir Jonathan, third baronet (1650–1721)’, *Oxford DNB* [accessed 25 Mar. 2016].

³⁵ Five of the original seven bishops became non-jurors, Trelawny and Lloyd of St Asaph took the oaths to William and Mary.

³⁶ All quotes in this section from Trelawny, 1702.

³⁷ Contemporary accounts refer to the ‘Anthem’ being sung, but references from later thanksgiving services mention Purcell’s Te Deum: Burrows, *Händel and the English Chapel Royal*, p. 36.

every Steeple Oracel had proclaim'd the Joyful news of your Success ... the whole Town was Deafened with the Mobs Huzza's and the Nonconforming Jacobites look'd as Pale as the Surprise, as the Whigs did at the Death of their late Benefactor; the Church Loyalists Express'd their Joy for the Good Tidings in reviving Bumpers and gave, like Faithful Subjects, the Honour of the Action to the Wisdom of Her Most Successful Majesty. The White-Friars Ballad-Singers bawl nothing at Shoe-Lane End and the Porter's Block in Smithfield, but England's Happiness, or A new Copy of Verses upon the Taking of the Plate-Fleet, set to an excellent New Vigo Tune.³⁸

The great guns of the Tower were fired. The night concluded with bonfires, illuminations and other public demonstrations of joy.

The 3 of December saw the staging of thanksgiving ceremonies around England and in Dublin.³⁹ In York the Lord Mayor, aldermen and common council members, assembled in the Minster in their 'formalities,' where, surprisingly perhaps, they heard a sermon⁴⁰ with no explicit praise of current or former majesties, governance or military heroes. They were treated to a long exposition about the biblical Ships of Tarish, supposing the term to be a corruption of Cadiz, and solemnly told that: "Thirst after Silver and Gold is no new Distemper of our days." After which the gentry and clergy were invited to the Guildhall:

where Her Majesty's and His Royal Highness Prince George's Health were drank; ... at the same time four Hogsheads of Punch were placed in each Corner of the Cross, and given to the common people, who drank the aforesaid Healths very cheerfully; Drums, trumpets, and Hautboys, with other music playing all the time. The evening concluded with Illuminations, Bonfires etc. and nothing was omitted that could express our Duty to Her Majesty.⁴¹

Oxford had not waited upon the official Thanksgiving Day, in mid-November on first news of the victory:

they have made extraordinary rejoicings there upon account of the Glorious success of her Majesties Arms, and especially for the late Action at Vigo in which his Grace the Duke of Ormonde, Chancellor of the

³⁸ *Letters from the Living to the Living, Relating to the Present transactions both Publick and Private* (London, 1703). This is a collection of purported letters, printed in book form in Jan. 1703 which are a vehicle for salacious rumour mongering at the time. Though bawdy, and possibly politically motivated, their descriptions of contemporary London have an authentic ring.

³⁹ In Ireland, the Thanksgiving Day was to be kept on 3 Dec. in Dublin and all over the kingdom sixteen days later. *Post Boy* (1695), 1182, 8-10 Dec. 1702.

⁴⁰ T.C., 1702. Unfortunately, the printed version of the sermon just gives the preacher's initials.

⁴¹ *Flying Post or The Post Master*, 8-10 Dec. 1702.

University, gained so much Honour. Those rejoicings have lasted a whole week, and were concluded on Saturday night by a magnificent Consort of Vocal and Instrumental Musick performed by Mr. Abel.⁴²

More formal celebrations ensued on 3 December, gown and town held separate though similar ceremonies. “In the morning there were Prayers and a Sermon⁴³ at St Mary’s and several Anthems sung, with Excellent Musick.”⁴⁴ After the service:

there were publick Exercises in the Theatre, consisting chiefly of Verses spoke by young Scholars upon the occasion, with a fine Comfort of Musick. After where the like was done in most Colleges: And in the evening there were Bonfires Illuminations, ringing of Bells and all imaginable Demonstrations of Joy and Expressions of the Loyalty and Affection of the University for Her Majesty.

The City also gave such Demonstrations of their Joy ... the Mayor and Corporation in their Formalities going to Christ Church, and after Divine Service, to the Bench there, where there was a Bonfire, and an Entertainment of Wine; and several Barrels of Ale were given to the People; and City Musick playing all the while. From thence they went to the Guildhall, and had there a splendid Entertainment, a great quantity of Venison having been given to the Corporation for that purpose by the Rt. Hon, the Earl of Abingdon, their High Steward; and in the Evening there were throughout the Town, Bonfires, Illuminations, ringing of Bells, and other Rejoicings.⁴⁵

The 1702 Thanksgiving produced eighteen published sermons, of which ten could be characterised as pro-ministry, disparaging of dissent, and to varying degrees of William’s memory. Two Church of England sermons – one preached in Amsterdam – are studiously politically neutral, and one published sermon was delivered to the German congregation in the Savoy Church; it too, was careful not to take sides. The sermons for the first of Anne’s thanksgivings flagged up a number of issues and themes that would recur in the years ahead. Reflecting on victories gave opportunities to address the role of providence, and indirectly thereby to reflect too on appropriate responses by the English people to God’s actions and provision. Such responses could be shaped by reflecting upon recent events in England, most especially upon the continuing resonances of the killing of Charles I in 1649, or upon the recent reign of William III, the liberator of 1688 but also the object of deep and increasing suspicion among many of his subjects. How preachers would handle, or indeed manage to dodge, such precedents were indicative of their prescriptions for England at the outset of the new reign. Even more so was the manner in which they

⁴² *Post Man*, 10-12 Nov. 1702.

⁴³ Dr Benjamin Woodroffe gave the sermon – Humphrey Prideaux, a contemporary and rival, had, peevishly noted Woodroffe’s reputation for recycling material for his sermons, but this day was surely singular: E. M. Thompson, ed., *Letters of Humphrey Prideaux, sometime dean of Norwich, to John Ellis, sometime under-secretary of state, 1674-1722* (London, 1875) pp. 7,8.

⁴⁴ *London Gazette*, 3-7 Dec. 1702.

⁴⁵ *London Gazette*, 3868, 3-7 Dec. 1702.

might choose to address the prevailing religious divisions within Protestant England. Already in 1702, preachers were using thanksgiving sermons to criticise either leniency or harshness towards Dissenters. Occasionally too there were reflections on the place of those members of the Church of England, who had taken a non-juring position in the aftermath of the revolution of 1688-9 (failing to take the oaths of allegiance to William and Mary) and a possible change in their circumstances brought about by the succession of Queen Anne.

The High Churchman Richard Fiddes's⁴⁶ published sermon took a firm anti-Dissenter viewpoint. In later years, Fiddes became a friend of Swift and chaplain to Robert Harley. Though friendly with non-jurors like William Law,⁴⁷ Fiddes proved himself a Hanoverian Tory on the death of Queen Anne. William Needham, who had been the non-juring Archbishop Sancroft's chaplain and visited him even after the latter's deprivation,⁴⁸ gave a sermon to his reverend colleagues at Convocation. Benjamin Woodroffe, of Christ Church Oxford, gave the sermon at St Mary's Church. In 1702, Woodroffe, already grappling with the expense of forming a college for Greek Orthodox students in Oxford, had formed a company to exploit the island of Tobago, and the obsequious introduction to his sermon reads like a prospectus, incongruously listing the advantages of the island: "the very key and door to the West Indies,"⁴⁹ along with praise of the year's victories. In Norwich, Humphrey Prideaux, who was waspish in his comments on Woodroffe, gave the sermon. Prideaux had lost out to Woodroffe for the tutorship of the High Tory Earl of Nottingham's sons while they attended Christ Church. Dr Ralph Lambert, who opposed Needham's views in the English Convocation, preached in London's St Giles-in-the-Fields. In 1708, Lambert, an ambitious, prolific, pro-Whig cleric was appointed the Earl of Wharton's chaplain⁵⁰ upon the latter's appointment as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. Lambert went on to become Bishop of Meath.

Two dissenting sermons were published, one by Daniel Williams, the doyen of respectable dissent in Queen Anne's London. Just over a mile to the east of St Paul's, Williams spoke at a large meeting-house in Hand Alley (now New Street), Bishopsgate, just outside the city walls, where he

⁴⁶ Richard Sharp, 'Fiddes, Richard (1671–1725)', *Oxford DNB* [accessed 7 Mar. 2016]

⁴⁷ Law published a Thanksgiving Sermon in 1713.

⁴⁸ After Sancroft's deprivation, he did not allow Needham, who had taken the oath of Loyalty to William and Mary, to officiate at any ceremonies; though Needham continued as one of Sancroft's two chaplains: George D'Oyly, *The Life of William Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury* (London, 1821), pp. 69, 90-94, 125.

⁴⁹ Woodroffe, 1702 Dedication p. 2. Woodroffe's Greek college, known as Woodroffe's Folly in his lifetime, eventually became Worcester College. Edward Vallance, 'Woodroffe, Benjamin (1638–1711)', *Oxford DNB* [accessed 7 Mar. 2016].

⁵⁰ Wharton had considered Jonathan Swift, at that point a Whig, for the post of chaplain, and unknowingly made a rod for his own back, by choosing Lambert instead.

preached to a: “very respectable congregation of Presbyterians.”⁵¹ It was a large place: “with three galleries, up to thirty pews and many benches and forms.”⁵² Williams had spent years preaching in Ireland, fleeing the rise of Catholic officialdom in 1687.

Like Trelawny, Williams had opposed James’s 1688 declaration of indulgence, though unlike Trelawny he was vociferous and unequivocal in his opposition: “it were better for them [Dissenting ministers] to be reduc’d to their former Hardships, than declare for Measures destructive of the Liberties of their Country.”⁵³ Williams’s sermon was more thoughtful than Trelawny’s. He first investigated if the war was just, and finding it so, noted that duty called for “Praise, Blessing, Thanksgiving and Joy” and he defined how each should be practised – “every motion of our Hearts tinctured with each.”⁵⁴ The previous 23 March, Williams had led a delegation of the “three denominations” of Dissenters – Presbyterians, Independents and Baptists – to present a declaration of loyalty to Queen Anne upon her accession to the throne. There had been no reply.

The other Dissenting sermon was by Joseph Jacob, a loquacious firebrand described by the *Observer* as: “not only a Dissenter from the Church of England but from all religious societies.”⁵⁵ Jacob’s followers were obliged to refrain from wearing ‘periwigs,’ forbidden to attend any other religious service, and made to stand when singing – the last an innovation at the time. Both sexes had a strict dress code, and the men were obliged to wear “whiskers on their upper lip,” which was claimed to be a demonstration “of being the Church Militant.”⁵⁶ Unusually for a Dissenting minister, Jacob voiced a low opinion of William – calling him “the stranger.” He disagreed with occasional conformity as injurious to the moral fibre of right-thinking Dissenters, praised the ministry for its attempts to put stop to the practice and admired the Queen who: “is zealous for her own way, and for one way only; and zealous for one way only, ought all Christians to be.”⁵⁷

In Ireland, the day of thanksgiving was to be kept on 3 December in Dublin and in the rest of the Kingdom sixteen days later.⁵⁸ “Their Excellencie’s [sic] the Lords Justices went to Christ Church in State, where the Right Reverend Father in God, the Bishop of Down and Connor, made an excellent Sermon.

⁵¹ Walter Wilson, *The history and antiquities of Dissenting churches and meeting houses in London, Westminster, and Southwark: including the lives of their ministers, from the rise of nonconformity to the present time: with an appendix on the origin, progress, and present state of Christianity in Britain* (4 vols, London, 1808), I, p. 339.

⁵² *Ibid*, p. 339.

⁵³ J. Evans, *A funeral sermon occasion'd by the much lamented death of the late Reverend Daniel Williams, D.D. who deceas'd January the 26th 1715/6* (1716).

⁵⁴ Williams, 1702, p. 5.

⁵⁵ *Observer* (1702), 6-9 Jan. 1703.

⁵⁶ Wilson *History...of Dissenting churches and meeting houses in London*, i, p. 141.

⁵⁷ Jacob, 1702, p. 32.

⁵⁸ *Post Boy*, 8-10, Dec. 1702.

The Bells rung all Day, and this Night we have Bonfires and Illuminations all over the City.”⁵⁹ Edward Smyth, the Bishop of Down and Connor, had fled the Jacobite regime in Dublin in 1689. He had been William’s chaplain for four years and benefited from Ormonde’s patronage in the later 1690s.⁶⁰ His sermon was overtly political as befitted a Protestant community, grimly ascendant but conscious of the threat of a Catholic majority. He was gladdened that: “we are blessed with a constitution where we enjoy all the advantages of Monarchy and are safe against arbitrary power.”⁶¹

Though thanksgivings had been held under William, the relative novelty of the event was evident throughout all sermons; pastors emphasised the need to attend thanksgivings, the proper decorum to give respectful, joyful thanks and the avoidance of excess. As the thanksgiving services grew to become an almost annual event, only the latter topic continued to exercise the various sermons. Edward Clarke in Nottingham felt that: “Tis therefore a sort of test of a Man’s Uprightness and Sincerity, to observe how he rejoices, especially upon this so Solemn an Occasion.”⁶² In Banbury, Benjamin Loveling noted for his disputes with local Quakers, felt that: “He who refuses to ascribe National Success to the Power and Direction of God, is a down-right Epicurean; for Divine Providence is chiefly concern’d in all Publick Transactions.”⁶³

Rather ironically, given the publication and sale of their printed sermons, other preachers frowned on judging services by the entertainment value of the preacher. In Amsterdam, John Cockburn complained: “[h]ow many ... Even of the better sort ... That come to Church, come not to Worship God, but to please themselves with some new fine or agreeable discourse. If no sermon they do not judge it worth their while, to attend the prayers or praises of God.”⁶⁴ Joseph Jacob, the Dissenter, in the midst of a condemnation of occasional conformity, advised: “say not, you can hear better Men in another place: It is not the Minister only, but the Church, you are to joyn to: If the Church be good, you ought not to go from it, if bad, you ought never to go to it.”⁶⁵

There was unanimity that God’s providence was the driving force behind all events. In Cheshunt, Hertfordshire, sixteen miles north of London, vicar Richard Chapman summarised as follows: “There is a Secret, Providential, Invisible Power, that is interwoven with, and actuates the Projects and Designs of Men... to which alone the Prosperity and Happiness of a People must be wholly referred.”⁶⁶ In

⁵⁹ *Post Boy*, 12 -15 Dec. 1702.

⁶⁰ E.I. Carlyle, rev. Toby Barnard, ‘Smyth, Edward (c.1662–1720)’, *Oxford DNB* [accessed 16 Mar. 2016]

⁶¹ Smyth, 1702, p. 7.

⁶² Clarke, 1702, p. 22

⁶³ Loveling, 1702, pp. 10, 14.

⁶⁴ Cockburn, 1702, p. 12.

⁶⁵ Jacob, 1702, p. 31.

⁶⁶ Chapman, 702, p. 7.

Nottingham, the vicar Edward Clarke held that providence was “[r]ewarding Righteous and Religious people with the Blessings of Peace, Plenty and Prosperity.”⁶⁷

Providence could show itself in long-term benefits: “No part, no Country of the Christian world hath had more remarkable and evident instances of God’s favour and Mercy towards them than we of this Kingdom,”⁶⁸ and short-term: “Cadiz escapes the blow, Vigo feels it: A lesser trophy is denied, but ‘twas because a greater was preparing for us.”⁶⁹ The Dissenter Daniel Williams noted God’s astuteness, not only to enable victory “by his Providence the unexpected News of the Flotas being at Vigo was brought to our Fleet,” but also to prevent public disaffection: “God directed the whole matter so to cover our Reproaches abroad, and prevent our Murmurs at Home, as if we had left Cadiz only to seize the Flota.”⁷⁰ Edward Clarke felt that society should not expect God’s help, “and not tempt him by a lazy and presumptuous reliance on such extraordinary interposition of his providence.”⁷¹

As evident as the existence of God’s favour was the threat of losing it. John Cockburn summed it up: “how then can any Nation, or City, or people look for singular protection; for extraordinary blessings, if they be careless to please God, and to order their ways aright before him?”⁷² Cockburn had had a peripatetic ministry – originally a Church of Scotland minister translated to a Church of England parish, he had declined to take the oaths to William and Mary, was deprived and eventually ordered to leave His Majesty’s dominions in 1693. He fetched up in St Germain but again began to feel out of favour there. Arriving in Amsterdam in 1700, he held services in a private chapel. His persistent efforts were crowned with the success of a lasting congregation, and he enjoyed cordial relations with the burgomasters, who granted the Anglicans the right to worship.⁷³ In St Paul’s, the doughty Trelawny held forth on providence: “It is only the steady performance of our Duty to God, in keeping his Laws and cleaving to his Commandments... that will engage him to protect, and fight for us, to bless our Counsels and prosper our Wars.”

He burnished his High Tory credentials by noting it was only God’s providence which had wrought “the happy Restoration” of Charles II, following the “never to be forgotten rebellion, and the

⁶⁷ Clarke, 1702, p. 15.

⁶⁸ Forster, 1702, p. 7.

⁶⁹ Woodroffe, 1702, p. 17.

⁷⁰ Daniel Williams, 1702, p. 10.

⁷¹ Edward Clarke. 1702, p. 15.

⁷² Cockburn, 1702, p. 5.

⁷³ Tristram Clarke, ‘Cockburn, John (1652–1729)’, *Oxford DNB* [accessed 25 Mar. 2016].

murder [sic] of the best of Kings.”⁷⁴ In Nottingham, Edward Clarke came close to identifying the ungrateful with the disloyal: “He that in such Occurrences as these, sees not the Finger of God, is Blind and Insensible, and he that seeing makes no acknowledgement of them to God, nor improvement to himself, is Obstinate and Rebellious.”⁷⁵ Benjamin Loveling worried that: “since to deny a Providence is to take away one of the strongest and most sensible Arguments for the Being of a God ... And whoever is so addicted to Scepticism as to assert this, is next door to an Atheist.”⁷⁶

Despite bromides such as Rector Charles Whiting’s: “[w]e are parts of a Nation, and (to our great happiness) Subjects of the best-constituted Government in the World,”⁷⁷ the disunity of English society – riven by party and religious contention – was a cause of great anxiety for all preachers. However, the nature of the division, whether it existed at all and how unity might be achieved, were the continuing differences that echoed through the thanksgiving sermons.

The division within the Established Church about how to regard Dissent, and the suspicion with which Dissenters were viewed by a significant section of Anglican clergy, formed a continuous theme through these sermons. William Needham, in a sermon to the Lower House of Convocation, implicitly expressed the view of religious Dissenters as political radicals and potential traitors: “the greatest admirers of what they call a Publick Spirit, are ambitiously indifferent as to unanimity in the Religion of their Country, and prone to prefer the Manners and Constitutions of every Nation to those of their own.”⁷⁸

Speaking in more religiously liberal Amsterdam, John Cockburn had a rather cloudy vision of the distinction: “Indeed the Church and the Civil State are distinct things, and may be considered apart; but it is best for either, when they are strictly allied and mutually concerned for each other, which was the prescription of God himself.” In the next breath, however, he warned against such religious enthusiasm as might give rise to disloyalty: “They are not the true church, neither have they the Principles of True Religion, who give disturbance to the Civil State.”⁷⁹

The view was somewhat clearer on the dissenting side, for Daniel Williams recognised the age-old enemy as popery and, its current manifestation, the arbitrary power of the French king. “The Enemy and his Abettors are not so weak, but that they may reduce us to such Distress, as our nation may be in

⁷⁴ Trelawny, 1702, p. 4. Throughout Anne’s reign, Trelawny showed an ability to tack with the prevailing wind. Though a correspondent and mentor of Atterbury and other incendiary High Church clerics, he was able to benefit from translation to more lucrative episcopal sees through judicious friendship with Godolphin and Marlborough.

⁷⁵ Clarke, 1702, p. 15.

⁷⁶ Loveling, 1702, p. 14.

⁷⁷ Whiting, 1702, p. 15.

⁷⁸ Needham, 1702, p. 19.

⁷⁹ Cockburn, 1703, pp. 25, 26.

danger by the Incapacity and Resentment of the aggrieved.” He squarely blamed the High Church as a destabilising force: “and the Oppressing part distinguished by a Fiery Zeal, not for any Protestant principle but for things so insignificant, as must narrow its bottom beyond Stability.” Williams characterised Anglican opponents of Dissent as “narrow,” the antithesis of the Dissenting (and Anglican latitudinarian) belief that the various interpretations of the reformed religion could be accommodated within a political and religious framework. For Williams, dissent in the political context was not disloyalty; in fact, the narrow view, which doubted Dissenters’ loyalty ran the risk of splitting the opposition before the papist behemoth:

yet Persecution must be now the greatest Folly ... Nor can the Protestant Religion be secure, when the Oppressed part of its Strength is made useless, and the Oppressing part distinguished by a Fiery Zeal, not for any Protestant principle but for things so insignificant, as must narrow its bottom beyond Stability.

Rather plaintively, Williams assured his congregation that the narrow view, so evident in contemporary political councils, would and could be moderated by Her Majesty “the Name of Persecution is become odious and that the thing shall be prevented, we have the Royal Word of Her Majesty.”⁸⁰

One of the most immediate sources of tension was Occasional Conformity, the result of which was, as Richard Fiddes fulminated, that:

there are some upon occasion amongst us, who are not of us ... Who communicate with us in order to qualify themselves for places of Trust or Profit, and then Raile at the terms of our communion, when they have done, who take the Oaths of Conformity out of Interest, and then pretend conscience for not Conforming.

He noted that there must exist “sober, moderate Dissenters themselves” who abhor “such indirect and scandalous Practices”⁸¹ which smacked of atheism or expediency. He was relieved to tell his congregation that the ministry had, at last, taken this dishonourable practice into consideration. Joseph Jacob’s Turners Hall sermon – delivered half-a-mile south of Dr Williams’s congregation – demonstrated the less-often heard criticism of occasional conformity from a dissenting point of view. Praising the Queen’s “plain profession of her Religion,” he also praised Parliament for: “making a righteous Vote against Occasional Conformity.” He condemned those: “who dare take the Sacrament in the National Church to Qualify them for an Office, when yet they shun it there at other Seasons.”⁸² Jacob’s published

⁸⁰ Williams, 1702, pp. 28, 29.

⁸¹ Fiddes, 1702, p. 17.

⁸² Jacob, 1702, pp. 29, 30.

sermon attracted derision in five separate editions of John Tutchin's *Observer*, which dismissed his congregation as: "Philadelphians, Sweet Singers, Seekers and Muggletonians."⁸³ Jacob responded by publishing an eighteen-page defence of his original sermon and took the calumny as confirmation of his calling. Jacob's congregation eventually deserted him, as he engaged in political and religious controversies continuously.⁸⁴

In Dublin, Edward Smyth expressed views that revealed both similarities and differences. In common with English High Church Tories, he believed Dissenters were not just disloyal but a tool of papist infiltration; however, in Ireland William was venerated in a way which was absent in English Toryism:

It [the execution of Charles I] was an instance of their [Rome's] Refined policy, to bring in Popery, by Crying out against it ... the Royal family was forced into banishment, and there received such impressions of Popery as would have proved fatal to our Church, had not God by Extraordinary (and I think I may say miraculous⁸⁵ Providences interposed, and raised up Our Late Glorious Sovereign to be Our Deliverer.⁸⁶

In St Peter's, Cornhill, London, Richard Holland attempted magnanimity from an Established Church viewpoint, while, as usual, intermingling theological and political loyalty: "Therefore it is not the persons of Men that are to be the object of our hatred, but their vitious [sic] habits only: Atheism and Profaneness, Schism and Sediton, Idolatry and Irreligion."⁸⁷ Richard Fiddes's invitation to non-jurors contrasted sharply with his discussion of Dissenters:

tis to be hoped, their secret wishes for the publick Good, will in time induce them to consider the unreasonableness of their private doubts, and their known honour, and veneration for Her Majesty's Person makes way for the effectual removal of their prejudices, against her Title.⁸⁸

William Needham's sermon in King Henry VII's chapel to the Lower House of Convocation also included a veiled invitation to non-jurors, a group of Anglicans who had not felt able to swear loyalty to

⁸³ *Observer*, 6-9 Jan. 1703.

⁸⁴ Walter Wilson, *The history and antiquities of Dissenting churches*, i, pp. 139-43.

⁸⁵ Miraculous, in this context is a key word, indicative of the orthodox classification of providence into Miraculous, Special and Ordinary. See William King, 1704 sermon and discussion (see p. 52 below).

⁸⁶ Edward Smyth, p. 5. 1702, Bishop of Down & Connor, Dublin. English Tories were quite capable of deploring the murder of Charles, conveying dismay at the reign of James II without the slightest mention of William. See Trelawny, 1702, Luke Milbourne, 1704 p. 26, Tomas Rivers, Nov. 1708/09 p. 5, Nov. 1709, p. 4. Francis Higgins in his 1704 Thanksgiving sermon p. 9 was, like Smith, able to praise both. For an Irish perspective, see Joseph Richardson, 'Archbishop William King (1650-1729): "Church Tory and State Whig"?', *Eighteenth-Century Ireland*, xv (2000) pp. 54-76.

⁸⁷ Holland, 1702, p. 8.

⁸⁸ Fiddes, 1702, p. 25.

William and Mary, and consequently had suffered deprivation during the previous reign. He spoke to a sympathetic congregation. The death of King James in 1701 had given some non-jurors pause – though they had sworn to be faithful to King James and his heirs and lawful successors, it was possible to look upon Queen Anne in the role of lawful regent for the then thirteen-year-old Pretender.⁸⁹ Some flexibility – not a notable non-juror trait – would have been required to maintain this view, necessitating as it did the overlooking the Act of Settlement and the Abjuration Oath. Though not a non-juror, Needham’s association with Sancroft would have been well known to his listeners, adding piquancy to his claim that the “demonstrations of divine Favour towards her ... [must] Shame and Silence her Secret Enemies, if there can still be any such,” and that God’s grace must “invite even those who hitherto have refused to come (and surely it would well become them All to come on such a day as this) and join with us.”⁹⁰

If Bishop Trelawny spoke for the officer-class of the High Church party – a minority of the episcopate – the Lower House of Convocation comprised its shock troops. The Lower House was successfully challenging the episcopate, represented in the Upper House of Convocation, and, spurred by pugnacious ministers such as Francis Atterbury, was bidding to become the spiritual counterpart of the House of Commons.⁹¹ They had doubtless been heartened by the introduction that week of the bill forbidding Occasional Conformity and by the Queen’s own declaration on the dismissal of Parliament the previous May that: “her own principals must always keep her entirely firm to the interests of the Church of England and would incline her to countenance those who had the truest zeal to support it.”⁹² Though his sermon’s tone was of even more high-flying than Needham’s, Richard Fiddes unknowingly reflected the tension which held the religious divisions in check, when he acknowledged that Her Majesty’s: “Gracious expressions towards us are temper’d with so much moderation and tenderness for her People in general, that they cannot offend those who Dissent from us.”⁹³

For Tories, the return of an orthodox, English monarch was a welcome contrast to the ambiguity and conflict under the Calvinist William. Fiddes praised Anne’s: “authority, exemplary Zeal, and encouragement ... [of] a general reformation, and her fixed resolution to make virtue, and merit the only recommendations to her favour.” He praised her “solid, unaffected piety, never had we a greater number of truly religious persons to stand in the gap, to turn away the divine indignation from us.”⁹⁴ Benjamin

⁸⁹ J.H. Overton, *The Nonjurors; their Lives, Principles, and Writings* (London, 1903), pp. 2-11.

⁹⁰ Needham, 1702, p. 10.

⁹¹ High Church members of the Lower House felt that most Bishops insufficiently zealous in defence of the church against dissent and the encroachment of civil authority: G.V. Bennett, *The Tory Crisis in Church and State 1688-1730: The Career of Francis Atterbury, Bishop of Rochester* (Oxford, 1975) p. 57.

⁹² L.J., 17, p. 150. 25 May 1702.

⁹³ Fiddes, 1702, p. 28.

⁹⁴ Fiddes, 1702, p. 20.

Loveling claimed that: “[t]he Throne is fill’d with a becoming mixture of Meekness and Majesty; the Court with Integrity and Country-Principles.”⁹⁵

Ralph Lambert praised the Queen’s: “constant Piety, Her Honour and Veracity,” but it was important to him that she saw her role as increasing her people’s happiness as “her solemn Promises, and those confirm’d by all her Actions, has engag’d to do all that lies in her to make us a happy People.” For the avoidance of doubt, he outlined the elements necessary for the people’s happiness: “impartial and equal Justice which our Constitution distributes to every Subject ... This constitution, these Privileges, these inestimable Rights, join’d to the unspeakable Happiness of having Christ’s true Religion an essential part of our Establishment.”⁹⁶

Richard Fiddes was more blunt, and had a shorter historical perspective: “No sooner did she ascend the Throne, but that Spirit of Enmity, and Discord, which was gone out unto the Nation, seem’d all of a sudden to vanish.”⁹⁷ Richard Chapman took a more consolatory view of the previous reign and mourned the loss “of his late Majesty whom his greatest enemies must own to have been *ipsam Confaederationis animam* [the life and soul of the Confederacy]. And yet if we consider, how much that loss has been repair’d by the Happy Accession of her present Majesty to the Crown.”⁹⁸

The Dissenter Daniel Williams was more vehement about the disregard of William, castigating murmurers who: “do prostitute the Fame of that glorious Prince, as if he had never delivered us from Popery and Slavery, or that his making the way to Protestant Successors or his chusing the best of the Clergy to fill the Sees ... were injuries never to be forgiven.”⁹⁹ A leading Dissenting Minister’s recommendation of members of the episcopate would surely have incited members of the lower House of Convocation, to whom William Needham was at that very moment fulminating about unorthodox views which held that: “every man enjoy’d of worshipping his own God, in his own way; or if he pleased, of worshipping none at all?” He wondered how every true Englishman would not “have flamed with Indignation against so much Treachery in their fellow Subjects; and so vile an Apostasy from the God of their Fathers.”¹⁰⁰

Bishop Trelawny expressed a contentedness not only in the Sovereign but also in those about her, most of whom were seated before him in St Paul’s. He believed the reign was set fair:

⁹⁵ Loveling, 1702, p. 18.

⁹⁶ Lambert, 1702, pp. 8, 9, 10.

⁹⁷ Fiddes, 1702, p. 26.

⁹⁸ Chapman, 1702, p. 6.

⁹⁹ Williams, 1702, p. 11.

¹⁰⁰ Needham, 1702, p. 10.

He [God] will bless our Queen with good Councils in Parliament, and at the Board, with due and happy Execution of them, by those he employs; with the Hearts of all her subjects, like her own, Entirely English ... Her Government, have exceeded the whole reigns of some of her Predecessors.¹⁰¹

Richard Fiddes noted that: “Tis a great felicity when those, who are concern’d in the publick administration act at once, upon prudential, and pious motives.”¹⁰²

One of the Queen’s most prominent servants was Marlborough, who Bishop Smyth felt was vindicated by this first year of campaigning: “[t]he world must now confess that our Great Earl of Marlborough had but the Station He deserved when he was placed at the Head of that Army.”¹⁰³ Fiddes was ecstatic: “The publick acknowledgements that have been made, Our great Captain General, the Earl of Marlborough, both by the Queen and Parliament declared how sensible they were of the numberable and signal services he has done England and Her Allies in one campaign.”¹⁰⁴

Edward Clarke implicitly denigrated William’s military prowess stating that: “we had... made that successful Progress, in a War within these Six months, such as, in that before, we did not make in so many years.”¹⁰⁵ There were murmurs and rumours about Marlborough which were to surface and resurface through the reign, evidenced in the condemnation of the clerics as the reign progressed. Only in the final Thanksgiving of 1713 were the aspersions of avariciousness made from the pulpit. In 1702, however, in Banbury, sixteen miles north of the site of Blenheim Palace, Benjamin Loveling bemoaned: “[h]ow malicious and unjust their former defamations were; Men that have been instrumental in effecting in a few Months, what in the compass of several years, was far from being accomplished by other hands: An invincible argument, that they had no thirst after French Money.”¹⁰⁶

The condemnation of Louis XIV was universal. However, the differing reasons for condemnation reveal something of the speaker’s views of royal authority. One theme emerged which condemned Louis as imperious, impious and untrustworthy – the “Grand Incendiary of Europe,”¹⁰⁷ ... “furiously driving on at Universal Monarchy.”¹⁰⁸ A powerful enemy who thinks himself “no longer oblig’d by the most solemn treatys than they can violate them with safety, and impunity,”¹⁰⁹ so diplomatically duplicitous that Edward Smyth, referring to the post-Ryswick interval, felt: “[h]e made peace more destructive than War

¹⁰¹ Trelawny, 1702, p. 16.

¹⁰² Fiddes, 1702, p. 15.

¹⁰³ Smyth, 1702, p. 11.

¹⁰⁴ Fiddes, 1702, p. 30.

¹⁰⁵ Clarke, 1702, p. 26.

¹⁰⁶ Loveling, 1702, p. 18.

¹⁰⁷ Loveling, 1702, p. 17.

¹⁰⁸ Forster, 1702, p. 28.

¹⁰⁹ Fiddes, 1702, p. 23.

for us.”¹¹⁰ In St Paul’s, Trelawny found Louis blasphemous, “requiring little less than Divine Worship paid to his own Effigies,”¹¹¹ and, together with Loveling, in Banbury, condemned as hypocritical “the singing of a Mock Te Deum ... lately sung at Paris, for the pretended victory of the French at Luzara,¹¹² and their sad fate at Vigo some small time after, are notorious instances of the Sin and Punishment of so hypocritical a Proceeding.”¹¹³

Ralph Lambert also condemned Louis’s “Bigottry and Ambition.” However, in significant contrast he explicitly mentioned the fate of French Protestants and: “the blood and spoils of the Palatinate,” and warmed to the topic of British liberty. “What cause was ever more just, more honourable and necessary than the defence of our Religion, Liberties, and Estates, against that Invader of them, whom no Oaths nor Treaties can bind,” warning that: “France have long been working to reduce us to the Model of his own Tyranny.”¹¹⁴

The Dissenter Daniel Williams was visceral: “Ambition, Oppression, Cruelty, Depredations, Treachery and usurping Designs, these lodge at his door.” He lamented that there were Britons who were susceptible to Louis’s bribes: “[which] oft procured Divisions among ourselves to the Hazard of our utter Ruin.” He explicitly named William: “our late King, who had stoppd [sic] this Torrent so long, baffled his Designs so often” and rejoiced that the destruction of the bullion fleet at Vigo had rendered Louis “somewhat less able to corrupt men in places of Trust, ... to bribe Men of Influence in several Courts, Camps and Navies ... less fitted to impede or scant the trade of his Neighbours by this Forces,”¹¹⁵ a theme he shared with Rector Charles Whiting in Hereford: “The Lord has not only given us victory in battle, but has greatly weakened our Enemies in their sinews of future war.”¹¹⁶

While all the preachers took heart at the year’s great setbacks for the French king, only J.J. Caesar, speaking to the German congregation¹¹⁷ in the Savoy Chapel, was ambitious enough to predict

¹¹⁰ Smyth, 1702, p. 9. A view eventually taken up by the dissenter Andrew Hill, eleven momentous years later, see below, p.222.

¹¹¹ Trelawny, 1702, p. 10. Trelawny may have been referring to the statue of Louis in the Place des Victoires, with the inscription ‘Immortal man.’ This statue, or descriptions of it, played a large part in denunciations of the French King in sermons throughout the reign of Queen Anne. (See below, p.85).

¹¹² In August, 1702 Prince Eugene and Vendome fought each other to a draw at Luzzara, in Italy.

¹¹³ Trelawny, 1702, p7; Loveling, 1702, p. 20.

¹¹⁴ Lambert, 1702, pp. 10, 11.

¹¹⁵ Daniel Williams, 1702, pp. 6, 19, 12, 8, 22.

¹¹⁶ Whiting, 1702, p. 9.

¹¹⁷ The High German Congregation of the Evangelical Reformed Religion in the Chapel Royal in the Palace of the Savoy. This was the third German congregation in London, and was formed of immigrants from the Palatinate who were of the Reformed (Calvinist) tradition. King William had granted use of the chapel to refugees from the Palatinate. In the early 1700’s there were only twenty paying members, and sixty others; the pastor’s stipend was provided by their patron, King Friedrich I of Prussia: Susanne Steinmetz, ‘The German Churches in London, 1699-1914’, in Panikos Panayi, ed., *Germans in Britain since 1500* (London 2003) p. 41.

that the end of the “inhumane tyrant” whose “haughty designs will perish with his Fall.”¹¹⁸ Conscious, perhaps, of this instance of the kindness of strangers, Caesar refrained from any commentary that might be perceived to be critical of his hosts. He did lament the “Departure of the Great Hero William” but made no other reference to England or its divisions. Caesar later had the sermon published, and in a foreword addressed to the Queen, noted the thanks which her victories had created “in the Hearts of us, though not Natives, yet faithful subjects in your Majesties Kingdoms.”¹²⁰

While apparently unanimous, themes emerge from the condemnation of Louis which mark differences in outlook among the pastors. For one group – Fiddes, Loveling, Woodroffe, Forster and Joseph Jacob – the blasphemous and duplicitous Louis was unsuitable for Kingship and was a bad vice-regent to the Deity, who would draw down God’s wrath on himself, his subjects and dominions. For others – Lambert, Prideaux, ‘T.C.’ and Daniel Williams – the issue of the abuse of Liberty is foremost, which Louis had demonstrated in his treatment of his own subjects. Daniel Williams hinted darkly of French bribery of those in positions of power. Later in the reign, as Louis continued the war, but offered peace terms, pastors concerned about liberty and arbitrary power would adopt the arguments about Louis’s duplicity to caution against the folly of trusting him.

Daniel Williams implied some level of imposition on Louis when he expressed the wish: “may not we hope a Resettlement of the Protestant Religion in his Kingdom, which would fill our souls with Gladness.”¹²¹ In Dublin, Edward Smyth was prescient, holding a view that would not be common for at least four years after Marlborough’s great land victories: “we now hold the Balance, and are become the Arbiters of Europe ... We only were able to break the chains that France had prepared for the rest of Europe ... we have got the Balance of Europe in our Hands.”¹²²

Queen Anne’s claim to the throne was both hereditary and by Act of Parliament – and her accession held the prospect of political calm not witnessed since the Restoration. She was the first sole regnant Queen since Elizabeth, she had begun her reign by invoking Elizabethan determination and decisiveness. Though her immediate predecessor had been considered indispensable in holding the unwieldy anti-French confederacy together, he had been able to do so partly because England was emerging as the indispensable economic and military power¹²³ in opposition to France. An England that withdrew behind its ‘wooden walls’ would allow the States of the Holy Roman Empire, Austria and the

¹¹⁸ Caesar, 1704, p. 25.

¹²⁰ Caesar, 1702, p. 7.

¹²¹ Williams, 1702, p. 22.

¹²² Smyth, 1702, p. 8.

¹²³ Barry Coward, *The Stuart Age* (London, 1980) pp. 469-485.

United Provinces to be picked off piecemeal by a rampant France. The policy of opposition to its hegemonic European power, styled variously as inimical to the Protestant interest, the Liberties of Europe, and international trade, would become a bedrock of British international policy for the next two centuries.

The attendance at St Paul's of monarch, court, lords and commons marked an explicit attempt by the Queen and her advisors to bind together the Established Church and the nation. The thanksgiving was a prime example of the Queen's use of the 'theatre of power,'¹²⁴ and stood in stark contrast to her predecessor's efforts at the manipulation of public pageantry. The calibrated cossetting of the London Lord Mayor and aldermen demonstrate that the monarchy and ministry recognised the importance of the city, its traders and financiers, in the political infrastructure of the state. Throughout the country, the formalities of local governance and established religion were united in thanksgiving and celebration. The contemporary reportage quoted in this chapter shows a population receptive to the Elizabethan analogies of Armada and audacious plunder.

The sermon given by Dr Piers at the Armada Thanksgiving on Sunday, 24 November 1588 is unrecorded;¹²⁵ only the orders of nobility in procession to St Paul's was published.¹²⁶ For the Elizabethan era, the pageantry was sufficient. Those who needed to be impressed were either present or would have to be impressed by word of mouth. English society upon the accession of Queen Anne was open to nostalgia and pageantry, as a re-awakening of English nationalism and a return to simplicity of the Elizabethan era, but in the interim, the population, especially in London, had become more literate,¹²⁷ complex and inquisitive. The range of publications, and desire and freedom to publish show a populace anxious for explanation and discourse.¹²⁸ Such a populace is the foundation of the early modern public sphere.¹²⁹ The range of opinions expressed, from sanctimonious to scurrilous, and available to those who had the ability and desire to purchase them, led to the need by power-holders to convince the public about the wisdom of

¹²⁴ The phrase is David Cannadine's: Cannadine, 'Introduction: the divine rites of kings' in Cannadine and Simon Price, eds., *Rituals of Royalty: Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies* (Cambridge, 1987); R. O. Bucholz "'Nothing but Ceremony": Queen Anne and the Limitations of Royal Ritual', *Journal of British Studies*, xxx (1991), pp. 288-323.

¹²⁵ Author's correspondence with Dr Claire Cross, Professor Emerita of History, University of York.

¹²⁶ John Stow, *The Annales of England* (1592) sig. 4P1-P1v. It is tempting to believe that this is the book Dr Sherlock, Dean of St Pauls, brought to the House of Lords in Nov. 1702, as they attempted to understand the protocol for the ceremony. See above p.25 n. 11.

¹²⁷ David Cressy, *Literacy and the Social Order: Reading and Writing in Tudor and Stuart England* (Cambridge, 1980).

¹²⁸ See Elizabeth Eisenstein, *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change: Communications and Cultural Transformations in Early Modern Europe* (2 vols, Cambridge, 1979); Kevin Sharpe and Stephen N. Zwickler, eds, *Reading, Society and Politics in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2003).

¹²⁹ Jurgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. trans. Thomas Burger (Boston MA, 1989).

policies being pursued. Despite their predilection for authority and passive obedience, even High Tory practitioners needed to be polemicists in the age of Anne.

The Vigo Thanksgiving sermons reflected a desire to explain how providence worked and could continue to benefit England in the future. The preachers stressed a transactional faith – praise and thanksgiving in exchange for blessings/wonders – in which most of their hearers believed. Only a minority of preachers referred to the Elizabethan analogy and a surprising number tried to encourage their congregation to celebrate in song. The complexity of the transaction – appropriately joyful thanksgiving, even singing – was endorsed, but rejoicing with hogsheads of punch was discouraged.

The sermons which are the subject of this chapter were not randomly selected, they are available today because at the time it was thought necessary or desirable for them to be published. Not alone were the listeners invoked to spread the word, but clergymen and their subscribers thought it necessary to attempt to influence readers beyond the congregation. Separate strands of opinion, which would be accentuated as the duration and strain of the conflict increased, are discernible within the sermons. There was a common agreement that the war was in defence of common liberties – “religion, liberty and estates,”¹³⁰ but as the war progressed a difference would emerge as to whether the liberties being defended were Anglo-centric or more extensive. The perception of the reduction in Louis’s power would also become a line of differentiation within Anglican opinion.

The opinions of the Tory-leaning preachers¹³¹ in relation to both the French and English sovereigns are illustrative of their view of monarchy – Louis was imperious, impious and untrustworthy, therefore unworthy to be God’s vice-regent and he was tempting providence to reign ruin on his subjects; Anne’s solid, unaffected piety commanded affection, reverence and obedience from her loyal subjects. In a rose-tinted view, her moderation banished the spirit of enmity and discord within the nation.¹³² Whig-leaning Anglicans and the eminent Dissenter Daniel Williams shared the viewpoint that Louis’s chief defect was his ambition to “reduce us to a model of his own Tyranny.”¹³³ Where Lambert, Forster, T.C and Caesar faulted his bigotry and ambition, Williams deplored his oppression and cruelty. All explicitly warned of his attempts to extinguish the Protestant religion. The Queen’s piety was a ‘splendid example’; her graciousness a source of impartial justice. Daniel Williams relied on her moderation to counter the

¹³⁰ Lambert, 1702, p. 11.

¹³¹ Fiddes, Loveling, Woodroffe, Forster.

¹³² See Richard Fiddes sermon above p. 39.

¹³³ See Ralph Lambert sermon above p. 41.

zeal of some of her 'narrow' High Church advisors. Only the extremist Joseph Jacob noted the single-mindedness with which the Queen pursued her faith, which contained an implicit warning to Dissenters.

Chapter Two: 1704 to 1706 Blenheim to Ramillies

*1704 "A victory which will not only humble our enemies abroad but contribute very much to ye putting a stop to ye ill designs of those at home"*¹

The victory over the combined French and Bavarian armies at Blenheim² was so unexpected and so complete as to make the Queen's reaction no more than a statement of the newly obvious. For the allies, 1703 had been a year of alliances and defensive action. Portugal and Savoy had joined the anti-French Coalition, but the Dutch had proved cautious, and the Hungarian revolt had distracted the Emperor's forces. In the late summer of 1704, Marlborough had used both daring and subterfuge to march 250 miles in five weeks from the Dutch border to the Danube and rout Louis's forces – inflicting over 30,000 French and Bavarian casualties, capturing Marshall Tallard,³ the French commander and securing Bavaria for the Emperor. Blenheim was the most significant single reverse that Louis had suffered in the previous twenty years. Strategically, the threat to Austria was eliminated, new allies such as Savoy and Portugal were encouraged, Louis's allies the Electors of Bavaria and Cologne were humiliated and their lands forfeit.

The victory also enhanced Anne's moderate new ministry – Godolphin was appointed Lord Treasurer in May 1702, and Robert Harley joined⁴ in May 1704, the High Tories – chiefly Nottingham and Rochester⁵ – left her ministry. The Tories in parliament, aided by those in the ministry, had twice launched bills to repeal the practice of occasional conformity, accompanied by propaganda that the

¹ Anne to Marlborough, 22 Aug. 1704, as a reply to his dispatch announcing the victor: Edward Gregg, *Queen Anne* (New Haven, 1980) p. 188.

² The Thanksgiving Proclamation refers to "Blenheim near Hochstet," most sermons and other contemporary accounts refer to Hochstet.

³ Marlborough's victory dispatch was modesty itself, informing the Queen that "Her Army has had a Glorious Victory. Monsr. Tallard and two other Generals are in my coach and I am following the rest,": Trevelyan, *England under Queen Anne*, i, p. 391). Marshall Tallard had been French ambassador in London up to the outbreak of the war. Upon Tallard's departure, Abbe Gaultier, his chaplain in London, stayed behind as a priest in the Habsburg embassy and spied for Paris, becoming a key interlocutor with the Earl of Jersey in tentative, semi-official peace negotiations in 1710. After his capture, Tallard was resident in Nottingham, where he apparently was influential in popularising celery and other culinary sophistications. In the later years of his captivity, he conspired with the Tories to undermine the Whig ministry. In 1711, the Tory Ministry allowed him to return to France without ransom: Linda and Marsha Frey, *The Treaties of the War of the Spanish Succession* (Westport CT, 1995) p. 433.

⁴ Harley was appointed Secretary of State for the Northern Department.

⁵ In fact, Rochester was offered the Lord Lieutenancy of Ireland, but instead resigned in the winter of 1703, while Nottingham was dismissed in the spring of 1704.

Church of England was in danger. Both bills were narrowly defeated in the Lords, but they infuriated the Whigs and insulted Anne, as supreme governor of the Church. In 1704, as part of the measures to counter the perceived threat to the Church, Anne, on Harley's advice, returned to the Church taxes – known as the 'first fruits' and 'tenths' – which Henry VIII had appropriated, with the stipulation they be used to help poor clergy. The Act, known as 'Queen Anne's Bounty,' gained honourable mention at many subsequent Church of England thanksgiving sermons and, remarkably, from at least one prominent Dissenting minister.⁶

The victory at Blenheim changed the course of relations with Scotland. In the summer of 1704, prior to receiving the unexpected news from Blenheim, Anne had reluctantly signed a Bill of Security, passed by the Scottish Parliament as a response to the English Act of Settlement. Instead of settling the succession on the House of Hanover, the Scottish Act stated that the Scottish Parliament would appoint a Protestant successor from the descendants of the Scottish kings, but not the English successor unless various economic, political and religious conditions were met. Anne was advised that vetoing the bill, as she had done in 1703, would bring about the withdrawal of Scottish battalions in Marlborough's army. The victory at Blenheim significantly enhanced England's prospects and changed the calculus of Scottish temporisation. Within months, the process of negotiations leading to union was initiated.

The proclamation of the 1704 Thanksgiving, issued on the 17 of August, conveyed a tone of relief and justification. The first sentence proclaimed the war to be just, and was diplomatic in mentioning the struggle: "in conjunction with our Allies" to disappoint the boundless ambition of France and – perhaps with a view to Scotland – "for the Common Safety of our Realms."⁷ Reports had reached London of the capture of Gibraltar by Admiral Rooke in July, and of a naval engagement with a French fleet off Malaga.⁸ In Parliament later in the year, disgruntled Tories would attempt to equate Rooke's victories with those of Marlborough, in an attempt to belittle the latter. However, the proclamation, issued with the advice of the Privy Council, named only Marlborough and acknowledged Blenheim as "a Signal and Glorious Victory."

Joy in the victory was widespread, on the day before the thanksgiving, Baron de Spanheim, Ambassador Extraordinary of the King of Prussia, "gave a Splendid Entertainment to all the Foreign Ministers residing in London."⁹ London's Lord Mayor, court of aldermen and sheriffs "attended Her Majesty at St James's with an Address to Congratulate Her Majesty upon the late Victory obtained over

⁶ Joseph Stennett, Feb 1709, p. 20. (see below, p. 156).

⁷ *London Gazette*, 4047, 21 Aug. 1704.

⁸ In William Elstob's case reports arrived during his composition of his thanksgiving sermons (see below, p. 51 n. 31).

⁹ *Post Man*, 1315, 7-9 Sept. 1704.

the French and Bavarians on the Danube.” Her Majesty was generous in return:¹⁰ “which address her Majesty received very favourably and was pleased to confer the Honour of Knighthood upon Joseph Woolf esq. One of the present Sheriffs.”¹¹

The thanksgiving ceremony itself had settled into a pattern.¹² The crowds and militia lined the streets, which were railed and hung with blue cloth, several livery companies in full gowns stood on specially erected scaffolds waving their banners, and the balconies and windows along the route were hung with rich tapestries. The transportation and scheduling hierarchy was by now established – all Lords and Privy Councillors who were in town (parliament was not in session) met at St James’s at eight o’clock to be dressed and marshalled. They proceeded about ten o’clock to St Paul’s in their coaches with six horses each. The Queen’s convoy left St James’s at 11 o’clock, and consisted of five coaches – containing equerries, pages, ushers, ladies of the bedchamber, the Dukes of Somerset and Ormonde. Only the last coach, containing the Queen and her husband, Prince George, the Duchess of Marlborough and Lady Frescheville – was drawn by eight horses, the others were limited to six. The Horse Guards brought up the rear. The Westminster militia lined the route as far as Temple Bar, where three regiments of the city’s trained bands took up that duty.

The Queen was met as usual at Temple Bar by the Lord Mayor¹³ on horseback, in a gown of crimson velvet, accompanied by the city’s aldermen and sheriffs, in scarlet. In the traditional symbol of obeisance the Lord Mayor dismounted, gave a short speech and surrendered the city sword to the Queen, she having returned it, he carried it before her coach the rest of the way to St Paul’s. Only Luttrell mentions the Queen’s physical condition,¹⁴ noting that she was carried in open chair from her coach to the throne.¹⁵ In a November 1704 letter, Rachel, Lady Russell, rather morosely described the arrangements necessary for the Queen’s coach travel: “she cannot set her foot to the ground; has a chair made so well that it is lifted with her in it into the coach, and then she moves herself to the seat, and the chair taken

¹⁰ Upon receiving Marlborough’s laconic dispatch from the Battlefield, Anne gave £1,000 to the bearer, Marlborough’s aide, Colonel Daniel Parke. ‘Parke, Daniel (1664/5-1710)’ *Oxford D.N.B.* [accessed 7 Mar. 2016].

¹¹ *Daily Courant*, 748, Thursday, 7 Sept. 1704.

¹² The following paragraph summarises accounts from *London Gazette*, 4052, 7-11 Sept.; *Post Man*, 1315, 7-9 Sept. 7, 1704; *Daily Courant*, 749, Friday, 8 Sept. 1704.

¹³ Sir John Parsons, Tory MP, a major brewer, tax farmer, victualler and insurance director: H.O.P. 1690-1715, iv, pp. 105-8.

¹⁴ John Evelyn’s diary observes the attire of “the Duchess of Marlborough in a very plain garment, the Queen full of jewels.” In the 1708 Thanksgiving, the Queen and Her Duchess of the Stole, would have a very public disagreement about the Queen’s thanksgiving attire (see below, p. 140).

¹⁵ Luttrell, *A Brief Historical Relation*, vi, p. 463.

away.”¹⁶ In St Paul’s the Queen and Prince George processed to the two-armed thrones arranged for them in the choir, the Duke of Richmond¹⁷ leading them with the Sword of State.

William Sherlock, the Dean of St Paul’s, who had proven so knowledgeable about thanksgivings past, gave the sermon. Despite being a noted controversialist¹⁸ Sherlock’s sermon was a straightforward discussion of providence’s blessings which were dispensed to the pious. Acknowledging from the outset that the occasion was glorious, with: “all the marks and characters of a peculiar Confidence,” he was clear that providence had been evident both at home, “when all Europe is in a flame ... your Subjects enjoy a profound peace at home and know no more of war, than what they learn from the Gazettes,” and at Blenheim where: “the fate of the Empire and the Liberties of Europe depended upon the Success of this Battle.”¹⁹ Sherlock was keen to calibrate the achievement as an example of special providence, just short of miraculous: “Successes in war, which do not amount to Miracles, and yet bear such visible marks of some invisible over-ruling Power, as may convince all, who are not obstinate Infidels, of a Divine Providence.”²⁰ Sherlock expressed a quite specific High Church view, that the Sovereign’s personal piety – rather than that of the Nation as a whole – played a direct part in winning God’s favour – “this great honour that God hath bestowed on your majesty is a visible Testimony of his Acceptance of your pious Offering [the ‘first fruits’].” Thus, did the Queen honour the Deity, and reap providence’s reward by aiding God’s Church of England, a connection which Dissenters might find too narrowly exclusive.

Sherlock acknowledged Her Majesty’s piety, devotion, justice and charity, “are not very common among Crowned Heads” – the extreme exemplar being Louis: “who know no other law than their own will and lusts, who oppress their subjects at home and invade their neighbours abroad, without any regard for right and justice, or common rules and Principles.”²¹

¹⁶ Lady Russell to Lady Granby, 2 Nov. 1704, *The Letters of Rachel, Lady Russell* (2 vols, London, 1818) ii, p. 169.

¹⁷ Lennox, Charles, natural son of Charles II. Dilettante, flexible in both his political and religious beliefs. A descendant summarised him: “his unfortunate propensity for being everything by turns and nothing long effectually militated against any chance of his name being emblazoned upon the scroll of fame.”: Timothy J. McCann, ‘Lennox, Charles, first duke of Richmond, first duke of Lennox, and duke of Aubigny in the French nobility (1672-1723)’ *Oxford D.N.B.* [accessed 7 Mar. 2016].

¹⁸ Sherlock had written tracts challenging dissenters since the 1670s, condemning papists in the 1680s. Sherlock had been at the centre of the London Anglican opposition to James, had taken a non-juror position at the revolution, but shocked his contemporaries by taking the oath of fealty to William and Mary, six months after the deadline.

Considered a traitor by non-jurors, his reluctance did not endear him to supporters of the Revolution: William E. Burns, ‘Sherlock, William (1639/40–1707)’ *Oxford D.N.B.* [accessed 7 Mar. 2016].

¹⁹ Sherlock, 1704, p. 20.

²⁰ Sherlock, 1704, p. 6. The careful classification of Providence was common to King’s, Fowler’s and Stennett’s sermons. Ordinary Providence was exemplified as natural bounty, Miraculous was Divine intervention – as in God’s help to Moses, and Special Providence was made evident when God worked through chosen individuals – special instruments. Speakers were keen to emphasise that while the individuals deserved praise, the faithful should focus on God’s work.

²¹ Sherlock, 1704, p. 2.

Sherlock blended the 'entirely English' monarch with a reprise of the Elizabethan pantheon:

It is in vain for any Prince to affect an Universal Empire while an English Queen sits upon the Throne. Queen Elizabeth, of blessed memory, gave such a fatal blow to the Spanish Monarchy, in the height of all their pride and glory, as they could never recover to this day: and we hope France will as long as sensibly feel the power of your Majesty's Arms and be glad hereafter to secure his own Dominions, without invading his Neighbours.

Marlborough too was given his due. Sherlock alluded to special providence: "God ... chuses fit instruments to execute his wise and gracious designs ... Certainly never was a man better fitted with Courage Conduct and unwearied Industry for so great an Enterprise." Sherlock made no calls for Protestant unity, the divisions he mentioned were political, disparaging the Jacobites: "I hope there are none among us, such professed Enemies to a most gracious Queen, to their native Country, and to the Religion, Government and Liberties of it, as to envy and repine at the prosperity of our Sion, and even to quarrel at the divine Providence for saving us." And any general dissatisfactions alluded to were civic and financial: "the publick Taxes, which, be they what they will, are not like free Quarter, or the plunder of Soldiers ... or the frights and terrors of a licentious Army."²²

The ceremony over, the by-now customary fusillades from the great guns of the Tower were discharged and the evening concluded with bonfires, illuminations and all possible demonstrations of joy. The popular zeal for celebration, an enthusiasm deprecated in many thanksgiving sermons, did not seem to have been dented. In Coventry, the mayor was described as having led "plentiful toasts to the health of the Queen, the Prince and the Duke of Marlborough"²³ and in Whitchurch, Hants., there were even greater rejoicings: "several Hogsheads of strong beer were given to the people to drink the Queen's and my Lord Duke of Marlborough's Health, by Mr. Wallaston,²⁴ one of the representatives in Parliament, who afterwards invited the Mayor and Burghers to his House to do the like and the whole night was spent with great rejoicings."²⁵

Of the thirty published Blenheim Thanksgiving sermons, twenty were delivered by Anglican ministers, eight by Dissenters and two to foreign congregations. Among the Anglican preachers were Luke Milbourne, a well-known High Church firebrand; ²⁶White Kennett, a Latitudinarian controversialist;

²² Sherlock, 1704, p. 19, 20.

²³ *Post Man*, 9-12 Sept. 1704.

²⁴ Richard Wollaston (1668-1728) Whiggish placeman, court supporter: H.O.P. 1690-1715, v, pp. 914-15

²⁵ *Post Man*, 7-9 Sept. 1704.

²⁶ Milbourne would support Sacheverell, and, in a series of sermons, denounce resistance to a prince. See Kevin Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule: The Restoration and Revolution Monarchy, 1660-1714* (New Haven, 2013), p. 568. Also Sarah Annes Brown, 'Milbourne, Luke (1649-1720)' *Oxford DNB* [accessed 16 Mar. 2106].

William Sherlock, the quasi non-juror; William Elstob, an Anglo-Saxon antiquary, and Benjamin Loveling, the scourge of the Banbury Quakers. Two bishops published – the Whig Edward Fowler, and William King, Church of Ireland Archbishop of Dublin. A significant subset were preachers with Irish experience – William King, Alexander Jephson and Nicholas Brady – whose experiences in Ireland inclined them towards gratitude to William and the Revolution even while they were wary of the perils of Protestant division. Three preachers were later raised to the episcopal bench²⁷ – William Fleetwood and Charles Trimmell in 1708, in the full heat of the partisan haggling, and White Kennett in 1718, as a reward for Hanoverian and Whig loyalty.

Three of the eight Dissenting sermons are known to have been delivered in London and four sermons were by non-London-based preachers.²⁸ Three of the Dissenting preachers were quite prominent – Joseph Stennett’s Blenheim sermon was brought to the Queen’s attention, who read and praised it.²⁹ Two other preachers, John Piggott and John Evans, were associated closely with Daniel Williams, whose bona fides were well respected beyond the Dissenting Community.

There were two further sermons delivered respectively to Prussian and Huguenot congregations at the Savoy Palace chapels. J.J. Caesar’s sermon was diplomatically balanced and is interesting in its discussion of the Elector of Bavaria’s disloyalty to his (Catholic) sovereign, the Holy Roman Emperor Leopold, to whom the sermon’s Protestant audience also had an allegiance. Jean Dubourdiou’s sermon to his comparatively well-to-do³⁰ Huguenot refugee community marks the nadir of the despondency of Dubourdiou’s (*père et fils*) during the war.

The sudden, unexpected and comprehensive nature of the victory led all preachers to witness to the work of providence. The details³¹ of the prelude to and conduct of the battle reinforced the general

²⁷Where all three took a Whiggish line: Norman Sykes, ‘Queen Anne and the Episcopate’. *E.H.R.*, 1 (1935), p. 433-64.

²⁸ The location of R. Norris’s sermon is unknown.

²⁹Joseph Ivimey, *A History of the English Baptists* (4 vols, London, 1814) ii, p. 494.

³⁰ The Huguenot congregation at the Savoy was considered to be connected to the diplomatic and military professions, whereas those in East London – Glasshouse Street, Leicester Fields, Le Tabernacle, and Ryder’s Court – were populated by artisans: R.D. Gwynn, *The Huguenots of London* (Brighton, 1998) pp. 13-19.

³¹ All sermons demonstrate a significant level of familiarity with the details of the battle. Henry Chandler, at Bath, quotes Marlborough’s laconic post-Blenheim dispatch to the Queen. In Gloucester, Bishop Edward Fowler noted in his application that he is quoting the Dutch Cavalry General von Hompesch’s letter to the States General and the stories of some French deserters. The dissenter John Evans in Chester quotes ‘prisoners,’ while his namesake, the Church of England minister in Ewell Surrey, lists General Hompesch’s letter and August’s edition of the *Monthly Mercury* as his sources. In his dedication – to Bishop Nicolson of Carlisle – William Elstob tantalizingly notes “While I am writing this the happy news is arrived of Her Majesty’s Fleet having obtained the Sole Domination of the Seas [i.e. Rooke’s engagement off Malaga].” He does not mention how the news arrived. It is tempting to imagine Elstob had just received his copy of John Dyer’s manuscript newsletter which Geoffrey Holmes described as “the political bible of the Tory squire and parson”: Holmes, *British Politics in the Age of Anne* (London, 1967) p. 30. However, Dyer’s newsletter is not mentioned in any sermon.

conviction that special providence was at work. The emerging facts of the immediate prelude to and action on the battlefield – especially the unaccountable complacency of the French commander Tallard in the run-up to the battle and the subsequent panic of the French cavalry – further convinced preachers of every persuasion that providence had intervened in a special way.

Both bishops – William King of Dublin, and Edward Fowler of Gloucester³² – as well as John Piggott, a Baptist minister, felt the need to clarify the ways and means of providence. They did so with remarkable consistency. William King was a talismanic figure in Dublin, having stayed behind and been imprisoned there during the Jacobite takeover of 1689-91. His thanksgiving sermon noted his audience’s “own memories” of war – “Pain, Labour, Famine, Sickness and Oppression” – and there is a flinty tone to his acknowledgement that: “[d]eath is a debt we owe to Nature ... yet many things are worse than Death ... a Life of Slavery and Misery.” King’s is a particularly muscular form of passive obedience: “an absolute and complete conquest giving so far a right, that he who is overcome, may look on his Conqueror as one set over him by God, and swear Allegiance to him, notwithstanding any obligation to a former Prince. This being one of the ways, by which Providence makes Kings.”³³

Edward Fowler had reached his seventy-third year and had been one of William’s original appointees, on Burnet’s recommendation replacing the non-juror Bishop Frampton of Gloucester in 1691. Previously as vicar of St Giles, Cripplegate, he had been suspended for giving the sacrament to Dissenters and was viewed by Tories as a Trimmer.³⁴ Fowler opened his sermon by ascribing the victory to: “the more Special Providence of God,”³⁵ and went on to mention the great presence of mind of the allied commander, the infatuation of a previously shrewd and wise enemy and the unaccountable protection of those in most imminent danger as evidence of special providence.

John Piggot, a Particular Baptist,³⁶ explained providence more fully to his congregation in Little Wild Street, a mile west of St Paul’s, less than half-a-mile north of the thoroughfare where the Queen had processed. Like Fowler and King, he defined three kinds of providence – common, miraculous and special. The common allowed the cultivation of crops and the continuation of life; the miraculous, such

³² Though Fowler delivered this sermon at the Guildhall.

³³ King, 1704, pp. 3, 4, 13.

³⁴ Mark Goldie and John Spurr, ‘Politics and the Restoration Parish: Edward Fowler and the Struggle for St Giles Cripplegate’, *E.H.R.*, cix (1994) pp. 572-96.

³⁵ Fowler, 1704, p. 33.

³⁶ Particular Baptists held to a Calvinist reading of the atonement as effective only for the elect: Ivimey, *History of English Baptists*, ii, pp. 451-63.

as the deliverance of the Children of Israel at the Red Sea, “are such as are produced by a mighty power, and are evident to sense.”³⁷

... Acts of Special Providence are special and extraordinary, but yet not strictly miraculous” and are mediated through selected individuals, usually referred to as ‘second causes’ – examples being the vanquishing of Goliath, the discovery of the Gunpowder Plot and the “Happy Revolution by the Illustrious Prince of Orange who enterprized our Deliverance at a desperate Juncture.”³⁸

Many preachers worried that the public’s praise of the second causes – the implementers of God’s plan, would be a distraction from veneration of the deity himself. There was a unanimity among all strands of opinion about the importance of providence as a guiding mechanism – the rural Anglican John Evans feared that without providence we are: “exposed to a World of sad and uncomfortable accidents; to Evils and Dangers; which we have neither the wisdom to foresee, nor the power to prevent.”³⁹ White Kennett exclaimed that the tale of Barak and Deborah – the chosen passage in the day’s form of prayer: “seems not barely a history of what then happened, but likewise a sort of prophecy of what is now again come to pass.”⁴⁰ In Brentford, the Dissenter John Walker was more straightforward: “All concerns of the World, and the Church especially ... are wrapped up and lodged in the hands of God who can open and order them as he pleases.”⁴¹ William Fleetwood, a popular London preacher, acknowledged providence but, unusually, admitted to a certain anxiety: “we Christians know of no such things as Chance and Fortune, but know that God above governs the world, and disposes well of all events: but Providence i.e. his way of ordering and disposing them, seems to us, so varying and uncertain.”⁴²

A more typical anxiety was the prospect of being undeserving of such providence and thereby losing it. All agreed on the necessity of personal probity – scripture having shown that God’s chosen people “were commonly successful or unsuccessful as their Piety and Virtue either declined or flourished.”⁴³ However, significant differences emerged among Anglicans about whether the differences among Protestants would bring about God’s displeasure. William Elstob queried:

How comes it to pass that on one Hand so many, who allow the Religion of the church of England to be True and Orthodox ... not only separate from us without reason, but contrary to the Intentions and Design

³⁷ Piggott, 1704, p. 6.

³⁸ Piggott, 1704, pp. 9, 12.

³⁹ John Evans, 1704, p. 8. Confusingly two preachers named John Evans published Blenheim Thanksgiving sermons. One was a vicar in Ewell, the other a dissenter in Chester.

⁴⁰ Kennett, 1704, p. 6.

⁴¹ Walker, 1704, p. 19.

⁴² Fleetwood, 1704, p. 13.

⁴³ Chapman, 1704, p. 17.

of the kind indulgence which is granted them ... boast themselves against us, and pretend to equal us with their numbers? ⁴⁴

Charles Trimmell, too, regretted the “unseasonable Separation” of the Dissenters, but in the spirit of making the best of things urged “inviolable adherence to the Protestant Succession.”⁴⁵ The Dissenting ministers said little that might be interpreted as theologically controversial and were keen instead to emphasise their loyalty while maintaining their independence. Joseph Stennett elided differences with the Established Church by stating to his Baptist congregation that the proclamation to observe the day did not undermine the Toleration Act: “There’s no Law to restrain any of us from rendering service to her Majesty and to our Native Country after this pious manner.”⁴⁶ Richard Norris was keen to look to the future and not leave any room for high-flying Tories to disparage Dissent: “Let us express our value for her Royal Person and most happy Government ... by our affectionate concern for the present Establishment, convince the world that Loyalty is a part of our Religion, and that it is a malicious Aspiration on our Persons and Principles that we are enemies to the Monarchy.”⁴⁷

By contrast, Benjamin Loveling expressed the underlying concern about Dissenter’s inherent challenge to established authority. He acknowledged that they did: “obey the magistrate in observing Days of Thanksgiving,” but was agitated that they held their own services, for “when subjects either obey or disobey Authority according to their own Pleasure, they make a plain discovery of their Pride and Ungovernable temper.”⁴⁸ In Dublin, William King summarised the general fear that atheists and Dissenters in disputing: “Providence that has so eminently appeared for us, we must expect that God will withdraw his Protection from us.”⁴⁹

Richard Chapman numbered all outside the Established Church as: “monstrous sects, and brooding heresies, that now swarm and crawl about to the great scandal of the Christian Religion.”⁵⁰ For some preachers, the practice of Dissent opened the way for papists, atheists, and deists to wreak havoc. William Elstob lamented both those who: “not only separate from us without reason ... contrary to the Intentions and Design of the kind indulgence which is granted them,” and those who sowed: “the seeds of Deism, in Opposition to reveal’d Religion are, I fear, but too fruitful amongst us.”⁵¹

⁴⁴Elstob, 1704, p. 7.

⁴⁵Trimmell, 1704, p. 22.

⁴⁶ Stennett, 1704, p. 32.

⁴⁷ Norris, 1704, p. 21.

⁴⁸ Loveling, 1704, p. 4.

⁴⁹ King, 1704, p. 7.

⁵⁰ Chapman, 1704, p. 21.

⁵¹ Elstob, 1704, pp. 6, 7.

White Kennett responded to the dogmatists within his own Church by pointing out the mortal danger which divisions among Protestants exposed: “let us all agree on the common faith, and the common interest, against the common enemy of both.”⁵² John Broughton, Marlborough’s chaplain, wished “that we may never sully the Glory of our foreign wars by our intestine broils,” urged “dutiful behaviour” to the Sovereign and “affection to each other.”⁵³ Charles Trimmell warned of being: “imposed on by any Pretences which might endanger the Protestant Succession and lead to “our inevitable Ruin.”⁵⁴

Dissenters too railed against the dangers of atheism, and for the same reasons as their critics in the Established Church. John Piggot excoriated those who “from Atheistical Principles neglect or despise the special favours of Providence.”⁵⁵ John Evans of Chester enunciated a common concern when he lamented: “The general corruption of our manners... the obstinacy of ill men against attempts at Reformation.”⁵⁶ However, Dissenters in general maintained a beady eye on: “the Unjustifiable Severities of those of the High Church Persuasion.”⁵⁷

The degree of mutual incomprehension was inadvertently revealed in contrasting views on the methods of giving praise. The High Churchman Luke Milbourne gave a *tour d’horizon* of the “sullen generation” of Dissenters who are: “so wholly out of Tune that they hate Consent and Harmony in anything belonging to the church.” He lambasted an entire range of “heavy Schismatics ... Quakers, Brownists, Independents and Anabaptists” for whom the singing of psalms is “extremely dangerous.” He admitted some separatists have become more “polished of late” though their singing is still “harsher than the sounding brass or tinkling cymbals.”⁵⁸ John Piggot, presumably one of Melbourne’s more polished Dissenters, exhorted his congregation to praise God by singing psalms: “a pleasant and delightful practice, as the sweet Psalmist of Israel assures us from his own Experience,” emphasising that “Prayer is most suited to the state of the Afflicted, but praise to the condition of the cheerful.”⁵⁹

Jean Dubourdieu’s sermon to the Huguenot congregation in the Savoy provides an interesting contrast with William King’s. Both men shared the trauma of enduring subjugation by militant Catholic regimes. However, King’s was short-lived and relieved by the overthrow of Jacobite forces at the Boyne. Dubourdieu’s congregation had suffered exile among: “this generous and charitable people, who at first

⁵² Kennett, 1704, p. 26.

⁵³ Broughton, 1704, pp. 27, 28.

⁵⁴ Trimmell, 1704, pp. 21, 22.

⁵⁵ Piggot, 1704, p. 16.

⁵⁶ John Evans, 1704, p. 15.

⁵⁷ Walker, 1704, p. 15.

⁵⁸ Milbourne, 1704, p. 18.

⁵⁹ Piggott, 1704, pp. 23, 24.

sympathised with us in our Afflictions, and for near twenty years have endeavoured to relieve us.”⁶⁰

Whereas King could uphold the principle of passive obedience, having had the threat of having to practice it lifted from him, Dubourdieu had to account for the past triumphs of the French sovereign: “an unjust and proud Prince the persecutor of the Church and the scourge of Mankind, surrounded with an amazing prosperity for above forty years.”⁶¹

In the same palace, J.J. Caesar’s sermon to the Prussian congregation was brusque in his assessment of a subject’s duty: “Mercenary Bavaria⁶² [sinned] against his own friend, and lawful superior, an Emperor of the same Religion and Empire, nay one of his nearest relatives, his Father-in-law ... and hath heinously offended against his loyal brethren and the custom and laws of the whole Empire.”⁶³ Caesar’s sermon did not dwell on the reasons for Louis’s past success, did not see calling on providence as presumptuous and had no qualms (as White Kennett had) about calling on God to finish the work of vengeance. Indeed, through his sermon. Caesar used the word ‘vengeance’ interchangeably with ‘providence.’

Dubourdieu was more contemplative and philosophically consistent, asking his congregation why the: “Churches of France, [which] were once so Fair and Flourishing, so pure in their Worship and Orthodox in their Faith?” had lost ground to the Church of Rome. Although acknowledging Louis’s depredations, he blamed factionalism among French Protestants: “the fatal disputes which arose on the Eucharist and Grace ... removed the Protection of His power from them ... They have degenerated from the Purity and Zeal of their Founders ... [into] corruption and Worldy-mindedness.” God “for reasons best known to himself suffered Pride, Tyranny and Cruelty to Triumph.”⁶⁴

Samuel Bromesgrove was assigned by the Bishop of London to minister to the largely Huguenot community who congregated at the Tabernacle in Spitalfields.⁶⁵ If the French Church at Savoy was considered the mother-church of the French congregations in London, Spitalfields catered for more

⁶⁰ Dubourdieu, 1704, p. 23.

⁶¹ Dubourdieu, 1704, p. 4.

⁶² Maximilian Emanuel Wittelsbach, Elector of Bavaria. He was married to Maria Antonia, daughter of Leopold, the Holy Roman Emperor. With his brother Joseph Clemens, the hunchbacked, un-ordained and non-celibate Catholic Archbishop Elector of Cologne, he allied with Louis at the outbreak of the War of Spanish Succession. Both were deprived of their lands within the Holy Roman Empire in 1706, both were restored in the treaties of Rastatt and Baden in 1714: Frey and Frey, *The Treaties of the War of the Spanish Succession*, pp. 221-24, 278-81.

⁶³ Caesar, 1704, p. 21.

⁶⁴ Dubourdieu, 1704, pp. 6, 10.

⁶⁵ As outlined in a Petition by Samuel Bromesgrove, licensed minister for sixteen years to a chapel in Spitalfields. E.G.W. Bill, *The Queen Anne churches: a catalogue of the papers in Lambeth Palace Library of the Commission for Building Fifty New Churches in London and Westminster, 1711-1759* (London, 1979) p. 38.

recently arrived refugees of the labouring class.⁶⁶ In a thanksgiving sermon, which brims over with assimilative advice, Bromesgrove emphasised the refugee's duties of the day:

whoever absents himself from the Congregation on such Solemn Festival days ... declares himself by that morose and ill-natured separation, no true Lover of his country. He is an ill-mannered Dissenter, let his Profession be what it will ... he cannot have the Face or the appearance of a true English-man.

Bromesgrove demonstrated that assimilation was a two-way street in his praise of the military: "There is an unquestionable Devoir due to those who have bravely signalised their valour in the Nations service." Going on to laud the primitive, apostolic and episcopal nature of the Church of England, Bromesgrove maladroitly praised his congregation for their "expressive Joy which is so legible in all your countenances ... Methinks the Hearts of every one of us, like that of the Queen's, appears in every lineament of our faces to be entirely English."⁶⁷

The victory at Blenheim instantly elevated the Queen into the pantheon. Comparisons with Elizabeth, made in 1702, to establish her Englishness and distinguish her regime from that of her predecessor, were now less fanciful. Comparisons with William were fraught with partisanship.

Archbishop King noted that Anne's armies on land had: "carried her Victorious Ensigns into the Heart of Europe," as Elizabeth's had on the "remotest Seas."⁶⁸ Luke Milbourne claimed Anne outdid Elizabeth: "God has crowned our Greater Anne in the very Beginning of her Government with more astonishing success against the better knit and more strongly cemented strength of France."⁶⁹ Alexander Jephson⁷⁰ noted that Elizabeth had been: "very fatal to the Spanish Monarchy, so that it never recovered the Blow it received from her." However, he stopped short of advocating the overthrow of the French monarch: "may our Great and Glorious queen Anne, bring the haughty French King down, to sue humbly for Mercy at Her Feet, and to beg leave of her to wear the Crown of France, as a tributary petty King."⁷¹

Jephson, who had fled Jacobite Ireland in the 1690s, spoke of William and loyalty: "some ungrateful People may speak coldly and indifferently of that Great Man, but I may venture to say, such

⁶⁶ Samuel Smiles, *The Huguenots: Their Settlements, Churches and Industries in England and Ireland* (New York 1867) pp. 272-73.

⁶⁷ Bromesgrove, 1704, pp. 9, 12.

⁶⁸ King, 1704, p. 21.

⁶⁹ Milbourne, 1704, p. 27.

⁷⁰ Alexander Jephson was Master of the Free School in Camberwell, Surrey. A graduate of Trinity College, Dublin, he had fled Dublin having preached a sermon welcoming William III's landing in 1688. He became master of a grammar school in Stepney in 1693 and moved to Camberwell in 1700: W.H. Blanch, *The Parish of Camberwell: A brief account of the parish of Camberwell: its history and antiquities* (London, 1875) p. 48.

⁷¹ Jephson, 1704, p. 13.

men are no real and sincere, Lovers of Our Gracious Queen.”⁷² Luke Milbourne denigrated William by comparison, stating that: “the honour of England shines already under her, than under the longer Government of her warlike predecessor.”⁷³ The Whig bishop, Edward Fowler perceived a seamless transition, judging the Queen: “zealous for the best of causes he [William] was such a champion for” and in general “who has to Admiration supplied our want of Him [William].”⁷⁴ Charles Trimmell praised the “Wise Prince, of Glorious Memory” who set up the alliance against Louis and left it: “[i]n the hands of Her Most Excellent Majesty.”⁷⁵ Fowler expressed a bitterness about the denigration of William’s glorious memory: “it has been blackened since his death by most shameless men [among whom are] Protestants of the highest Denomination, whom I can scarce think of with patience.”⁷⁶

The Dissenting ministers shared the veneration and the indignation but were more comfortable with claiming that providence had reserved the greater achievements for the Queen, and were anxious to demonstrate their loyalty to Anne’s regime. “What mighty hopes were raised in us from the Piety and the Valour of our Glorious William? ... but ‘twas otherwise ordere’d by our God. This Honour was reserv’d for another.”⁷⁷ In Chester, the Dissenter John Evans ruminated: “We had a long struggle with France in the Reign of the late glorious King ... yet so complete a Victory was reserved by Providence for the Trophy of a Female Reign ... it is no unusual thing with Providence in this as well as other instances to chuse what the world esteems weak to confound the things.”⁷⁸

The measured Joseph Stennett echoed Fowler: “[some] have been so unjust to the name of a Prince to whom (under God) they owe the Restoration their Civil and Preservation of their Religious Liberties as to refuse that Honour to His Memory.”⁷⁹ In the end, though John Piggot put it most succinctly: “William checked Louis, but Anne Defeated him.”⁸⁰

How the Queen had achieved the victory revealed intriguing divergences among the pastors. For Nathaniel Hough, Church of England lecturer at Kensington: “the Victory looks like an attendant upon the charity.”⁸¹ The charity in question was the return by the Crown of the first fruits and tenths, a welcome, if overdue, restitution to the Established Church.

⁷² Jephson, 1704, p. 10.

⁷³ Milbourne, 1704, p. 27.

⁷⁴ Fowler, 1704, p. 12.

⁷⁵ Trimmell, 1704, pp. 9, 15.

⁷⁶ Fowler, 1704, p. 11.

⁷⁷ Walker, 1704, p. 22.

⁷⁸ Evans, 1704, p. 5. In print, the sentence ends abruptly, but refers to 1 Corinthians 1.27, where the sentence ends: “to confound the things which are mighty.”

⁷⁹ Stennett, 1704, p. 21.

⁸⁰ Piggot, 1704, p. 33.

⁸¹ Hough, 1704, p. 17.

The plight of the recipients of the first fruits was well known to all shades of opinion. In St Paul's, William Sherlock discreetly welcomed: "the First-Fruits and Tenths for the Augmentation of small Vicarages,"⁸² Bishop Edward Fowler, Vicar John Evans and even the Dissenter Henry Chandler used the words "indigent clergy" to describe the beneficiaries⁸³ and Samuel Bromesgrove welcomed: "the removal of that contempt ... owing to nothing more than the scantiness and penury of their not-competently endowed livings."⁸⁴

In the transactional interplay between deity, sovereign and Established Church, the Queen's: "[o]blation [was] not only accepted and approved of... [but] has furthermore met with its reward in those successes to her victorious Arms."⁸⁵ If Luke Milbourne was bombastic:

In Queen Elizabeth's day, hungry courtiers tore away the Churches patrimony, and apply'd the sacred but devouring Fire to their own nests, but our present Queen, under all the extreme pressures of an Expensive War, has laid all the Ecclesiastical Revenue which the Law had invested in the Crown, at the Foot of God's altars.⁸⁶

Nicholas Brady was harmonious, though equally certain: "by her Charity at Home to the Poorest of God's ministers has had a prevailing Efficacy for the procuring his Assistance ... the prayers of the Queen will always be successful, who makes the Law of God her will, in respect of things spiritual and the law of the land in relation to things temporal."⁸⁷

White Kennett expressed an alternative view. While acknowledging the Queen's charity, he emphasised the Queen's example to be emulated, rather than a transaction with the Deity over the heads of the faithful, the "most proper way [of giving Thanks] is to follow the precept and the splendid example of our Glorious Sovereign the Queen."⁸⁸ Edward Fowler mentioned it as an example of the Queen's: "hearty zeal for the reformation of her people's manners," coupled with "two pious proclamations within two years ... against vice and profaneness."⁸⁹ The Dissenters were, perhaps understandably, muted on this

⁸² Sherlock, 1704, p. 23.

⁸³ Norman Sykes drew attention to a sub-class of clergymen without position. The first fruits did not completely alleviate their plight. In 1726, White Kennett complained about: "itinerant curates ... that ramble without license or settled employ to spread faction and disorder": Norman Sykes, *Church and State in England in the XVIIIth Century* (Cambridge, 1934) p. 221.

⁸⁴ Bromesgrove, 1704, p. 25. Bromesgrove's 1711 petition to the Commission for the building of the fifty new churches, notes that for sixteen years: "his chief maintenance for Himself and His family does depend... on the Liberal Contributions of the inhabitant's two Adjacent extraparochials viz. the Old Artillery Ground and Norton Fallgate, and the piety of Revd Sir George Wheeler."

⁸⁵ Elstob, 1704, p. 12.

⁸⁶ Milbourne, 1704, p. 26.

⁸⁷ Brady, 1704, p. 12.

⁸⁸ Kennett, 1704, p. 2.

⁸⁹ Fowler, 1704, p. 13.

topic, Joseph Stennett rather blandly hoping that: “[w]e may long enjoy the advantages we possess under the Influence of her happy government. Let us contribute what we can to the support of it.”⁹⁰

The potential advent of a new military strongman was a cause of apprehension across the spectrum of opinion. Preachers of all shades strove to emphasise Marlborough’s loyalty and Anne’s wisdom in choosing such a faithful commander. As well as comparing him to Hannibal, Caesar, Joshua and Barak,⁹¹ the sermons describe Marlborough as: “her faithful, her loyal, her conquering General”⁹² possessed of “matchless courage and fidelity.”⁹³ White Kennett underlined that Anne’s armies were commanded by: “a wise and valiant English Subject.”⁹⁴ Luke Milbourne, in an opinion which he would reverse in later years, extolled Marlborough as: “very modest, and willing to assign all his successes to the auspicious influences of their superiors.”⁹⁵ Henry Chandler assured the Dissenters of Bath that: “[o]ur Queen has shewn her great wisdom in sending a Man upon so important an Affair in so very critical a conjuncture of whose sufficiency and Fidelity, she was well assured.”⁹⁶ Archbishop King sought to reassure his congregation with the thought: “Tis her glory and her wisdom ... to choose such [generals/ministers] ... no one ever yet had a wise council, that was not wise himself.”⁹⁷ Richard Chapman comforted his congregation that the prayer was mightier than the sword: “the late success is no less owing to her Majesty’s piety and Goodness, than to the Conduct and Courage of her Captain General.”⁹⁸ In the Chapel of St Charles the Martyr, Tunbridge Wells, Andrew Archer⁹⁹ veered slightly off course in stating that: “no value too great can be set upon such Commanders,” before giving the vaguely uneasy reassurance that: “happy are the people, that can equally rely on the wisdom and sobriety of their General in his councils, as on his fidelity and bravery in the Field.”¹⁰⁰ However, John Broughton, Marlborough’s chaplain, left his audience in no doubt that all was right with the world: “He, we know, ascribes all to God and his Queen, and She does, this Day before the World, ascribe all to God.”¹⁰¹

⁹⁰ Stennett, 1704, p. 31.

⁹¹ Deborah and Barak, Judges, Chapter 5.

⁹² Bromesgrove, 1704, p. 8.

⁹³ Evans, 1704, p. 19.

⁹⁴ Kennett, 1704, p. 2.

⁹⁵ Milbourne, 1704, p. 23. In his 1713 Thanksgiving sermon Milbourne would condemn those who held “the prodigious Estates rais’d of Late Years by those who have had the handling of the Publick Revenue and were worth little or nothing before must believe that something more than the Lawful Perquisites of the Places went to the raising of such mighty Banks” (see below, p. 235).

⁹⁶ Chandler, 1704, p. 5.

⁹⁷ King, 1704, p. 23.

⁹⁸ Chapman, 1704, p. 22.

⁹⁹ The church, a site of High Tory veneration, had no resident minister until 1709 so relied on visiting clergymen to conduct services: Andrew Lacey, *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr* (London, 2003) p. 167.

¹⁰⁰ Archer, 1704, p. 8.

¹⁰¹ Broughton, 1704, p. 21. In the sermon, Marlborough’s fidelity is contrasted with Caesar’s seizure of power.

All preachers expressed delight in Marlborough as an instrument of providence and a significant number commented on public envy of Marlborough's achievements. William Elstob proclaimed Marlborough a: "[p]rofessed member of the Church of England" and blamed the enemies of the Church for "who so little while ago had suffered so hard, both in their speech and Opinions of him."¹⁰² The forthright Archbishop King advocated that: "[a]bove all things we ought to avoid Envy, 'tis the shadow of great actions ... by means of it the greatest conquerors have lost the benefit of the most glorious victories."¹⁰³ William Pearson inveighed against the "[e]nvious ... the Factious Hanno's in our Carthage ... either to Sullen the Glory or lessen the Success."¹⁰⁴ A significant section of Anglican clerics was spare in their praise and did not mention any murmurings. Neither Charles Trimmell nor William Fleetwood mentioned Marlborough by name referring only to "Our General," though Fleetwood did award him the adjectives "wise, brave and fortunate"¹⁰⁵ – the sting, perhaps, lying in the tail. Joseph Jacob, who departed from the mainstream of Dissenting thought, was alone among Dissenting ministers in showing concern for Marlborough's reputation: "Let none detract from the due praise of the instruments by whom God has given us any Mercies."¹⁰⁶

Louis's past excesses and newfound defeat gave the ministers almost boundless scope for invective – "[he] threaten[s] all Europe with chains and Fetters,"¹⁰⁷ was a "Great and mighty oppressor,"¹⁰⁸ ... "cholerick, proud, haughty, covetous ... ambitious,"¹⁰⁹ ... "an old, inveterate, implacable Enemy, an Enemy to our Religion, a monstrous and merciless persecutor of it even among his own Subjects."¹¹⁰ Providence, even in an unwelcome guise, was evident; for the Dissenter John Walker: "he has been the Rod of God's Anger and one of the most terrible Scourges of Mankind."¹¹¹ Bishop Edward Fowler believed Louis was God's instrument: "God Almighty [is] using him as his Rod to chastise those who have been given to Himself [God], not him [Louis], high offence," and in a baleful echo of Dubourdiou's lament, he said that: "the Rod was chiefly designed for the Reformed churches, to chastise them for their woeful degeneracy."¹¹²

¹⁰² Elstob, 1704, p. 13.

¹⁰³ King, 1704, p. 26.

¹⁰⁴ Pearson, 1704, p. 28.

¹⁰⁵ Fleetwood, 1704, p. 24.

¹⁰⁶ Jacob, 1704, p. 16.

¹⁰⁷ Sherlock, 1704, p. 13.

¹⁰⁸ Grant, 1704, p. 6.

¹⁰⁹ Fleetwood, 1704, p. 5.

¹¹⁰ Jephson, 1704, p. 6.

¹¹¹ Walker, 1704, p. 11.

¹¹² Fowler, 1704, p. 9.

Many pastors referred to Louis as “haughty.” Nicholas Brady condemned the “haughty Pretender”¹¹³ who over-reaches the legitimate power of princes to covet God’s power. William Fleetwood saw Louis’s power from a different perspective: “if he were not absolute at home, he could do no great mischief abroad.”¹¹⁴ Joseph Stennett gave a pan-European perspective:

With unparalleled barbarity he has persecuted the Protestants in France, as well as those of Piedmont, and the principality of Orang ... how many have been condemned to the slavery of the Gallies, or that of the American Plantations, and how many have been exposed to the Difficulties of Flight, and the Poverty and Hardship attending the state of Exile in foreign countries.¹¹⁵

Within unanimity of condemnation lay differences in motivation, as some Anglican sermons condemned Louis as a threat to England and Europe, and a breaker of treaties, while other Anglican and especially the Dissenting ministers emphasised the plight of foreign Protestants. William Fleetwood established that: “when [France] lost its liberties, and came entirely into the disposal of its Princes, it became troublesome and vexatious, and [has been the ruin of] more than a million of his own People.”¹¹⁶ In Bath, the Dissenter Henry Chandler condemned: “Lewis[sic], who hath Murdered, Massacred and Banished so many Hundred Thousands of his Subjects.”¹¹⁷

The lawfulness of the war exercised some preachers in revealing ways. In Dublin, Archbishop King summed up the providential, though rueful view of: “a battle being a sort of appeal to God.”¹¹⁸ Benjamin Loveling was terse: “war is not forbidden in the bible therefore it’s not unlawful.”¹¹⁹ Three other sermons deliver a piquant contrast, not on the lawfulness of conflict but on the subject of lawful initiation. Richard Chapman stated: “subjects of a well-ordered, civilised state, they have ... immediate recourse to the Laws for its decision ... When Monarchs or Princes quarrel, the Sword only is their law.”¹²⁰ The Dissenter Joseph Stennett echoed the concept; however, he made the significant substitution of ‘nation’ for ‘prince’:

¹¹³ Brady, 1704, p. 23.

¹¹⁴ Fleetwood, 1704, pp. 5, 6.

¹¹⁵ Stennett, 1704, p. 23.

¹¹⁶ Fleetwood, 1704, p. 9.

¹¹⁷ Chandler, 1704, p. 18.

¹¹⁸ King, 1704, p. 5.

¹¹⁹ Loveling, 1704, p. 13. Loveling’s sermon went on to disparage people – Quakers among them – who refuse to give thanks because of “their avowed principle of the unlawfulness of War.” In a jibe presumably aimed at William Penn’s past accommodations with James II: “If this opinion were universally held the Romans [sic] would come and take away both our Place and Nation.”

¹²⁰ Chapman, 1704, p. 8.

a private man may appeal to the Magistrate who is God's vice-regent ... but when nations contend and have no Judge on Earth to whom they can agree to refer their cause ... [they must] make an appeal to God the Sovereign judge of the universe and refer their Quarrel to the Decision of his providence.

Indeed, Stennett strayed towards radicalism in stating that: “[a] people who are affronted” must “betake themselves to arms to assert their Rights, and seek to preserve themselves by the Slaughter of their enemies.”¹²¹ William Fleetwood's view resolutely underlined his adherence to limited monarchy:

this is one of the Excellences of our own Government, that tho' for wise and good reasons, the power of making War and Peace is put in our Prince's hands, yet they can neither be lasting, nor of great moment, unless the wisdom of our nation find them useful and lasting.¹²²

John Broughton justified the preservation of “our Commerce, our Constitution, our Liberty and our Religion.”¹²³ The latitudinarian White Kennett nonetheless saw an opportunity for the Church of England: “we wish and Pray, that now at last all foreign protestants will come nearer until us, and nearer unto each other ... and will make the Church of England the Centre of that Unity.”¹²⁴

While there was national pride in the rescue of the Holy Roman Empire – “the drooping Eagle [Holy Roman Empire] visited and relieved by the generous British Lion”¹²⁵ – the appropriateness of the alliance with Roman Catholics¹²⁶ was a cause for concern. Marlborough's chaplain John Broughton called a spade a spade: “We do not call the present a Religious war; we are confederated with those of a different religion.” However, he could not forebear one-upmanship: “we contend earnestly for the Faith which was once delivered to the Saints, they, blindly, for that Faith which only pretended Saints have delivered to them.”¹²⁷

The sermons varied in their prognostications of the immediate future. Samuel Bromesgrove, perhaps in consideration of his Huguenot congregation, hoped that: “God, in his own time, would give us

¹²¹ Stennett, 1704, pp. 15, 16. The Tory view of the Prince's authority to make war would be echoed by Richard Coleire in his 1708 sermon (see below, p. 227). Stennett rather obscures the clarity of the distinction in political philosophies in his Feb 1708/09 sermon “as war is an Appeal to God to give, by his Providence, a Decision of such Controversys [sic] between Princes and States, as cannot be otherwise determined for want of sufficient Arbiters on Earth,” p. 17.

¹²² Fleetwood, 1704, p. 6.

¹²³ Broughton, 1704, p. 22.

¹²⁴ Kennett, 1704, p. 22.

¹²⁵ Kennett, 1704, p. 11.

¹²⁶ The tense relationship – soon to lead to open warfare – between the Pope and the Holy Roman Emperor was never mentioned. Insofar as he was mentioned at all, the Emperor was believed to be in thrall to the Jesuits. Tony Claydon has shown that equating Louis with the Turks and Egyptians served the purpose of justifying allegiance with continental Catholic powers to preserve ‘Christendom’ during William's reign: Claydon, ‘Protestantism, Universal Monarchy and Christendom in William's War Propaganda, 1689-169, in David Onnekink, ed., *‘Redefining William III, the Impact of the King-Stadholder in International Context’* (Aldershot, 2007) pp. 125-42.

¹²⁷ Broughton, 1704, p. 23.

the Blessing of an honourable and a lasting peace.”¹²⁸ The Church of England John Evans was relieved that now Louis’s neighbours may live quietly by him, without the danger of being invaded by France.”¹²⁹ While his namesake, the Dissenter John Evans, was more cautious: “we are not so vain as to think that this has broken all the power and strength of our enemies.”¹³⁰ Likewise, William King’s experience told him that this “first uncontroverted defeat at Land” would “fire all the passions of his Mind, and fills him with Indignation, Spight and Resentment, and doubtless he will use the utmost of his skill and power to revenge himself.”¹³¹ Nicholas Brady, who, like King, had witnessed the 1689 fighting in Ireland, nonetheless felt that: “by this we have made a step toward a universal peace, the end of all Wars.”¹³²

Whereas some clerics emphasised the return of balance, others were not mollified. Those Dissenting ministers who foresaw victory did so in terms that focused on oppressed Protestants and envisaged major change in French polity. Joseph Stennett anticipated that: “those of the Reformed Religion in France, who have so long hazarded their lives in the defence of that and their Civil Liberty, may be delivered.” He looked forward: “in hope for the like future success against all enemies of God and his Church.”¹³³ John Walker imagined that this victory: “tho’ obtained in Germany, may open a way into the very Heart of the Enemies country,” but he leavened this awesome prospect with a piece of topical humour: “if we thus celebrate this Victory, we may comfortably conclude that it will be but the First Fruits of a full Harvest.”¹³⁴

The stunning victory at Blenheim saved the Austrian Habsburgs and their German and Italian allies from French and Bavarian hegemony. It was the greatest reversal of French policy in Europe in twenty years, disinheriting the Wittelsbach electors – William Fleetwood’s censorious comment that Louis’s “friendship is as fatal, as his Enmity” now included “the two Electoral Brothers” as well as “our late unhappy King.”¹³⁵ Blenheim was a victory greater in scope than any achieved by William III, inflicted by a British general who had captured a marshal of France and festooned Westminster Hall with the colours and standards of the French armies. Nonetheless, Marlborough was a divisive figure – Bromesgrove, Elstob, John Evans (Church of England), Nicholas Brady and Andrew Archer were

¹²⁸ Bromesgrove, 1704, p. 30. Bromesgrove had spent the preceding pages distinguishing between personal, private enemies – “Bless them that curse you, do Good to them that hate you” [Matthew 5:24] – and National enemies for whom a more Old Testament treatment is recommended.

¹²⁹ Evans (Church of England), 1704, p. 24. This is the first, cautious mention of a possible end to the war in the series of thanksgiving sermons. It would require the victory of Ramillies in 1706 to convince a significant body of Anglican preachers that the war was won.

¹³⁰ Evans (Dissenter), 1704, p. 11.

¹³¹ King, 1704, p. 26.

¹³² Brady, 1704, p. 11. See James Sambrook, ‘Brady, Nicholas (1659–1726)’ *Oxford DNB* [accessed 16 Mar. 2016].

¹³³ Stennett, 1704, pp. 31, 5.

¹³⁴ Walker, 1704, pp. 29, 30.

¹³⁵ Fleetwood, 1704, p. 20.

effusive in their praise, Luke Milbourne and William Pearson expressed a desire to suppress envy of Marlborough's achievements, whereas William Fleetwood, Charles Trimnell and White Kennett were spare in their praise and did not mention any murmurings. A further distinguishing characteristic between Tory and Whig-leaning Anglican preachers was the latter's veneration of William – Fowler, Trimnell and Kennett made special mention of William; an attribute shared with Dissenting ministers – Stennett, Evans, Piggott, Walker and Norris. Some preachers – Milbourne, Elstob, King, Sherlock and Jephson – used the Elizabethan comparison to venerate the Queen, with Milbourne, Elstob and Grant used her achievements to undermine William's. A significant number of preachers – Sherlock, Elstob, Grant, Evans, Brady, Pearson, Jephson, Loveling, Chapman, Hough and Archer – found that the Queen's overall piety and her charity towards the Church had led directly to God's favour, whereas Kennett, Fowler and Chandler found her charity and piety as example to be emulated by all.

While only the Anglican John Evans was so bold as to envisage that the battle had defeated Louis, there was sufficient popular euphoria for other pastors – including William King in Dublin and the Dissenter John Evans – to caution that Louis was still a formidable foe and the struggle was not over. While opposition to Louis was universal, differences reflecting various viewpoints emerged. The Whiggish Charles Trimnell hoped: "I cannot but hope the Reformation, which has for a great while run backward, will get ground in the World."¹³⁶ The extent to which French power could or would be circumscribed or transformed would be divisive within Britain in the years to come.

The division within the Church of England regarding Dissent was clearest, with fears that Dissent would open the floodgates to deism, atheism and God's wrath evoked by Milbourne, Bromesgrove, Elstob, King, Evans, Pearson, Jephson, Archer, Loveling and Chapman; whereas Kennett, Fowler, Fleetwood, Broughton and Trimnell advocated various stages of persuasion and toleration.

The plight of foreign Protestants then residing in England was illustrated by the sermons of Dubourdiou, Caesar and assimilative Bromesgrove. Jean Dubourdiou's despondency closely aligned with the providential view that his native Church had not deserved God's protection, while Caesar saw the fate of German churches as bound up with their duty of loyalty to their respective sovereigns. Bromesgrove's rather conventional, though manipulative sermon illuminated a staging post in the process of integration of the Huguenots into the Church of England.

¹³⁶ Trimnell, 1704, p. 19.

*Our almost Languid Joy with the grateful news of a Fresh, Glorious and (we hope) a very important Victory: 1705*¹³⁷

The autumn and winter of 1704 saw the failure of Rochester and Nottingham's parliamentary stratagems. The attempt in the House of Commons to 'tack' the outlawing of Occasional Conformity onto a taxation bill failed. By common consent the Commons had the prerogative to initiate taxation measures, which the Lords interfered with at their peril; however, the 'tack' was plainly a method which, if successful, would have disempowered the House of Lords. The Godolphin ministry relied on a combination of courtiers and personal adherents of Godolphin¹³⁸ and Marlborough Harley-ite moderates and Tory placemen (nicknamed 'sneakers'), along with Whig/Junto support to defeat the measure in both Houses. In the Lords, the Tories attacked the ministry for having advised the Queen to sign the Scottish Act of Security the previous August, in a bout of weakness immediately reversed by the news from Blenheim. The Junto Whig lords – Somers particularly – countered with a proposed Aliens Act, which threatened Scotland's trade with England unless the Scottish Parliament nominated commissioners to negotiate a union. The Queen attended the Lords debates over the winter, to show support for the ministry, and perhaps to intimidate waverers.

On 3 January 1705, Marlborough had been honoured with a triumphal parade, viewed by the Queen, from the Tower to Westminster Hall, featuring the 128 enemy standards captured at Blenheim, carried by the Horse Guards, to the backdrop of forty-gun artillery salutes.¹³⁹ Parliament voted Marlborough thanks, and, at the Queen's request, funds to construct what became Blenheim Palace. Parliamentary resistance was limited to High Tory attempts to place Admiral Rooke's clashes with the French fleet off Malaga on a par with Blenheim.¹⁴⁰ The Queen gave permission for Marlborough to become a Prince of the Holy Roman Emperor, a process slowed down by the death of Leopold and the accession of his eldest son, Joseph, in May 1705.¹⁴¹

Anne prorogued Parliament on 14 March 1705 and election writs were issued on 23 April. The ensuing campaign saw the High Tories ignore the war, and promote the view that the Church of England was 'in danger' under Godolphin's administration, a notion that infuriated the Queen. Anne lent her

¹³⁷ Higgins, 1705, p. 15.

¹³⁸ W. Speck, 'The Choice of a Speaker in 1705', B.I.H.R. xxxvii (1964).

¹³⁹ Thomas Lediard, *John Duke of Marlborough* (2 vols, London, 1743) i, p. 306.

¹⁴⁰ A tactic, which found little purchase in the country, with few mentions in thanksgiving sermons.

¹⁴¹ Marlborough was granted the Principality of Mindelheim, in Upper Swabia, fifty-five miles west of Munich. The tale of Marlborough's German principality illustrates the lethargic and multi-faceted workings of the Holy Roman Empire, as well as Marlborough's rather unbecoming desire for wealth: Peter Barber, 'Marlborough as Imperial Prince, 1704-1717', *British Library Journal*, viii (1982) pp. 46-79.

support for anti-Tacker candidates,¹⁴² and by holding audiences with prominent Whigs during progresses around the country, demonstrated that the party was no longer out of favour. In April, the Queen visited Cambridge University, attending while the Junto Lords Wharton, Sunderland and Orford were conferred with honorary degrees and knighted Sir Isaac Newton, who was standing as a Whig candidate.¹⁴³ Significant national controversy was stirred by the pamphlet *The Memorial of the Church of England*, which criticised the ministry and the Queen. When parliament reopened in the autumn, Godolphin, revealing the thin skin that would have such disastrous consequences with Dr Sacheverell in 1709, had the pamphlet burned and James Drake, one of the authors, prosecuted.¹⁴⁴ The election resulted in increased Whig representation in the House of Commons, though the two parties were in rough parity.¹⁴⁵ The Godolphin Ministry governed with Whig and moderate Harley-ite Tory support.

The Queen began the appointment of moderate Whigs to influential posts – specifically, she gave the Whig General Peterborough command in Spain, appointed her first Whig-supporting bishop – William Wake to Lincoln – in July 1705.¹⁴⁶ She replaced the Tory, Sir Nathan Wright with the youthful, moderate Whig, William Cowper, as Lord Keeper in October.

In Spain, the Earl of Galway's campaign from Portugal petered out, with skirmishes and ultimately a retreat to pre-existing borders. English and Imperial troops led by Prince George of Hesse captured Gibraltar in August 1704, the British fleet keeping the enclave resupplied from Lisbon. The one significant naval engagement occurred in August 1704 when Rooke fought the French fleet off Malaga, establishing British Naval supremacy in the Mediterranean. In October, the allies under Lord Peterborough opened another front by capturing Barcelona.

In Hungary, under allied pressure, the new Emperor eventually entered armistice talks in October 1705 at Tyrnau¹⁴⁷ with the rebel leader Prince Rakoczi, facilitated by British and Dutch mediators. However, Rakoczi's hard-line demands, encouraged by French promises of an alliance, and increasing

¹⁴² Gregg, *Queen Anne*, pp. 195-217.

¹⁴³ Newton's candidacy was opposed by mobs shouting "no fanatic." He was unsuccessful, not helped by the fact that he refused to canvass: H.O.P. 1690-1715, iv, pp. 1025-27.

¹⁴⁴ William Stephens, who published a thanksgiving sermon in Dec. 1706, wrote a controversial pamphlet in reply to the Memorial, which was critical of Marlborough and Harley: Stuart Handley, 'Stephens, William (1649/50-1718)' *Oxford D.N.B.* [accessed 7 Mar. 2016].

¹⁴⁵ Tories 260 down from 304 in 1702 (after election appeals), Whigs 233 up from 170 in 1702. A further twenty of the 1705 MPs are unclassified, though with Robert Harley's 'moderates' among the Tory contingent, the two parties were neck-and-neck: H.O.P. 1690-1715, i, pp. 225-7.

¹⁴⁶ The Queen, influenced primarily by Archbishop Sharp, had appointed Tories as Bishops up to this point. William Nicolson – initially a Tory, sided increasingly with Whigs as the reign progressed – was named to Carlisle in May 1702; George Hooper to St Asaph, then Bath and Wells in October 1703; William Beveridge to St Asaph in Jul. 1704; George Bull to St David's in Mar. 1705: Sykes, *Queen Anne and the Episcopate*, pp. 437-39.

¹⁴⁷ Today, Trnava in Slovakia, 70 miles east of Vienna.

Imperial military success against the rebels in Transylvania led to a tapering off of negotiations in mid-1706. In Italy, Savoy was surrounded by French and Spanish-Bourbon forces, which occupied territories around Milan, Genoa, and coastal Tuscany. In August 1705, Victor Amadeus's first cousin Prince Eugene, having crossed Lake Garda to draw forces away from Turin, was repulsed by French and Bourbon forces under Marshall Vendome – also Eugene's first cousin – at Cassano, twenty miles east of Milan.¹⁴⁸

In Flanders and on the Rhine the campaigns of 1705 did not repeat the spectacular success of 1704. Marlborough had hoped to launch an attack through the Moselle valley on Metz in 1705, but pusillanimity on the part of Prince Ludwig Wilhelm of Baden¹⁴⁹ and a successful attack by Marshal Viilleroi on Liege on the Dutch frontier forced Marlborough to campaign in the less-manoeuverable Netherlands. The campaigning season ended with allied troops successfully breaching the French lines in Brabant – opening the prospect of an invasion of the Spanish Netherlands in subsequent campaigns. This achievement, which had eluded William in the Nine Years War, was the specific event celebrated in that year's thanksgiving proclamation but was nonetheless perceived as an anti-climax in England.¹⁵⁰

The proclamation for the Thanksgiving of 1705 repeated the strategic reasoning of its Blenheim predecessor. However, the description of the tactical victory celebrated was trammelled to: “having forced the French lines,” in contrast to the expansive: “Signal and Glorious Victory over the French and Bavarian Forces at Blenheim.”¹⁵¹

The pageantry of the Thanksgiving Day – 28 August – took the now-accustomed form, the streets lined with militia in Westminster and trained bands in London; the London Companies decked out on scaffolds, crowds thronging the streets, balconies hung with tapestries and carpet. The Queen and Prince George were accompanied by the Countess of Sunderland and her mother, the Duchess of Marlborough – recently returned from an icy withdrawal from court, her last attendance on the Queen having been at the January parade of the French standards captured at Blenheim. The aldermen and Lord Mayor – Sir Owen Buckingham, a wealthy Presbyterian sail-maker¹⁵² – “in a very rich Crimson Velvet Gown, and wearing the City Jewel” – paid their usual homage to the Queen, who was able this year to alight from her coach at

¹⁴⁸ Charles Ingrao, *In Quest and Crisis: Emperor Joseph I and the Habsburg Monarchy* (West Lafayette, IN, 1979), pp. 80-2, 132-7.

¹⁴⁹ Margraf Ludwig Wilhelm Baden-Baden was titular head of the Imperial Army, saviour of Vienna in 1680, he had felt sidelined by Marlborough and Eugene in the Blenheim campaign. A power struggle in Vienna following the death of Leopold in May 1705 saw Prince Eugene reassigned to the Italian front: Frey and Frey, *The Treaties of the War of the Spanish Succession*, pp. 27-9.

¹⁵⁰ See sermons by Louis Atterbury and Francis Higgins below.

¹⁵¹ *London Gazette*, issues 4047 and 4143.

¹⁵² H.O.P. 1690-1715, iii, pp. 389-91.

St Paul's and walk to her usual place in the choir, the Duke of Ormonde carrying the Sword of State before her in the cathedral, as he had in the Thanksgiving of 1702.

The reduced novelty of the event is again marked by the terseness of its coverage – the *Post Man* devoted 114 words to the ceremony, as against 223 the previous year.¹⁵³ Abel Boyer noted the reduced number of addresses to Her Majesty on this occasion: “it appearing that the Forcing of the lines was not attended with such advantageous Consequences as were at first expected; it was even whisper'd at Court, that the Thanksgiving Day would not have been solemnised but for the Good News which, at this very juncture, was brought from Prince Eugene's army.”¹⁵⁴

The sermon at St Paul's was given by Richard Willis, who had accompanied William III to Holland as chaplain in 1694 and been rewarded with the deanery of Lincoln in 1701. In Queen Anne's reign, Willis took Archbishop Tenison's side against the High Church faction in Convocation, thereby becoming an adversary of Francis Atterbury.¹⁵⁵ In a reflection of how much the war had receded from public concern, it took Willis a full eleven pages, out of a total of sixteen, before the first mention the conflict.

Willis took as his lesson Isaiah 11: 13-14,¹⁵⁶ “Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim. But they shall fly upon the shoulders of the Philistines.” In the first ten pages, he equated Ephraim with England's Dissenters and Judah with the Church of England, while reserving the last six to label Louis a Philistine. Willis's sermon was latitudinarian in intent. However, speaking before the Supreme Governor of the Church of England it was necessary to establish priorities: “[it is] the first duty of Ephraim, to return into Communion with his brother Judah ... they ought not then to shew any bitter Zeal against the church ... They ought not to give any Umbrage of Suspicion that they affect the Overthrow of Religion Established by Law among us .”¹⁵⁷ Judah's first duty was “to endeavour to persuade Ephraim to return to [Communion],” ... “we should not let those that are in Error go quietly on with their Mistakes.” Eventually however, Willis's latitudinarianism emerged: “but suppose after all those who separate from our church will not come in ... neither side must vex or oppress the other.”

¹⁵³ Luttrell's account runs to 126 words in 1705, 251 in 1704.

¹⁵⁴ Boyer, *History of the Life and Reign*, p. 198. Prince Eugene was heading west from the Tyrol and drawing French troops away from its encirclement of the remnant territories of Savoy. Later in the month, his advance was stopped at the battle of Cassano, east of Milan.

¹⁵⁵ W. R. Ward, ‘Willis, Richard (*b. ap.* 1664, *d.* 1734)’ *Oxford DNB* [accessed 16 Mar. 2016].

¹⁵⁶ Thereby taking some latitude with the form of prayer, which had recommended either 1 Chronicles 19:6-10 or Ephesians 6:10-14.

¹⁵⁷ Willis, 1705, p. 5.

Willis appealed to both: “Reason and Experience [which] shews us that nothing is so apt to gain upon a Man and take off his Prejudice, as good words and fair Dealing” and is critical of misplaced zeal:

It has been too common a mistake for men to think they have done enough in religion, if they have been for the party they reckon orthodox ... A great part of our Zeal has been taken up with Heats among ourselves...the chief things promoted are Animosities, Feuds and Factions ... Schisms and Heresies in the Church, and Discontent and Faction in the State.

Willis extolled the “[g]racious Queen who ... loves Judah, is against vexing Ephraim, and is Zealous and Hearty against the Philistines.” Turning to the Philistines, Willis noted that Louis was a “[t]error to all his neighbours ... Forcing at least 200000 souls to leave their native land ... to seek their bread in strange countries where they can get it ... Prevailed upon [some] to dissemble their Religion, and wound their consciences to save themselves.”¹⁵⁸

Though Abel Boyer felt that Willis’s sermon had “occasion to press and recommend Unity and Moderation, and drew other inferences most proper for the Day,”¹⁵⁹ it did provoke controversy among Dissenters, who took exception to the patronising tone and the analogy with Ephraim, who biblical scholars knew, was considered an Idolater by orthodox Jews, who worshipped in “groves and High places”¹⁶⁰ rather than in Solomon’s temple. The sermon provoked the publication of an irritated ‘review,’ and in turn, in the manner of the day, sparked a ‘vindication.’ The three publications illustrate the genteel, less bruited, but no less fundamental, differences between Dissenters and the latitudinarian wing of the Church of England, two groupings that are usually seen as compatible, when judged against the hectoring High Churchmen.¹⁶¹

The number of published thanksgiving sermons – five, like the number of Loyal Addresses, published in relation to the thanksgiving, was low when compared with the thirty Blenheim sermons. Along with Willis’s sermon, three other sermons were from Anglicans: one, by Richard Fiddes, was High Church in tone, the other two were more moderate, one being penned by Lewis Atterbury, the older, milder brother of the high-flying Francis, and the last by Francis Higgins, an Irish minister, who would become a noted firebrand, nicknamed ‘the Irish Sacheverell’ on his arrival in England later in the reign.¹⁶²

¹⁵⁸ Willis, 1705, pp. 6,7,8,10,11.

¹⁵⁹ Boyer, *History of the Life and Reign*, p. 198.

¹⁶⁰ 2 Chronicles 31:1 recounts how King Hezekiah sent the Jews from the cities of Judah, and entered the neighbouring lands, including Ephraim, and destroyed the idolatrous images of Baal and other false Gods.

¹⁶¹ See Appendix 1 for a specific controversy pitting latitudinarian against dissenter.

¹⁶² On 26 Feb. 1707, Francis Higgins, a prebendary of Christ Church Dublin, preached a highly offensive sermon at Whitehall that suggested the Church was in danger, despite a declaration by Parliament to the contrary, and castigated both ecclesiastical and secular authority for doing little to stem the tide of heresy and atheism in England: Nicolson, *London Diaries*, p. 421. The Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Tenison, tried to get Higgins to moderate his preaching, but Higgins disregarded this order and was arrested on Feb. 28th 1707. In Apr., the grand Jury of

The remaining sermon was a millennial tract published by the interminable and enigmatic Dissenter Joseph Jacob.¹⁶³ In the preface to his thirty-two-page work, Jacob says that: “he concentrates as little as possible with Matters or Ministers of State.” This indeed is true, although Jacob does castigate other Dissenters for the corruption of Occasional Conformity. His sermon is an outlier in terms of published Dissenter opinion.¹⁶⁴

Once again, there was unanimity as regards God’s providential care for England, though the tone varied from a rather muted acknowledgement from Willis to a vociferous affirmation by Richard Fiddes. Lewis Atterbury succinctly noted that: “[a] pious and virtuous People will be fortunate.”¹⁶⁵ Fiddes summed up the generally held classification of ordinary, special and miraculous providence and concentrated on elaborating on special providence, as a direct contradiction of deism. “God in the Government of Mankind Acts by immediate and particular Wills,”¹⁶⁶ and in doing so God can “vary or suspend the General Laws of Motion.”¹⁶⁷ If God can and does act in particular ways, “[w]e must therefore attribute these Evils of Punishment to the Positive Will of God; and the curse which the sin of Man provoked him to inflict on his Works.” Of the numerous flaws of deism, perhaps the most glaring is that it renders human interaction with God superfluous: “indeed if all Effects come to pass by a fatal and fix’d chain of Natural Causes, ‘twill be hard to evince the necessity of Prayer to Christians, as a means of averting any Evil.”¹⁶⁸

Lewis Atterbury’s sermon was less emphatic than Fiddes, but as convinced that: “the affairs of this world are not govern’d by Chance and Fortune, but by an infinitely Wise and Good and powerful being; who continually watches over, protects and defends us.”¹⁶⁹ Though Francis Higgins acknowledged that: “God has frequently and almost Miraculously interposed for us against all our enemies around us,” he expressed anxiety that society had “not made suitable returns for the many good things he has already

Middlesex found against Higgins for sedition, though in May the attorney agreed not to proceed against him: Hearne, *Remarks*, i, p. 337; Luttrell *Brief Historical Relation*, vi, pp. 143-4, 164, 177. However, this was not the end of Higgins troubles, for in July he printed his sermon along with a postscript purporting to be a dialogue between Tenison and himself in which he defended his actions: Hearne, *Remarks*, ii, and p. 25. The postscript attracted the attention of the Irish Parliament, and in August, the Irish Lords found that the postscript was: ‘false, slanderous, and seditious Libel, designed to vilify a most Reverent Minister in England’ and ordered the postscript to be burnt by the common hangman in Dublin: Boyer, *History*, p. 290.

¹⁶³ Who had also published in 1702.

¹⁶⁴ Apart from Jacob, dissenter sermons were surprisingly uniform in tone throughout the thanksgivings of the reign.

¹⁶⁵ Atterbury, 1705, p. 10.

¹⁶⁶ Fiddes, 1705, p. 1. i.e. Wills/Individuals are the media chosen to implement God’s particular purpose.

¹⁶⁷ Presumably to the chagrin of the newly elevated, but electorally vanquished, Sir Isaac Newton.

¹⁶⁸ Fiddes, 1705, pp. 4, 7.

¹⁶⁹ Atterbury, 1705, p. 22.

done ... the Rod of his Power which he makes use of in the day of Wrath against us, grows among ourselves and we shall Scourge one another.”¹⁷⁰

The summer election had left sectarian animosities in its wake and the most controversial differences between the sermons lie in the attitude of the preachers to Dissent. Fiddes was wary of the Queen’s new advisors: “Our Venerable Mother seems almost at a loss to distinguish her true and Genuine Sons, from a Spurious and Foreign Brood.” He excoriated Dissenters and warned about attempts at conciliation: “that desire to go into the Distinction of Low Church, upon ill designs of Reducing the Church to a Level, in favour of a Faction, or to show their Gratitude to it.” Despite his own intemperate language, Fiddes believed: “the Church does not stand in need of men of Turbulent Spirits.”¹⁷¹ Francis Higgins was convinced that the Church lay between: “Superstitious, Idolatrous and Bloody Men on one hand, and the dangerous underminings of Schismatical, Factious, and Turbulent Men on the other.”¹⁷² Lewis Atterbury similarly saw the Church as the sane centre-point: “without turning aside either to Enthusiasm on the one hand or Superstition on the other.” In a year when Louis’s France seemed tamed, he saw: “Our worst enemies are those of our Household.”¹⁷³ Willis took a different view. He was not troubled by occasional conformity, seeing it as means by which Judah can persuade Ephraim, and questioning whether Occasional Conformers were motivated by worldly advancement, observing that there were a “very great number in all parts of the Kingdom who have not apparently any Temporal Interest to serve by it.” He urged Dissenters to return to communion, forthrightly stated the latitudinarian position – “suppose after all those who separate from our church will not come in... neither side must vex or oppress the other” – and pointed to High Church hypocrisy:

It has been too common a mistake for men to think they have done enough in religion, if they have been zealous for the party they reckon orthodox ... when perhaps all the while have been only gratifying their own Pride and Passions ... A great part of our Zeal has been taken up with Heats among ourselves ... [which has led to] Schisms and Heresies in the Church and Discontent and Faction and division in the state.¹⁷⁴

Fiddes felt that since Anne’s accession England had witnessed: “visible effects of the Favour of Heaven upon Her Majesty’s Administration and Arms ... beyond our Hopes.” Nonetheless, the Queen’s behaviour of late, disposing of vehement Tories, bringing the Whigs in from the cold, had seemed puzzling, indeed worrying. In the midst of doubt, Fiddes relied on passive obedience: “if we cannot

¹⁷⁰ Higgins, 1705, pp. 15, 8. The Irish Thanksgiving Ceremonies took place on 28 Aug.

¹⁷¹ Fiddes, 1705, pp. 14, 16.

¹⁷² Higgins, 1705, p. 7.

¹⁷³ Atterbury, 1705, pp. 26, 20.

¹⁷⁴ Willis, 1705, pp. 6, 10.

always penetrate into the Motives of Her Conduct, let us acquiesce in the Submission that is due to those who represent the Sovereign Power. Princes may have wise reasons for the Measures they take tho, those reasons do not appear to us.”¹⁷⁵

Francis Higgins displayed that particular fondness for William characteristic of Irish Tories¹⁷⁶ (“our late Glorious King and Deliverer. There are truths past contradiction, whatever Stiffnecked and Ungrateful Murmurers may say elsewhere”) and saw Anne as his “auspicious” successor. Higgins ran the gamut of royal reputations – Anne, gracious; William and Elizabeth, glorious; James [II], “unhappy, deluded and biggotted.”¹⁷⁷ Lewis Atterbury, like the more excitable Luke Milbourne in 1704, felt “that Name of Ann [sic] is had in as great or greater Veneration, than ever that of Elisabeth was.”¹⁷⁸ Atterbury related the Queen’s success to her “personal and political Vertues [sic] which are requisite to compleat that Illustrious Character she bears.”¹⁷⁹

Only Willis thought it necessary to justify the war: “we have not entered into this war to inlarge our own Dominions, or to possess ourselves of what belongs to our Neighbours ... and therefore we have this to intitle us to the blessing and assistance of God, which we have a just cause.”¹⁸⁰ Francis Higgins admitted to merely “languid Joy” at the glorious success. Lewis Atterbury languidly acknowledged that Blenheim had so overshadowed this year’s success: “this Victory is so inconsiderable in some Men’s Estimation, must be imputed only to the extraordinary Success, God was pleased to give to our Arms last year... they appear much less than really they are.”¹⁸¹

None of the sermons evinces a fear of Marlborough’s loyalty, nor did any condemn envy of Marlborough, both of which had been features, the former implicit, the latter explicit, of the Blenheim thanksgiving sermons. Fiddes did not allude to Marlborough whatsoever. Lewis Atterbury thought him: “the most excellent General in the World.”¹⁸² Even the independent Dissenter Joseph Jacob felt Marlborough: “seems to be the man of this Age whom God delights to honour.”¹⁸³ Francis Higgins, despite alluding to Rooke’s Malaga exploits, venerated Marlborough as a: “Great and Glorious Man,” the

¹⁷⁵ Fiddes 1705 pp. 12, 13.

¹⁷⁶ Which distinguished them from English Tories: see the Blenheim sermons of Archbishop William King, Alexander Jephson, and Nicholas Brady (see above p.51).

¹⁷⁷ Higgins, 1705, p. 9.

¹⁷⁸ Atterbury, 1705, p. 18. Only Luke Milbourne, a vehement high-flying Tory held this opinion among the Blenheim Thanksgiving sermons. Milbourne’s views would be more akin to Lewis’s High-Tory brother, Francis.

¹⁷⁹ Atterbury, 1705, p. 17.

¹⁸⁰ Willis, 1705, p. 14.

¹⁸¹ Atterbury, 1705, p. 19.

¹⁸² Atterbury 1705, p. 18.

¹⁸³ Jacob, 1705, Preface ii.

saviour of the “sinking Empire” and drew comparisons with “Cressy, Poitiers and Agincourt.”¹⁸⁴ Richard Willis called Marlborough the: “honour and Glory of our Nation, as well as a blessing” and, in the presence of the Queen, saw him as no threat to her power. It was after all a question of gender: “She cannot indeed, by reason of her Sex, go abroad and Head our Armies but blessed be God she does not need it; She has had the wisdom and Happiness to make Choice of a General who supplies that Defect.”¹⁸⁵

The Thanksgiving of 1705 was thus marked by a complacency about the external threat – one preacher described the public reaction as “languid” – and the news commentary on the ceremony was terse. Despite the achievements of 1705 in Brabant and Spain having exceeded any of the gains in the Nine Years War, they paled in comparison to the 1704 victories. The 1705 Thanksgiving services produced the fewest published sermons thus far. Within England, Tories were left uncertain as the Queen moved towards a policy which seemed to encourage, if not embrace, Whigs. Their puzzlement was reflected by Richard Fiddes’s exhortation to passive obedience in the midst of anxiety. Tories would have need of more obedience in the coming years, particularly as the union with Scotland juxtaposed the security of the Protestant Succession with a perceived threat to the position of the Established Church. Tories’ key fear found expression in disparagement of Dissenters as ‘restless,’ an element in society which would initiate schism and instability, bringing England on the path of deism and atheism which would lead to the forfeiture of God’s favour.

For Whigs the view was brighter, the selection of Willis to give the St Paul’s sermon marked the first time in the reign that an avowed Whig had done so – another sign of increasing favour. The fact that Whiggish-inclined Anglicans had a more tolerant view of Dissent than their High Church counterparts did not necessarily mean that there was mutual accord between latitudinarians and Dissenters. One interpretation of Willis’s use of the Judah-Ephraim analogy was that Dissenters were unsophisticated and needed encouragement and example rather than condemnation. It is not difficult to envisage the indignation this patronising tone caused among Dissenting preachers, who were attempting to foster loyalty to the Queen and ministry while practising separate and, in their eyes, equally valid forms of Protestantism.

Ramillies “Speak Hochstet, Speak Blenheim, speak Danube, speak Bavaria, Speak Tallard, speak Westminster-Hall with thy Standards and Colours, and now speak Brabant”: June 1706¹⁸⁶

¹⁸⁴ Higgins, 1705, p. 10.

¹⁸⁵ Richard Willis, 1705, p. 15.

¹⁸⁶ Knaggs, Jun. 1706, p. 29.

Marlborough's victory at Ramillies in May 1706 was another stunning setback to French ambitions. The disorderly retreat from the battle yielded most of the territory of the Spanish Netherlands to the Confederates. If Blenheim had stopped the French advance, Ramillies marked a strategic recovery of conquered territory.¹⁸⁷

Urged on by Louis, who wished to attack on all fronts to ensure his peace entreaties would not be taken as a sign of weakness, Marshall Villeroi had advanced past defensive positions on the Dyle River to give battle on the plain of Ramillies. Many thanksgiving sermons saw the hand of providence in the infatuation of the French with advancing across the river to give battle, and especially in the panic that overtook their forces once their lines had been breached. In the event all their artillery was abandoned, retreating Walloon forces defected and in the following weeks towns as far away as Ghent, Bruges, Ostend and Antwerp surrendered without a fight.¹⁸⁸ The public's imagination was captured by Marlborough's personal peril during the battle. At one stage, he was thrown from his horse while being pursued by French forces, as he climbed onto another mount, his *aide-de-camp*, Colonel Bringfield, who was holding the stirrup, was decapitated by a cannonball. Marlborough was untouched. Many preachers saw this as evidence of God's particular protection of Marlborough, quoting Psalms 140:7 "thou hast covered my head in the day of battle."¹⁸⁹

The extent of the French reversal was such that Marlborough and Godolphin were concerned that the Dutch might sign a separate peace.¹⁹⁰ Indeed, in July, Louis initiated secret contacts through a Dutch citizen, Hennequin, offering the Dutch concessions on trade and a barrier in Spanish Netherlands, recognition of Queen Anne for the English and an offer to split Habsburg territories in Spain, Italy and the Americas between Charles and Phillip. The proposed terms threatened to split the Habsburgs from the maritime powers. The Emperor tried to tip the scales within the alliance by offering Marlborough the

¹⁸⁷ Bavaria was reclaimed for the Empire after Blenheim, and Vendome had crossed the Rhine and captured Palatine territory in early 1706. However, the fall of most of the Spanish Netherlands marked a major reversal for Louis and a significant, though nominal, territorial acquisition for the Habsburg claimant.

¹⁸⁸ In a roughly north-westerly direction, Ghent is 79 miles from Ramillies, Bruges 106, Ostend 112, and Antwerp 62. The opening of the ports, Ostend in particular, increased the logistical flexibility for further campaigns. The extent of the recovered territory may be compared with the interminable rate at which French territory fell after 1709 (see p. 197 n. 6) as a measure of public expectation and eventual exasperation with the campaign.

¹⁸⁹ Colonel Bringfield's plight was largely unmentioned, though Trevelyan notes that the Queen ensured his widow was pensioned. A memorial to Bringfield is mounted on the north aisle of the nave of Westminster Abbey: Trevelyan, *England under Queen Anne*, ii, p. 113.

¹⁹⁰ Marlborough to Godolphin. 30 Aug. 1706, in Snyder ed., *The Marlborough-Godolphin Correspondence*, ii, pp. 653-54.

lucrative governor-generalship of the newly won territory in July and again in December 1706.¹⁹¹ The Dutch were opposed, and Marlborough reluctantly refused the offer. Under pressure from the English and in the euphoria following the relief of Turin, the Dutch ended the Hennequin connection in October 1706.¹⁹²

In June 1706, the siege of Turin by French forces was in its second month. Victor Amadeus was on the run from the French among the Vaudois, and Prince Eugene was stalled near Lake Garda, rebuilding Imperial forces devastated by Vendome in the previous campaign. In Spain¹⁹³ the Confederacy had held Gibraltar and, in April, had lifted a renewed siege of Barcelona.¹⁹⁴ King Charles had been welcomed in Barcelona and had established his impecunious court there. In late spring, the allies made the first of their attempts to occupy Madrid by simultaneous assaults from Catalonia and Portugal. The Portuguese efforts fizzled out in May, while the Catalan-based force actually reached Madrid in June but evacuated the city in August as the Castilians failed to rally for Charles, and French and Spanish forces threatened the long supply lines back to Barcelona.

In England,¹⁹⁵ the newly elected Commons had met in October 1705 and narrowly elected John Smith as speaker, a moderate choice backed by Junto-Whigs and Court-Tories. Though Anne's second parliament was her most productive, its continued success depended on the management of Whigs and moderate Tories, which in turn required the skills of Godolphin and Harley, an alliance which would have been more permanent had the latter not coveted the former's position. As well as continued funding of the war effort, the ministry plotted a path through the fraught relations with Scotland, achieving the repeal of the Aliens Act.¹⁹⁶ In December 1705, the ministry secured the nomination of Whig or Court Tory commissioners on the English panel to discuss unification with Scotland, and the agreement of the Scottish Parliament to the Queen's right to nominate the Scottish members to the commission. Between May and June 1706, with the English Parliament in recess, the commission, meeting in London, agreed the outline proposal for union – much welcomed in the thanksgiving sermons – which agreed to the Hanoverian Succession in both realms, a single national parliament at Westminster with Scottish

¹⁹¹ This is not to be confused with the conferring of the principality of Mindelheim in Bavaria, which Emperor Leopold offered in Jun. 1704. Marlborough accepted the principality, but it proved a drain rather than a source of funds.

¹⁹² This paragraph summarises the relevant section from Roderick Geike and Isabel A. Montgomery, *The Dutch Barrier, 1705-1719* (Cambridge, 1930) pp. 55-62.

¹⁹³ This paragraph is taken from A.D. Francis, *The First Peninsular War, 1702-1713* (London, 1975) pp. 197-243, and Ingraio, *In Quest and Crisis*, pp. 169-173.

¹⁹⁴ Following its capture by Lord Peterborough and Prince George of Hesse, Prince George had been killed in the capture in Sept. 1705, and was remembered by Burnet and Woodroffe in their Jun. 1706 thanksgiving sermons.

¹⁹⁵ The following section is taken from Gregg, *Queen Anne*, pp. 199-232.

¹⁹⁶ The repeal was a deliberate lowering of tensions with Scotland, in that the Scottish Parliament had made its repeal a prerequisite to negotiations. See above p. 66.

representation, free trade between both countries and Scottish access to English colonial markets. Indeed the commissioners were still meeting when news of the Ramillies triumph reached London – along with reports of the bravery of the Scottish regiments, including Argyll’s Scots Brigade.¹⁹⁷ The contentious matter of the status of the Church of Scotland had been excluded from the commission’s terms of reference. The treaty would not be formally outlined until July, and would need approval by both parliaments, however, by June Burnet could proclaim in his thanksgiving sermon that: “We hear promising Tidings of a happy Project of making this island to become one People.”¹⁹⁸

The Tory leadership in parliament were increasingly disruptive and incendiary. On the 15 November 1705, with the Queen attending *incognita*, Lord Haversham¹⁹⁹ proposed in the Lords that the presumptive heir to the Crown be invited to reside in England, to secure the Protestant Succession during the dangerous days following Queen Anne’s death. Supported by Rochester, Nottingham, Jersey and other High Tories, the effort was an attempt to damage those who voted against the motion in the eyes of Hanover²⁰⁰ or force the ministry to act against the Queen’s known objection to the invitation. The Queen, who had lived through discomforts and humiliations during William’s reign, was aghast at the idea of a potential alternative court within the realm. Personal mortification can only have been added to political anxiety with the Duke of Buckingham’s²⁰¹ contribution that: “the Queen might live till she did not know what she did, and be like a child in the hands of others.”²⁰² In an effort to sidestep the invitation proposal, the court proposed a Regency bill, which detailed governance procedures during the interregnum. Introduced in the Lords by the Junto Lord Wharton, the bill received the support of six Tory-inclined bishops.²⁰³ The Regency Bill, though procedurally opposed by the Tories, quashed the divisive intent of the invitation.

Lord Rochester’s intemperate and ineffective leadership of the High Tories was further illustrated in November 1705, when he accepted the challenge to debate whether the Church of England was in danger. This again was an affront to the Queen, who prided herself on her concern for the Church, had taken practical steps to aid its poorer clergy, and whose speech on the opening of Parliament in October had warned against those who: “so very malicious, as even in Print to suggest, the Church of England, as

¹⁹⁷ Christopher A. Whatley, *The Scots and the Union* (Edinburgh, 2006) p. 235.

¹⁹⁸ Burnet, Jun. 1706, p. 2.

¹⁹⁹ John Thompson, 1st Baron Haversham (1648–1710), “a convert from Whig to Tory intransigence.” The elegant phrase is, of course, Trevelyan’s: *England under Queen Anne*, ii, p. 89.

²⁰⁰ The Electress Sophia was supportive of the idea, her son George was against, seeing it as an undermining the war effort.

²⁰¹ John Sheffield who had been dismissed as Lord Privy Seal in Mar. 1705, in favour of the Whig John Holles, Duke of Newcastle.

²⁰² Reported by Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, quoted in Gregg, *Queen Anne*, p. 211.

²⁰³ Nicolson, *London diaries*, pp. 289, 306-7.

by Law established, to be in Danger at this Time.”²⁰⁴ The debate allowed the High Tories to vent their frustration at the Queen’s advisors, and the increased demands of the Junto, but the motion was lost in the Lords by sixty-one to thirty, a significant defeat for the High Tories, who, in the end, attracted no support from the bishop’s bench. Their only consolation was the humiliation of Wharton²⁰⁵ during the debate by the veteran Duke of Leeds.²⁰⁶ Wharton goaded the Tories to name: “those rogues that had got into the pale of the Church.” Leeds reduced Wharton to silence with the following allusion to commonly held tales of Wharton’s youthful exploits: “if there were any that had pissed against a communion table, or done his other occasions in a pulpit, he should not think the church safe in such hands.”²⁰⁷

The proclamation of a thanksgiving to be held on 27 June in England bore the form of its predecessors, the war was just – “engaged in for the common safety of Our Realms and to disappoint the boundless ambitions of France.”²⁰⁸ A thanksgiving proclamation was issued by the Scottish Privy Council, based on a request from the: “Presbytry [sic] of Edinburgh in behalf of the Church and Ministers thereof”²⁰⁹ and its differences with the English version are interesting. The Scottish proclamation did not tarry with the justification of the war, and did not name the French foe but celebrated the successes “against the Enemies of the True Protestant Religion, and the Liberties of Christendom.” The English proclamation celebrated the signal and glorious victory in Brabant, which had returned: “the greatest part of the Spanish Netherlands to the possession of the house of Austria, in the person of King Charles the Third” and went on to mention the successes in Catalonia. The Scottish proclamation was more laconic, noted: “successes in ... the Netherlands and Catalonia,” and left the Catholic Habsburg ally unmentioned.

The English proclamation noted that, as usual, the Queen had: “given directions to the Archbishop and Bishops ... to compose a form of prayer... to be used in all Churches and Chapels and other places of public worship,” and that: “All loving Subjects” were “charged and commanded” to “religiously obey” so necessary a duty, upon pain of “suffering such punishments as We may justly Inflict.” The Scottish Proclamation was less declamatory. Though issued in the name of the Queen it circumnavigated the position of the Church of Scotland by stating: “the Presbytery of the Edinburgh, in behalf of the Church and Ministers thereof, have applied to the Lords of Our Privy Council, that a Day of Solemn Thanksgiving and Prayer may be appointed.” Her Majesty, with comparative delicacy, enjoined

²⁰⁴ *L.J.*, 18, pp. 6-9. 27 Oct. 1705.

²⁰⁵ Even the sympathetic Burnet described Wharton as “an Atheist grafted onto a Presbyterian”: Burnet, *History of His Own Time* (6 vols, Oxford 1833) v, p. 228.

²⁰⁶ Thomas Osborne, Earl of Danby and Duke of Leeds, Statesman and Courtier to King Charles II, who would make something of a comeback in the post-Sacheverellite tide of 1710. See below, p. 187 n. 285.

²⁰⁷ Burnet, *History*, v, p. 236.

²⁰⁸ *By the Queen, a proclamation, for a publick thanksgiving* (London, 1706).

²⁰⁹ *Proclamation appointing a solemn national thanksgiving* (Edinburgh, 1706).

the day: “to be kept [sic] with all Religious Exercises suitable to such an Occasion,” though adding that failure to do so would entail “the highest Peril.”²¹⁰

The procession from Westminster to St Paul’s followed the familiar pattern, militia and trained bands lining the thronged streets, blue cloth and tapestries hung at various vantage points.²¹¹ Lords, Privy Councillors and Knights of the Garter, having been marshalled by the officers of arms, proceeded about 11 o’clock in their coaches with six horses each towards St Paul’s. The Queen’s entourage was led by the Knight Marshall²¹² and men on horseback, with seven coaches carrying her household attendants, each drawn by six horses, one body chariot perhaps overfull with the bumptious egos of the Dukes of Somerset and Ormonde, Master of the Horse and Captain of the Guards in waiting respectively, again drawn by six horses, then Her Majesty’s Coach of State, drawn by eight horses, with Yeomen of the Guard on foot on either side. The Queen was accompanied by the Duchess of Marlborough and the Dowager Countess of Burlington. Only Luttrell’s account explicitly draws attention to Prince George’s absence: “being unable to endure the fatigue.”²¹³ The Queen’s Horse Guard brought up the rear.

As usual at Temple Bar the Lord Mayor, this year Sir Thomas Rawlinson, a wealthy Tory vintner, presented the City Sword on bended knee, and it being returned, carried it before Her Majesty to the cathedral. As Her Majesty processed to her throne in the cathedral the Sword of State was borne by George Fitzroy,²¹⁴ Duke of Northumberland.

The sermon was given by Dean George Stanhope, a renowned preacher, Boyle lecturer, and later a Hanoverian Tory.²¹⁵ Stanhope’s lesson was taken from Deuteronomy 33:29, extolling Israel’s protection

²¹⁰ It was a vain hope. Caudle notes that Orthodox Calvinistic Presbyterian practice did not permit the keeping of calendrical feasts or fasts which were not demonstrably scriptural. Thus, the Scottish non-observance of the State Holidays was not a specific resistance to the Anglican commemoration, but merely an extension of the principle by which they did not observe Good Friday or Christmas ... Queen Anne had pointedly asked Secretary Johnston why the Presbyterians did not observe the martyrdom of Charles I. Johnston replied, “Why truly, Madam, they do not keep the day of the Saviour’s death [Good Friday] or birth [Christmas], yea, no set days that are not in Scripture.” The Queen reportedly replied, “That is more than I knew”, and added sympathetically, “I perceive it is matter of principle with them, and not of pick [pique].”: Caudle, *Measures of Allegiance*, p. 236.

²¹¹ The day’s events are summarised from *London Gazette*, 27 Jun. – 1 Jul., 1706; *Post Man*, 27-29 Jun. 1706; *Daily Courant*, 28 Jun. 1706; Luttrell, *Brief Historical Relation*, vi, p. 61.

²¹² Sir Philip Meadows, court-Tory MP for Tregony, who had purchased the position from Lord Jersey in June 1700, for a consideration of £5,000. Meadows’s wife was the niece of Lord Treasurer Godolphin. At the end of 1706, Meadows was appointed envoy to the Emperor, arriving at Vienna he made a determined protest to Emperor Josef in Nov. 1708 against Habsburg persecution of Silesian Protestants (see p. 176): H.O.P. 1690-1715, iv, pp. 789.

²¹³ Luttrell, *Brief Historical Relation*, vi, p. 61.

²¹⁴ Fitzroy was the natural son of Charles II, he held several household appointments under Queen Anne and was a colonel in the Royal Horse Guards. John Evelyn described him as: “of all his majesty’s children the most accomplished and worth the knowing.” Another of Charles’ natural sons, Charles Lennox, Duke of Richmond had carried the sword in 1704 Thanksgiving.

²¹⁵ Stanhope has been associated with High Toryism, publicly reacted in favour of Sacheverell, and was subsequently a member of the Tory October Club. His 27 Jun. 1706 thanksgiving sermon has been, in my view,

by the Lord, and its happiness that: “thine Enemies shall be found Liars unto thee and thou shalt tread upon their high places.” Given the circumstances – “A Country wont to be gotten by Inches, but now retrieved (rescued rather) in the beginning of one Glorious Campaign”²¹⁶ and foes, in Spain and Brabant, who: “have [been] confounded ... with ... Terrors”²¹⁷ – Stanhope was understandably triumphant.

He was in no doubt that providence was on the allies’ side, that: “[w]ar in the Nature of the Thing, does however continue to be an Appeal to the Sovereign Judge of All ... God still asserts his ancient Prerogative.”²¹⁸ He went further to justify why the appeal had been made:

The Cause, in which we are embarked is ... Christian and commendable. Not an inordinate Thirst of false honour ... acquired by Slaughter and Devastation. Not a Greediness to enlarge our Territories ... But a desire to bring back into its own Channel what encroachment and Usurpation have driven away.²¹⁹

Louis, by contrast, ensured that: “a Most Christian Tyranny may put on chains, as Heavy as a Heathen one.”²²⁰ Stanhope restated the common misperception that Marlborough’s forces were outnumbered at Ramillies: “the Providence of God is frequently signalised by ... dispiriting the Strong, defeating the many, inspiring with uncommon Bravery the Few.”²²¹

The Queen’s auspicious reign had seen “signal and accumulated successes” which evidenced that she was the “Person whom God delights to honour.”²²² Stanhope expressed a view that the Monarch directly interfaced with the Deity: “Religious and good Governours work unseen and at a distance; while

mischaracterised as attempting to minimise Marlborough’s achievements: H.O.P. 1690-1715, v, pp. 298-304. In fact, a reading of Stanhope’s sermons, especially the 1710 Thanksgiving before a High Tory attendance at St James’s, shows him to have been recognisably Tory but even-handed and far short of the fulminations of Atterbury, Milbourne, Trapp or Morse. Thomas Hearne even called Stanhope a member of the Low-Church party, proving only that he was not as High Church as Hearne. His work as prolocutor in the 1713 Convocation, led G.V. Bennett to the view that Stanhope was a Hanoverian. Bennett, *Tory Crisis in Church and State*, p. 174.

²¹⁶ George Stanhope, Jun. 1706, p. 12.

²¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

²¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

²¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

²²⁰ Boyer, *History*, p. 8, the *Post Man* and the *Daily Courant* had made special note that the Moroccan Ambassador, Ahmad Qardanash [or Ben Ahmed Cardenas], and his retinue attended the Solemnity. They had been seated in the little Middle Gallery, by themselves, in a different place from the other Foreign Ministers. One wonders if they were offended by, or diplomatically deaf to, the heathen reference. Qardanash had arrived in Apr. 1706 and would spend two frustrating years in Britain, and be imprisoned upon his return: J.A.O.C. Brown, ‘Anglo-Moroccan Relations and the Embassy of Ahmad Qardanash 1706-1708’, *Historical Journal*, li (2008), pp. 599-620.

²²¹ George Stanhope, Jun. 1706, p. 9. Later scholarship suggests the forces were roughly balanced, but Marlborough’s initial feint made the French concentrate their forces, leaving the southern flank weaker, allowing the allies to break through: Trevelyan, *England under Queen Anne*, ii, pp. 104-15. It’s intriguing to think that Winston Churchill may have read this sermon, it bears a resemblance to his Aug. 1940 speech praising ‘the Few.’

²²² George Stanhope, Jun. 1706, p. 13.

their Piety and their Prayers qualifie [sic] their Forces for Victory, and the Chapel and the Closet crown the Sea and the Field with Efficacy and Success.”²²³

Thus, anything that might disturb Her Majesty from the execution of this work, such as libertinism, faction or irreligion, was to be discouraged. Marlborough received great praise: “A commander so formed by Nature, so finished by Experience, for bold and noble enterprises,” and Stanhope retold the story of Marlborough’s narrow escape from death on the battlefield as evidence of God’s favour.

In a gesture unusual among Tories but perhaps required by the exigencies of the event, Stanhope paid deference to: “[t]he memory of our deceased Prince [who] deserves to Live in Honour, and must needs do so, as long as there are Liberties in Europe,” while quickly noting that providence had reserved to the Queen: “the Glory of finishing that Great Work speedily, which He [William], in despite [sic] of all difficulties, had so magnificently begun.”²²⁴ Stanhope’s sermon shared some characteristics with Willis’s the previous year – its assertion that England’s war aims were non-acquisitive, its praise of William, and its support for the Habsburg claimant. Despite the euphoria which accompanied this victory and which would influence maximalist war aims, Stanhope reverted to a bounded view of the preferred outcome of the war:

To Adjust such a Balance of Power as may prevent ourselves and our allies becoming a Prey to an insatiable Devourer. To Establish Security of Commerce and a mutual good understanding between adjacent Countries, and to assure the Quiet and Safety of the whole Western World ... By a cheerful and Modest Obedience to that Centre of our common Happiness and Honour.²²⁵

There are twenty-four published thanksgiving sermons.²²⁶ Among the high-profile preachers were Dean Stanhope, Bishop Burnet, Philip Stubbs²²⁷ and Richard West, a latitudinarian polemicist.²²⁸ A significant number of prominent Dissenters – the Seventh-day Baptist, Joseph Stennett, independent minister Thomas ‘Bold’ Bradbury, and Presbyterians Robert Fleming, John Evans, John Spademan – chose to publish. Indeed, Spademan was among three Dissenting ministers – one each representing Presbyterian, Congregationalist and independent preachers, who presented a loyal address to Her Majesty

²²³ Ibid, p. 14.

²²⁴ Ibid, p. 8.

²²⁵ George Stanhope, Jun. 1706, p. 9.

²²⁶ Including Stanhope’s at St Paul’s

²²⁷ With Luke Milbourne, Stubbs became a prominent High Tory preacher after the Sacheverell riots. Leonard W. Cowie, ‘Stubbs, Philip (1665–1738)’ *Oxford DNB* [accessed 16 Mar. 2016]. See also W.R. Owens and P.N. Furbank, eds., *Political and Economic Writings of Daniel Defoe* (5 vols, London, 2000) iii, p. 113.

²²⁸ West was Burnet’s chaplain. In 1702 he had published a defence of Burnet, and of toleration, in the pamphlet ‘*The True Character of a Churchman*’. Henry Sacheverell’s replied with a pamphlet, refuting West, called ‘*Character of a Low Church Man*’.

ten days before the thanksgiving. Jean Dubourdieu published his sermon given at the Savoy to his Huguenot congregation. Perhaps the clearest example of a preacher tacking to prevailing political winds is the sermon of the Rector of Maldon, William Bramston. Though of Tory stock – Bramston’s uncle was borough High Steward ‘in the church interest,’ and his brother became a Tory MP in 1712²²⁹ – his sermon was very appreciative of William: “Our Glorious Monarch of Happy Memory,”²³⁰ and very supportive of the restoration to the House of Habsburg of its Spanish and Flemish Territories.

Once again, there is unanimity from all the sermons about the providential nature of the year’s successes. Burnet delighted that: “[t]owns which have cost whole Campaigns, have not stood before us one week; and in many different places at once, Victory and Triumph follow us”;²³¹ Samuel Terrick in York²³² spoke of the enemy “strangely infatuated”;²³³ Richard West, Burnet’s chaplain, asked: “Whence come the Infatuation? It was of the Lord no doubt.”²³⁴ The Dissenter John Evans concurred: “Enemies that had a formidable Strength, are strangely infatuated... if their Pride and Confidence betray them to the indiscreetest Measures ... These are usually those special Characters of Divine Perfections.”²³⁵

However, there was some evidence of the limits to which providence could be stretched. Andrew Low, a Dissenting minister, found providence, working through Parliament had trumped Divine heredity: “The right of Succession must [after the death of the Prince of Gloucester], according to lineal descent, have devolved on a Papist ... but Providence has answered these objections, and anticipate our Fears, and has directed the wisdom of the Nation to settle the succession on a Protestant Family.”²³⁶

With almost all of the Spanish Netherlands liberated, Marlborough’s triumph was undeniable, and his survival of the cannonball which decapitated his aide gave a vivid demonstration that he was: “cut out by Providence for Extraordinary designs.”²³⁷ Some preachers focused on his loyalty as well as his valour:

²²⁹ H.O.P. 1690-1715, ii, pp. 197-202.

²³⁰ Bramston, Jun. 1706, p. 12.

²³¹ Burnet, Jun. 1706, p. 10. Military historians have arrived at a rather more prosaic assessment. The only towns that surrendered were those whose fortifications were in a state of disrepair – a legacy of Spanish rule – or whose inhabitants actively opposed French rule. Vauban’s fortress structure – rendering a field invasion of Northern France perilous – had only been extended to Flanders in certain places *e.g.* Oudenarde: Jamel Ostwald, ‘The “Decisive” Battle of Ramillies, 1706: Prerequisites for Decisiveness in Early Modern Warfare’, *Journal of Military History*, lxiv (2000), pp. 649-77.

²³² Terrick had been chaplain to Alexander Stanhope, father of James Stanhope, William’s ambassador extraordinary to Spain between 1696 and 1699, and afterwards had been Chaplain to Archbishop Sharp: Joseph Hunter, ed., *The Diary of Ralph Thoresby FRS (1677-1724)* (2 vols, London, 1830) ii, p. 266.

²³³ Terrick, Jun. 1706, p. 16.

²³⁴ West, Jun. 1706, p. 16.

²³⁵ Evans, Jun. 1706, pp. 8, 12.

²³⁶ Low, Jun. 1706, p. 3.

²³⁷ Stennett, Jun. 1706, p. 17.

“He distinguished himself to his Royal Mistress, to be as Good a Christian as he is a Soldier.”²³⁸ His piety was considered in light of the Roman tradition of triumphant generals laying their victory laurels in the lap of the statue of Jupiter, thereby acknowledging a higher power.²³⁹ Many used the comparison implicitly to Gideon, the biblical ‘mighty man of valour’²⁴⁰ and explicitly to Caesar.²⁴¹ Indeed, in the eyes of both Richard West: “Not to be excell’d by an example of a Roman,”²⁴² and Benjamin Woodroffe: “I carry you now beyond the greatest Caesar”²⁴³ – Marlborough exceeded those exemplars. In an anonymous sermon preached at sea, which foreshadowed some of the adulation to come, Marlborough was said to have excelled even his own heights: “now our brave General has not only out-done all the great Captains ... but he has out-done himself.”²⁴⁴ Dissenting preachers, belying their reputed enthusiasm, were more circumspect in their praise and concentrated more on the General’s deliverance: “God covered His Head in the Day of Battle, when the Ball was suffer’d to carry off his Nearest Attendant’s [head].”²⁴⁵ Robert Fleming gave an ungrudging salute to his German reward: “Mindelheim is, by the Emperors orders, erected for him as a Triumphal Arch to his lasting Honour.”²⁴⁶

The division regarding William’s memory persisted. Some Anglican ministers took the opportunity to obliquely disparage him. John Catlyn compared Ramillies with past “imperfect attempts,”²⁴⁷ while Samuel Terrick damned with the faintest of praise: “[w]e had as Great numbers in the Field before ... we should be unjust to their Memories [of those Great Men], should we suppose in them a want of either Personal Courage or Bravery, and yet we cannot say, we were ever Honoured with such success as this.”²⁴⁸ On the other hand, Daniel Hill in Rochester Cathedral protested too much: “[a] general wise and Valiant ... Inferior to none herein, I say, but our Late King of glorious Memory.”²⁴⁹

²³⁸ Gardiner, Jun. 1706, p. 2.

²³⁹ Stubbs, Jun. 1706, p. 6.; Gardiner, 1713, p. 2.

²⁴⁰ West, Jun. 1706, p. 9. Whittle, Jun. 1706, p. 9. Knaggs, Jun. 1706, p. 29. Catlyn, Jun. 1706, p. 11.

²⁴¹ Wilder, Jun. 1706, p. 18. Woodroffe, Jun. 1706, p. 2. West, Jun. 1706, p. 23.

²⁴² West, Jun. 1706, p. 23.

²⁴³ Woodroffe, Jun. 1706, p. 2. In an age of obsequious dedications, Woodroffe’s, addressed to Marlborough, oozed oleaginousness: “I bring to mind what the parting words were, when waiting on your Grace at Woodstock, before embarking on the Glorious Service you have since done.”

²⁴⁴ J.N., Jun. 1706, p. 21. Unfortunately, no details have been uncovered of the preacher or location.

²⁴⁵ Evans, Jun. 1706, p. 19.

²⁴⁶ Robert Fleming, Jun. 1706, p. 67. The award brought little material gain and little prestige. See Peter Barber, ‘Marlborough as Imperial Prince, 1704-1717’, *British Library Journal*, viii (1982) pp. 46-79. The Habsburg offer of the governor-generalship of the Spanish Netherlands to Marlborough was formally made in Jun. 1706, and was being discussed by the English and Dutch Ministry’s though the summer. Marlborough declined the offer, to avoid complicating relations with the Dutch, in Jul. 1706: R.Geike and I.A. Montgomery, *The Dutch Barrier, 1705-1719* (Cambridge, 1930), pp. 15-23.

²⁴⁷ Catlyn, Jun. 1706, p. 11.

²⁴⁸ Terrick, Jun. 1706, p. 14.

²⁴⁹ Hill, Jun. 1706, p. 16.

Approximately half of the Anglican sermons²⁵⁰ disparaged those who spoke ill of Marlborough, though no Dissenting preachers saw fit to mention the issue. The prevalence of condemnation demonstrates its topicality – Samuel Terrick hoped to: “now at last put a stop to the many fly insinuations and place him for ever above the Envy and Slander of the Malicious,”²⁵¹ while John Catlyn bemoaned the fact that: “the most illustrious examples of meritorious Valour ... must bear the Malignant reflections of some men.”²⁵² Gilbert Burnet’s admonition was typically grandiloquent: “let neither Envy, nor Jealousy, Slander or Detraction lessen those great and just Praises that all abroad pay him.”²⁵³ Burnet’s chaplain, Richard West, amended Psalm 64:3 to his purpose: “what a miserable thing it is, to have enemies at home to struggle with, whet their Tongues like sharp Razors, and shoot out their arrows even bitter words.”²⁵⁴ William Bramston decried: “any Tongues to Blaspheme the Noble Actions ... Shall his greatness be the Object of Obloquy?”²⁵⁵ John Wilder gave the most naïve and, with hindsight, most wistful defence:

He has a soul that is Proof against all Charms of Bribery that is more ready to despise those gilded temptations... His virtue and Love for his Country will give ear to no base Proposals, to nothing but what is for the Honour, Interest and Glory of his Triumphant Mistress.²⁵⁶

Unsurprisingly, Louis XIV continued to be universally despised. On this occasion in addition to the usual epithets – ‘haughty,’ ‘tyrant,’ ‘infamous’ – there was a noticeable concentration on Pharaonic and Islamic comparisons: “the Egyptian-French King (for doubtless France, as well as Rome, is an Egypt for Cruelty)”²⁵⁷; “A Christian Turk as equally a Common enemy ... Perfidious Violator of all Sacred Leagues and disturber of the Peace of the whole World “;²⁵⁸ “This modern Egypt ... it appears that God is not so nigh unto him as he is unto us.”²⁵⁹ In Rochester Cathedral, the Prebend Daniel Hill mocked him as: “that Bubble of Greatness that he is no more Invincible, than he is Immortal.”²⁶⁰ The Dissenter John

²⁵⁰ Woodroffe, Terrick, Catlyn, Bramston, West, J.N., Burnet. Spademan’s was the only dissenting sermon to mention Marlborough, and rather conventionally compares him with Barak.

²⁵¹ Terrick, Jun. 1706, p. 25.

²⁵² Catlyn, Jun. 1706, p. 9.

²⁵³ Burnet, Jun. 1706, p. 13.

²⁵⁴ West, Jun. 1706, p. 30. Psalm 64:3 “Who whet their tongue like a sword, And bend their bows to shoot their arrows, even bitter words.”

²⁵⁵ Bramston, Jun. 1706, p. 18.

²⁵⁶ Wilder, Jun. 1706, p. 21.

²⁵⁷ Gardiner, p. 10, 1713, p. 10.

²⁵⁸ Gatchell, Jun. 1706, p. 22. The Jun. 1706 sermons saw an increase in un-Christian analogies for Louis. Tony Claydon identified these as a justification for alliance with continental Catholic powers during William’s reign: Claydon, ‘Protestantism, Universal Monarchy and Christendom in William’s War Propaganda 1689-67 in David Onnekink, ed, *Redefining William III*, pp. 125-42.

²⁵⁹ Burnet, Jun. 1706, p. 2, ponderously applying Deuteronomy 4:6-8 to contemporary England.

²⁶⁰ Hill, Jun. 1706, p. 14.

Spademan displayed that mixture of awe and disgust which moved so many opponents of the Sun King. Spademan condemned Louis:

unparalleled Vainglory: Witness that Proudest Monument erected Twenty years ago (with his Approbation) ... in which he is represented by a Gigantic Statue (thirteen Foot high) ... placing him in the midst of four wretched slaves, a spectacle very pleasing to him. Under this statue is the short, but most Arrogant Inscription *Viro immortal*, To the Immortal Man: And on the Frontispiece, he is proudly styl'd *Semper Felici*, Always Happy ... As though no defeat could attend his Enterprises ... This Mighty One hath been celebrated for destroying the Protestant Religion, which in his Monument is called Calvinian Impiety; as this day 'tis termed The Northern Heresy.²⁶¹

Bishop Burnet revealed by condemnation the existence of murmurs about the burden of taxation:

Let us bear our burden yet with Patience, and not run with too much Precipitation into such a False Peace, as a Treacherous enemy may offer us ... as an artifice to disjoint a great Alliance ... So the impatience of those who are uneasy under an unavoidable Expense, may not again, as it did Nine Years Age, lose all advantages.²⁶²

Samuel Terrick was stoic, continuing the pledge of loyalty to the “common cause, which at the expense of so much money and blood, we have so long maintain'd.”²⁶³ Richard West professed: “a Readiness to design and execute, to forward and dispatch whatever was necessary for carrying out a vigorous war.”²⁶⁴ The Dissenting ministers were more down to earth. Andrew Low praised the: “Publick Tranquility ... [from War] tho' we are deeply engag'd in it, yet know little of the inconvenience beside Publick Taxes.”²⁶⁵ And John Evans felt that murmurings about the burden of taxes was tantamount to Jacobitism:

²⁶¹ Spademan, Jun., 1706, p. 26. The original statue, of Louis XIV crowned by Fame and trampling the Triple Alliance underfoot, in gilt bronze, stood on a high square pedestal with bas-relief panels and effusively flattering inscriptions; dejected bronze figures, representing the nations defeated by the Treaty of Nijmegen (1679), were seated at the corners. Each expresses a different reaction to captivity: revolt, hope, resignation, or grief. There is some evidence that the statue's grandiosity even embarrassed Louis. In 1699, Louis's chancellor, the Comte de Ponchartrain, wrote in connection with the design of another statue, “nothing grand, nothing in a word, that resembles the reliefs, slaves and inscriptions of the Place des Victoires”: Rochelle Ziskin, ‘The Place de Nos Conquêtes and the Unraveling of the Myth of Louis XIV’, *The Art Bulletin*, lxxiv (1994), pp. 147-162. During the French Revolution, the gilt bronze statue of the king was melted down, but the captives, seen as victims of absolute power, were spared and the chains that shackled them were broken. They were taken to the Louvre in 1790, where, as Four Captives, they remain on display.

²⁶² Burnet, Jun. 1706, p. 13. Burnet was perceptive in this regard. In Jul. 1706 Louis offered peace terms to the Dutch, through Hennequin, an agent in Rotterdam. Though initially eager, the Dutch refused to conclude a separate peace: Ingrao, *In Quest and Crisis*, pp. 169-70.

²⁶³ Terrick, Jun. 1706, p. 19.

²⁶⁴ West, Jun. 1706, p. 22.

²⁶⁵ Low, Jun. 1706, p. 14.

But hearty Protestants and English Men will be asham'd to indulge so narrow a Spirit as to lay a private Loss in Balance with the many prosperous Circumstances of the Nation, You are 'tis true, at a considerable Expence for the War, your enemies have given some Obstruction to your Trade ... but certainly he deserves to feel the Weight of the French Yoke, that is so indifferent for his Religion and Liberties as not to reckon the Securing them worth Part of his Estate.²⁶⁶

Negotiations on the outline of a Treaty of Union with Scotland were concluding in London during June 1706. The machinations to gain parliamentary approval in both realms were some way in the future, but the method by which a United Kingdom would deal with two antagonistic Established Churches would cause significant problems for the Church of England. In Woodstock, Benjamin Woodroffe attempted to sublimate his anxiety: “She is uniting two of her own Kingdoms ... and by her Mediation, endeavouring to unite so many others.”²⁶⁷ In contrast, Bishop Burnet, himself a Scot, and his chaplain, Richard West, were enthusiastic supporters of a union. Burnet’s political connections allowed him to: “hear promising Tidings of a happy Project of making this island to become one People. ... A happy union of several Nations and different Religions seems fixed”²⁶⁸ and West felt that: “the Union of the two Nations ... [would] compleat the Happiness of this Island.”²⁶⁹ Dissenting ministers, who might be expected to benefit by whatever status the Presbyterian Church of Scotland would attain, were silent on the subject. Only the Presbyterian John Spademan, in his joint address to the Queen rather than his sermon, noted in terms similar to Richard West’s: “May your reign be honoured with a Happy Union of your two Kingdoms of Great Britain.”²⁷⁰

Richard West was convinced that the victory ensured the security of the Protestant Succession and even the: “Deliverance from factions at home. For as the Power of France sinks and decays, so our intestine Jarrs and Animosities crumble into nothing ... Whence come our Cries of the Dangers of the Church but from French Engines that were set at work to pull down the State?”²⁷¹

Bishop Burnet was uncharacteristically cautious wishing that the Queen: “may procure ... such a Peace to all Europe, as may settle the Balance and secure the Quiet of the World,” though he did voice support for the Habsburgs, a theme which would increasingly distinguish Whig from Tory: “To save the Empire ... to rescue Spain from a Perfidious Invader and restore it to the Rightful Owner.”²⁷² Whig

²⁶⁶ Evans, Jun. 1706, p. 26.

²⁶⁷ Woodroffe, Jun. 1706. p. 20.

²⁶⁸ Burnet, Jun. 1706, p. 2.

²⁶⁹ West, Jun. 1706, p. 2.

²⁷⁰ Spademan, Jun. 1706, un-paginated address. In the event, dissenter sentiment on the Union was a mixture of English national solidarity and joy at the discomfiture at the predicament of the Church of England. See Daniel Williams’s May 1707 Thanksgiving sermon, p. 12.

²⁷¹ West, Jun. 1706, pp. 25, 26.

²⁷² Burnet, Jun. 1706, pp. 11, 13.

support for the Habsburg policy would become embodied in the policy of ‘No Peace without Spain,’ whereas France’s retreat would eventually spur Tories to denigrate the Habsburg alliance, summarised in a 1713 sermon: “The Virulence of Popish Zeal Reigns no less at Vienna, than at Versailles ... Has not the Emperor bin a vast Gainer by this War?”²⁷³ John Whittle, rector of Fooks-Cray in Kent, agreed that the Spanish Netherlands were: “by this Master-stroke reduced back again from him [Louis] to the House of Austria in the Person of Charles III, whose undoubted right it is.”²⁷⁴ In Rochester Cathedral, Roger Hill proclaimed that the victory:

is restoring Europe to its former Repose, Quiet and Tranquillity: securing to it a firm and lasting Peace, by adjusting the Balance of Power in it, and making the Scale thereof (so prodigiously heavy on the French’s side from the weight of the power of France, laying therein) to incline and weigh down to the Austrian Family.²⁷⁵

The Dissenters were exuberant about the triumph. Joseph Stennett was comparatively restrained in saying: “that nothing is too great to be expected by us,”²⁷⁶ whereas John Evans was convinced that it was a Protestant victory: “The Deliverance of Germany and Spain and Flanders, are principally owing, under God, to the Zeal and Vigour of those of our Religion.” He was quick to focus on the needs of French Protestants: “Who knows what Advantage God designs by all this to the Reform’d Interest in France,”²⁷⁷ a topic which would eventually divide Dissenting ministers from all shades of opinion in the Church of England, though not before eliciting some exuberant passages from Bishop Burnet.²⁷⁸ The Dissenting ministers were rather more muted in war aims in the addresses which they issued,²⁷⁹ Fleming being content to wish that: “France may be humbled and reduc’d to its old limits; and that the Balance of Europe, may ever be held by the Sovereign of Great Britain,” while Spademan sought: “the speedy reduction of the Power of France to its just limits, the restitution of Liberty and Peace to Europe, the effectual relief of the reformed Churches abroad, and the Security of that Provision of the Law has made for a Protestant Succession to the Crown of this Kingdom.”²⁸⁰

²⁷³ Hartwell, 1713, p. 17.

²⁷⁴ Whittle, Jun. 1706, p. 23.

²⁷⁵ Hill, Jun. 1706, p. 20.

²⁷⁶ Stennett, Jun. 1706, p. 22.

²⁷⁷ Evans, Jun. 1706, p. 20.

²⁷⁸ Bishop Burnet’s thanksgiving service at St Paul’s in Dec. 1706 would become the high-watermark for Huguenot hopes. (see pp. 107 and 211).

²⁷⁹ Addresses are attached, unpaginated, to the printed versions of Robert Fleming’s and Jonathan Spademan’s sermons. It is not clear if Fleming’s address was published separately; Spademan’s was and indeed was presented to the Queen. Fleming’s address strikes an interesting note proclaiming he and his fellow dissenters as “conscientiously, and therefore involuntarily, dissident from the Established Church.”

²⁸⁰ Spademan, *The Humble Address of the Dissenting Ministers in and about the City of London, presented to the Queen by Mr. Spademan, on the 17th June 1706* (London, 1706)

Jean Dubourdieu, minister to the Huguenot congregation at the Savoy, published a sermon on this occasion, as he had for the Blenheim Thanksgiving. He was entirely celebratory of the victory, and whereas Blenheim had represented for him: “promising hopes of its Liberty and Quiet,” Ramillies portended: “the visible presages of [Louis’s] Ruine.”²⁸¹ With a relish perhaps based on bitter familiarity, Dubourdieu noted: “What was become of the so much boasted intrepidity of the Kings Household?”²⁸² Dubourdieu displayed more markedly Whiggish sentiments than in 1704, noting: “the Wisdom and courage of our great William,” a tribute which had been omitted from his 1704 sermon, while he praised the Queen as usual for her: “zealous[ness] for the Religion she professes” but added that she was: “moderate and charitable to those who Dissent from it ... submissive to the Laws, tho’ sovereign ... serving for an example to all her Subjects, by the sincerity of her Piety ... devotion,” whereas in 1704 she had been “the Joy of her People, a mother to the Poor, a refuge for the persecuted, the support of Her allies and the Hopes of all Princes and People that are oppressed.”²⁸³

The recapture of almost the entire Spanish Netherlands after Ramillies turned the tide of the war in three significant ways: putting the French on the defensive; establishing territory over which Charles III was nominally sovereign; and forcing the allies to attempt to define their concept of victory. The latter would prove divisive.

Annually from 1706, and with increasing desperation, Louis XIV would offer peace terms, which he hoped would induce one or more of the allies to break ranks. The Dutch were the most likely to waver, as with the collapse of the Spanish Netherlands, they were able to re-occupy strategic towns to form a barrier against future French aggression, which was their principal war aim. Their interest in other spheres of the war was waning as the costs of each campaign wore on their Treasury. Nonetheless, the impracticality of an actual barrier – as evidenced by the fall of the Spanish Netherlands in 1702 – led to the Dutch desire for *de facto* occupation of the Spanish Netherlands for the duration of hostilities; a major source of irritation in their relations with the Habsburgs.

King Charles III, nominal overlord of the Spanish Netherlands, and in June 1706 of Catalonia, Valencia and Gibraltar, now became a source of friction between England and the United Provinces, as the two powers negotiated a new Barrier Treaty. Charles’s offer to Marlborough of the lucrative governor-generalship of the Netherlands was an effort to win England’s influence as the third *de jure*, but ineffectual, power in the area. Marlborough, aware of Dutch suspicions of the offer, reluctantly declined

²⁸¹ Dubourdieu, 1704, p. 4; Jun. 1706, p. 9.

²⁸² Louis’s household cavalry, a byword for battlefield *élan*, had buckled and fled at Ramillies.

²⁸³ Jean Dubourdieu, 1706 pp. 22, 23; 1704 p. 24.

the position. English war aims, reflected in the rejection of all French peace proposals, coalesced around the demand of the integrity of the Spanish monarchy and its settlement, undivided in the Habsburg line.

In England, the stream of military success gave impetus to those who wished to continue the war. The Whigs, aware of their growing importance to the management of the Queen's affairs, became increasingly assertive in demanding power and position. In the summer of 1706, they controversially demanded a major office in the ministry, that of the secretaryship for the Junto Earl of Sunderland, Marlborough's son-in-law.²⁸⁴ The Queen was averse to the proposal and resisted it until December, then granted it only in the face of Godolphin's threat of resignation. Godolphin, and to a lesser extent Marlborough, felt that the Whigs could be accommodated and managed, whereas Harley, knowing that he would be a target of the ascendant Whigs, felt there was a better possibility of steering a moderate course among the currently mismanaged Tories.

The thanksgiving sermons exhibit some early signs of the divisions which would plague the latter part of the reign. Some preachers – Stanhope, Gatchell and Gardiner – though not yet content that Louis had been contained, could nonetheless envisage the restoration of balance of power which would keep him in check. The centre of gravity of the sermons had also shifted in the direction of Whigs – thus Philip Stubbs, in 1710 a prominent Sacheverellite and then in 1713 a Tory firebrand, had given quite a muted sermon in 1706. William Bramston, from a prominent Tory family in Essex, gave a sermon with significant pro-Williamite sentiments. For most, notably Burnet, West, Whittle, Perse, J.N. and Knaggs, Louis's untrustworthiness precluded almost any negotiated settlement, which led to an ultimately futile policy of total victory embodied in the 'no peace without Spain' war aim. Though only Hill mentioned the Habsburgs by name, West, J.N. and Knaggs described Louis as the scourge of Christendom, which Tony Claydon has observed had previously been used as a means of justifying an alliance with Catholic powers.²⁸⁵ A significant minority of Anglican preachers continued to asset the lawfulness of continuing the war.²⁸⁶ Dissenting ministers openly called for the re-establishment of the Huguenots in their native country and were graphic in their depiction of their sufferings.

²⁸⁴Sunderland was not the first Whig appointee; the amiable Lord Cowper had been appointed lord keeper in Oct. 1705. However, Sunderland, who displaced Sir Charles Hedges, was a controversial figure and not a favourite of the Queen.

²⁸⁵ Tony Claydon, 'Protestantism, Universal Monarchy and Christendom in William's War Propaganda, 1689-169,' in Onnekink, *Redefining William III*, pp. 125-142.

²⁸⁶ See sermons from Bramston, Perse and Hill.

“There is no peace ... till the Exiles are recalled, the Prisoners are set at Liberty.” December 1706

The proclamation of the second thanksgiving in 1706 differed significantly from the first. Both documents asked for God’s continued protection and assistance in disappointing the boundless ambition of France. However, in June, the people had been commanded to give thanks for the: “signal and glorious victories in Brabant and Catalonia,”²⁸⁷ whereas by November God’s blessing was called upon: “for restoring and perpetuating Peace, Safety and Prosperity.”²⁸⁸ The relief of Barcelona in April, the victory at Ramillies in May and the subsequent fall of most of Brabant, were followed in September by the lifting of the siege of Turin by Austro-Savoyard forces under Prince Eugene and Victor Amadeus, Duke of Savoy, leaving French forces besieged and isolated in Northern Italy. Within weeks of Ramillies, Louis, whose country was suffering great economic hardship, had offered peace terms to the allies,²⁸⁹ something which alarmed Marlborough and Godolphin. The unofficial talks had petered out by October.

The prospects of peace raised public hopes and expectations. In July, even before the successes of Savoy, a humble address to the Queen from the gentlemen and clergy of the county of Suffolk had spoken of the “fair Prospect opened to us of a Safe, an Honourable and a Speedy Peace.”²⁹⁰ The *Post Man* echoed official caution: “there is nothing more prejudicial to the true Interest of the Grand Alliance than these false Rumours of Peace, which tend to stir up Jealousies between the High Allies, there is no doubt but the French will use again like Artifices.”²⁹¹ The *Observer* was distrustful of Louis’s wiles: “Now we have got the French King down. Let us keep him down.”²⁹² The rumours of peace could not be quelled, the *Flying Post* reported that “Veniations and Swissers” were joining in proposals of peace, and that the “Duke of Lorraine has sent proposals to Vienna by his brother the Bishop of Osnaburg [sic].”²⁹³ The *Daily Courant* had it that the Elector of Bavaria was the envoy.²⁹⁴ The *Flying Post* published a copy of a letter to the Holy Roman Emperor and the French King from the Swiss Cantons, urging them to “give particular attention to our Proposals of Peace, and thereby give us an occasion to persuade all the other

²⁸⁷ *By the Queen, a proclamation, for a publick thanksgiving.* (London, 1706)[21 May]

²⁸⁸ *By the Queen, a proclamation, for a publick thanksgiving.* (London, 1706)[19 Nov.]

²⁸⁹ See above p. 75.

²⁹⁰ *The Humble Address of t.he Two Grand Juries, High Sherrif, Justices of the Peace, Gentlemen and Clergy of the County of Suffolk*, 20 Jul. 1706, in *Daily Courant*, 2 Sept. 1706. The address was presented in Jul. by the Earl of Dysart and Sir Robert Davers, who were introduced by Secretary Harley.

²⁹¹ *Post Man*, 12-14 Sept. 1706.

²⁹² *Observer* (1702), 25-28 Sept. 1706.

²⁹³ *Flying Post or The Post Master*, 7-9 Nov. 1706.

²⁹⁴ *Daily Courant*, 7 Nov. 1706. It was true that, in parallel with the Hennequin contacts, Maximilian Emmanuel was in contact with Marlborough and the Dutch throughout Oct. 1706: Geikie and Montgomery, *Dutch Barrier*, pp. 68-73.

Powers.”²⁹⁵ By mid-November, the *Gazette* published extracts of a letter from the Dutch leaders: “firmly resolved to observe their alliances in every part,” while holding out for a peace that could: “reasonably promise its being firm and lasting.”²⁹⁶ Within the week, the *Post Boy* and the *Daily Courant* published the Elector of Bavaria’s proposals to Marlborough and the Dutch, and by the end of November, “*A memorial dispers’d in Holland by an Emissary of France, containing overtures towards a General Peace, with an Answer to it. Done out in French*” was available on the streets, price one shilling. By late November, the *Observer* could outline the peace proposals: “the Dutch must have their barrier. The Dukes of Bavaria and Savoy must have their dominions restored with compensation. The House of Austria is to be satisfied for their Pretensions and Philip V is to be left in possession of the Crown of Spain.”²⁹⁷ The *Observer* had been forced to clarify how the French King might be kept down: “one campaign more will entirely do his business ... One campaign more will reduce the Fire of France so low that Louis will send the Allies a blank Sheet of Paper, whereon to write their own Terms.”²⁹⁸

On 3 December, the Queen addressed Parliament and acknowledged that the “desired fruit” of the war effort was “an honourable and durable peace” and that: “the Goodness of God has brought this happy prospect much nearer to us.” Nonetheless, her war aims remained the rather ambiguous combination of *status quo ante* and a subjugation of Louis. “We may ... see such a Balance of power established in Europe, that it shall no longer be at the pleasure of one Prince to disturb the Repose and Endanger the Liberties of this part of the World.” While peace may have been getting nearer there was no mention of negotiation, indeed she hoped the gentlemen of Parliament had: “serious and steady Resolutions to prosecute the Advantages we have gain’d,” and she requested: “supplies sufficient for carrying on the war next year.”²⁹⁹

The year’s second thanksgiving took place on Tuesday, 31 December. The Queen processed from Whitehall to St Paul’s in the familiar style, so predictable that the *Post Man* gave it a terse six-line description, concluding: “in the same State and Attendance, as on the like occasions.”³⁰⁰ The great guns of the Tower thundered at salient points during the progress. The Queen was accompanied in her eight-horse coach by Lady Marlborough, Groom of the Stole, and by the Lady Frescheville, the Lady of the Bedchamber, protected by the First Troop of the Horse Guards. “The streets were lined by the trained

²⁹⁵ *Flying Post or The Post Master*, 12-14 Nov. 1706.

²⁹⁶ *London Gazette*, 14-18 Nov. 1706.

²⁹⁷ *Observer* (1702), 23-27 Nov. 1706. This was not entirely true. Louis had offered that Philip would give up the Spanish throne, to be compensated by Italian territories, anathema to the Austrian Habsburgs. England was offered commercial treaties and recognition of Anne, the Dutch a strong barrier. The *Observer* does reflect a view that Spain could be forfeit in a negotiated peace.

²⁹⁸ *Observer* (1702), 72, 20-23 Nov. 1706.

²⁹⁹ *C.J.*, iv, pp. 45-68.

³⁰⁰ *Post Man*, 31 Dec. 31 – 2 Jan. 1707.

bands, and the several companies of this city in their livery gowns and the streets crowded with spectators.”³⁰¹ The *Gazette* had noted: “The Balconies and Windows of the Houses were hung with fine Carpets and Tapestry.” Following the usual gesture of obeisance from the Lord Mayor³⁰² at Temple Bar, the Queen was met at the entrance to St Paul’s by the peers, the Sword of State carried before her by the Duke of Marlborough.

Both Queen and Duke were at the height of their powers. On 5 December, she had requested Parliament to settle on him the honour and manor of Woodstock, the house of Blenheim and a £5,000 per annum pension,³⁰³ with which they duly complied. On 29 December, she had ennobled Godolphin and a number of Whigs who had been members of the commission for union with Scotland.³⁰⁴ The Duke, invincible commander, negotiator with Princes, Emperor and High Mightinesses, had been much feted upon his return:

On the 19th December the Duke of Marlborough din’d in the City upon invitation of the Lord Mayor and Court of Aldermen. The Colours and Standards taken at Ramelies, were brought from Whitehall in Military Pomp, through the Park, where the Queen saw them from Lady Fitzharding’s Lodgings, to Guildhall, where they were put up as Trophies of that Victory.³⁰⁵

Winston Churchill noted that the captured Ramillies standards could not be hung in Westminster Hall, decked as it was, with the standards captured at Blenheim.³⁰⁶ So it is perhaps unsurprising that, though honoured by Parliament’s and the Queen’s bestowal of Blenheim, Marlborough made an additional request of their Lordships that the house and lands be granted to his line in perpetuity.³⁰⁷ This too was speedily granted, though later his critics would see this as overweening greed.

Gilbert Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury, Whig latitudinarian, tactless of speech and manner; friend and supporter of Marlborough; tolerated, if that, by his Queen,³⁰⁸ chose to give a sermon based on Psalm

³⁰¹ Luttrell, *Brief historical relation*, vi, p. 122.

³⁰² Sir Robert Bedingfield, a woollen-draper, Bedingfield was a strong Tory and had at one time been a crony of Judge Jeffreys. H.O.P. 1690-1715, iii, pp. 163-4.

³⁰³ Parliament had blocked a grant in 1702, see above p.26.

³⁰⁴ Godolphin needed Whig votes to continue to control the Commons, and Whigs of various hues were being favoured: Thomas Wharton, Evelyn Pierrepont, John Pawlet, Hugh Cholmondeley, and Henry Howard became Earls; William Cowper and Sir Thomas Pelham became Barons; Godolphin became an Earl. Rochester, Nottingham, Jersey and Buckingham were removed from the Privy Council at the same time: Keith Feiling, *A History of the Tory Party, 1640-1714* (Oxford, 1924) p. 395.

³⁰⁵ John Oldmixon, *The history of England, during the reigns of King William and Queen Mary, Queen Anne, King George I* (London, 1735) p. 383.

³⁰⁶ Winston Churchill, *Marlborough: His Life and Times* (3 vols, London, 1934) ii, p. 214.

³⁰⁷ William Coxe, *Memoirs of John, Duke of Marlborough: With His Original Correspondence* (5 vols, London, 1820) ii. p. 173.

³⁰⁸ Martin Greig, ‘Burnet, Gilbert (1643–1715)’ *Oxford D.N.B.* [accessed 7 Mar. 2016].

72:4 which, perhaps characteristically, did not appear on the recommended form of prayer: “He shall judge the poor of the people, he shall save the children of the needy, and shall break in pieces the oppressor.”

Following conventional preaching style Burnet parsed each sub-clause for his listeners. The poor were to expect impartial justice: “Justice flows from the throne like a stream, watering all with its Moisture.” While England was blessed with: “[a] Queen, who is the admiration of all Her Subjects.” Burnet stayed true to Revolution politicks: “It is the particular Happiness of a well constituted Government that these are settled boundaries, and established Checks to restrain and over awe those on whom corruption or Frailty might otherwise prevail too much.”

Louis was a misguided Sovereign who: “has broke [sic] through all the liberties of his People, debased all their Judicatories, invaded all their Properties and subjected everything to his own will and Pleasure.” Burnet excoriated Louis in markedly personal terms for his four great destructive wars, begun with so much injustice, and five treaties all perfidiously broken.

Saving the children of the needy was both the national and international duty of: “[a] just and merciful prince, who thinks it not enough for him to make his own Country safe and happy, but looks on himself as bound by the ties of Nature and Humanity, of compassion to the miserable, and regard to the common interests of Mankind to vindicate an injured neighbour.” Restoring peace would level all European monarchs “that a true balance may be kept among them, so that none of them may outgrow the rest.” This last was perhaps not the most diplomatic of phrases, when preaching before one’s own monarch.

Burnet warmed when he came to the passage: “and shall break in pieces the oppressor.” Louis, “in whom arbitrary power appeared in its natural colours, Luxury and Cruelty,” was leading: “a Nation exhausted by a long tract of War, and dispirited by all the contrivances of Oppression.” England, on the other hand, was a land which: “seems to be the particular care of Providence,” led by a Monarch whose “Triumphant Reign, that has every Year shined out, in a course of wise counsels, and great Designs happily executed, but beyond all example in this Marvellous, Marvellous Year.” Pausing briefly to consider peace – “God forbid that thy who carry the Name of Christian, should resolve against all Terms of Peace to sound the Trumpet of War” – Burnet dismissed any prospect of an accommodation with such a duplicitous adversary:

a false desultory Peace, a Peace in which any Confidence is put in a Faith so often and so impudently Broken, A peace that may lay us open to new Wars.” He urged taking the tide at its flood, knowing which

side the Deity favoured: “Happy Providences ...when they are signal and surprising on the side of a just and righteous cause, we may certainly rely on them.”³⁰⁹

Straying from his chosen passage, Burnet invoked Isaiah, that undiplomatic scourge of temporal rulers: “There is no Peace, saith God, to the Wicked.”³¹⁰ Lest this was insufficiently clear, Burnet set a series of conditions which, if not to be achieved by conquest, were suggestive of Revolution. There could be no peace:

Till what is perfidiously seized on is restored, till the Exiles are recalled, the Prisoners are set at Liberty, till the Edicts that were their Inheritance are revived and Compensation is made for the precious blood that has been shed, till the oppressor is so bounded that his own people are secured from oppression and his Neighbours from invasion.³¹¹

Astute political opinion commented on Burnet’s tactlessness. James Johnston, Burnet’s cousin and London-based advisor to the Scottish Squadrone,³¹² wrote: “[t]he Bishop of Salisbury preached this day at the Te Deum, and said a great many good things, but spoke too freely (it will be said) of one crown’d head to another.”³¹³ But the speech had a dog-whistle effect on the Huguenot community. The volatile Jean Armand Dubourdieu, son of Jean and now a minister in his own right at the French Chapel at the Savoy, in a preface to his own thanksgiving sermon humbly asked pardon of: “my Lord Bishop of Salisbury for the liberty I take in putting myself under his banner and protection.”³¹⁴ Dubourdieu, whose *ad-hominem* attacks on Louis had been criticised within his own community as lacking caution and respect for a crowned head, commented that the bishop: “did not consider that the presence of the most Venerable of the State, had to restrain ... or oblige him to moderate his expression.”³¹⁵ Dubourdieu relished the fact that: “one of the finest ornaments of the Church of England” had described Louis as: “the most infamous, most cruel, most extravagant, the most effeminate and most cowardly who ever reigned.”³¹⁶

³⁰⁹ In this he was more optimistic about Providence than William Fleetwood in 1704 for whom Providence “seems to us, so varying and uncertain.”

³¹⁰ Isaiah 57:21.

³¹¹ Burnet, Dec. 1706, pp. 15, 5, 8, 6, 2, 1, 4, 14, 12, 10.

³¹² The Squadrone was the term for a grouping of Scottish parliamentarians, independent of Court or Country parties, who were to be influential in passing the Act of Union: J R. Young, ‘Johnston, James (1655–1737)’ *Oxford DNB* [accessed 16 Mar. 2106].

³¹³ *Correspondence of George Baillie of Jerviswood*, ed. G.E. M. Kynynmound, Earl of Minto (Edinburgh, 1842) p. 170.

³¹⁴ Jean Armand Dubourdieu, Dec. 1706.

³¹⁵ *Ibid*, p. 3. Burnet was soon importuning Her Majesty at court, with a petition signed by 200 French Protestants at the Savoy to have their interests taken care of during putative treaty negotiations: Luttrell, *Brief historical relation*, vi, p. 151 (22 Mar.), p. 155 (3 Apr.).

³¹⁶ Dubourdieu’s sentence summarises and paraphrases Burnet, and in the preface he states that he refrained from direct quotations as he believed his audience were aware of the details of Burnet’s sermon “because it has not only

There are twenty-one published sermons associated with the 31 December Thanksgiving. Among the preachers were William Stephens, rector of Sutton, Surrey, a Whig controversialist whose 30 January sermon to the House of Commons in 1700 had been perceived as an insult to Charles I, so much so that Stephens was refused the customary vote of thanks. In May 1706, Stephens had been spared the pillory on the intervention of the Duchess of Marlborough for aspersions he had cast on Secretary Harley in his pamphlet *The Letter to the Author of the Memorial of the State of England*.³¹⁷ Three ministers were chaplains to influential politicians.³¹⁸ Josiah Hort would follow the Earl of Wharton as chaplain when the latter became Lord Lieutenant of Ireland in 1709, and in 1721 Bishop of Ferns and Leighlin.³¹⁹ Thomas Wise would become rector of St Alphege Church, Canterbury (1709), vicar of Bekesbourne (1711), and publish works summarising the philosopher Ralph Cudworth's 'Intellectual System' – an attack on atheism. Deuel Pead had been a chaplain in the British navy in 1671, and settled in Anne Arundel County, Maryland, in 1682. By November of 1683, he had become the minister of Christ Church, Middlesex County, Virginia, and remained in this post until returning to England some seven years later. In 1691, Pead was appointed a minister of St James's, Clerkenwell. Two preachers – Edmund Arwaker and William Goldwin – were minor poets.³²⁰ Two ministers made explicit references to the 1640s, an indicative but infrequent occurrence – William Ward, vicar of Portsmouth,³²¹ quoting *Eikon Basilike* and William Lloyd, curate of Diss in Norfolk, lamenting the time when: “[u]rsurpation thrived and Palms and Laurels were heap'd on Unrighteousness and Oppression.”³²² There were seven Dissenting sermons and

been through three editions, but three different translations in our [French] Language.” In May 1713, in the immediate aftermath of the signing of the Utrecht peace treaty, Dubourdieu would be summoned before the Bishop of London, at the behest of the Queen, on foot of a request from the new French ambassador, to answer charges that he had dispersed “bitterness and animosity against the [French] King.” Dubourdieu's defence was that while he could not deny having done so, he had refrained from such activity once the peace treaty had been signed. It was enough to avoid punishment (see below, p. 210).

³¹⁷ Stuart Handley, 'Stephens, William (1649/50–1718)' *Oxford D.N.B.* [accessed 7 Mar. 2016].

³¹⁸ They were Josiah Hort, vicar of Wendover, chaplain to the Earl of Wharton; Thomas Wise of Richmond Surrey, chaplain to Duke of Ormond; Deuel Pead, minister of St James, Clerkenwell, chaplain to the Duke of Newcastle. Of the Dukes only Ormond was a Tory, though Wise's sermon was decidedly Whiggish in tone, in praising William, disparaging those who complained at the expense of the war, and welcoming the forthcoming Union with Scotland.

³¹⁹ Archbishop William King of Dublin refused to take part in Hort's consecration as bishop, as a protest against the practice of translating English clerics to Irish sees. Swift attacked the new Bishop Hort, anonymously in 1721 as a “whore-mongering atheist” in a poem “The Storm”: Irvin Ehrenpreis, *Swift: the Man, his Works and the Age* (3 vols, London 1962-83) iii, pp. 171-2, 718-21.

³²⁰ Arwaker's works are perhaps best left to history, though Goldwin, later vicar in Bristol, did publish a poem of ninety-five competent and sometimes graceful lines of Latin hexameters on a rural cricket match. It was called *In Cremate Pilae* (On a Ball Game): Goldwin, *Musae Juveniles* (1706).

³²¹ A town where the well-known dissenter Simon Browne had acquired a considerable reputation. In addition to a renowned competitor, Ward was plagued by unco-operative churchwardens. Their disputes about rights to perquisites began in 1703 and led, via six different actions in six different courts, to Ward achieving a pyrrhic victory at Winchester Assizes in 1713. <http://history.inportsmouth.co.uk/people/vicars-of-portsmouth.htm> [accessed 8 May 2014]

³²² Lloyd, Dec. 1706, p. 10.

one from Jean Armand Dubourdieu, at the Savoy, which mixes Whig and Dissenter traits with a passion born of persecution.

The seven Dissenting ministers who published December 1706 Thanksgiving sermons represent some of the leading preachers of the period. Daniel Williams, a Presbyterian, had been consulted by William III, especially on Irish affairs. In the new reign, he kept an active correspondence with Robert Harley.³²³ He also represented English Dissent, having led the joint address in March 1702 of the ‘Three Denominations’³²⁴ on the accession of Anne. Joshua Oldfield was a Presbyterian, respected as a minister who avoided extremes in religious controversy, but who was at the same time a strong supporter of civil and religious liberty. Oldfield chaired the Salters’ Hall debates on subscription to the Westminster confession in 1719, perhaps the defining event for Dissenters in the first half of the eighteenth century.³²⁵ Matthew Henry, a Presbyterian based in Chester, had the reputation of a leading minister of his generation based on an active evangelical ministry both in the pulpit and in publication.³²⁶ Thomas Colton was an independent minister, well known in the York area, executor, friend and pastor to Sarah, Lady Hewley, widow of Sir John, a prominent non-conformist, and herself a major benefactor and patron of non-conformist meetings in York.³²⁷ Nathaniel Hodges was a Baptist Minister in Artillery Lane in Spitalfields. A nephew of Sir William Hodges, a wealthy merchant and moderate Whig MP, Nathaniel became wealthy by inheritance on his uncle’s death in 1714. A Greek scholar, Hodges was one of twelve ministers who presented a petition against the Schism Act to King George in 1714. Hodges was one of the non-subscribers at the synod at Salters’ Hall in 1719, and, disillusioned, he laid down his ministry. He was knighted in 1721.³²⁸ John Short, an independent minister at Miles Lane, London: “was a man of considerable learning, of great piety, and of sound judgement. He had the misfortune to have an impediment in his utterance, which was a great denial to him, and occasioned his not being heard with pleasure in the pulpit.”³²⁹ George Mills, minister at the rural community of Guestwick, Norfolk, “had not a regular education for the ministry” but “was always been spoken of as a very worthy man, who had a very pleasant delivery, and was highly esteemed by this congregation.”³³⁰

³²³David L. Wykes, ‘Williams, Daniel (c.1643–1716)’ *Oxford D.N.B.* [accessed 7 Mar. 2016].

³²⁴One of the first occasions that the Presbyterians, Independents, and Baptists had acted together.

³²⁵Alan Ruston, ‘Oldfield, Joshua (1656–1729)’ *Oxford D.N.B.* [accessed 7 Mar. 2016].

³²⁶David L. Wykes, ‘Henry, Matthew (1662–1714)’ *Oxford D.N.B.* [accessed 7 Mar. 2016].

³²⁷Joseph Hunter, *The rise of the old dissent, exemplified in the life of Oliver Heywood, one of the founders of the Presbyterian congregations in the county of York. 1630-1702* (London, 1842), p. 377.

³²⁸Joseph Ivimey, *A History of the English Baptists*, iii, p. 342.

³²⁹Walter Wilson, *The history and antiquities of Dissenting Churches and Meeting Houses, London, Westminster, Southwark* (London, 1808) i, pp. 463-465.

³³⁰John Browne, *History of Congregationalism and Memorials of the Church in Norfolk and Suffolk* (London, 1877) p. 325.

As ever, there is a consistency among all shades of opinion that God favoured England and the allies' military exploits. However, within the uniformity, some shades were evident – Nicholas Beare, curate at St Botolph's – focused on the direct interaction of the Prince: "God acts mediately, and therefore we may not detract what is of right due to his Vicereagents."³³¹ In York Minster, Canon William Stainforth warned that: "God, In his just Providence suffers good Kings to fall into misfortunes and distresses ... for the Correction and Chastisement of an insolent and obdurate People."³³² While bad things may happen to good princes, and thereby his subjects, in Dungannon, Edmund Arwaker, whose congregation had more recently seen conflict on their own soil, focused on the failings of the subjects: "God, does for the sins of his People, make use of cruel and outrageous Instruments to punish and afflict them for awhile, in order for their Reformation."³³³ While it was generally accepted that a people's insolence or vice could bring down God's wrath despite the best efforts of a good prince, the converse was only expressed in the context of Louis XIV's depredations.³³⁴

William Goldwin, a fellow of King's College, Cambridge, was unusual in taking his Newnham congregation through the nuances: "As the interest of a King and his People are inseparably interwoven, the good or ill condition of a Kingdom very often turns on the Merits or Demerits of its Prince ... for whilst Virtue and Equity sway the Sceptre, Slavery and Oppression keep at a distance."³³⁵

Bishop Burnet was more concerned to acknowledge the fruits of victory, rather than worry about the withdrawal of God's grace, claiming that: "[t]his nation seems to be the particular care of Providence."³³⁶ In the same vein Charles Lamb, a curate in Enfield, noted: "we seem to be God's Peculiar People."³³⁷ William Stephens once again categorised the levels of providence – miraculous, special, and common³³⁸ – and saw God's special providence in the infatuation of panic, which gripped the enemy at Ramillies:

We own these Victories to be very Providential ... but yet they were not Miraculous ... God's agency does not exclude, but commonly supposes the Fitness and Excellency of Instruments: For 'tis not the ordinary Method of Providence to make Cowards brave and Fools wise men.³³⁹

³³¹Beare, Dec. 1706, p. 9.

³³²Stainforth, Dec. 1706, p. 22.

³³³ Arwaker, Dec. 1706, p. 11.

³³⁴ See Conclusion, of discussion of Louis/France as 'Other' (page 230).

³³⁵ Goldwin, Dec. 1706, pp. 6, 7.

³³⁶ Gilbert Burnet, Dec. 1706, p. 14.

³³⁷ Charles Lamb, Jun. 1706, p. 22.

³³⁸ Which had been enumerated by William King in his 1704 Thanksgiving sermon (see above p. 52).

³³⁹ Stephens, Dec. 1706, pp. 10, 11.

The Dissenting ministers were simultaneously triumphalist and full of foreboding. Daniel Williams exulted that: “the very Atheists own a Providence by sensible Observation.”³⁴⁰ Thomas Colton, in York, used an increasingly common phrase to describe the emerging nation: “Great Britain has had no small share in this wonderful Providence of God ... we were far from Canaan, yet we were near the Heart of God.”³⁴¹ In rural Norfolk, George Mills, referring to both “the Civil Rights of Man and the external welfare of the Nation,” saw God’s hand behind secular events: “Men ... whose primary intentions are only to promote and establish the civil peace, and welfare of a Nation do thereby further the prosperity of the Church and People of God in it.”³⁴² Nonetheless, jeopardy lay all around: “we must reproach ourselves who have contributed more to our own Ruin than any others have done ... we could not expect better from those that were of the French Religion and Principles.”³⁴³ Joshua Oldfield railed against “our shameful ingratitude, and ... everything that looks like Murmuring or Discontent.”³⁴⁴ In Chester, Matthew Henry, speaking to his congregation in a meeting-house newly extended to accommodate a burgeoning membership, was similarly incensed: “There is yet so much Wickedness to be found among us; so much Impiety, so much Immorality, and both arising from practical Atheism and Infidelity, and accompanied by a Contempt of Religion and Sacred things.”³⁴⁵

The Queen’s reputation was unassailable, though those of various viewpoints saw her successes differently – in Dorset, Benjamin Lacy continued to implicitly undermine William in comparison: “Since her accession this Nation hath rode Triumphant,”³⁴⁶ while for Josiah Hort: “Our late Sovereign of Glorious Memory, laid the Foundation ... but the glory of building it up to this Height ... was reserved for the Queen, who wisely trod in his steps, and pursued the Scheme which he had formed.”³⁴⁷

Whereas the enthusiastic Dissenter George Mills acknowledged that: “an incomparable Queen who has fully and over and over made up our Loss of the Great William” but only after railing against High Churchmen who disparaged: “the late King William of Glorious Memory,” ... whose memory had been “blackened by a Generation of ungrateful Wretches, who pretend not only to be Englishmen but Protestants, and that of the Highest Denomination.”³⁴⁸

³⁴⁰ Williams, Dec.1706, p. 11.

³⁴¹ Colton, Dec. 1706, p. 9.

³⁴² Mills, Dec. 1706, pp. 16, 17.

³⁴³ Colton, Dec. 1706, p. 12.

³⁴⁴ Oldfield, Dec. 1706, p. 24.

³⁴⁵ Henry, Dec. 1706, p. 10. The meeting-house in Crook Lane, was completed in Jul. 1700. In Sept. 1706, a gallery was added to accommodate the members of the independent meeting which had dissolved and united with Henry’s.

³⁴⁶ Benjamin Lacy, p. 22, Dec. 1706, p. 22.

³⁴⁷ Hort, Dec. 1706, p. 19.

³⁴⁸ Mills, Dec. 1706, pp. 27, 24.

Some Anglicans focused on the Queen's majesty: "an Ornament to Crowned Heads,"³⁴⁹ ... "a bright ornament to Her Holy Religion."³⁵⁰ William Goldwin noted that: "the particular goodness of the Sovereign has engag'd Gods Providence and Favour."³⁵¹ Others preferred to concentrate on the Queen's wise management and example. Burnet praised her reign as: "one continued Flood of Prosperity, without any Ebb or Mixture of Misfortunes,"³⁵² and William Stephens praised the royal example of moderation and mutual charity.³⁵³

Views of governance, as might be expected, evoked significant differences among the preachers. Some focused on the established hierarchy, urged: "Dutiful Obedience to the Queen, and all that have authority under her,"³⁵⁴ praised her ministers who "faithfully imploi'd all the public Taxes"³⁵⁵ and supported "the wise Management of our Treasury ... the Courage of our Soldiers."³⁵⁶ Others inclined more to credit balanced government and moderation: "the particular Happiness of a well constituted Government that these are settled boundaries, and established Check;"³⁵⁷ ... "growing Tyranny is prevented by the Gospel Spirit of Moderation in the Supreme Power."³⁵⁸ Another group of clerics were warming to the new configuration in parliament: "Thus do many Members of Civil Bodies cement and joyn together, and hence of course results the Welfare of States and Kingdoms;"³⁵⁹ though Charles Lamb was perhaps blinded by emotion, praising: "that agreement of inclination, that unanimity and zeal for the Publick Welfare, which ... is the Shining Ornament of our two Houses of Parliament."³⁶⁰ The tone among Dissenters was positively euphoric. Matthew Henry praised: "The Harmony and Good Understanding between the queen and the two Houses, and their meeting Confidence in each other, and that between the Houses."³⁶¹ The astute Daniel Williams commented that: "among our benefits we may well count ... the mutual confidence between Her Majesty and Parliament."³⁶² Thomas Colton noted that: "the beginning of the year open'd with the most Auspicious Harmony between the Queen and Her Houses

³⁴⁹ Lloyd, Dec. 1706, p. 23. He was quoting Sir Francis Bacon's praise of Queen Elizabeth.

³⁵⁰ Stainforth, Dec. 1706, p. 16. The phrase 'bright ornament of the Church' would be ridiculed when used by Dr Sacheverell in the dedication of the printed version of his pivotal 'False Brethren' sermon, to an ill-starred Tory Lord Mayor of London: Geoffrey Holmes, *The Trial*, pp. 90-93.

³⁵¹ Goldwin, Dec. 1706, p. 5.

³⁵² Burnet, Dec. 1706, p. 14.

³⁵³ Stephens, Dec. 1706, p. 15.

³⁵⁴ Ward, Dec 1706, p. 19.

³⁵⁵ Stainforth, Dec. 1706, p. 30.

³⁵⁶ Lloyd, Dec. 1706, p. 16.

³⁵⁷ Burnet, Dec. 1706, p. 5.

³⁵⁸ Stephens, Dec. 1706, p. 13.

³⁵⁹ Wise, Dec. 1706, p. 21.

³⁶⁰ Lamb, Jun. 1706, p. 15.

³⁶¹ Henry, Dec. 1706, p. 16.

³⁶² Williams, Dec. 1706, p. 18.

of Parliament”³⁶³ and Joshua Oldfield went so far as to enumerate the estates: the “Best of Queens and Princes, together with the most agreeable Constitution ... Those Noble Lords; in our Favourable and Prudent Representatives, the Honourable House of Commons.”³⁶⁴

Nonetheless, the religious divisions remained a source of tension. Benjamin Lacy foresaw that: “[a]s the Civil Government will then be happy, so will, we trust, the Church flourish also,” and referring to domestic enemies, he hoped God would aid in: “making them see their Error, and own their Unreasonable Obstinacy, in quitting and flouting at an Established Unfaulty Church, to make a Causeless and an Unjustifiable Separation.”³⁶⁵ Thomas Wise gave the latitudinarian, though less clear-cut, view and urged his congregation in Richmond: “to live peaceably with all men, with those, I add not only within, but also without our Church of England ... [for] so long, as this does not interfere with Her Government nor infringe upon the rights of the Established Church.”³⁶⁶

William Stephens reminded his audience of the continued need for Protestant solidarity, having praised previous generations who had: “given to themselves a Liberty of Judgement concerning the Popish Superstitions ... For in that Day, protestants of all denominations forgot those unnatural Heats, which ... had too long divided them. They embraced each other as Fellow Sufferers.”³⁶⁷

Matthew Henry expressed, for a Dissenter, an accommodationist line:

our communion with the Religious Assemblies of our own land, both those by the legal Establishment, and those by the Legal Toleration is, in a particular manner, comfortable to us ... we desire always to be found Quiet and Peaceable, Humble and Charitable in the use of, and Diligent and Faithful in the Improvement of, for the glorifying of God.³⁶⁸

Marlborough’s reputation continued to rise. Nicholas Beare, felt he: “seems to exceed all the mighty Warriors in former Ages.”³⁶⁹ In Norfolk, William Lloyd observed: “We have not reason to envy the Antients for their Glorious Heroes, since all the virtues of their Alexanders and Hannibals, their Caesars and their Pompeys concenter in our Marlborough.”³⁷⁰ Edmund Arwaker, in Dungannon, quoted from Lord Keeper Cowper’s speech of thanks to Marlborough in the Lords: “what his Grace hath

³⁶³ Colton, Dec. 1706, p. 23.

³⁶⁴ Oldfield, Dec. 1706, p. 8.

³⁶⁵ Lacy, Dec. 1706, p. 19.

³⁶⁶ Wise, Dec. 1706, p. 22.

³⁶⁷ Stephens, Dec. 1706, p. 15.

³⁶⁸ Henry, Dec. 1706, p. 25.

³⁶⁹ Beare, Dec. 1706, p. 9.

³⁷⁰ Lloyd, Dec. 1706, p. 16.

perform'd this last Campaign, has far exceeded all hopes."³⁷¹ Burnet, a man never knowingly outshone in public displays of emotion, declared, with Marlborough present in St Paul's, that: "he came over to us and lets us see that all the New Accessions of Glory cannot alter that beautiful Modesty that makes everything else shine the brighter."³⁷² Modesty was, however, in short supply among the preachers. In Enfield, Charles Lamb opined that: "No encomiums are too Exalted, no Honours too great, such is his Modesty ... such his Honour, such his Virtue, such his Affection to us his countrymen." Even Caesar's reputation dulled; in retrospect: "Caesar's Character, that Venit, Vidit, Vicit, that he came, he saw and overcame. However, of our Warriour we may say that he conquered Cities before he approached ... for they met him with Submissions."³⁷³ In Hertfordshire, William Goldwin agreed: "the World is not without hopes of seeing once again a Caesar, or may I not say, a greater than Caesar in Gaul."³⁷⁴ For the Dissenters, John Short spoke of a hero who was: "adorned with Temperance and shines in Humility."³⁷⁵

For the first time in the sequence of thanksgiving ceremonies, envy of Marlborough was not a topic of condemnation for mainstream preachers. Only two preachers, the Huguenot Jean Armand Dubourdieu, and the Dissenter George Miles, in rural Norfolk, saw the need to defend the reputation of: "our Noble brave General (a person that in spite of repining Envy and all the little snarls made at him discovering the cankered teeth of malice ... Will be honoured ... as the Glory of the Age and English Nation."³⁷⁶

Louis's reputation was not enhanced by his offers of peace. Preachers of all shades found common cause to disparage him. Benjamin Lacy could have been mistaken for a Dissenting minister in the fervour of his condemnation: "To harass and butcher his own subjects, who aim to reach heaven in a pure way of primitive worship."³⁷⁷ Burnet used the inscription on Louis's statue in the Place des Victoires, as had the prominent Dissenter John Spademan the previous June,³⁷⁸ to inveigh against the monarch's pride and insolence. The various clerics were indistinguishable in their epithets –

³⁷¹ Arwaker, 1707, p. 23. Cowper's speech occurred on the 5 Dec. 1706, and Arwaker includes it in his sermon on the 31 Dec. some indication of the rate at which news could travel across the Irish Sea.

³⁷² Burnet, Dec. 1706, p. 12. Burnet's haste to be the first to bring the news of William's death to the new Queen Anne, and the incongruity of his prostration before her in imparting the news was the subject of mockery at the time: Gregg, *Queen Anne*, p. 129.

³⁷³ Lamb, Jun. 1706, pp. 6, 9. By 1713, as well as disparaging Marlborough for corruption, the Tory preachers would proclaim the Queen's promotion of peace above victory, as having a character greater than Caesar's. (See below, p. 220).

³⁷⁴ Goldwin, Dec. 1706, p. 17.

³⁷⁵ Short, Dec. 1706, p. 19.

³⁷⁶ Mills, Dec. 1706, p. 29.

³⁷⁷ Lacy, Dec. 1706, p. 11.

³⁷⁸ See above p.85.

“Insufferable,”³⁷⁹ “Tyrannick Hostile Prince,”³⁸⁰ “Grand Oppressor,”³⁸¹ “Perfidious”³⁸² – though for virulence the Dissenting Ministers consistently excelled – “Potent, proud, political and insolent Foe,”³⁸³ “titles full of Blasphemy,”³⁸⁴ “intolerable Degree of Arrogance and Prophanity [sic]”³⁸⁵ – with George Mills being the most memorable with his description of the: “Gallick Tyrant, the insatiable Cormorant and common Disturber of the peace of Europe.”³⁸⁶

The invective against Louis is interesting for two reasons. Firstly, it articulated the seldom expressed view, by Tory opinion at least, that: “a monarch’s crimes draw down a heavy load of God’s displeasure on the whole body of a State.”³⁸⁷ The second aspect of condemnation of Louis is only clear in retrospect, when at the 1713 Thanksgiving for peace, several sermons, almost exclusively Tory,³⁸⁸ stated that the French supplication for peace was the point at which the war turned, “after Reasonable Conditions of Peace offered us; they are of weight enough to turn the balance, and cast the justice of War on the other side.”³⁸⁹ However, not one published sermon in December 1706, of any shade of opinion, found French diplomacy to be anything other than suspicious.

The year had conjured up prospects of peace; however, caution predominated. In Hertfordshire, William Goldwin warned his audience about being: “beguil’d by Sham-Pretences to Peace.”³⁹⁰ Benjamin Lacy in Exeter used the prospect of negotiations to criticise William obliquely: “In the last War, abundance of Men and Money were thrown away to procure such a dishonourable Peace, as worked much detriment to the whole.”³⁹¹ However, the differing war aims were again becoming evident, as some preachers largely stuck to the established line: “to curb the exorbitant Power of France and procure a Balance of Power in Europe.”³⁹² In York, William Stainforth generalised that: “the French King can be brought to harken to Reason and complie [sic] with just and equitable conditions of Peace.”³⁹³ None of the Anglican clerics went so far as Burnet, who had demanded the restoration of the liberty and property

³⁷⁹ Beare, Dec. 1706, p. 22.

³⁸⁰ Wise, Dec. 1706, p. 15.

³⁸¹ Ward, Dec 1706, p. 13.

³⁸² Pead, Dec. 1706, p. 7, and Daniel Williams, Dec. 1706, p. 14.

³⁸³ Colton, Dec. 1706, p. 15.

³⁸⁴ Williams, Dec. 1706, p. 14.

³⁸⁵ Hodges, Dec. 1706, p. 15.

³⁸⁶ Mills, Dec. 1706, p. 19.

³⁸⁷ Goldwin, 1706, p. 6. The term ‘haughty’ as used about Louis inferred his aspiration to power rightly belonging to God, Anne’s piety was seen in direct contrast. See below p. 230.

³⁸⁸ Whig ministers refrained from publishing in 1713, and only one Dissenting sermon was published.

³⁸⁹ Eyre, 1713, p. 14.

³⁹⁰ Goldwin, Dec. 1706, p. 17.

³⁹¹ Lacy, Dec. 1706, p. 17. For most Tories William could be credited in neither war nor peace, and John Catlyn and Samuel Terrick had implicitly denigrated William’s military skills the previous Jun.

³⁹² Edmund Arwaker, Dec. 1706, p. 22.

³⁹³ Stainforth, Dec. 1706, p. 31.

of French Protestants, and compensation for Louis's domestic victims. However, there was a mood of 'one more push.' William Stephens was delighted that Flanders had been: "snatched out of the hands of Usurpers and restored to their Rightful Sovereign."³⁹⁴ The implicit question about who held rightful sovereignty over the Huguenot refugees and the people of Spain would be problematic for the rest of the war. Stephens felt: "one such Campaign more as this last, will enable us to make Peace upon what Terms we please."³⁹⁵ Wharton's chaplain, Josiah Hort, said: "will it not be our Wisdom to improve the Advantage we have got, till we shall disarm his ambition."³⁹⁶ Burnet, Hort and Stephens warned of Louis's duplicity, which Deuel Pead managed to personify in the fact that the most prominent of peace emissaries was the Elector Maximilian Emmanuel of Bavaria: "Is he a proper Person to be employ'd in such an Embassy?, of whose barbarous Perfidiousness, contrary to the greatest Obligations, the whole World rings."³⁹⁷ Perhaps adopting Wharton's political bludgeon, Hort castigated, as Jacobites, those who favoured peace now:

There are those amongst us, who are loth that the King of France should be brought too low, because it would defeat such hopes and Prospects as they are pleased to entertain, but durst not own ... [they want him to recover so that] he may be able to send them help from St Gemains ... we may hope that [God] will utterly break our proud Adversaries, like Potters Vessels, and conclude this war (which in itself considered, is a heavy judgement to the Conqueror) with a solid and lasting Peace.³⁹⁸

Nathaniel Hodges, in common with most London-based Dissenters, exhibited good international information and foresaw the success in Savoy as a springboard for further offensives into France. "Almost all the Milanese is in the power of the Allies ... and we have the prospect ... of acting offensively on that side the next Campaign."³⁹⁹ The Dissenting ministers' expectations of peace exceeded all but Burnet's. Daniel Williams, still a confidant of Harley, gave perhaps the most nuanced Dissenting view. He viewed God's hand at work in the anomaly of the Protestant powers supporting the Catholic Habsburgs: "By secular interests he divided Popish Princes in this War... and they whose union had been dangerous to the Protestant Religion are brought to weaken him, who by Jesuit Prediction was to prefect the extirpation of the Northern Heresy." He also seemed to acknowledge a *modus vivendi* between princes and subject of

³⁹⁴ Stephens, Dec. 1706, p. 2.

³⁹⁵ Stephens, Dec 1706, pp. 2, 16.

³⁹⁶ Hort, Dec. 1706, p. 13.

³⁹⁷ Pead, Dec. 1706, p. 19. Maximilian Emmanuel, had betrayed his Emperor and sided with France, been ousted from Bavaria at Blenheim, and lost his putative governor-generalship of the Spanish Netherlands in the aftermath of Ramillies.

³⁹⁸ Short, Dec. 1706, pp. 14, 24.

³⁹⁹ Hodges, Dec. 1706, p. 25. Prince Eugene did attack the base of French Mediterranean fleet at Toulon in Jul. 1707, aided by the British navy. The land attack was insufficiently supported by the Emperor and the Duke of Savoy and was repulsed with severe losses. Damage to French naval ships in port, during the attack, nonetheless sealed the dominance of the Mediterranean by the British Navy for the remainder of the war.

different faiths, using the example of the part the Protestant Vaudois community had played in the restoration of the Catholic Victor Amadeus in Savoy:

The Vaudois had an opportunity, by their service, to convince the Duke of Savoy, that they are necessary to him and fit to be trusted, and that neither that country's interest, nor these men's character were justly apprehended in the Times of their Persecution.

Nonetheless, Williams shared a common bottom line among the Dissenting ministers: "If they [Allied negotiators] neglect to settle the reformed Religion in France... they should never expect the Appearances of God on this side ... God forgets not the Blood of the Protestants."⁴⁰⁰ Joshua Oldfield was definite that a peace "such as may be Lasting, Safe and Honourable both for us and our Confederates" must lay the "[f]oundation of a happy Deliverance to the miserable Subjects of France, and particularly our persecuted Brethren who are either driven out to seek their Bread, or there detain'd in worse than Aegyptian Bondage."⁴⁰¹

Preachers revealed the burden of the war by condemnation of those who complained about it. Benjamin Lacy noted that: "many of our nearest Relations and Fellow-Subject have been urg'd into service and our Treasure hath very largely (and I may say freely and generously) parted with," but nonetheless he looked for: "a speedy issue to this Tedious and Expensive War."⁴⁰² Other preachers worried that Louis's duplicitous offer of peace would be accepted due to a short-sighted desire for relief from the burden of taxation. In counteracting this, they raised the spectre of the impermanence of the Peace of Nijmegen,⁴⁰³ though without echoing Benjamin Lacy's implicit attack on King William's memory: "We made a dear Experiment of this in the last Peace, every one cry'd to be eas'd of Taxes, and to have an end put to the War, and what was the Consequence? – it soon broke out again into a new War."⁴⁰⁴

Charles Lamb re-emphasised the subject's duty to pay tribute to the: "Noble Army which now fights under England's banner, and in Europe's Cause," and any failure to do so would make his listeners: "Enemies to our Native Country."⁴⁰⁵ Fresh from excoriating English advocates of peace as Jacobites, Josiah Hort turned on others: "who are very warm for a Peace, for other reason than that they are weary of

⁴⁰⁰ Williams, Dec. 1706, pp. 15, 16, 23.

⁴⁰¹ Oldfield, Dec. 1706, p. 8.

⁴⁰² Lacy, Dec. 1706, pp. 18, 25.

⁴⁰³ A series of treaties signed in the Dutch city of Nijmegen between Aug. 1678 and Dec. 1679. The treaties ended various interconnected wars among France, the Dutch Republic, Spain, Brandenburg, Sweden, Denmark, the Prince-Bishopric of Münster, and the Holy Roman Empire. Rather alarmingly, the much-castigated statue of Louis in the Place des Victoires commemorated the Peace of Nijmegen.

⁴⁰⁴ Stephens, Dec. 1706, p. 15.

⁴⁰⁵ Lamb, Dec. 1706, p. 24.

taxes,” saying that a hasty peace: “would be the worst husbandry in the World, for the sake of saving a year or two’s taxes, we should bring ourselves the necessity of paying them perhaps as long as we live.”⁴⁰⁶

The Dissenting ministers praised the bounty with which providence had enabled the country to continue the struggle. Daniel Williams evoked: “How Gracious our God is, that under great Losses the Nation is able, and the Body of it so prudent, as to desire the Continuance of the War, notwithstanding its expensiveness.”⁴⁰⁷ For Matthew Henry: “the Expense of Blood and Treasure must be grudg’d when ‘tis necessary, for the settling of the Balance of Power.”⁴⁰⁸ Echoing the Church of England’s Charles Lamb view on the subject’s duty of taxation, George Mills emphasised his co-religionists loyalty in that they should:

freely pay the Taxes for the support of her benign Government and convince the World, that it is an unjust and malicious Aspersion cast upon us and our principles, to represent us at any time as Malcontents and disaffected to the Monarchy.⁴⁰⁹

In any case, Matthew Henry felt that England’s burden was lighter than that of France:

Whatever Complaints bad hearts may make of bad Times, the Scarcity of Money, and the burthen of Taxes, and the like; those that know the World better than I do, observe, That whatever there are in France, in England there are no visible marks of Poverty ... nor any sign that ... the Decay of our Trade and the Expence of the War being insupportable.⁴¹⁰

The outline of a union treaty had been agreed in the late summer by English and Scottish negotiators. In York, William Stainforth welcomed that a: “comprehensive and entire union is near compleat throughout the British Isle.”⁴¹¹ The union treaty would be ratified in both Parliaments in the spring of 1707,⁴¹² but not without heated exchanges, much soul-searching and some Jesuitical reasoning, especially by the bishops of the Church of England.⁴¹³ Nonetheless, in December, Stainforth welcomed the proposed union: “so that both Nations ... May be united in affection as well as interest ... for their Common Defence and Preservation.”⁴¹⁴ Thomas Wise mixed euphoria and pragmatism, while foreseeing Anglican factional objections:

⁴⁰⁶ Hort, Dec. 1706, p. 15.

⁴⁰⁷ Williams, Dec. 1706, p. 19.

⁴⁰⁸ Henry, Dec. 1706, p. 17.

⁴⁰⁹ Mills, Dec. 1706, p. 28.

⁴¹⁰ Henry, Dec. 1706, p. 23.

⁴¹¹ Godwin, Dec. 1706, p. 9.

⁴¹² 16 Jan. in Scotland, 6 Mar. in England.

⁴¹³ See below, p. 117.

⁴¹⁴ Stainforth, Dec. 1706, p. 20.

I think no argument weighty enough for opposing the desir'd Union of Hearts, of Interests and Forces, granting that this would put an End to our Fear of Troubles beyond the Tweed ... And so speaking Peace within the Borders of our State, would no way hazard, but secure the Welfare of our Church.⁴¹⁵

The Dissenting ministers, perhaps conscious of High Church suspicions that a union might embolden their congregations, praised the union in strictly non-sectarian terms. Daniel Williams stressed the common benefit, while Joshua Oldfield spoke of pursuing “the general welfare of these nations.”⁴¹⁶ The Baptist Nathaniel Hodges anticipated: “A union which promises us a lasting influence upon the Safety of the Protestant Religion.”⁴¹⁷ The Presbyterian Matthew Henry came closest to expressing fellow-feeling with the Scots, and used the Judah and Ephraim analogy: “England and Scotland, like Judah and Ephraim, may become one Stick in the Hand of the Lord, which our Wise Men think will add greatly to the Strength, Wealth and Honour of this Island.”⁴¹⁸

In Richmond, Thomas Wise, the Duke of Ormonde’s chaplain, summed up the Spanish campaign: “Things in Spain have for some time, and still do, look a little doubtful.”⁴¹⁹ Burnet’s praise of Charles III at St Paul’s: “He, who with the Noble Branch of his own Royal House has ventured and suffered so much, and now so gloriously recovered all,”⁴²⁰ may have been justified in terms of Flanders and Brabant, but in Spain the campaign was not advanced. In fact, Charles’s forces had already left Madrid, unable to attract popular support, and worried about their supply lines. Few preachers mentioned the discouraging events in Spain since the relief of Barcelona in April; however, Thomas Wise was well informed:

Tho’ the Austrian Prince [Charles III] did not now entirely Subject the Spanish Kingdom, nor having quite routed his Rival Kinsman of the House of Bourbon, did take and keep Possession of the Escorial; yet still the good Providence of God is to be acknowledged.⁴²¹

⁴¹⁵ Wise, Dec. 1706, p. 21.

⁴¹⁶ Oldfield, Dec. 1706, p. 8.

⁴¹⁷ Hodges, Dec. 1706, p. 26.

⁴¹⁸ Henry, Dec. 1706, p. 9. The analogy inflamed English dissenters when used by the Whig-leaning Richard Willis at St Paul’s for the 1705 Thanksgiving, in the context that Dissenters/Ephraim were strangers with primitive customs which the more learned Judah would strive to educate and accommodate (see Appendix 1). The Biblical tribes of Ephraim and Judah were used on occasion to indicate the conflicting kingdoms of Israel and Judah. While Henry’s use of the analogy evoked no controversy, its implication that the Scots were economically and socially backward underscores the underlying English nationalism of most published dissenting sermons.

⁴¹⁹ Wise, Dec. 1706, p. 14.

⁴²⁰ Burnet, Dec. 1706, p. 16.

⁴²¹ Wise, Dec. 1706, p. 14.

Daniel Williams, also aware of difficulties, noted in passing that providence can provide reverses to good causes such as the “unhappy stop to our promising Affairs in Spain.”⁴²²

Jean Armand Dubourdieu’s sermon in the Savoy marked a break from those of his father, firstly by being published in French,⁴²³ but also in its aggressive, revolutionary tone. Whereas in 1702 his father had drawn the inference that the defeat and exile of French Protestants were signs of unworthiness, Jean Armand lambasted the French who did not flee: “who are accustomed to servitude are as worthy to be slaves as he is unworthy to be a King.”⁴²⁴

The sermon was mixture of Cartesian categorisation of the elements of a tyrant’s pride, using Nebuchadnezzar as a template; *ad-hominem* attacks on Louis’s cowardice, vanity and odour;⁴²⁵ and an equally overblown homage to ‘Our Queen’ and to England, which he cautioned against negotiation: “while she fights the enemies of our Liberty, not to enter a criminal peace with the enemies of our salvation.”⁴²⁶ Dubourdieu commented on rumours about Marlborough which had: “defeated envy ... It has changed its murmur, into an admiring silence and will not start to speak except to condemn itself or proclaim your virtues.” He noted that God favoured sovereigns and nations which limited power: “As unlimited power is a Sacrilegious allocation of Divine Power, and an unrestrained insolence, an impious pride, it is inseparable from the exercise of Arbitrary power” and explicitly called for Louis’s overthrow: “Defeat him ... it is easier to destroy him than to humiliate him.”⁴²⁷

The published preface, which runs to twenty-six pages,⁴²⁸ is perhaps even more interesting, for Dubourdieu enumerates the criticisms that his sermon had received from within his own community. There were those who deplored the attacks on a sovereign: “Frankly I’m surprised that, after our desolation, there are amongst us people who still propose the power of Kings, the outrageous idea that has ruined our Church”;⁴²⁹ those who claimed that such personal attacks were undignified and horrific: “It was a question of showing the everyday hubris of this Prince who has made us suffer from that trait of immortality and divinity”;⁴³⁰ those who urged that such attacks, though valid, would impede a possible Huguenot recall “a mirage.”

⁴²² Williams, Dec. 1706, p. 16.

⁴²³ Jean Dubourdieu’s sermons were published in English.

⁴²⁴ Dubourdieu, Dec. 1706, p. 33.

⁴²⁵ Dubourdieu makes particularly unpleasant use of the fact that Louis suffered from an anal fistula for many years.

⁴²⁶ Dubourdieu, Dec. 1706, p. 42.

⁴²⁷ Ibid, pp. 39, 10, 34.

⁴²⁸ The sermon itself is forty-two pages long.

⁴²⁹ Dubourdieu, Dec. 1706, Preface p. 5.

⁴³⁰ Ibid. Preface p. 17.

Throughout his preface, Dubourdieu noted that: “I have been nurtured since my childhood on the principles of liberty in a free country. I am French by birth, but in this regard, I have an English heart.” He excused his criticised intemperance by noting: “I have been confirmed in my feeling from the lesson of the Sermon of My Lord the Bishop of Salisbury.”⁴³¹ He commended Bishop Burnet as: “an Excellent Historian, a conformist Theologian, a perfect Orator,” and rhetorically asked: “Do the good people who reproach me for defects, imagine that the Grand Minister [My Lord Bishop of Salisbury] who preached before the Queen on the thanksgiving day ignored the respect and caution that one must have for Princes?”⁴³² Even though the Bishop’s sermon: “has not only been through three editions, but three different translations in our Language,” he summarised Burnet’s epithets: “[Louis] XIV is a Tyrant, an Oppressor, the scourge of the Human Race, a Traitor, a Liar, breaker of Treaties, impious to the point of blasphemy, God’s equal, usurper of Crowns.”⁴³³

Overall, the sermons reflected universal delight and surprise at the gains of the year, which were attributed to Queen’s piety and the righteousness of the cause. The liberation or restoration of Flanders, Brabant and Savoy to rightful princes opened the way for contradictions to follow. The successes began the process of consideration of what a suitable end to hostilities might entail. If the Whigs were confident, and Dissenters expectant of further military success, the Tories were not yet exasperated by the expenditure the effort entailed.

The sermons in December 1706 exhibited no fear in relation to Scotland, something which was to feature among Tory-leaning sermons the following year. For the moment, most were content to follow the measure the Queen and her ministry proposed. In Benjamin Lacy’s words, the aims were: “the Defence of the Protestant Religion, where Established and keeping the Balance of Power equal in Europe.”⁴³⁴ Lacy, Arwaker, Beare, Lloyd, Stainforth and Ward indicate an emerging irritation at the burden of taxes, thus far regarded by Tories as an investment, while Burnet, Stephens, Hort, Wise and Lamb and Dissenters regarded them as a necessary sacrifice for religious and secular liberty. Specifically, for Dissenters, Williams, Mills, and Henry urged the uncomplaining payment of taxes as yet another way of demonstrating their fealty to Queen and nation. As with the rumours about Marlborough, the condemnation of murmuring about taxation reveals something about the discourse among the public.

Whigs were encouraged at the turn of affairs in Parliament and exhorted their congregations to continue to support the war effort. There was widespread belief that, however burdensome English taxes,

⁴³¹ Ibid, Preface pp. 8, 5, 25.

⁴³² Ibid, Preface p. 6, though the Scottish politician James Johnston, for one, felt Burnet had “spoke[n] too freely.” See above p. 94.

⁴³³ Dubourdieu, Preface p. 7.

⁴³⁴ Lacy, Dec. 1706, p. 13.

English trade and national wealth were significantly greater than those of the French. While stopping short of calling for the overthrow of Louis, Burnet, Stephens, Hort, Pead, Lamb and Wise in general considered further military pressure necessary before sufficient concessions could be wrung from France, particularly in light of Louis's duplicitous track record concerning solemn treaties. Burnet, Stephens and Wise shared an enthusiasm for Charles III, despite the fact that astute observers were aware of significant setbacks in Spain.

Dissenters were exuberant about the emerging political and military situation and were emphatic that the war aims must include recall, relief and restoration of French Protestants. John Short, minister in Miles Lane, London felt that providence would move beyond *Cuius Regio, Eius Religio*. He acknowledged God's instrumentality in the: "many secular states and Princes ... engaged in the present war; some for the Preservation, and others for breaking the just and necessary Balance of Civil Power."⁴³⁵

The sermons of the December thanksgiving represented a continuation of the broadly shared opinions – England as a favoured nation; the continued importance of providence; delight at the peacefulness of the nation; the graciousness or gloriousness of the Queen; the facets which displayed significant differences; Anne's policies as a continuation of William's; the obligations to support international Protestantism or the balance of Europe. However, a significant new fissure emerged amidst the euphoria of the 'Marvellous, Marvellous Year.'⁴³⁶ A body of opinion was emerging among Tory-inclined pastors for whom the great victories were a reason to expect, if not an immediate halt, that just one more push would bring an end to the conflict. However, Burnet's intemperate sermon voiced the opinion, which would be applied to the rising Whig influence on policy – the continuation of the war in pursuit of unattainable ends. The thanksgiving sermons of December 1706 represented the opening of a break between those who celebrated the beginning of the end, and those for whom the year's triumph's represented perhaps the end of the beginning.

⁴³⁵ Short, Dec. 1706, p. 2. Short's sermon was entitled 'Upon the Headship of Christ', and took Ephesians 1.22 "and gave him to be Head over all Things, unto the Church." Even by eighteenth-century standards, it eschewed any notion of separation between the secular and the divine.

⁴³⁶ Typically, the phrase is Burnet's, p. 12.

Chapter Three: 1707 “Vis Unita Fortior”¹

In April 1707, Sir Joseph Jekyll, Whig MP for Eye in Suffolk, wrote that the negotiation of the union with Scotland was: “one of the great victories of the last year,”² on a par with Ramillies and Turin. His view is somewhat partial as his correspondent was his benefactor and brother-in-law Lord Somers, a Junto member and an influential commissioner in the negotiations which lead to the union. Nonetheless, though the thanksgiving of 1 May 1707 for the: “wonderful and happy conclusion of the Treaty” was the only one of Queen Anne’s reign which was not related to a military outcome, it shared with the previous thanksgivings a sense of England’s, now Britain’s, increasing security, power and prestige. The proclamation set a pragmatic tone of gratitude for: “the wealth, strength and safety of the whole island ... for the peace and quiet of our people at home and for the security of our Religion, by a firm establishment of the Protestant Succession throughout Great Britain.”

There was the merest hint of triumphalism in the parenthetical: “a work of so much difficulty and nicety in its own Nature... till now all attempts ... in the course of the last hundred years, have proved ineffectual.”³ The incorporation of the English and Scottish Parliaments into one body closed off a key English strategic vulnerability – the possibility that a Scottish Parliament might settle their crown on someone other than the Hanoverian line. With the death of the Queen’s only surviving child in 1701, the English Parliament had settled the succession on the Queen’s Protestant distant cousins in Hanover, but the Scottish Parliament had not done the same. The intervening years had seen relations between the countries reach a nadir. Pro-union Scottish opinion was driven by a desire to achieve security for the Presbyterian Kirk and to find a solution to Scotland’s economic underdevelopment.⁴ The Kirk set up a Commission of the General Assembly, to protect the interest of the church, which met on 9 October 1706, six days after the Scottish Parliament convened for its final session, and remained in session thereafter. By careful interplay between the Commission and Parliament, the formal Kirk position to the union was assuaged by the passing of a Security Act. The publication of the Articles of Union brought mobs on the streets of Edinburgh, Glasgow and a wave of condemnatory addresses to Parliament.⁵ Once the Kirk was

¹ United Strength is Stronger, used in many of the Thanksgiving Day sermons.

² Holmes, *British Politics*, p. 85.

³ *By the Queen, a proclamation, for a publick thanksgiving* (London: 1707).

⁴ Derek J. Patrick, Christopher A. Whatley, ‘Persistence, Principle and Patriotism in the Making of the Union of 1707: The Revolution, Scottish Parliament and the *squadron volante*.’ *History*, xcii (2007) pp. 162-86.

⁵ Mollifying the Kirk, while simultaneously fending off English Tory reaction was an intricate process. Keeping populist fulminations at bay was, by comparison, quite straightforward: Jeffrey Stephen, *Scottish Presbyterians and the Act of Union* (Edinburgh, 2007) pp. 82-180.

secured, the advantages to Scotland of union were largely economic – access to new markets and capital. The Scots secured a payment of £398,085⁶ – called ‘the Equivalent’ – which was a compensation for taking a portion of the English national debt and was used to make good shareholders losses on the failed Scottish colony of Darien. This sum amounted to approximately fifty percent of all the Scottish coinage in circulation at the time.⁷

While there was joy and relief in England, the public mood in Scotland was more volatile. The populist view of the union held it to be a corrupt surrender of sovereignty for economic gain. There were no official thanksgiving ceremonies in Scotland, to the relief of the Queen’s Scottish officials. On 15 April, Sir David Nairn, Under-secretary for Scottish Affairs, wrote to William Carstares, former moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland:

I am very glad that the Queen took not such measures as might have been used, for publishing a thanksgiving, to be kept on the first day of May in Scotland, as is to be in England. Her majesty considered the ill impressions that were made of a union of the two kingdoms ... upon many people there ... and left it entirely to her servants there to consider of the reason, ableness of declaring it; and though she still wishes it could have been, yet her Majesty is far from proposing, much less ordering, what may offend.⁸

As it had neither opposed nor welcomed the union, the Kirk took no action in relation to the thanksgiving for the union. On 1 May, a correspondent in Edinburgh informed the Earl of Mar, Scottish Secretary of State: “There is nothing so much taken notice of here today as the solemnity in the south part of Britain and the want of it here.”⁹

A significant Scottish pro-union polemic was John Arbuthnot’s pamphlet which purported to be a sermon, but which was neither written by a clergyman nor delivered at Edinburgh as the title suggested.¹⁰ Arbuthnot was an exiled Scot, whose clergyman father had fallen foul of Kirk authorities. By 1703, Arbuthnot had become physician extraordinary to the Queen.¹¹ His pamphlet illustrates the Scottish pro-union position. It is a very effective discourse, concentrating primarily on the economic benefits. Written in January 1707, following the Scottish parliamentary vote in favour of the union, it berates his countrymen for further opposition to the wisdom of their representatives: “you have received it [the vote

⁶ *Memoirs of the life of Sir John Clerk of Penicuik*, J.M. Grey, Scottish History Society (Edinburgh, 1892) p. 69.

⁷ Douglas Watt, *The Price of Scotland: Darien, Union and the Wealth of the Nations* (Edinburgh, 2006) p. 221.

⁸ Joseph McCormick, *State-Papers and Letters, Addressed to William Carstares* (Edinburgh, 1774) p. 761.

⁹ HMC, *Mar and Kellie MSS*, p. 389.

¹⁰ It is interesting to note that by calling it a sermon, its author presumed it might attract a readership which a pamphlet might lack. John Arbuthnot. *A Sermon Preach'd to the People, at the Mercat-Cross of Edinburgh; on the Subject of the Union* (Dublin, 1707).

¹¹ Reputedly by treating Prince George when he was taken ill at Epsom: Angus Ross, ‘Arbuthnot, John (*b. ap. 1667, d. 1735*)’ *Oxford DNB* [accessed 8 Mar. 2016].

on the union] with Riots, Mobs and Tumults ... A treaty that was entered into at the desire of your own Parliament ... It is a very unfit subject for the judgement ... of boys, apprentices and tradesmen.”¹²

His view was echoed by James Ogilvy, Lord Seafield, Lord Chancellor of Scotland, who when the addresses of the Scottish people – unanimously opposed to union – were read at the opening of each day’s business in Parliament was said to have observed that: “they were only fit to make kites.”¹³ While this has been interpreted as patrician disdain, a close reading of the debates show that the addresses were heard without debate, and were seen to have little-organised support in the country, having been “procured by people mostly disaffected [sic] to the Government.”¹⁴

Though the union was described as an incorporation, rather than a federation, the London negotiation had left the legal systems in both countries separate. While the commissioners on both sides had been forbidden to negotiate the status of the churches,¹⁵ the topic was too controversial to be ignored, and the penultimate vote of the Scottish Parliament was to pass An Act for Securing the Protestant Religion and Presbyterian Church Government which guaranteed to the Scottish people the Presbyterian creed, worship, discipline and government: “without any alteration ... in all succeeding generations.” It required all office-bearers of all four Scottish universities¹⁶ to acknowledge the civil government and conform to the Presbyterian creed and worship. It absolved all Scotsmen from taking any oath or test within the Kingdom of Scotland inconsistent with their religious principles. Only deft handling by pro-union parliamentarians avoided the inclusion in the act of forward-looking clauses calling for Church of England bishops to be excluded from voting on issues to do with the Church of Scotland and excluding Scots from the sacramental test for office holders.¹⁷ In his thanksgiving sermon, Daniel Williams lamented the fact that the Scots had not taken the opportunity to: “exempt themselves from the Engine of Prophaneness, the Sacramental Test.”¹⁸ On 16 January 1707, the unicameral Scottish Parliament passed

¹² Arbuthnot, *Sermon preach'd ...at the Mercat-Cross*, p. 1.

¹³ P.H. Scott, *The Union of 1707: why and how?* (Edinburgh, 2007) p. 61.

¹⁴ Earl of Mar, quoted in Karin Bowie, *Scottish Public Opinion and the Anglo-Scottish Union, 1699-1707* (Woodbridge, 2007) pp. 131-134. Of the sixty-eight presbyteries in the church only three addressed parliament. This was five per cent of the total. Only sixty-three parishes addressed parliament, which represented about five per cent of all the parishes in Scotland. The sixty-three parishes came from thirteen presbyteries and twenty of the addresses came from the three presbyteries that addressed parliament: Stephen, *Scottish Presbyterians* p. 109.

¹⁵ Burnet, *History of My Own Time*, v, p. 283. The Earl of Leven believed that the English did not want to include the church in negotiations because they would be obliged, in order to satisfy the High-Church party, to ask for toleration for Episcopalians in Scotland, and as a result the Scots would ask for the same for dissenters in England, something they could not do without further irritating the High-Church party: Stephen, *Scottish Presbyterians*, pp. 67-75.

¹⁶ The four Scottish universities were to “continue within this Kingdom for ever.”

¹⁷ Derek J. Patrick, ‘The Kirk, Parliament and the Union, 1706-1707’, *Scottish Historical Review*, lxxxvii, Supplement (2008) pp. 94-115.

¹⁸ D. Williams, 1707, p. 12.

the Treaty of Union by a majority of 110 to sixty-nine. As passed it preserved each Church's authority and discipline within its territories¹⁹ but was silent on how the Kirk would interact with the Church of England or the British Parliament and monarch.

On 28 January 1707, Queen Anne addressed, and pressurised, both Houses at Westminster: "I shall look upon it as a particular Happiness, if this great Work, which has been so often attempted without Success, can be brought to Perfection in My Reign." In the Lords, a combination of Junto Whigs and pro-union, Low-Church Bishops shepherded the bill through.²⁰ Archbishop Tenison sought to spike the guns of Church-in-Danger Tories by introducing a Bill for the Security of the Church of England, a mirror of the Scottish Act. Tenison worked on the bill in conjunction with the bishops of Worcester (Lloyd), Salisbury (Burnet), Oxford (Talbot) and Bangor (Evans), Richard Willis, Dean of Lincoln, White Kennett, Archdeacon of Huntingdon, and Charles Trimmell, Archdeacon of Norwich.²¹ When the Security Bill was introduced on 3 February the episcopal battle lines were drawn when Sharp, Archbishop of York and the Bishops of London [Compton], Rochester, Chester, Durham and St Asaph attempted and failed to add an amendment to include a test in the Security Bill. Tenison co-ordinated tactics with Somers, among others, to see the bill through.

On 15 February in the Lords, Lord Haversham tried to defy the Queen's expressed will for the union in the only way open to a Tory loyalist – by invoking the papist menace:

the queen herself, from the throne, approves of [the union]; and yet ... though it be the strongest motive to incline the will, is the weakest argument in all the world to convince the understanding. It is the argument the Church of Rome makes use of for their superstitious worship.²²

Haversham criticised any bishop who voted for the measure as being insufficiently zealous for his religion. As Burnet was in the chair for the debate and therefore required to be neutral, William Talbot, the bishop of Oxford, was chosen to rebut the charge. Later, to counter Haversham's practice of publishing his contributions to the Lords, Talbot would publish his speech. In the end, Bishops Compton

¹⁹ "The Parliament of England may provide for the security of the Church of England as they think expedient to take place within the bounds of the said Kingdom of England and not Derogating from the security above provided for Establishing of the Church of Scotland within the bounds of this Kingdom." <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/aosp/1707/7> [accessed 7/Mar./2016].

²⁰ The following paragraph relies on entries from Jan. to Mar. 1707 in Clyde Jones and Geoffrey Holmes, eds, *The London Diaries of William Nicolson, Bishop of Carlisle* (Oxford, 1985) pp. 406-27.

²¹ The three last were Whigs and latitudinarians, Trimmell was chaplain to Sunderland and became Bishop of Norwich in Jan. 1708, Kennett and Willis were vocal in opposition to Atterbury in Convocation. Kennett became Dean of Peterborough at the same time as Trimmell was elevated. Willis had to wait for promotion to Bishop of Gloucester until Dec. 1714 having been repeatedly denied promotion under Queen Anne. Trimmell published thanksgiving sermons in 1704 and Feb. 1709; Kennett in 1704 and Nov. 1709; Willis in 1705. W.R. Ward, 'Willis, Richard (*bap.* 1664, *d.* 1734)' *Oxford DNB*, [accessed 7 Mar. 2016].

²² *L.J.* 18, 15 Feb. 1707.

and Hooper joined the Tory opposition on the day. On 4 March, as a last-ditch effort, the High Tories – Rochester, Nottingham, Thanet, Bishop Hooper²³ and others – attempted to attach an addendum to the Act of Union which stated: “That nothing in this Ratification contained shall be construed to extend to an Approbation or Acknowledgment of the Truth of the Presbyterian Way of Worship, or allowing the Religion of the Church of Scotland to be, what it is styled, the true Protestant Religion.”²⁴ This final amendment failed, and the Act of Union duly passed into law on 6 March 1707.

The English ministry’s propaganda efforts among the people of Scotland continued even after English parliamentary approval.²⁵ In March, Defoe released an anonymous pamphlet entitled *A voice from the South*²⁶ claiming to be an address from some protestant Dissenters in England to the Kirk of Scotland. Addressing the Kirk as ‘Brethren,’ the author claimed to be surprised and disappointed at the “strange and unexpected” opposition of the Kirk to the treaty, and delicately mentioned that he: “would not enter too far into the weakness of your condition” and, instead concentrated on the Presbyterian Settlement. The pamphlet noted that the establishment of the Kirk was now “unalterable and indissoluble” and that in this, the Kirk had: “the very Votes of the Bishops themselves.” Given this rather embarrassing fact, Defoe gleefully pointed out that: “The Church of England cannot now offer you the least Molestation, without flying in the face of their own constitution, unravelling their own foundation.” This opinion was to find an echo in Daniel Williams’s sermon on the union – perhaps reflecting both men’s interaction with Robert Harley.

If the geographical limits of both Churches’ establishment had been set, it was unclear to contemporaries how the future interaction between Kirk and Church would work in practice, particularly as the Church of England bishops sat, by right, in the House of Lords, where they would have both legislative and judicial functions.²⁷

²³ Hooper gave the St Paul’s sermon at the 1713 Thanksgiving.

²⁴ *L.J.*, 18, 4 Mar. 1707.

²⁵ Harley had been particularly assiduous in sending paid agents to Scotland – in addition to Defoe, Viscount Barrington was sent to convince the Scottish nobility, while Samuel Roswell and Christopher Taylor – who would publish a thanksgiving sermon – were sent to convince Church of Scotland pastors: Paula Backscheider, *Daniel Defoe: His Life* (London, 1992) p. 305.

²⁶ *A voice from the south: or, an address from some protestant dissenters in England to the Kirk of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1707).

²⁷ In 1711, James Greenshields successfully appealed to the House of Lords against his 1709 imprisonment for “innovation in worship” by following the Anglican liturgy at his meeting house in Edinburgh. This decision allowed the spread of Anglican/Episcopalianism in Scotland. The decision led to the 1712 Scottish Toleration Act, which legitimised prayer meetings authorised by any Protestant bishop. It was an attack on the Kirk, and annulled under George I: Alasdair Raffe, ‘Presbyterians and Episcopalians: The Formation of Confessional Cultures in Scotland, 1660–1715’, *E.H.R.* cxxv (2010) pp. 570-598.

The ceremony of thanksgiving had become such a feature of London life that enterprising metropolitans began to find in it opportunities for profit. In the week before the service, the *Daily Courant* published a classified advertisement: “a balcony by St Paul’s is to be Lett the Thanksgiving Day, for ten Guineas, 8 is bid, Enquire at the Swan in Ludgate-Street.”²⁸ On 1 May itself the Scottish nobility were conspicuous; Abel Boyer noted the: “magnificent appearance of the Nobility and Gentry of each Nation,”²⁹ while Luttrell counted: “upwards of 60 coaches with 6 horses, waited upon the queen to the thanksgiving at St Paul’s,” the increased number being made up of the: “English and Scotch nobility about town, bishops, judges and members of the house of commons, with some of the foreign ambassadors.”³⁰

While there was no mention of the frailty of the Queen herself, her consort’s absence was noted: “The Queen, the duchesses of Marlborough and Somerset were with her in the coach, the prince not there, being unable to endure the fatigue.”³¹ The usual exchange with the Lord Mayor³² ensued, the Queen was met by the Lords at the entrance of St Paul’s, and she processed through the Cathedral, with the Earl of Seafield carrying the sword of State before her. As Lord Chancellor of Scotland Seafield had played a key role in the Scottish parliamentary manoeuvring which resulted in the passage of the union. The choice of Seafield was a significant innovation, being the first thanksgiving of the reign in which the sword of State was not carried by a royal household retainer.³³ Seafield’s part in the ceremony signified the importance the Queen attached to the union and for Seafield promised rewards to come.³⁴

Sir John Clerk, one of the Scottish commissioners who had negotiated the union, and now an MP of the Parliament of Great Britain, attended the ceremony and felt: “at no time Scotsmen were more acceptable to the English than on that day.” Sitting in stalls to the Queen’s left in St Paul’s, he noted that:

²⁸ *Daily Courant*, 28 Apr. 1707.

²⁹ Boyer, *History*, p. 223.

³⁰ Luttrell, *Historical relation*, vi. p. 166. Christopher Whatley takes a more jaundiced view of the Scottish in London for the thanksgiving, commenting that they were present “in hopes of obtaining one of the fewer but more lucrative plums of office that were to be had in the Queen’s service.”: Whatley, *The Scots and the Union* (Edinburgh, 2006) pp. 314-5.

³¹ Luttrell, *Historical relation*, vi p. 166.

³² Sir Robert Bedingfield, a woollen-draper, a strong Tory. H.O.P. 1690-1715, iii, pp. 163-4.

³³ Previous sword carriers had been the Dukes of Richmond (1704) and Northumberland (June 1706), natural sons of Charles II, and two significant military figures, both strongly affiliated with the royal household, the Duke of Ormond (1702 and 1705) and the Duke of Marlborough (Dec. 1706).

³⁴ Though he did not receive a dukedom, Seafield was chosen as one of the sixteen peers to represent Scotland in the new parliament. He was sworn of the English Privy Council in 1707, and was also appointed as lord chief baron of the Exchequer in the same year. His services in securing the union in Scotland were recognised in 1708 with a pension of £3000 sterling per annum. Nevertheless, his disillusionment with the progress of the union came to the fore in 1713, when he introduced a bill for its repeal. His motion was defeated by only four votes, a telling indication of the state of the Union at that particular time: John R. Young, ‘Ogilvy, James, fourth earl of Findlater and first earl of Seafield (1663–1730)’, *Oxford DNB* [accessed 7 Mar. 2016].

“no body on this occasion appeared more sincerely devout and thankful than the Queen herself.” Indeed, he realised that: “the Citizens of London ... [had been] terribly apprehensive of confusions from Scotland in case the Union had not taken place.”³⁵

William Talbot, Bishop of Oxford, was a kinsman of the Duke of Shrewsbury, a relationship which had helped his advancement. His voting record in the House of Lords was reliably Whig, though, unlike Burnet, his speeches indicate that he was sympathetic to High Church views – he had identified with supporters of Occasional Conformity bills, but ultimately opposed the bill, ensuring its failure in December 1703.³⁶ He had spoken in favour of the union in the Lords, enduring Tory criticism for his stance. His opulence and extravagance eventually led to financial embarrassments from which his lawyer son Charles Talbot, then Lord Chancellor, had to extricate him. Talbot’s sermon was a curious blend of pragmatism, sycophancy and utopianism which skilfully elided controversy. He took as his reading Psalm 83: “how pleasant it is for Brethren to Dwell together in unity,” and his definition of brethren stretched to those who are: “members of on Civil Society, Subjects of a Kingdom who have the same Political Parent.”³⁷

Talbot noted that England had enjoyed: “Peace and Plenty within our Borders, while War and Devastation, Poverty and Misery, have march’d through most of the countries of Christendom,” and that given the history of “continual dissensions and feuds” between England and Scotland, the: “least mischief of such a separation must have been the keeping up of Standing Armies, to Man the Garrisons and Guard the Frontiers of both sides.” He noted with pride that God had allowed England: “to carry on a long and expensive War” abroad, for eighteen years, baring “a short desultory Truce,” while simultaneously, “maintain[ing] our Credit so at Home, that while our Enemies Mint-Bills [with] difficulty pass at 60 per cent discount, we have had two Rich Bodies here contending who should circulate our Exchequer Bills at lower interest than is generally given.” Along with the explicit comparison with the weakening French exchequer was an unspoken recognition of the relative economic failure of Scotland.

Talbot’s pride in England’s credit would have unexpected resonance within four months when England finally dispatched the equivalent payment to Edinburgh Castle. The money was forwarded in twelve wagons, which lumbered into Edinburgh Castle in early August 1707. “There was a vast number of

³⁵ *Memoirs of the life of Sir John Clerk of Penicuik*, p. 69. The novelty of the proceedings is perhaps the reason for Clerk’s misidentification of the preacher on the day. William Talbot, Bishop of Oxford spoke, not as Clerk thought, Henry Compton, the Bishop of London. This mistake is repeated in MacKinnon’s otherwise excellent account of the union, James Mackinnon, *The union of England and Scotland: A study of International History* (London, 1896) p. 336.

³⁶ Margot Johnson, ‘Talbot, William (1659–1730)’, *Oxford DNB* [accessed 7 Mar. 2016].

³⁷ Unless otherwise stated, all quotes are from Talbot, 1707.

spectators, and some [sic] of the mob threw stones at some of those who drove the wagons,” while there were cries of “Judas Money.”³⁸ It was found that only £100,000 had been sent in bullion, and the remainder in exchequer bills. This gave rise to a further outcry against England’s apparent lack of good faith. The indefatigable John Clerk was dispatched to Edinburgh to help with the funds’ distribution. In doing so he was obliged to stay longer than expected – as a consequence missing the opening of the first British Parliament – as the exchequer bills “had fallen into a discount of 5 per cent.” A rejection of the exchequer bills would have called for an immediate payment in specie by the Bank of England, and ultimately by the English government. The fact that, within a few months, the bills were accepted as payment by Scottish creditors was a pragmatic endorsement of the union by Scotland’s commercial class. Clerk notes: “This was an affair of great trust, however it was managed with the success that was necessary for the credit of the Bank. I carried up the retired notes with me to London in February 1708, and received the thanks of the Directors of the Bank.”³⁹

At St Paul’s, Talbot’s sermon extended praise to all present: “How Glorious was it in our Gracious Queen, to engage in an Undertaking, which had baffled all former Attempts”; the “Noble and Worthy Patriots, that were Commissioned to treat of this Union, must be ever remembered with Honour”; the English Parliament with: “surprising and almost incredible dispatch ... carry’d [the Union Bill] thro’ the two Houses here, demonstrate[ing] what a Noble Spirit animates those August Assemblies.” He nodded towards a unity of endeavours by praising: “the unanimity of our Parliaments, the Wisdom and Secrecy of our Counsels, the provident management and just disposition of our Publick Revenues, and the wonderful successes of our Victorious Forces” – though it is evident that English power and grandeur are foremost within his purview.

The fact that the nation now had two Established Churches caused the bishop the most discomfort. Oxford’s published speech from the Lords debates in March provides a useful contrast with what he avoided saying in St Paul’s and illustrates the discomfiture of those bishops who supported the union. It is perhaps understandable that, magnanimous in May, he characterised his peers in the Lords as “noble in spirit,” whereas in the heat of contention in March he had complained that his noble opponents had traduced the pro-union bishops with: “hard insinuations or suspicions ... as if we were not heartily

³⁸ David, 3rd Earl of Leven to [John, Earl of Mar, Secretary of State for Scotland] 5 Aug. 1707, in Sir William Fraser ed., *The Earls of Melville and the Earls of Leven, Correspondence* (3 vols, Edinburgh, 1890) ii, 213. Leven was keeper of Edinburgh Castle.

³⁹ *Memoirs of the life of Sir John Clerk of Penicuik*, p. 69. Christopher Whatley mentions that an additional £50,000 worth of gold was sent north when the problem arose, though this would still leave the bulk of the Equivalent in exchequer bills: Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, p. 16.

inclined to the Constitution of our church: And truly if such Jealousies can be entertained and expressed of us within, we ought not to wonder at the usage we have without doors.”⁴⁰

At St Paul’s it was the position of an established, Presbyterian church which Talbot had somehow to accommodate. He acknowledged that the union secured: “the firmer Establishment of the Protestant succession in the whole Island.” In the service, he allowed that: “it must not be thought that by this Union of judgement, is meant such a perfect Agreement in Opinion, as to exclude all Difference: in matters of small consequence ... wise and good men may differ without prejudice to themselves.”

In March, his view on the extent of difference was stark: “The Scotch in the Bill for Security of the Kirk ... have called their Presbyterian Religion, the True Protestant Religion ... Does the Bill enact, that their Religion is the True Religion? No such thing.” His speech displayed a rather Jesuitical view that: “they of Scotland shall enjoy the Religion Established there, which they call the true One; and we shall enjoy the Religion Established here, which we call and know to be the True.”⁴¹

In March, Talbot had sought to counteract the High Tory attacks on the pro-union bishops by reaffirming that in relation to the Scottish Kirk: “I shall not fear to speak my Judgement freely of ‘em, which is, that really I take ‘em to be guilty of a Wilful, and most Unjustifiable Deviation from the pattern of the Apostles and Primitive Church.” He did not use the occasion of St Paul’s to speak his judgement, preferring instead to allow: “if they yet Dissent with Modesty and Sobriety ... In short if these would not judge each other, nor the other despise these, this is ... as great a Union in Judgment and Opinion as can be expected.”

Though no published Dissenting sermon was so gauche as to say so, Arbuthnot’s pamphlet-sermon starkly voiced a pragmatic latitudinarianism: “the putting an end to uncharitable and unreasonable divisions about our trifling differences in Religion is one of the great Benefits Scotland will reap by this union.”⁴² The fact that, by voting for the union, those Church of England bishops who supported it, had acquiesced in the categorisation of differences in Church discipline as ‘trifling’ was to divide the Church of England preachers in their thanksgiving sermons.

⁴⁰ William Talbot, *The Bishop of Oxford's speech in the House of peers in answer to several speeches made by the Lord Haversham, and others. Against the union* (Dublin, 1707).

⁴¹ The range of pro-Union opinion on the bishops bench is visible when this sentiment is compared with Archbishop Tenison’s view, given in the Lords that to him the Church of Scotland was “as true a protestant church as the Church of England, though he could not say it was so perfect.”: William Marshall, ‘Tenison, Thomas (1636–1715)’ *Oxford DNB* [accessed 7 Mar. 2016].

⁴² Arbuthnot, *A Sermon.... at the Mercat-Cross*, p. 8. The intemperate Isaac Bates came closest to voicing such a view: Bates 1707, pp. 18, 28.

In the cathedral, Talbot optimistically proclaimed that the union would lead to a unity of affections where the brethren “wish well to one another, bear one another’s burthen ... rejoice in one another’s Good and discharge to each other all charitable offices of Advice Succour and Comfort.” Earlier, in the Lords he had expressed a more predatory view:

[it is] Far more likely that England may sometime or other restore Episcopacy to Scotland, than ever Scotland should be able to introduce Presbytery into England ... let us reflect upon the superiority of Numbers that England will have over Scotland in the British Parliament.

Furthermore, he foresaw the ability to affect change by influencing those Scottish representatives: “these that come into this House must be of nobility, and those that come, into the other, must probably be the best Gentry; we shall have occasion of Strength to the cause of Episcopacy.” Talbot’s speech in the Lords acknowledged that the High Church attacks on the pro-union bishops had hit a nerve: “Of what fatal consequence must it be to the Church of England to have the Clergy and People possessed with an Opinion that the Bishops and Governours of it do not approve of, or are not friends to her Constitution.”⁴³

He had managed to deflect this criticism by ignoring doctrinal ambiguities and instead proclaiming loyalty to the head of the Church of England: “we have been and are as Zealous for, as unshaken in our adherence, to the same Government, now so gloriously administered in the hands of Her present Majesty (whom God long preserve) to Her Interest and Service.”

In St Paul’s, perhaps again trying to deflect attention from awkward realities, Talbot foresaw the union as spiritual catalyst and conveying material benefit, in that: “In such a state, Ingenuity and Industry and useful inventions for the improvement of the Natural Productions,” could flourish in stark contrast to the rumours of political manipulation and corruption associated with the negotiations he felt that in the new Britain: “there is no room for the artful Management of a Politick enemy ... Gifts and Pensions to corrupt Ministers, and bribe Officers to betray their Trusts are offer’d in vain.” He finished with the hope that a spiritual union of universal extent might come about, a concept which outdid even the most exuberant of the day’s Dissenter sermons:

Our Two Kingdoms are this day united, let our Hearts from this time be so too ... let all Names of parties and characters of distinction be buried with them ... till it shall be swallowed up in that Universal union of all the People, nations and languages of the World, in that Glorious Kingdom of Christ.

The 1707 Thanksgiving yielded twenty-eight published sermons, eighteen from Anglican preachers and ten from Dissenters. Twelve of the day’s published thanksgiving sermons took Ezekiel 37.22 as their

⁴³ This was something that Francis Hutchinson at Bury St Edmunds, in particular was keen to emphasise: Hutchinson, 1707, pp. 13, 14.

passage, in which the prophet is transported to a valley in which are scattered the dry bones of a fallen race, and the Lord promises to breathe life into them. Ezekiel prophesied that God would bring together the Israelites – divided into two states, Judah and Israel – and this was symbolised by the prophet taking two sticks and, through God’s intervention, merging them into one.

As might be expected, the union divided Anglican opinion, with a significant group fearful that the Church of England’s position was being eroded by the inclusion of another Established Church. This group was hoist on the petard of passive obedience, given that the Queen was being decisively pro-union. Among this group were the poet Nicholas Brady, the newly-ordained Nathaniel Marshall whose publications would make him a preacher and historian of note in the Hanoverian period, and Hugh Todd, vicar of Penrith and an ally of Atterbury in his long struggle with Bishop Nicolson of Carlisle. One of their number would become a bishop, Thomas Manningham being raised by the Queen to the bishopric of Chichester in 1709, following significant Tory-Whig contention.⁴⁴ The others were local vicars and rectors. Robert Davidson, the rector of Hayes in Kent, dedicated his sermon to a kinsman, Capt. John Trotter, who captained the *Warwick* in the ill-fated expedition to Barbados in 1705. The one truly intemperate High Church sermon was published using only the initials ‘P.D.’ – for Patrick Dujon, vicar at St George’s in Doncaster – a sign, perhaps, of awareness and unease at the vanquishing of High Church sentiment.

Another strand of Anglican thinking welcomed the union, though this welcome ranged from a latitudinarian view that various strands of Protestantism were acceptable *per se* to a view that, by closer proximity with Church of England ministers and practices, Scottish religious views would change sufficiently to conform in time. The range went from the deeply political William Talbot to the conforming Calvinist John Edwards, who believed some of his fellow Anglican priests were the true Dissenters, to Thomas Pyle, a fiercely intelligent polemicist hoping for advancement via the Townshend-Walpole interest. They also include sermons from Deuel Pead, former naval chaplain and minister of Christ Church, Middlesex County, Virginia; John Ollyffe, namesake of a more noteworthy father;⁴⁵ and Richard Collins, vicar of Burnham, Kent and chaplain to Mary, Countess Dowager of Fauconberg, daughter of Oliver Cromwell.⁴⁶ Two of the number were to become bishops in the Hanoverian regime:

⁴⁴Sykes, ‘Queen Anne and the Episcopate’ pp. 433-64.

⁴⁵ Jim Spivey, ‘Ollyffe, John (1647/8–1717)’, *Oxford DNB*, [accessed 7 Mar. 2016] for John Ollyffe senior, whose concept of order included Protestant solidarity against popery, beginning with his oft-repeated plan for readmitting moderate dissenters to the church (*An Essay towards a Comprehension*, 1701; 3rd edn, 1718). Just as Ollyffe asserted “I am no Dissenter, but I love and honour Dissenters that are good Men.”

⁴⁶ Thomas Belasyse, later Earl Fauconberg, married Mary Cromwell during the Protectorate. He was sufficiently flexible to bribe Charles II, while Ambassador-Extraordinary in France, and to join General Monck’s March south prior to the restoration. Opposed to James II, he found renewed favour in minor roles under William. In 1707, Mary Cromwell was a wealthy widow, aged seventy, though still ‘fresh and gay’. Her numerous properties in Yorkshire,

Edward Chandler, immensely wealthy, would in 1717 become a Whiggish Bishop of Lichfield, and Francis Hutchinson, historian of Suffolk witch trials, would become Bishop of Down and Connor in Ireland in 1720. Charles Bean, fellow of Merton College, preached a sermon at St Mary's Oxford and was immediately accused of having shown either too slight a zeal for the Established Church by praising the union, or too slight a respect for William and Anne by showing inadequate zeal for the union. This intolerable situation forced him in early June to publish his sermon to counteract the rumours circulating through Oxford.

English Dissenters welcomed the union and, to a certain extent, felt that the recognition of another Established Church would copper-fasten the liberties of toleration. However, in their published sermons, they evinced no religious common cause, and a number focused on the benefits to English secular security and prosperity. Leading Dissenters Daniel Williams, Joshua Oldfield and Joseph Stennett were among those who published. The remaining Dissenting preachers contain intriguing characters. Christopher Taylor, an Edinburgh graduate and London Baptist minister had been sent by the English ministry in 1706 to work with Kirk ministers who feared for the Established Church in Scotland. Taylor's meeting-house in Leather Lane would be one of those sought out and destroyed by the Sacheverell mob. Isaac Bates, a Glasgow graduate, catalogued Daniel Williams's library after the latter's death. Bates's sermon is the most excoriating of Anglican intolerance. Around this time, Bates, Taylor and Williams were in correspondence with William Carstares and others to found an academy to train English Dissenting ministers in a Scottish university.⁴⁷ Another notable sermon was published by Joseph Standen who, twenty years later would conform to the Church of England.⁴⁸

At the new chapel in Ormonde Street, Nathaniel Marshall, while accepting the union as a temporal benefaction, noted that it: "must seem some reasonable abatement of that Joy ... That our Religious Interests do not go Hand in Hand, as our Civil, henceforwards always do." In an encomium to his Church, he praised a religion: "so free from the errors of Idolatry ... [and] the Freaks of Enthusiasm." He did, however, introduce the caveat that: "were a Church so Excellent as ours ... to suffer by this

Lancashire, Middlesex, and Soho Square, London featured in many contemporary rumours concerning the removal and secret burial of her father's remains.

⁴⁷ Bates was a theology graduate of Glasgow University, in his seventh year of his ministry to an afternoon Congregation in Hackney: A.D.G. Steers, "New Light Thinking" and Non-Subscription amongst Protestant Dissenters in England and Ireland in the early 18th century and their relationship with Glasgow University and Scotland' (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Glasgow, 2006), pp. 61-2.

⁴⁸ W.R. and V.B. McLeod, *Anglo-Scottish Tracts, 1701-1714: A Descriptive Checklist* (Lawrence, KA, 1979) is a useful source for biographies and summaries of the Union Thanksgiving sermons.

incorporation, then indeed we would buy it at a much dearer rate than any advancement of our Civil interests could make us amend.”⁴⁹

Patrick Dujon, in a High Church sermon, tentatively granted that the union: “in all probability will be so much to the Strength and the Prosperity of the United Kingdom, and to the flourishing of Religion, as may be strongly presumed from the securing of the Protestant Succession.”⁵⁰

Thomas Manningham, soon to be Bishop of Chichester and a reliable Tory vote in the House of Lords, was willing to allow time for unity by osmosis. However: “[i]n the meantime Government must be kept up and a national establishment of Religion maintained, that whatever indulgences are allow’d, Anarchy and enthusiasm may not break in upon us.”⁵¹ In St Dunstan’s, John Grant accentuated the positive: “’tis then very plain that our Happy Established Church must receive particular Advantages and Blessings by it,”⁵² though, beyond the Protestant Succession, he cited no particular examples.

Alternatively, the pragmatic advantages of union aligned with a latitudinarian view of Protestantism. In Buckinghamshire, John Ollyffe’s pragmatism contrasted with William Talbot’s disingenuousness: “if we are not agreed in the same form of Church Government, we have however chosen what we think best, whilst they have chosen what they think best ... But since we cannot agree on the whole, why should not we, however, agree in the part, if we can?”⁵³

However, the occasion also brought forth some passion. John Edwards, the parish incumbent at St Sepulchre’s in Cambridge, gave voice to the views of Calvinists who stayed within the Church of England: “We are united in the same Happy Government, with the Succession in the Protestant Line ... it is of mighty importance to have a Prince of our own Religion.” His evocation of Protestant unity was evidently unconventional in that he felt that his fellow Anglicans: “Our Arminian Clergy then are Dissenters ... Those that they commonly call Dissenters, allow not of the use of a Cope or Surplice; and these men (Arminian) allow not the Doctrine of Man’s original Impotency and Inability, as to Spiritual Good.”⁵⁴

⁴⁹ Marshall, 1707, pp. 12, 15.

⁵⁰ Dujon, 1707, p. 9.

⁵¹ Manningham, 1707, p. 14.

⁵² Grant, 1707, p. 19.

⁵³ Ollyffe, 1707, p. 20. The Oxford DNB entry mistakenly attributes this Thanksgiving sermon to John Ollyffe senior, rather than his son.

⁵⁴ Edwards, 1707, pp. 12, 10.

In Lyme Regis, Thomas Pyle, in a sermon dedicated to Charles, Viscount Townshend,⁵⁵ the most influential of the Norfolk Whigs, commingled the temporal and the religious: “Our kingdom is enlarged, not by that Sword ... but by regular and honourable agreement. Our laws are embraced, not [out of] fear, but upon the Love and Value of them” and addressed the doubts of his congregation by an appeal to God and country:

I trust in God, and in the Old British loyalty, that none of us will ever dare use the Name of such a religion as ours, with the least design to keep open those wounds of Division and animosity, which it has been long the duty of every Christian and every good Subject to bind up and cure.⁵⁶

Edward Chandler emphasised common theology while carefully delineating mutual enemies:

But let all Protestant Churches, however they differ in other Matters, unite most closely in the Main, in support of the Christian Profession, the Authority and Use of the Scriptures, the Divine Mission of a Ministry, the Necessity of the Sacraments, and some form of Church-Government and Church Discipline against Deists, Papists, Socinians and Libertines.⁵⁷

Francis Hutchinson, in the midst of an over-emphatic defence of the pro-union episcopacy, turned the tables on High-Church doubters, by disingenuously painting the mute Kirk as supplicants:

For is it not an Honour to have a Protestant Church voluntarily trust itself into the Hand of a Queen and Nation, in the Government of which ever [sic] the Bishops themselves have an honourable and large share? Did we not always used to dispute, contend and maintain the rights of our episcopal church against both Independent and Presbyterian Congregations? Yes, and we shall do so still with the same arguments and such as maintain our own in the same degrees of honour.⁵⁸

⁵⁵ In 1707, Townshend had been a member of the House of Lords and Lord Lieutenant of Norfolk for six years. He had been one of the commissioners to negotiate the treaty of union between England and Scotland. A protégé of Lord Somers, in 1709 he was appointed Ambassador-Extraordinary to The Hague, where he helped to draw up the harsh peace terms that Louis XIV rejected. Townshend was Robert Walpole’s brother-in-law: Linda Frey and Marsha Frey, ‘Townshend, Charles, second Viscount Townshend (1674–1738)’ *Oxford DNB* [accessed 7 Mar. 2016].

⁵⁶ Pyle, 1707, p. 18. King’s Lynn was Robert Walpole’s constituency. Pyle’s hopes of advancement were ultimately unfulfilled.

⁵⁷ Chandler, 1707, p. 24.

⁵⁸ Hutchinson, 1707, pp. 11, 14. In 1720, Hutchinson was deemed to have secured the bishopric of Down and Connor by means of the influence of Charles Trimmell, the Bishop of Norwich. The advent of yet another English born bishop to an Irish see provoked resentment in Ireland, not least from Archbishop King: Ehrenpreis, *Swift*, iii, p. 171.

In fact, the overwhelming response within the Scottish Kirk was to see it as their duty to submit and yield a passive subjection to the established constitution, and that it would be sufficient to represent their grievances to parliament for consideration. The Commission of the General Assembly did not agitate against the union or attempt to block the treaty. Neither the commission nor any of its committees insisted on the maintenance of the Scottish Parliament. They did not oppose the establishment of a British Parliament. However, the commission did object to the constitution of the British Parliament having bishops sitting in the House of Lords. The Scottish government could neither realistically insist upon the removal of the bishops in parliament nor of the test because they knew it was not an option for the English negotiators, so that the Scottish Act of Security was a pragmatic compromise.⁵⁹

English Dissenting ministers were at once nationalistic and optimistic, keen to be seen as loyal within the English community, but many nonetheless seeing the union as confirmation of their non-conformist liberties. Daniel Williams assured his London flock:

The Addition is most properly made to England, in as much as its Representatives in Parliament are far more numerous, and the Legislature is chiefly in our hands. All our Peers retain their right to vote; nor are our Commons diminished in Number, or the way of Election or Voters in such Elections alter'd.

Williams implicitly emphasised England's domination by using the image of Scotland as a back door "at which foreigners entered to distress this Land ... How oft has France by a Scottish invasion prevented our Triumphs?"⁶⁰ So did Christopher Taylor, noting that: "by this union that BackDoor [sic] is ever barr'd."⁶¹ Taylor, an Edinburgh graduate and Baptist minister, had spent a large part of 1706 in Scotland, funded by Harley, proselytising for the union.⁶² Both might have been uncomfortable to know they shared this description of Scotland with the High-Churchman Hugh Todd, who obliquely lamented the martyred King in claiming the union: "effectually shuts up that Postern at which the enemy has so often entered to the unspeakable damage and disadvantage of our Publick Affairs."⁶³ In Andover, the Presbyterian George Burnet illustrated an early-modern understanding of opportunity cost: "what expenses might each nation necessarily have been to Maintain standing forces, to Garrison and Fortify their Frontier-Towns?... it is what the enemies of our Constitution might wish for."⁶⁴

⁵⁹ Jeffrey Stephen, *Scottish Presbyterians and the Act of Union* (Edinburgh, 2007) pp. 73-195.

⁶⁰ D. Williams, 1707, pp. 5, 11.

⁶¹ Taylor, 1707, p. 20.

⁶² W.D. Jeremy, *The Presbyterian fund and Dr. Daniel Williams's trust* (London, 1885) p. 12.

⁶³ Todd, 1707, p. 18.

⁶⁴ George Burnet, 1707, p. 10. Burnet knew whereof he spoke, though ministering in Hampshire, he was born in Berwick-on-Tweed: W.H. Summers, *History of the Congregational Churches in the Berks, South Oxen and South Bucks Association* (Newbury, 1905) p. 162.

Most Dissenters saw the incorporation of a second Established Church as a welcome move, further restraining official Anglican intolerance. Isaac Bates tried to be as matter-of-fact as possible: “a nation that is Episcopal and a Nation that is Presbyterian have thought it in their interest to joyn together in firm Friendship and become one.”⁶⁵ Richard Allen saw the union as a progression of the advances made in 1688:

This Union was agreed on with such Readiness (especially on the part of England) though between Nations of so different sentiments in doctrine and discipline ... we may hope will conduce to perpetuate that toleration and liberty of conscience, which we have several years enjoy'd as the fruit of the Glorious and never-to-be-forgotten Revolution.⁶⁶

Neither did the Dissenters express much in common with the Kirk of Scotland, with only Daniel Williams, perhaps the most authoritative of the London Presbyterian Ministers, seeking to allay Scottish religious apprehension, with an appeal to British sincerity and Protestant solidarity: “A British Parliament must renounce the Revolution Principle, before they can conceive [violence against Kirk] ... few true Protestants are such bigots, as to disregard the Sacredness of a solemn Treaty.”⁶⁷ Joshua Oldfield was as hopeful for religious unity as some of his Anglican counterparts: “if the civil incorporation shall be advanc'd into that Spiritual Union, which is between Christ and Believers, they shall then be built up together as an Habitation of God.”⁶⁸ Giles Dent was both more prosaic and latitudinarian:

since we worship the same God, tho we differ in some Modes of worship, as far as we have attain'd let us walk by the same Rule, let us mind the same thing; and in other things let us make use of the Apostle's advice, and bear with and forbear one another... for let a man worship God either after one or another manner, provided he worships him at all.⁶⁹

In Andover, George Burnet was even more matter-of-fact, though nonetheless optimistic:

So our heats and disturbances among ourselves will be much allayed by the greatest security the Act of toleration of Protestant Dissenters could receive ... This union is sufficient barrier to the Toleration Act; while one holds out, the other is safe: so that Protestant Dissenters by the entire removal of their fears will be easy, and their enemies thorow [sic] despair will sit still.⁷⁰

⁶⁵ Bates, 1707, p. 15.

⁶⁶ Allen, 1707, p. 14.

⁶⁷ D. Williams, 1707, p. 9.

⁶⁸ Oldfield, 1707, p. 12.

⁶⁹ Dent, 1707, p. 15.

⁷⁰ George Burnet, 1707, p. 15. Ironically, in 1712 The House of Lords passed the Scottish Toleration Act which attempted the reintroduction of Episcopalianism in Scotland.

Dissenting ministers evinced little desire to reunite with their Anglican fellow countrymen. In general, they felt confirmed in their existing liberties, and, apart from Isaac Bates, were content to let sleeping dogs lie. Bates's sermon revealed the frustration of Dissenting congregations when he castigated the: "[p]ersecution for Conscience-sake, Ecclesiastical bigotry, severe Judgings of our Christian Brother for a different Form of Church-Government, and a different mode of Worshipping the true God."

He blamed not just: "the French, popish and High-Church Faction" but also: "a Generation of Selfish Ignorants that feared detriment of their own Interest, more than they loved the Publick Good, and ... Narrow-minded Zealots which conceived a mortal rancour against Puritanism." Uniquely among the published Dissenting sermons of the day, he rounded on Anglican intolerance and foresaw its oblivion:

those doctrines that confine the Validity of Christ's ordinances to Episcopal Ordination, those that represent Popery more favourably than Presbytery etc. must now appear strange doctrines, and he must have a front of more than Brass that Preacheth them in this part of our Island. ⁷¹

Thomas Freke was more latitudinarian: "If there be Uniformity in doctrine, 'tis not absolutely necessary for Peace sake, that there should be always Uniformity in Discipline."⁷²

Joseph Standen's sermon revealed something of the strain and fissiparousness⁷³ of English nonconformist life. Somewhat plaintively he urged Anglicans to follow the practice of Archbishop Tillotson, asserting that: "it would be for the Advantage of the establish'd church, if there were more of her communion who treated their Brethren with Candour and Civility," while also lamenting his fellow nonconformists "unreasonable Humours to one another." Standen's sermon was given in Coleford in Somerset. Nineteen years later, while minister to the Presbyterian congregation at Newbury in Berkshire, he conformed to the Church of England and was made vicar of Speen in the same county. His thanksgiving sermon prefigured his doubts about his fellow Dissenters:

it would look better in many of them if they would not be unwilling to allow their Brethren the same latitude in their Exposition of the Articles of the Church of England, if they would always forbear censuring those as Apostates and Renegados [sic] who go over from the Dissenters to the Church.⁷⁴

⁷¹ Bates, 1707, pp. 15, 20, 28.

⁷² Freke, 1707, p. 9.

⁷³ Chandler expressed a weary frustration that "many of the sectaries, who differ more from one another, than some of them do from us, do readily unite to maintain their separation against the Established Church": Chandler, 1707, p. 24.

⁷⁴ Standen, 1707, pp. 23, 24, 25. His mood had lightened by 1726. His farewell sermon to his dissenting congregation, was from Acts 8: 46. "Lo! I turn to the Gentiles." He was highly respected by both Churchmen and dissenters, and continued friendly with the latter to the time of his death: E.M. Gray, *The History and Antiquities of Newbury and Its Environs* (Speenhamland, 1839) p. 123.

In perhaps the clearest interpretation of the impact of the union on Dissenting thought, Joseph Stennett noted that: “the different sentiments of Protestants in Matters of Religion, are very consistent with their living peaceably together under the same Government and being mutually serviceable to the Public,” an important, though largely unnoticed, renunciation of *Cuius regio, eius religio*. With the plight of foreign Protestants never far from Dissenter’s thoughts, Stennett felt the union, and its concomitant toleration, would:

clear [sic] the hearts of the Reform’d in other parts of Europe; and who knows how much it may make way for the re-establishment of the Reformation in those countrys [sic], from when it has been extirpated by all the methods of Treachery and Violence?⁷⁵

Stennett’s aspiration was widely shared by Dissenting ministers, Richard Allen stated that: “we have manifold grounds to hope [the union] will not only be a great Benefit to this Kingdom, but also to the Reform’d Interest Abroad.”⁷⁶ Dent hoped: “May she give liberty to the Captives and rescue those that are persecuted for Righteousness sake out of the hand of their powerful and merciless oppressors.”⁷⁷ Isaac Bates was slightly more measured:

Our govenours design’d to make our new Incorporated Nations the abitrators of Europe, Powerful Patrons of Liberty and the Reformed Religion ... They aimed to make the Island happy within itself at Home, and able to appear Victoriously and Decisively in every Good Cause it may patronize abroad.⁷⁸

The bemusement of those Anglicans who feared the union was clear in their sermons. Nathaniel Marshall acknowledged some of the mystery of providence:

It is not always we see the greatest Policy which is crown’d with the greatest success ... Ordinarily indeed where God designs the Tokens of his Favour, he veils ‘em with a shew of such Means as may in Humane Account be entitled to ‘em. But then again he sometimes does otherwise.

He tentatively concluded that, though the path ahead looked uncertain, the means must justify the end:

Upon the whole then, if the favour of God be generally necessary to National Happiness, and if the way to obtain his Favour be an Endeavour to deserve it, the true Policy, that which is most likely to attain its End, must consist in such Endeavours.⁷⁹

⁷⁵ Stennett, 1707, pp. 14, 15.

⁷⁶ Allen, 1707, p. 10. Allen was notable among Baptists in his support of public singing at services. Ivimey, *History of the English Baptists*, ii, p. 445.

⁷⁷ Dent, 1707, p. 16.

⁷⁸ Bates, 1707, p. 15.

⁷⁹ Marshal, 1707, pp. 4, 5, 8, 9.

Nicholas Brady, poet, psalmist, clergyman in Richmond, chose to ignore the machinations and celebrate the outcome: “A blessing, which tho’ aimed at throughout all the last Century, has been reserved by Providence as a peculiar Ornament to set off the glorious reign of her Present Majesty.”⁸⁰

Perhaps due to the months of negotiations and parliamentary machinations, even those Church of England clerics who welcomed the union were somewhat tentative in ascribing it to the workings of providence. The plainspoken Deuel Pead seemed to elevate the outcome from special to the realms of miraculous providence: “if we consider how Obstinate and Perverse some in both Kingdoms have been ... we can attribute this work to none but God.”⁸¹ Nor did the Dissenting ministers do than more generally acknowledge that: “The accomplishment of this great work was, it seems, reserv’d by Providence to make an Addition to the Glories of this Reign.”⁸²

It was their hopes for providence’s future blessings that chiefly distinguished Church of England from Dissenter sermons. Almost all Church of England ministers⁸³ pondered the two Established Churches in one nation and rather anxiously hoped that they portended future unity. Nathaniel Marshall, vicar of St Pancras, hoped that God’s favour to England: “shall render their Happiness observable to their neighbours.”⁸⁴ John Ollyffe, at Uxbridge, in another circuitous reference, was content to: “leave it to Providence, who already has Peaceably wrought one wonder, peaceably to work another.”⁸⁵ However, Edward Chandler came closest to naming the unfinished religious conundrum inherent in the incorporating union, remarking that: “tis possible God may incline our Brethren of Scotland to seek a closer union with us in Religion.”⁸⁶

Those dubious about portents for the union fell back on obedience. For Robert Davidson: “Our Gracious queen hath shewd a particular Zeal and Concern, recommending it to Her Parliament, in the First Speech that she made from the throne.”⁸⁷ Patrick Dujon, in the most High Church of the published sermons, acknowledged that God: “has given the Queen her heart’s desire.”⁸⁸ John Grant considered the glorious Queen’s martial triumphs: “greater ... than all the English Annals have recorded, yet still our

⁸⁰ Brady, 1707, p. 1. Brady too had some experience of plenty. He was perpetual curate of Richmond chapelry, Surrey; continuing to hold the curacy and to reside in Richmond while successively vicar of Stratford upon Avon, and a rectory of Holy Trinity, Clapham, Surrey. James Sambrook, ‘Brady, Nicholas (1659–1726)’ *Oxford DNB* [accessed 7 Mar. 2016].

⁸¹ Pead, 1707, p. 14.

⁸² Dent, 1707, p. 12.

⁸³ John Edwards being the obvious exception.

⁸⁴ Marshall, 1707, p. 3.

⁸⁵ Ollyffe, 1707, p. 20.

⁸⁶ Chandler, 1707, p. 32.

⁸⁷ Davidson, 1707, p. 3.

⁸⁸ Dujon, 1707, p. 19.

Pious sovereign ... believes this happy union ,[to be] the greatest Ornament and Glory of all Her Reign.”⁸⁹ Charles Williams reassured his flock of: “Her Pious Care and affectionate Zeal for the National Church and Established Religion,” though in a hint of incomprehension noted: “and (I must also add too) in her Moderation and Indulgence to the Inflexible stiffness of Sectaries.”⁹⁰ Dujon managed at least to make a muffled criticism of the efforts of “her great and wise predecessors, so often wish’d for, so often in vain attempted.”⁹¹

Charles Bean, rather courageously given his Oxford audience, took a sympathetic view of William’s failure to bring about union:

Our late Deliverer ... was constantly prevented by Domestick Jealousies and foreign wars. And perhaps providence might think that this great Work of peace and tranquillity improper for a Prince personally engaged in wars, blood and slaughter; and reserve it like the building of the Temple, to one happy in a more universal affection of Her People.

Later in the sermon, he strove for balance by proclaiming that: “The Queen who was the Principal Mover and Finisher of this Happy Union deservedly reckons it the Glory of her Reign.”⁹² John Ollyffe too had a word for the waverers: “yet those who have a value for her Majesty’s judgement in this matter ... are willing, if it were for nothing else, to think themselves under some little Obligation, at least, to think well of it.”⁹³ Thomas Pyle took a more inclusive view:

Yet, whoever... is a hearty Friend to the Fourth of November, may venture thankfully, and free of all scruple, to make One in the Praises and Blessings of the First of May [union day]. The one is nothing but the Addition of Strength and Beauty to that Noble Structure, of which the other was the First and Glorious Foundation.⁹⁴

Those who welcomed the union were altogether more inclined to credit Her Majesty’s advisors. Deuel Pead praised: “those Honourable Persons who managed the Treaty of Union, when they ... allow[ed] Liberty of Conscience ... [and ensured that] the Liberty shall not be used for a Cloak of Maliciousness.”⁹⁵ Richard Collins sought to shore up the episcopate, battered by apparent division

⁸⁹ Grant, 1707, p. 5.

⁹⁰ C. Williams, 1707, p. 4.

⁹¹ Dujon, 1707, p. 8.

⁹² Bean, 1707, pp. 11, 13.

⁹³ Ollyffe, 1707, p. 16.

⁹⁴ Pyle, 1707, p. 10. William’s landing in Torbay is normally dated 5 Nov., nevertheless it is clear that he is referring to the Glorious Revolution, and on the same page admonishes his hearers for “ingratitude to the best of princes, and base returns to the Kindest Deliverer; by our murmurings and Repining’s at our own good fortune.”

⁹⁵ Pead, 1707, p. 8, 1707. Pead, usually one of the more forthright of the thanksgiving preachers, in addition to being Minister of St James Clerkenwell was chaplain to the Duke of Newcastle, English Lord Privy Seal, was a commissioner for negotiation of the union with Scotland.

between religious and temporal loyalties, noting that the Queen had preserved the Church: “[b]y preferring to the highest Stations of the Church, Men of the Greatest Piety and Vertue.”⁹⁶ Francis Hutchinson, later to join the episcopal ranks, gave:

Thanks ... to God we have bishops who ... are not afraid to trust their cause to the providence of God, and the conscience of their fellow subjects, rather than obstruct the nation’s good, for fear of a distant uncertain danger.⁹⁷

The Dissenting ministers shared the view of the Queen as facilitator of William’s legacy, and leader of wise counsellors: “King William brake off our Bands and Fetters; but the Queen hath the Glory of conducting us into the promised land.”⁹⁸ Isaac Bates envisioned: “our gracious Queen ... designed this great...End...the wise and well-affected commissioners that settled the terms of Union... [and] the majority in the parliaments of both nations that perfected them,” led to the result that: “By the kind mediation of Her Majesty, her wise counsellors and Patriots, have conquer’d one another without war.”⁹⁹

If the reaction to the religious aspects of union varied between tentative and triumphalist, there was general agreement among all English preachers that the greater economic power was incorporating a lesser state, sharing the fruits of trade, in exchange for strategic security. Edward Chandler rather coldly stated that: “[w]e have all the Benefits of conquest, without the Toil: The Scots all our Privileges, without Slavery.”¹⁰⁰ Hugh Todd in Penrith, Cumberland saw the union as a “glorious transaction,” voicing an unsentimental view of his near-neighbours: “A brazen door is shut upon all such Dangers for ever, and we need not now fear that any Swarms of the meaner sort of people, arm’d with Hunger and Fury, will rush in upon us and despoil us, as they have often done.”¹⁰¹

The backwardness of the Scottish economy was commonly acknowledged, though only Patrick Dujon’s sermon made their relative economic failure explicit: “That unsuccessful attempt upon Darien opened the eyes of the wisest ... to see that an Assistance and Conjunction with their Neighbours vers’d in Trade, and backed by Riches, was necessary to give Life and Being to new Colonies.” His was the only published sermon which balked at the fact that the Scots were to be allowed: “into all the sweets of their profitable places at Home, and to share of the advantages of their foreign trade and Plantation Improvements and Acquisitions abroad.”¹⁰² Arbuthnot’s pro-union pseudo-sermon took the point of view

⁹⁶ Collins, 1707, p. 21.

⁹⁷ Hutchinson, 1707, p. 13.

⁹⁸ Taylor, 1707, p. 16.

⁹⁹ Bates, 1707, pp. 13, 29.

¹⁰⁰ Chandler, 1707, p. 19.

¹⁰¹ Todd, 1707, p. 19.

¹⁰² P.D., 1707, pp. 10, 11.

of a Scot warning his fellow countrymen about expectations of too sweet a deal: “Can any man believe that the English will maintain Plantations, garrison them, and defend them with their Fleets and armies to let the Scots who are at none of these charges, reap the Profit of the Trade?”¹⁰³

All the other published sermons abandoned mercantilism. William Talbot foresaw that: “Ingenuity... and useful inventions”¹⁰⁴ would flourish. Edward Chandler felt that: “Union multiplies men for Business, and consequently makes plenty.”¹⁰⁵ The Dissenter George Burnet felt confident to: “[a]llow it only that the Scotch will be enrich’d without any diminution of the English Wealth.”¹⁰⁶ Directly contradicting Dujon’s fears for English colonies and trading posts, John Grant noted that: “we have at once the addition of some Millions of warlike, hardy and industrious people capable and ready to supply our plantations abroad.”¹⁰⁷

Joshua Oldfield, in Southwark, saw no danger to trade: “Some are ready to think that trade divided must thereby be diminished; but a more prudent and intelligent persons seem to be a far different mind.”¹⁰⁸ Isaac Bates may even have stumbled on a rudimentary theory of comparative advantage, as he noted the advantages trade would bring: “The Scotch have their linen-cloth, their cattle, coals etc.; we have our Woollen Manufacture, our hard Ware, and our East-India goods.” Bates went on to cast his eye on Scotland’s fishery: “our whole nation is sensible what advantages the Fishery upon the Northern coast promises us.”¹⁰⁹ In this he was joined by another London-based Dissenter, Richard Allen: “especially that the Fishery in the Northern Seas belonging to this Island will be greatly increased ... which is an inexhaustible spring of wealth and Riches to our Kingdom.”¹¹⁰ Arbuthnot’s polemic had suggested that the Scots themselves had wasted this resource, since up to now: “we have one peculiar ... I mean our Fish; thus we starve with that Commodity at our doors, from which our Neighbours the Dutch draw the very Foundations of their Wealth and Maritime Power.”¹¹¹

¹⁰³ Arbuthnot, *Sermon preach’d... at Mercat-Cross*, p. 6.

¹⁰⁴ Talbot, 1707, p. 10.

¹⁰⁵ Chandler, 1707, p. 15.

¹⁰⁶ George Burnet, 1707, p. 16.

¹⁰⁷ Grant, 1707, p. 14. Whatley notes that Clerk suspected that the Scots might well be offered favourable terms, especially if the English thought that as a result of the present war they would extend their colonial empire in the Caribbean – which could then be people by Scots: Whatley, *Scots and the Union*, p. 253.

¹⁰⁸ Oldfield, 1707, p. 9.

¹⁰⁹ Bates, 1707, pp. 19, 21.

¹¹⁰ Allen, 1707, p. 10. Scottish fisheries and its ancillary industries were of a topic of great interest to contemporaries. See Bob Harris, ‘Scotland’s herring fisheries and the prosperity of the nation’, *Scottish Historical Review*, lxxix (2000), pp. 39-60; Christopher A. Whatley, ‘Salt, coal and the union of 1707: a revision article’, *Scottish Historical Review*, lxxvi (1987) pp. 26-45.

¹¹¹ Arbuthnot, *Sermon preach’d... at Mercat-Cross*, p. 3.

A mood of English nationalism pervaded the pastors' views of the Scots as a part of the one new nation. Thomas Manningham observed that the Scots had previously been "a rough engine fitted upon all occasions to molest us, especially as it was managed by the Policies of France."¹¹² John Ollyffe in Uxbridge was more tolerant, if no less condescending: "and if they cannot make us rich as we may do them, 'tis something, however, if they can, in return for our Kindness, help to make us strong."¹¹³ Francis Hutchinson, noting that Scotland had delivered up "their Sword, and Purse and Keys of their country forever," coldly presaged the Fifteen and Culloden:

Supposing the worst that can be supposed, that some Turbulent unquiet men should some time or other be Mutinous in that Corner ... could we not quiet them as easily when our Crown had possession of their Militia, Revenue, Garrisons and Courts of Justice, as we might if they had a separate Right, and Sword, and power of Consultation and calling in assistance?¹¹⁴

John Ollyffe's sermon summarised the necessary accommodation from an English perspective: "it lies upon them to avoid all sinister dealings towards us; and on us to avoid all contemptuous carriage towards them, and all envious grudging at any prosperous success they may meet in their trade and merchandize."¹¹⁵

In general, the Dissenting ministers were more welcoming, though no less national in their thinking. Joseph Standen expressed the case for moderation: "I hope there are very considerable numbers on both sides who would do [what] they cou'd to compose our Differences, and in the meantime desire to treat one another with all imaginable Temper and Moderation."¹¹⁶ Daniel Williams, as usual, was most politically astute, noting that: "tho' Scotland share in the Benefit, yet its strength is an appendage to England: for as we have that Superiority in Parliament, the disposal of men and Treasure will be chiefly in our hands, and our Influence proportionable."¹¹⁷ Isaac Bates summed up the curmudgeonly stance best: "Reflect not upon 'em, nor encourage any that do so: Give 'em not occasion to complain as they have done often formerly, of their ill Usage from us."¹¹⁸

Though the war did not feature explicitly in many sermons, clerics acknowledged the enhanced security which followed the union: "Whenever the English were engaged in War abroad ... their enemies were wont to engage the Scots to give a diversion."¹¹⁹ Nicholas Brady felt the union was: "a greater shock

¹¹² Manningham, 1707, p. 4.

¹¹³ Ollyffe, 1707, p. 18.

¹¹⁴ Hutchinson, 1707, p. 14.

¹¹⁵ Bates, 1707, p. 12.

¹¹⁶ Standen, 1707, p. 25.

¹¹⁷ D. Williams, 1707, p. 12.

¹¹⁸ Bates, 1707, p. 30.

¹¹⁹ Davidson, 1707, p. 13.

given to the common and professed enemy of our Church and Nation ... than by all the Wonders of our late unparalleled Successes.”¹²⁰ For some the war was almost won: “A Proud Sennacherib that ... threatened all Europe with his Chains and Vassalage ... should be thus miraculously broken by the hands of a woman.”¹²¹ John Grant took his audience on an imaginary tour of France: “with their manufactories broken, their ... trade and Commerce, now lost and undone ... that miserable People, universally beggared and ruined ... the Court and Ministry’s measures broken, the wisest among them at their Wits end,” and with an indicative pride in British credit, he castigated: “tricking, Dissimulation and Flatteries, their frequent lowering and raising their Coins; their Royal Money’d bills, with scandalous discounts now upon them.”¹²²

As in December 1706, the increase in taxation was noted, though only Richard Enock of Sutton in Suffolk raised it as a serious burden, commenting that: “some here may object and say ... Are not we engaged in a long and expensive war? Do not we pay great Taxes and Assessments for carrying on this war?”¹²³ In Middlesex, Charles Williams was more sanguine: “tho’ our national exigencies have been indeed considerable, yet we have felt so little Smart under them, that they have made not the least abatement or abridgement of the Luxuriancy either of our table or apparel.”¹²⁴

In contrast, a significant number of preachers had not changed their opinion of the French monarch’s designs or duplicity: “Our enemies Maxim is Divide & imperia, Divide and Subdue; let ours be Quos Dues conjuxit nemo separet.”¹²⁵ “The boundless ambition of France makes this and all Projects of this sort more needful in our Time ... We have reason to think this accession of Strength very reasonable and providential.”¹²⁶ The sermons published by Dissenters saw the union as a signal of God’s intention to increase the pressure on France. George Burnet acknowledged that God: “has delivered the Nations from jealousies of one another, that they may employ their United Strength against his and the Common enemy.” He was content that Scotland: “will no more be a handle or instrument for France, to embroil, molest and weaken the other.”¹²⁷ In Hand Alley, Daniel Williams spoke of the augmented power of the nation: “God is increasing us when he is reducing France, as a punishment of its barbarous Attempts against the reformed interest.”¹²⁸

¹²⁰ Brady, 1707, p. 1.

¹²¹ C. Williams, 1707, p. 13.

¹²² Grant, 1707, p. 16.

¹²³ Enock, 1707, p. 24.

¹²⁴ C. Williams, 1707, p. 8.

¹²⁵ Pead, 1707, p. 15. *Quos Dues conjuxit nemo separet* [What God has joined together, let no man pull asunder].

¹²⁶ Hutchinson, 1707, p. 11.

¹²⁷ George Burnet, 1707, p. 18.

¹²⁸ D. Williams, 1707, p. 3.

The union was indeed a glorious transaction,¹²⁹ and, from an English point of view, a great temporal blessing in that it brought the “Sword, Purse and Keys”¹³⁰ of Scotland under English control. The Protestant Succession was copper-fastened, England’s security enhanced. For the temporal nation, it was worthy of thanksgiving. The Queen’s enthusiasm for the process and unequivocal endorsement of the outcome disarmed Tory critics. The use of the existing pageantry of thanksgiving, and specifically the innovation of extending the symbolic privilege of carrying the Sword of State to a politically important Scot, which had hitherto been restricted to Dukes of royal blood or significant military prowess, showed a developing acumen on the part of the Queen and the ministry.

However, for the bishops who supported the union, it represented an uncomfortable compromise where: “rather than obstruct the nation’s good, for fear of a distant, uncertain danger,”¹³¹ they implicitly voted to establish the Presbyterian Kirk of Scotland. While the advantages were clear to Parliamentarians, this appeared to be a reduction of *de jure divino* to the level of a trifling difference and was a source of anxiety to most Church of England clergymen. This is most vividly illustrated by the contrast between Bishop Talbot’s speech to the Lords defending the union and his sermon at St Paul’s where he commended it.

Anglican ministers who were at best tentative regarding the union – Dujon, Grant, Charles Williams, Manningham, Marshall, Todd and Brady – were perplexed that providence should have led the nation in this path and were reluctantly obedient to the unambiguous wishes of the Queen. As regards the war, a view was crystallising that Louis was defeated, France was impoverished and English taxes, always burdensome, were becoming unnecessary. The admittedly sparse comments on the war continued a trend, evident since the victory of Ramillies, that in Europe, the balance was close to being restored.

If some were perplexed, the alternative Anglican view was pragmatic. With the exception of the Calvinist-inclined John Edwards, welcoming clerics – Pead, Ollyffe, Pyle, Chandler, Hutchinson and Collins – adopted Bishop Talbot’s guardedly optimistic tone. If the twists and turns, negotiations and exclusions of the treaty process made the divine hand hard to see, comfort could be taken that considering how “Obstinate and Perverse some in both Kingdoms have been ... we can attribute this work to none but God.”¹³² In terms of the war, clerics continued to emphasise the duplicity of the French king, and postpone a definition of terms which might bring the war to an end. Both groups of Anglicans, to a greater or lesser extent, set their hopes that providence was laying out a path by which the Kirk would see

¹²⁹ Todd, 1707, p. 6.

¹³⁰ Hutchinson, 1707, p. 14.

¹³¹ Hutchinson, 1707, p. 13.

¹³² Pead, 1707, p. 14.

the light, a hope made even more forlorn by the preceding forty years' interaction with English Dissenters.

The reaction of English Dissenters is perhaps more surprising, for none of the published sermons exhibit any inclination to seek the protection of the newly established Kirk or attempt to extend its ambit beyond the now-permeable frontier. While noting the Kirk's more secure position – in that it did not suffer the English Test Acts – English Dissenters: Bates, Daniel Williams, Oldfield and Allan,¹³³ allowed that the Scots could now benefit from English liberties and tolerance, as well as English economic advantage. The faith evidenced by Dissenting sermons from Taylor, Daniel Williams, Dent, George Burnet, Bates and Standen¹³⁴ in the bedrock of English (now British) parliamentary guarantees of liberties is striking, given the relatively disadvantaged position of Dissenters in English society. Stennett, Dent and Allan¹³⁵ focused on the plurality of modes of worship permitted in Britain as a model for the oppressed Dissenting churches of Europe and saw the union as a gathering of forces for the liberation of the reformed religions abroad.

The evidence of all the published sermons in England (and perhaps an inference to be taken from the absence of Scottish sermons) is of a thoroughly English national identity which was far from incorporating a Scottish identity. There is no distinction between Dissenter and Anglican in the condescension to the ordinary Scot; awareness of the superiority of English commerce, capital and credit; and the view that England has the better of the security and political transaction. Nonetheless, the incorporation of Scotland added to the general level of discomfiture felt by the ordinary members of the Church of England, while simultaneously adding to the confidence of the Junto Whigs, in particular, that great prizes were within their grasp.

¹³³ All Presbyterians.

¹³⁴ All Presbyterians save Standen, a Baptist and George Burnet, whose affiliation is unknown.

¹³⁵ Stennett was a Seventh-Day Baptist, Dent and Allan were Presbyterians.

Chapter Four: 1708 to 1710 Oudenarde to Bouchain

1708 The “Insolent Attempt” and Oudenarde

Between 1708 and 1710, the war in northern Europe resulted in further allied victories, both on the battlefield and in the capture of key fortified towns. Yet in Spain the allies’ swift advance in the summer of 1710 was followed by swift retreat, the hope of victory in Spain disappearing. The outwardly hard line on a future peace settlement was beginning to be challenged. Politically, the advance of the Whigs, through electoral success in 1708, and the inclusion of Junto leaders within the ministry came under challenge in the aftermath of the failed Sacheverell impeachment, and by the autumn of 1710 both the high offices of state and control of the Commons were moving into Tory hands.

During these years five thanksgivings were held in England. This chapter will chart the continuities and the changes, often subtle, in the themes which emerge. In part, these reflect changes in Anne’s own situation, as the Queen, newly widowed, retreated from some of aspects of public ceremonial, and broke definitively with Sarah Churchill. More strikingly, they indicate growing tendencies towards seeing the war’s end as in sight, or indeed actively aspiring towards peace, the latter position associated with the Tories rather than the Whigs, who instead would come to box themselves into the prolongation of war on the grounds of demanding ‘no peace without Spain.’ Sermons echoed this tension between celebrating present victories and claiming confidence in more to come, alongside mounting hopes of ending a costly conflict. Domestic divisions remained a prevalent theme, though the readiness of preachers to identify these more with Jacobite threats, party factionalism or religious Dissent, could be telling as to their own alignments. The readiness of individual preachers to praise the Queen’s generals or ministers, individually or collectively, can also serve to indicate something of their political preferences, given the rapidly changing profile of government across these years.

The proclamation of the August 1708 Thanksgiving deprecated the late: “insolent attempt to invade our Kingdom” and praised Marlborough’s: “Signal and Glorious Victory near Audenarde.”¹ Even at six months’ remove, the attempted invasion of Scotland was a great source of unease in Britain. The phrase ‘just and necessary war’ replaced a ‘just war,’ for the first time in the reign, perhaps an indication of a renewed appreciation of the threat to the homeland. In March 1708, a French fleet, with some 4,000

¹ *By the Queen, a proclamation, for a publick thanksgiving.* Jul. 1708 (London, 1708).

troops and James Francis Edward, the Jacobite Pretender, had evaded the naval blockade of Dunkirk and attempted to land in the Firth of Forth.

In the face of invasion the Ministry suspended *habeas corpus* and arrested twenty-one Scottish noblemen, among them the Duke of Hamilton.² Further doubts about the loyalty of a Scottish population were evident when the Queen, in person in the Lords, vetoed an Act for the creation of Scottish militia, despite its having passed unopposed through both the Lords and Commons.³ There was no comfort either in the ministry's estimation that no more than 1,500 regular troops were available in Scotland to resist such an invasion. On 9 March, in the midst of the invasion scare, the Earl of Leven, keeper of Edinburgh Castle, wrote to the Earl of Mar, Secretary for Scotland, of the great ferment in Scotland: "particularly in the West Country; and that the Jacobites are very Uppish," adding that confidence in the London had government evaporated and that: "[t]he Officers can hardly get money for the Bills sent from London." Four days later, Leven was even gloomier: "It vexes me to think I must retire towards Berwick if the French land on this side of the Firth."⁴ On 11 March, as Anne deployed the veto, she implicitly admitted to the Lords the strategic threat of the Pretender's attempt: "that Ten Battalions of My Troops were embarked at Ostend, ready to sail with their Convoy as there shall be Occasion: And I shall continue to take all proper Measures for disappointing the Enemy's Designs."⁵

The invasion fleet was prevented from landing by a superior English naval force under Admiral Byng and returned in disarray to Dunkirk. In February of the following year, in his criticism of the ministry's reaction to the proposed landings, Lord Haversham⁶ presented the House of Lords with the documents detailing the frantic measures being undertaken – the troops from the continent were to be landed at Harwich, their horses at Tynemouth, 300 miles north. Somehow, horses and men were expected to link up and proceed a further sixty miles to Berwick, all this while the French fleet was off the Scottish coast. Haversham's publication of his attack on the ministry helped confirm public apprehensions about

²Hamilton had rhetorically led Scottish parliamentary opposition to the Union, but failed to attend for crucial votes. He had dallied with Jacobitism, but had a vague claim to the English throne. In 1708, following his arrest, he aligned himself with the Junto Lords in order to secure his release. Henceforth he carried favour with the Queen. In 1709, he called his third son Anne in her honour, perhaps hoping to be recognised as her heir. After 1710, he threw in his lot with the Tories, and in autumn 1712 was named ambassador to France. He died in a duel before taking up his position: Rosalind K. Marshall, 'Hamilton, James, fourth duke of Hamilton and first duke of Brandon (1658–1712)' *Oxford DNB* [accessed 8 Mar. 2016]

³ *L.J.*, 18, pp. 504-6. It was the Queen's sole veto of her Reign, and the last Royal veto of home-countries legislation. Royal vetoes continued to be used in British Colonies.

⁴ Gentleman in South-Brittain. *An account of the late Scotch invasion* (London, 1709).

⁵ *L.J.*, 18, pp. 504-6.

⁶ John Thompson was an inveterate and intemperate critic of the ministry. A convert to Toryism in 1704 he had proposed inviting the Electress Sophia to England, in 1705, opposed an 'incorporating' Union in 1707. Had he not died in Nov. 1710, he might have earned a significant place in the Harley-Bolingbroke Ministry.

Britain's readiness, but his timing was off, for by February 1709 the ministry had a new and more competent composition, with the admission of leading Junto Whigs.

Oudenarde, in July 1708, had been another of Marlborough's comprehensive victories, putting to flight the French armies under the joint and quarrelsome command of Maréchal Vendome and Louis's grandson, the Duke of Burgundy.⁷ Much allied consternation was caused when Vendome and Burgundy claimed they had performed a strategic retreat, rather than been saved from a rout, by the fall of night. After the battle, Marlborough and Eugene crossed the French frontier and had begun the siege of the strategic fortress of Lille as the thanksgiving was taking place in London. The prospect of a full-scale invasion of Northern France beckoned.

To France's east, a rough stalemate set in and no significant action took place on the Rhine in 1708. Austria concentrated on putting down the Hungarian rebellion and occupying Spanish-Habsburg territories in Italy, specifically Naples following the convention of Turin⁸ which ended the conflict in Northern Italy. France redirected its forces from Savoy to Spain. Berwick and Orleans had defeated the allies at Almanza in April 1707, occupied Valencia and were encroaching on Aragon. In the late summer, the allies failed in an effort to invest the French Mediterranean fleet's home port at Toulon, but England did capture Sardinia and the strategically important port of Port Mahon in Minorca, which afforded the British fleet a usable year-round base in the Mediterranean.⁹

In the political arena, the rise of the Whigs continued. In December 1707, Somers and Wharton were instrumental in carrying a motion in the Lords which asserted: "That no Peace can be honourable or safe, for Her Majesty and Her Allies, if Spain ... be suffered to continue in the Power of the House of Bourbon."¹⁰ Such Tory opposition as the policy provoked at the time focused on the tactics rather than the strategy of support for Habsburg as opposed to Bourbon hegemony in Spain. However, as the war

⁷ Burgundy's death in 1712, of smallpox, along with that of his father the Dauphin, would be cited in 1713 Thanksgiving sermons as a providential strike against Louis, impelling him towards peace (see below, p.204).

⁸Essentially a local non-aggression pact signed in Sept. 1706, between Austrian and French forces. Louis ceded territories occupied in Northern Italy, and in return was allowed to withdraw the 20,000 French troops who had been marooned behind the Savoyard lines. The Anglo-Dutch viewed this as an act of breath-taking self-interest by the Emperor Joseph, allowing Imperial troops to invade Italy, capturing Spanish Habsburg possessions, and allowing Louis to reinforce his forces in Spain contributing to the devastating defeat of forces loyal to Joseph's brother, Charles. It represented a particularly poor return for the Anglo-Dutch powers financing of the Imperial efforts in Spain, and Savoy: J.A. Lynn, *The Wars of Louis XIV, 1667-1714* (London, 1999) p. 257.

⁹ A.D. Francis, *The First Peninsular War 1702-1713* (London, 1975), pp. 243-65. A useful reconsideration of the Toulon descent is given by Ciro Paoletti, 'Prince Eugene of Savoy, the Toulon Expedition of 1707 and the English Historians: A Dissenting View', *Journal of Military History*, lxx (2006) pp. 939-62.

¹⁰ *L.J.*, 18, pp. 394-6.

progressed, this policy was to prove burdensome to the nation, and would eventually break the executive power of the Whigs.

At the elections of May 1708, the reaction to the Jacobite menace both tarnished the Tories and helped the Whigs win seats. The new House, insofar as the English and Welsh constituencies were concerned, comprised 268 Whigs and 225 Tories, with a further twenty MPs unclassified (the Scottish contingent was dominated by twenty-eight MPs who might be labelled as ministerial supporters).¹¹ The Whig Junto's expectations of influence and office caused problems for Godolphin's relationship with the Queen, who, as ever, was determined: "neither [to] be in the hands of the Whigs nor the Tories."¹² Godolphin had persuaded a reluctant Queen to appoint the volatile and indiscreet Earl of Sunderland to the ministry in December 1706; the Junto had demanded the further elevation of Whig-inclined clergymen as bishoprics became available. In January 1706, Godolphin, with a certain amount of subterfuge – which infuriated the Whigs – fulfilled a long-term commitment by having the Tory Trelawny¹³ translated from Exeter to the more lucrative see of Winchester, and in June Anne elevated William Fleetwood, a noted Whig cleric and a personal favourite of hers, to the see of St Asaph.¹⁴ Anne was particularly incensed when the Junto, on pain of voting against the ministry, pressured Godolphin and Tenison to propose Whigs Charles Trimmell and Samuel Freeman for the vacant sees of Exeter and Chester, as well as the deanery of Peterborough for White Kennett.¹⁵ Anne stubbornly insisted on elevating candidates of a more Tory hue. However, the pressure which Anne felt through Godolphin, led her to doubt the Treasurer and listen to the intrigues of Robert Harley, who proposed a method by which she could govern without the influence of the Junto Whigs, but rather draw together a 'moderate scheme' of parliamentary support. Though the row over ecclesiastical appointments was resolved by assigning some candidates favoured by each political side, by the New Year the political crisis had grown to the point where Godolphin, backed by Marlborough, forced the Queen to choose between her main counsellors, leading to Harley's resignation in February 1708. However, it was a close-run thing. Anne's confidence in Godolphin was undermined, and in July she went so far as to receive Lord Haversham, the

¹¹H.O.P. 1690-1715, i, pp. 225-27.

¹² Thomas Sharp, *Life of John Sharp, Archbishop of York* (2 vols, London 1825) i, p. 323.

¹³ Sir Jonathan Trelawny had given the triumphal 1702 Thanksgiving sermon in St Paul's. One of the seven bishops who opposed James, Trelawny was a Royalist, Tory and was a patron of Atterbury during the Convocation controversies. During Anne's reign, Trelawny was prepared to accommodate the increasingly Whig ministry and this resulted in his translation to the enormously lucrative see of Winchester: Andrew M. Coleby, 'Trelawny, Sir Jonathan, third baronet (1650–1721)' *Oxford DNB* [accessed 28 June 2016].

¹⁴ Fleetwood published a Whiggish thanksgiving sermon in 1704, and did so again in 1708.

¹⁵ G.V. Bennett, 'Robert Harley, the Godolphin Ministry, and the Bishoprics Crisis of 1707', *E.H.R.*, lxxxii (1967), pp. 726-46.

ministry's perpetual critic, at Windsor.¹⁶ Only the backing of the indispensable Marlborough¹⁷ preserved Godolphin's white staff.

On 19 August, the Queen processed to the thanksgiving service in St Paul's in the usual manner, Luttrell noting that: "[i]n the coach with the queen were the Duchess of Marlborough and the Countesse [sic] of Burlington,¹⁸ the prince not there, being unable to endure the fatigue."¹⁹ The crowds of people which followed Her Majesty's carriage on its return to St James's were: "so great that it could scarcely move."²⁰ Unobserved by the public, in the Queen's carriage the relationship between the Queen and the Duchess of Marlborough reached its nadir. As the Queen's Groom of the Stole, the Duchess was responsible for the Queen's clothing. Anne had decided against wearing the heavy jewels laid out for her and the Duchess interpreted this as a slight; an argument then ensued *en route* to St Paul's. On leaving the coach, the Duchess went so far as to tell the Queen to be quiet.²¹ Relations between the two never recovered, which was a further complicating factor in the relations between the ministry and the Queen.

The pageantry of the procession to St Paul's demonstrated a career in the ascendant: Viscount Townshend led the Yeomen of the Guard in procession to St Paul's and perhaps the most incongruous participant was the Duke of Hamilton, who four months previously had been arrested on suspicion of treason,²² and, as Captain of the Guards, brought up the rear of the coach procession through Westminster and London. Within the cathedral, protocol, having accommodated the Scottish Lord Seafield the previous year reverted to the usual retainers, with Charles II's natural sons again well represented – the Duke of Northumberland bore the Sword of State and the Duke of St Albans brought up the rear of the procession within the cathedral.

Ten published sermons exist for the August 1708 Thanksgiving: seven from Anglican clergymen, two from Dissenting ministers and the tenth from Jean Armand Dubourdieu, who delivered what was, for him, an unusually temperate sermon to his Huguenot congregation at the Savoy. The Anglican preachers

¹⁶ H.L. Snyder, ed., *The Marlborough-Godolphin Correspondence* (3 vols, Oxford, 1975) ii, pp. 1034-5.

¹⁷ As an example of his continued influence, Marlborough's chaplain and biographer, Francis Hare, had been appointed by the Queen to a canon-residentiary at St Pauls Cathedral, and became a royal chaplain in Jul. 1707: Alexander Pettit, 'Hare, Francis (1671–1740)' *Oxford D.N.B.* [accessed 8 Mar. 2016].

¹⁸ Juliana Noel Boyle, widow of Charles Boyle, 3rd Earl of Cork. She held the office of Mistress of the Robes to Queen Anne: Cokayne, *The Complete Peerage*, ii, p. 432.

¹⁹ Narcissus Luttrell, *A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs* (6 vols, Oxford, 1857)vi, p. 340.

²⁰ L'Hermitage to the States-General, 20/31 Aug. 1708, quoted in Gregg, *Queen Anne*, p. 277.

²¹ This paragraph, reconstructed from correspondence between the Queen and Duchess, is taken from Gregg, *Queen Anne*, pp. 276-8.

²² For Hamilton's machinations with Sunderland, the Junto and the Ministry in 1708, see P.W.J. Riley, *The English Ministers and Scotland 1707-1727* (London, 1964) pp. 99-110.

were Thomas Manningham, who had also published a thanksgiving sermon for the Scottish union;²³ Michael Stanhope at the Chapel Royal; Henry Stephens, fellow of Merton College included an obsequious dedication to Marlborough; Richard Coleire, rector of Harrietsham in Kent, an acquaintance of Swift;²⁴ William Fleetwood, Bishop of St Asaph; Thomas Knaggs,²⁵ who had published a sermon for the Ramillies Thanksgiving; and John Hoadly, chaplain to Bishop Burnet²⁶ and younger brother of Benjamin Hoadly, initiator of the Bangorian Controversy.²⁷

The two Dissenting sermons were by two Presbyterian ministers, Thomas Colton in York, who had published a sermon for the December 1706 Thanksgiving, and Josiah Woodcock of Oxford. Oxford might be expected to be stony soil for a non-conformist minister but even the curmudgeonly non-juror Thomas Hearne noted that Josiah Woodcock was so well respected that two Anglican clergymen risked reproach by attending his funeral in All Saints Church in July 1709.²⁸

The sermon at St Paul's was given by the recently elevated Bishop of St Asaph, William Fleetwood. Fleetwood was a former chaplain to William and Mary and had gained a reputation as a

²³ Manningham was one of Her Majesty's Chaplains, and would be made bishop of Chichester in 1709, thereafter voting reliably Tory. The sermon quoted in this chapter was actually given on 11 Jul. 1708, the first Sunday after the news of the victory reached London, and not on the actual Thanksgiving Day. However, it has been included as it was delivered before the Queen at Windsor, and is titled as a celebration of 'the late great victory'. Manningham would be chosen to preach before the Queen at the Feb. 1709 Thanksgiving ceremony. He has been described as 'severe with Dissenters' during his tenure as bishop of Chichester: Jeffrey S. Chamberlain, "A regular and well-affected" diocese: Chichester in the eighteenth century', in Jeremy Gregory and Chamberlain eds, *The National Church in Local Perspective: the Church of England and the Regions, 1660-1800* (Woodbridge, 2003) p. 77.

²⁴ Coleire may have been the inspiration for *Gulliver's Travels*. He had taken plurality to a new level. Between 1706 and 1713, he was listed as chaplain of at least five different ships, all the while having been rector in Harrietsham since 1702. In 1706, his ship, the *Medway*, left Portugal without him and he was forced to make his way back to England by various means. Swift spent six weeks with Coleire in autumn 1708. See Michael Treadwell, 'Swift, Richard Coleire, and the Origins of *Gulliver's Travels*', *Review of English Studies*, xxxiv (1983) pp. 304-11.

²⁵ Knaggs had been chaplain to Monmouth's confidant Ford, Lord Grey. In 1697 "he had left All-Hallows [Newcastle], following an argument with Dr. Atherton, a strong passive obedience man, got himself many potent enemies and removed to the rectory of St Giles, in London.": William Hylton Dyer Longstaffe, ed., *Memoirs of the Life of Mr. Ambrose Barnes, Late Merchant and Sometime Alderman of Newcastle upon Tyne* (London, 1867) p. 447.

²⁶ John Hoadly became Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of Ireland, with Robert Walpole's help, in the reign of George I. His 1708 sermon proved no embarrassment to his bishop, in marked contrast to that of Canon Richard Eyre, whose 1713 Thanksgiving sermon at Serum was judged by White Kennett to have: "run down the Bishop of the Church wherein he preached." (see below, p.212 212).

²⁷ In 1717 Benjamin Hoadly, then the Low-Church bishop of Bangor, preached his sermon '*The nature of the Kingdom, or church, of Christ*' before the King. It denied the spiritual authority of the church, and was a call for a further reformation. The sermon provoked outrage within the Church of England, resulting in over 200 publications. The struggle that followed was bitter, which led the King to suspend Convocation in 1717. It did not reconvene until 1852.

²⁸ C.E. Doble, ed., *Remarks and Collections of Thomas Hearne* (8 vols, London 1885) ii, p. 217. Colton was reported to have been ordained in the Presbyterian manner, at York in 1692, having previously studied medicine in Holland, and acted as chaplain to Sir William Ayscough: Joseph Hunter, *The Rise of the Old Dissent, Exemplified in the Life of Oliver Heywood* (London, 1842) pp. 377-8.

vigorous preacher among the powerful in London. He had been named as Canon of Windsor shortly before William's death. Tory opponents tried to block his nomination, but in 1702 Queen Anne confirmed his appointment.²⁹ Fleetwood's tone was subdued for one considering: "the many and great Favours we continually receive at God's hands." His sermon began with a warning against complacency: "The Year, the People think, is quite lost that does not bring the Queen to this Place, to render her Thanks to God for some great Victory." Nonetheless, he praised the Queen and Marlborough: "Her most Valiant Wise and Fortunate Commander, crowned with Fresh Laurels every other Year." Indeed, the Oudenarde Thanksgiving was only the third of Queen Anne's thanksgivings where the preachers felt no need to disparage envy of, or murmurings about, Marlborough. He was: "worthy of his Great Mistress's Honour by his Faithfulness and Britain's unalterable Veneration by [his] noblest Actions and most Signal Successes,"³⁰ possessed of a: "True Love of your Country, a Loyal Regard for the Honour of the Best of Queens, and a Generous Concern for the Happiness of Europe,"³¹ and, "a modesty equal to his Valour."³² In St Paul's, William Fleetwood noted that Marlborough was a commander whom the troops "love to follow."³³ Josiah Woodcock, felt that: "Victory seems to have made him its prime Favourite."³⁴

By protesting too much, Fleetwood displayed unease in relation to the Pretender.³⁵ He disparaged the invasion attempt as: "so soon and easily defeated, that it hardly gave us anytime to apprehend any Danger from it ... it seems to have derserv'd the general Scorn it was receiv'd withal." Nonetheless, he evinced a realisation of an enemy within: "as profess themselves Reformed, and live among us, as our Friends, [who nonetheless] ... invite, encourage, and abet these Enemies of God, our Queen, and Government, our Laws and Religion." He was unnerved that this fifth column: "should tamely ... surrender all these Blessings and Advantages, in Exchange for a detested Superstition, Poverty and Chains, under the Rule of One, whom they neither love, nor fear, nor know." Other preachers were keener to disparage the Pretender personally. In rural Kent, Richard Coleire found that the Queen's: "suppositious Rival, of Uncertain Birth, Foreign Education, Popish Principles," had launched an "impious Enterprise against the Lord's Anointed that God's Hand was Conspicuous in Turning it into Foolishness!"³⁶ At St Mary's Oxford, Henry Stephens also deprecated the Pretender: "we may defend our

²⁹ Fleetwood, then rector at St Austin's, had published a thanksgiving sermon for Blenheim, Stuart Handley, 'Fleetwood, William (1656–1723)' *Oxford D.N.B.* [accessed 8 Mar. 2016].

³⁰ Stanhope, 1708, p. 12.

³¹ Stephens, 1708, Dedication p. 1.

³² Manningham, 1708, p. 7.

³³ Fleetwood, 1708, p. 18.

³⁴ Woodcock, 1708, pp. 21-2.

³⁵ And compared him unfavourably with George Augustus, the future George II, both of whom fought at Oudenarde in July. Of the two, James Francis Edward had arguably demonstrated more noble ardour and adventurous courage that year.

³⁶ Coleire, 1708, p. 22.

Liberties from Slavery, our worship from Idolatry, and no vain Pretender may dream of shaking the Throne, or disturb and endanger the Protestant Succession.”³⁷

In York, the Dissenting minister Thomas Colton was geographically and literally closer to the truth, in giving a clear assessment of the year’s double deliverance. The country was saved: “not only from an Enemy Without, but from a worse within.” He acknowledged France’s cold logic; they “design’d an invasion on the North Part of Great Britain, which was remote from whichever Army we had to repel them ... They knew the heats and animosities had formerly been between those once two Nations.” In striking contrast to the Earl of Leven’s pleas for specie, Colton and his flock had been mesmerised by the fortune England had sent to Edinburgh and surmised that the enemy had attempted to invade: “where the Equivalent money was lodg’d, which might easily have been seized had they landed.” He lamented that: “[t]he Invaders would have found too many Friends amongst us and we too many treacherous Hearts.”³⁸

The question of divisions within, and the dangers they might pose, proved common among the preachers of 1708. But the way they addressed the question was indicative of the range of opinions brought before their congregations and readers. In London, Thomas Knaggs made no overt mention of the Pretender’s attempt, but did warn that: “Our Divisions lay us open, and give our Enemies the Advantage against us ... A tempest within will raise one without.” He alluded to: “some among us of so unhappy a temper, as to forfeit the Advantage of the late Great Victory” and urged unity and the Queen’s example: “the Nursing Mother of the Church has proposed Unity as the best way to support it,” and: “lay aside all unpeaceable disputes and animosities among ourselves.”³⁹

Insofar as the reality that the invasion scare had brought a renewed understanding of the perils of discord, the preachers were unable to bridge the divisions within Protestantism. Michael Stanhope was as clear about the danger of division as he was unable to avoid blaming Dissenters for it:

‘tis a sad thing that Professors of the same Faith, should destroy one another by an unreasonable separation ... this mistake Distempers Government, exasperates the people, and offends our God ... Nevertheless, I can’t but think the and honestly declare, that the Dissenters are the cause of our differences in Religion, and do things contrary to the Doctrine they have learnt.⁴⁰

³⁷ Stephens, 1708, p. 10.

³⁸ Colton, 1708 pp 8, 13.

³⁹ Knaggs, 1708, pp. 15, 14, 16.

⁴⁰ Stanhope, 1708, p. 14. Stanhope’s sermon is moderate in tone, but his overall viewpoint is further emphasised in his 1710 published sermon entitled *The sinfulness of separation from the established Church of England* (London, 1710).

Thomas Knaggs, so vehement to continue the war, and visceral in his condemnation of “[t]hose Barbarities, Poysonings, Treacheries, Massacres and Persecutions, which are so proper to Popery,” demonstrated both flexibility and the moral superiority which Dissenters found irritating:⁴¹

‘Tis a great Misfortune that any among us who call themselves Protestants should Dissent from Her. But all Men have not the like Apprehensions. None of us are infallible. Two good men may differ in the way to Heaven, and yet both meet there at last ... As for particular Sects who are deluded with the Enthusiasm, take their idle fancies for Gospel, and trust to Spurious Revelations which they falsely father upon the Spirit of God, we have great reason to pray that they may be convinced and that they may come into the right way in which our Church teacheth her communion to walk.⁴²

The language would seem to be suggestive of a greater acceptance of disagreement in less fundamental matters which, combined with a rather scathing dismissal of ‘enthusiasm,’ could seem indicative of a latitudinarian position. The Dissenter Josiah Woodcock demonstrated yet a third direction from which the pastors could talk past one another, by wondering if any divisions actually existed. Starting from the premise that: “Unity and Uniformity are two very widely different things,” he went on to mingle the Established Church’s divided attitude to the Kirk with the divisions among English Protestants:

Some have seem’d to be afraid, that two different Religions would hinder that good Effect and Success of the Union ... but God forbid that our two Religions, if they are really two different ones, should subject us to the dreadful Calamities in the Civil State.⁴³

Jean Dubourdieu’s sermon at the Savoy was more restrained than his outpouring the previous year in his thanksgiving sermon for the union. Nonetheless, he was convinced that Louis was shattered: “the ways of Providence ... Previously always victorious; today almost always defeated: He fails in all his plans.” Anne was “the person whom God has pleased to Honour.” Marlborough was brave and skillful, but above all humble in the face of providence: “as long as God distinguished him from all others with these blessings, he distinguishes himself by his piety.”

With the knowledge of a native, Dubourdieu gave the most detailed description of the battle of all the published sermons: “on the same day, with eighty thousand combatants marching five leagues, crossing two rivers, beating the enemy: Scarcely upon being informed of our movements, Vendome surprised ... bewildered, trembling, fled.” He mocked the Duke of Burgundy, who: “by his flight, gives public proof of respect for the Genius of our generals.” Dubourdieu called on Louis to: “Bring yourself to the Place des Victoires ... There in the centre of your Capital ... Full of a salutary repentance, Remind

⁴¹ See Appendix 1.

⁴² Knaggs, 1708, pp. 14, 16.

⁴³ Woodcock, 1708, pp. 18, 19.

yourself that these trophies are a loose flattery erected to your vanity. Delete with your own hand these impious titles, that these sumptuous inscriptions.”

Dubourdieu was politely silent on the Pretender’s attempt and on Britain’s internal divisions. He ended with a prediction that this latest in a series of victories – Blenheim, Turin, Ramillies and now Oudenarde – would: “re-establish the Peace of Nations and raise the Protestant Religion, from the ruins of lies and idolatry.”⁴⁴

Tories especially were keen to contrast the virtues of the Queen: “whose shining, but unaffected Piety, hath engaged Heaven to Fight her Battels [sic]”⁴⁵ with both her “suppositious Rival”⁴⁶ and “Insidious, formidable Enemy,”⁴⁷ who would have “bow’d our necks to the French, Popish, Tyrannical Yoke.” It is perhaps telling that Michael Stanhope drew a conclusion which prioritised loyalty and obedience: “Let us express our esteem for Her Majesty ... by Obedience and Gratitude ... demonstrate that Loyalty is one of the Favourite Principles of our Religion.”⁴⁸ It may be indicative of John Hoadly’s more Whiggish alignment (his association with Burnet saw him ascend through the ranks in the diocese of Salisbury) that he found a contrasting way of praising Her Majesty: “Who feels the happiness of Governing a Free People, and will never teach or tempt them to Violate that Conscience.”⁴⁹ In Oxford, the Presbyterian Josiah Woodcock praised her predecessor for redeeming “us from the Hand of the Enemy” and found: “Under Her Government, Religion, Liberty and Property and whatsoever is most dear to us, find Protection and Countenance.”⁵⁰

For Richard Coleire, Louis had undermined kingship itself, he contrasted Anne’s “royal Pattern of all Imitable Virtue” with the faithlessness of Louis, who brought shame not only to France but to kingship: “when promises and Leagues are only made by Kings to delude their Neighbours ‘till they can plausibly break them; the Wars which are stir’d up by this Impious Conduct give an incurable Wound to their Royal Probity.”⁵¹ Stanhope praised the Queen’s modesty which “will take the least Encomium as Flattery ... She is not fond of Her own Glory.”⁵² John Hoadly condemned the “scourge of Europe” and,

⁴⁴ Dubourdieu, 1708, pp. 27, 31,33,34,35.

⁴⁵ Stanhope, 1708, p. 11.

⁴⁶ Coleire, 1708, p. 22.

⁴⁷ Stephens, 1708, p. 14.

⁴⁸ Stanhope, 1708, pp. 12, 13.

⁴⁹ Hoadly, 1708, p. 13.

⁵⁰ Woodcock, 1708, p. 15.

⁵¹ Coleire, 1708, p. 13.

⁵² Stanhope, 1708, p. 11.

presumably referring to the iconic statue in Place des Victoires, disdainfully noted that he had “assumed the Titles of Invincible and Immortal to himself.”⁵³

Some clerics yearned for the conclusion of the war – Richard Coleire saw in the year’s favours, God’s plan that: “will enable Her to perform the work which He has given Her to do and make her the Restorer of Peace, the Preserver of Nations.”⁵⁴ Conversely, Thomas Knaggs borrowed from the proclamation that the war was just and necessary, and extrapolated that the enemy was unjust, bloody, and resilient, and, despite the reverses would: “endeavour to Revenge his Defeat, Engage himself still in Blood and Rapine, aim at the Subversion of our Selves, attempt again our lives, Liberties and Religion, our Church and State.”⁵⁵ Knaggs maintained an internationalist view of the aim of this just war, stopping just short of interfering in the internal affairs of France: “to reduce an Exorbitant Power, to curb an unbounded Ambition, and we Fight only to secure our Country, and help other States and Princes from being destroy’d by a furious Foe.”

The balance between the rigorous pursuit of the war and the potential of an imminent peace would become more apparent in the years ahead. Perhaps already feeling the contradiction between a resurgence of the martial spirit and the weariness of continued struggle, Thomas Manningham, preaching in Windsor before the Queen, trod a fine line. Making strenuous efforts to avoid being seen to interfere in affairs of State – “War belongs to the Civil Rights of Empire, which Christianity does not meddle with” – he nonetheless proceeded to set some limits: “But then again, our Christianity obliges us to make War no longer than the Necessity lies upon us, and to bring that War we are justly engaged in to as speedy an End and as happy a Conclusion as may be.”

Upon publication, Manningham’s sermon marked the first explicit expression before the Queen of a view that the war was won, a view which, we have seen, had been building in the two years since Ramillies.⁵⁶ Later in the sermon, perhaps to compensate for accusations of undue pacifism, he goes beyond the limits which any Anglican, had set on peace terms, save Burnet in St Paul’s. He defined:

an Honourable Peace, in which we hope, the poor suffering Party of the French Protestants may be so far considered, as to be restored to their own Country, and to their Ancient Rights; that they, and their

⁵³ Hoadly, 1708, p. 12. For the Statue see above p. 85.

⁵⁴ Coleire, 1708, p. 24.

⁵⁵ Knaggs, 1708, pp. 11, 14.

⁵⁶ Peter McCullough attributes great power to the setting of sermons, arguing that preachers had more liberty to exhort or admonish the monarch in the relative privacy of the royal chapels than in the more public arenas...where the monarch was visible to the audience throughout the sermon. McCullough focussed mainly on Elizabethan and Jacobean sermons, and I believe the routine publication of sermons in Anne’s time weakens this argument for the reign in question; nonetheless, it has some resonance in this case: Peter McCullough, *Sermons at Court: Politics and Religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean Preaching* (Cambridge, 1998) pp. 155-63.

Religion, may be established upon a firmer Foundation, than the treacherous Edict of Ambitious and Designing Princes.⁵⁷

In St Paul's, Fleetwood ended his muted sermon with an excoriation of society's manners and morals:

the most important Truths of Christianity are attacked with insolence and great Rudeness, Infidelity and Breaches of Matrimonial Contact were less regarded, life is one continued Revel, intemperate Gaming occupied indolent and Party Strife the public men.⁵⁸

In this he echoed his Queen who had, that week, issued another proclamation for the encouragement of piety and the punishing of vice, profaneness and immorality.⁵⁹ Three other preachers mentioned this theme. In Oxford, Henry Stephens spoke obliquely: "We have not made suitable returns for so signal Blessings, our National Repentance has been imperfect, our acknowledgements unsincere."⁶⁰ In London, Michael Stanhope urged: "Riot and Excess don't become a Day of Thanksgivings ... We are I confess, permitted more freely to enjoy ourselves upon such occasions, but yet that allowance is given us not to lose our senses, but to innocently please 'em."⁶¹

Thomas Knaggs more directly insisted that: "When those abominable Sins of Cursing, Swearing and other grievous and heinous Crimes, which defile our Land are purg'd forth, then may we expect God will still be for us."⁶² After the ceremony at St Paul's, the unchastened London public celebrated the evening with "bonfires, Illuminations, Ringing of bells and all other Demonstrations of Loyalty and Affections to Her Majesty's person and Government, and of publick Joy upon so Glorious and Happy an Occasion."⁶³

The thanksgiving for the double deliverances in 1708 prompted the second fewest number of published sermons – ten – for all the thanksgivings of the reign. For the first time in the proclamation for the thanksgiving described the war as 'just and necessary'; formerly the war was described as 'just.' It seems likely that 'necessary' was added to reflect the renewed invasion threat. In marked contrast to the

⁵⁷ Manningham, 1708, pp. 5, 8.

⁵⁸ Fleetwood, 1708, p. 23.

⁵⁹ *By the Queen, a proclamation, for the encouragement of piety and virtue, and for the preventing and punishing vice, profaneness, and immorality.* (London, 1708) [Issued on 18 Aug. 1708].

⁶⁰ Stephens, 1708, p. 2.

⁶¹ Stanhope, 1708, p. 15.

⁶² Knaggs, 1708, p. 12.

⁶³ Abel Boyer, *The History of the Reign of Queen Anne, Digested Into Annals, Year the Ninth* (London, 1711) p. 243.

sermons to date, not one sermon praises the Queen's wise counsellors. The silence may have reflected a view that the ministry, shaken by the Pretender's attempt and weakened both by the departure of Harley⁶⁴ and the arrival of Sunderland, was not the potent, united force it seemed in the years of Ramillies and the union.

The bulk of the thanksgiving sermons were noticeably stronger than in previous years in support of the righteousness of the war and disparagement of the Pretender. Even clergymen who inclined to a limited war and a deprecation of Dissenters made sure to underline their loyalty. Richard Coleire referred to the Queen's "suppositious Rival, of Uncertain Birth, Foreign Education, Popish Principles."⁶⁵ Divisions persisted, nonetheless, with William Fleetwood and Thomas Knaggs, as well as the Dissenters Thomas Colton and Josiah Woodcock going further than an attack the Pretender, to invoke fears of the political Jacobite enemy within, whereas Michael Stanhope and Henry Stephens focused on sectarian divisions. A minority of sermons displayed a weariness with the war. Stephens lamented: "this dreadful and expensive War," and significantly, Manningham's sermon to the Queen was explicit in its view that Britain must: "make War no longer than the Necessity lies upon us." However, the majority opinion was still in favour of pursuing the war and Fleetwood, Knaggs, Hoadly, Dubourdieu and both Dissenters saw only the need to continue the fight, the year's victories having renewed their conviction that providence was on Britain's side. Nonetheless, the division in relation to the war would become more pronounced in the years ahead.

⁶⁴ Bennett, 'Robert Harley, the Godolphin Ministry, and the Bishops Crisis', pp. 728-729.

⁶⁵ Coleire, 1708, p. 22.

February 1709: “Never had we so fair a prospect of bringing this War to an honourable and Speedy Conclusion, as at this Time”⁶⁶

The winter of 1708 marked the zenith of English, and allied, military confidence. In December, the fortress of Lille fell, which brought about the hasty re-surrender of the towns of Ghent and Bruges⁶⁷ and a French withdrawal from an attempt to besiege Brussels. Lille, heavily fortified by Vauban, had been thought impregnable. Marlborough, aided by clement weather, had maintained the siege into December far beyond the normal campaigning season and had conjured logistical marvels to keep his forces provisioned despite French flooding low-lying areas near Ostend and harassment from Ghent and Bruges behind his lines.⁶⁸ The fall of Lille marked the advance of the war into Picardy. The “taking Lisle [sic] is cutting a Nerve in the Body Politick, one of the largest and most useful Nerves, from whence his greatest Armies received their Nourishment, from when his Flanders forces were always paid.”⁶⁹ Nonetheless, allied casualties were high. In 1713, the Tory-leaning Canon Richard Eyre retrospectively identified the “[m]any Sieges, that have cost us more Blood, than the greatest Battles,”⁷⁰ as the final straw in popular support for the war.

The unseasonably mild autumn gave way to harsh frosts in January 1709, which lasted three months and were among the most severe in European history, bringing a financially precarious France to the brink of famine. While France assembled an army under Vendome’s successor, Villars, to retake Lille, in March Louis revived the informal peace proposals made in 1706.⁷¹ As may have been Louis’s intent, the prospect of peace proved divisive. The Dutch desire to occupy a barrier of fortresses in the Spanish Netherlands was viewed with apprehension by the Habsburgs; potential Dutch hegemony in the Netherlands threatened trade competition with England, and any negotiations implied some compromise about the crown of Spain, as the Bourbon forces held the upper hand there. In particular, the Austrian

⁶⁶ Marston, Feb. 1709, p. 16.

⁶⁷ Ghent and Bruges surrendered to Marlborough’s forces in the aftermath of Ramillies in Jun. 1706. In Jul. 1708, amid popular discontent with allied occupation, they surrendered themselves to French forces, only to recapitulate to Marlborough in Dec. 1708 following the fall of Lille.

⁶⁸ General Webb fought off French forces at one important skirmish, which occurred at Wijendael in September. In initial dispatches Marlborough mistakenly attributed credit to General Cadogan. In Parliament, later in the year, Tories accused Marlborough of favouring Cadogan – a Whig – rather than Tory generals.

⁶⁹ Hare, 1708, p. 8.

⁷⁰ Eyre, 1713, p. 14. Eyre’s political orientation was described by the Whiggish White Kennett description of the sermon as “condemning the War, arrainging the General and running down the Bishop of the Church wherein he preached” (see below, p. Richard Eyre).

⁷¹ Through Herman Van Petkum, an envoy of the Duke of Holstein-Gottorp: Geikie and Montgomery, *Dutch Barrier*, pp. 99-106. For Van Petkum, Frey and Frey, *The Treaties of the War of Spanish Succession*, p. 342.

Habsburgs feared that a settlement might involve a restoration of Spain to Charles with Philip being compensated with Italian Habsburg territory.⁷²

In the event, the Dutch resisted Louis's blandishments and in early March the allies endorsed a draft set of articles of peace, actually a maximalist set of war aims, to be put to the French. These included French recognition of the legitimacy of the Protestant Succession in Britain; banishment of the Pretender from French dominions; the establishment of the agreed Dutch barrier of fortresses and a demand that Louis encourage and, if necessary, enforce the restoration of Habsburg rule in Spain. The House of Commons had appended the destruction of the fortified harbour of Dunkirk, to prevent French naval marauding in the future. To further bolster Dutch resolve, the British – through their new plenipotentiary, the ambitious but relatively inexperienced, Viscount Townshend⁷³ – entered talks which resulted in an Anglo-Dutch Barrier Treaty in October 1709. Its terms were generous to Dutch aspirations and thus alarmed the Habsburgs, who were already discommoded at having to cede the newly occupied island of Minorca to the British. Henceforth, Britain would have an all-year Mediterranean port.⁷⁴ The peace proposals, though ambitious, contained no demands concerning French or Palatine Protestants. Even a Whig-dominated ministry at the height of its powers did not see itself able to interfere in the plight of co-religionists in an enemy's home territory.

Austrian forces had followed their 1706 victory in Turin with an occupation of the northern Italian principalities, and a contested march through the Papal States to subdue the Spanish Habsburg forces in Naples. With Austrian boots on papal soil and no French assistance forthcoming, the Pope recognised the Habsburg Charles as King of Spain in October 1709. On the Hungarian front, the Austrian victory at Trentschin, in August 1707, marked the end of a policy of negotiation with the rebels and the resumption of military suppression in Hungary and Transylvania and concomitant threats of repression to Silesian Protestants.⁷⁵

In Spain, 1708 had been a year of consolidation and change. Britain had hoped that Austria would transfer Prince Eugene and sufficient manpower to Spain; however, in the end Guido, Count

⁷² Charles had been proclaimed King of Naples in Sept. 1707, following its defeat by Austrian Habsburg forces. Nonetheless, Emperor Joseph, Charles's brother, displayed a marked reluctance to exchange Italian territory for Spanish.

⁷³ Sent to aid Marlborough, who took almost no part in the negotiations. Any barrier which pleased the Dutch would come at the expense of Habsburg sovereignty in the Spanish Netherlands: Geikie and Montgomery, *Dutch Barrier*, pp. 13-32.

⁷⁴ Gibraltar was not ceded to the British until the Treaty of Utrecht. The agreement to cede Minorca to Britain, though initially secret, caused tension when it was revealed to the Dutch during 1709. The Dutch viewed the agreement as Britain taking advantage of the war to gain commercial advantage; the British ministry felt obliged to concede maximum Dutch demands for the Barrier Treaty as a consequence.

⁷⁵ Charles Ingrao, *In Quest and Crisis*, pp. 96-107, 148-150.

Starhemberg, with laurels from the campaigns in Southern Italy, was chosen and Austria haggled for the maritime powers to finance the Austrian military effort in Spain. General James Stanhope, soon to become a Whig icon of ‘deed and word,’⁷⁶ replaced the ageing Earl of Galway as commander of British forces.⁷⁷ In a sign of renewed political partisanship, Marlborough came under Tory criticism – primarily from Rochester and Bromley – for lack of assertiveness in Spain, and for favouring Whig commanders for posts in the army in Flanders.⁷⁸

For Queen Anne the winter of 1708 marked a personal nadir, for on 20 October Prince George, her spouse of twenty-five years, died after a series of respiratory illnesses. Even prior to her bereavement Anne led a solitary, debilitated existence. Sir John Clerk,⁷⁹ in two audiences in late 1707 and 1708, noted that she was afflicted by gout: “ill-dressed, blotted in her countenance, surrounded by plaisters, catapalsims, and dirty-like rags ... no court Attenders ever came near her.”⁸⁰ Queen Anne succumbed to continued Junto pressure and in November, Wharton and Somers were appointed Lord Lieutenant of Ireland and Lord President of the Council respectively. Anne’s bereavement and continued illness brought the issue of the succession into stark relief, reviving rumours of an invitation to the Hanoverians to set up court in England in order to be ready for the Queen’s death, potentially forming an alternative power structure, leading in January to a joint parliamentary address to the Queen: “not so far [to] indulge Your just Grief, as to decline the Thoughts of a Second Marriage.”⁸¹ While Anne had probably been made aware that this was a parliamentary tactic to forestall another invitation to Princess Sophia, her son or grandson,⁸² the advice to the newly widowed, childless survivor of fourteen pregnancies must have seemed presumptuous in the extreme. The Queen’s answer tersely addressed the kernel of the issue: “The Provision I have made for the Protestant Succession will always be a Proof how much I have at My Heart the future Happiness of the Kingdom ... The Subject of this Address is of such a Nature, that, I am persuaded, you do not expect a particular Answer.”⁸³

If the almost annual thanksgiving assemblies of the Queen, Lords and Commons at St Paul’s had represented the true glory of the sovereign,⁸⁴ the thanksgiving of February 1709 represented the dimming of that lustre. Whether through illness, alienation or aversion, the Queen held a thanksgiving service in

⁷⁶ See Thomas Bradbury 1710 Thanksgiving sermon p. 13 (below p. 193).

⁷⁷ A.D. Francis, *The First Peninsular War 1702-1713* (London, 1975), pp. 260-263.

⁷⁸ Of which the Webb-Cadogan contretemps was the most prominent example: Peter Wentworth to Lord Raby, 4 Jan. 1709, p. 69 in J.J. Cartwright, ed., *The Wentworth Papers, 1705-1739* (London, 1883). See above p. 149 n.68.

⁷⁹ Whose indefatigable efforts in the pro-Union cause are related following page 115 above.

⁸⁰ *Memoirs of the life of Sir John Clerk of Penicuik*, Scottish History Society (Edinburgh, 1892), XIII, pp. 62, 72.

⁸¹ *L.J.*, 18, pp. 619-21.

⁸² Gregg, *Queen Anne*, p. 285.

⁸³ *L.J.*, 18, pp. 622-24.

⁸⁴ Trelawny, 1702, p. 15.

the Chapel Royal in St James's Palace – with the sermon given by a moderate Tory,⁸⁵ Thomas Manningham (who would be elevated to the see of Chichester later that year), while Parliament held two separate services, the Lords were addressed by Charles Trimmell, newly elevated Whig Bishop of Norwich, at Westminster Abbey, the Commons by Marlborough's Chaplain-General, Francis Hare, in St Margaret's.

Manningham's sermon⁸⁶ noted that: "We are keeping the day of Thanksgiving in a Mourning Chapel ... Human Life, at the best, is but a sort of Chequer Work, and for the most part, the dark Colour abounds." Even the great victory at Lille, that "master-piece of war" was "slowly carried on" and the "War, tho' we have success in it, is so direful a Calamity."

In Westminster Abbey, Charles Trimmell struck a more effusive tone. Associated with a group of Whig senior churchmen and politicians,⁸⁷ Trimmell was described as: "[a] very good man whom even the Tories valued, though he preached terrible Whig sermons."⁸⁸ Trimmell counted out the blessings of providence: "every other year has been crowned with greater Blessings by far than we could ever expect."⁸⁹ Curiously omitting to mention the Queen's recently deceased husband, he lamented William "of Glorious Memory" and mourned his loss. Fortunately, God had facilitated Her Majesty and the increasingly Whiggish ministry in the: "Wise and Faithful Management of the Publick Supplies."

Francis Hare, presided at the Common's thanksgiving in St Margaret's, and those gathered there were treated to a thorough hagiography of Marlborough. Hare had been tutor to Marlborough's son, had participated in the Blenheim campaign, written the *Life and Glorious History of Marlborough* in 1705 and been appointed canon at St Paul's by the Queen in 1707. His sermon went into the detail of the recent Flanders campaign and thirsted for more: "Louis's kingdom and treasury were so exhausted," that "the very Continuance of the War, in all Probability, would sink him."⁹⁰ Hare praised not just the general but Her Majesty's ministry, "the faithful and able Management of the Revenue, and the happy Administration of Affairs in other branches."

The February 1709 Thanksgiving saw the publication of ten sermons, a number equal to the Oudenarde Thanksgiving. The number is inflated by the three separate official ceremonies that took place,

⁸⁵ Sykes, *Queen Anne and the Episcopate*, pp. 433-464.

⁸⁶ Manningham, Feb. 1709, pp. 3, 4.

⁸⁷ The group was headed by Archbishop Tenison, included Bishops William Nicolson and William Wake, Deans Francis Blackburne and White Kennett, and Archdeacon Edmund Gibson, closely associated were the Earl of Halifax, the Earl of Wharton, Lord Somers, and the 3rd Earl of Sunderland: W. M. Jacob, 'Trimmell, Charles (*bp.* 1663, *d.* 1723)' *Oxford D.N.B.* [accessed 7 Mar. 2016].

⁸⁸ S.H. Cassan, *The lives of the bishops of Winchester* (2 vols, London 1827) ii, p. 208.

⁸⁹ Trimmell, Feb. 1709, pp. 11, 12.

⁹⁰ Hare, Feb. 1709, pp. 26, 3, 25, 29.

before the Queen the Lords and the Commons, each of which produced an officially sanctioned publication. Josiah Woodward in Whitechapel foresaw Louis's complete overthrow; Deuel Pead, the blunt minister at Clerkenwell, gave a comprehensive *tour d'horizon* of the state of Europe, with particular disparagement for Pope Clement's support for the Pretender; William Marston,⁹¹ Vicar of Redbourn near St Albans, urged that the opportunity for peace be taken as soon as possible.

The Dissenter sermons⁹² come from prominent preachers: the Baptist Joseph Stennett; the pugnacious Presbyterian Daniel Mayo, pastor in Kingston-on-Thames, Surrey; George Conway, minister in Wokingham who gave a moderate sermon, and Simon Browne, minister in Portsmouth, would later submit to and document a complete mental collapse.⁹³

The preachers agreed that the length of the year's campaign, which had extended well beyond the usual foraging season, was divinely ordained to facilitate the allied campaign. Josiah Woodward surmised that: "God's providence was evident in a miraculous Serenity of the Season, for about Three Months together."⁹⁴ Charles Trimmell took a less detailed view: "No Place or Time, within the compass of a single Campaign, did ever afford more eminent Instances ... [of the] signal interpositions of the providence of God."⁹⁵ Daniel Mayo was explicit, about the unusual: "lengthening out the Season of Action."⁹⁶ In London, Joseph Stennett commented that: "war is an Appeal to God to give, by his Providence, a Decision of such Controversy's [sic] between Princes and States, as cannot be otherwise determined for want of sufficient Arbiters on Earth."⁹⁷ In Portsmouth, Simon Browne, setting a sombre tone which pervaded his sermon, sought to dampen any self-congratulation his congregation might be feeling. "God hath wise and good reasons for those Donations to a very wicked people." He warned that: "[God] may do great things to a Sinful nation for his names sake, tho' not for their sake."⁹⁸

The Pretender's invasion attempt had taken place eleven months previously, and most preachers took the opportunity to disparage it once more. William Marston emphasised that the attempt was an

⁹¹ Little is known about William Marston, M.A. He is listed in the frontispiece of the sermon as chaplain to His Grace the Duke of Marlborough. Marston was a common land-owning name in the St Albans area. John Gape, High-Tory MP for the borough, is described as being a brother-in-law of a William Marston. Gape, in common with the Tories, became decreasingly enamoured of Marlborough through the decade, so it is possible Marston's chaplaincy dates from the early period.

⁹² Three of the four dissenting ministers have *Oxford D.N.B.* entries.

⁹³ His writings and the testimony of fellow ministers give an early insight into mental illness: D.Berman, 'Simon Browne: the Soul-Murdered Theologian', *History of Psychiatry*, vii (1996), pp. 257-263.

⁹⁴ Woodward, Feb.1709, p. 16.

⁹⁵ Trimmell, 1709, p. 12.

⁹⁶ Mayo, 1709, p. 10.

⁹⁷ Stennett, Feb.1709, pp. 17, 16, 22. Stennett had stated the same belief in war being an appeal to providence before. In his 1704 Thanksgiving sermon, he used 'Nations' as the entity performing the appeal, in this thanksgiving he used the rather more politically neutral 'Princes and States.'

⁹⁸ Browne, Feb. 1709, p. 4, 6.

“unnatural enterprise ... attempted by some of Her Own Subjects, assisted by a French Power, supported and encouraged by the precarious Title of a spurious and Unjust Pretender.”⁹⁹ Addressing his noble peers, Bishop Trimnell perhaps ascribed too much malevolence to the twenty-year-old Chevalier¹⁰⁰ by claiming that had his attempt succeeded: “instead of a Nursing Mother have [would have] had a Furious Oppressor.”¹⁰¹ Deuel Pead, unvarnished as usual, noted that the Jacobites: “had numerous of Friends in Scotland ready to assist them,” before veering off into an extended excoriation of the Pope for: “his Approbation by a free Contribution of a vast sum of Money together with his benediction”¹⁰² to the invasion attempt. Conversely, Francis Hare was dismissive of the extent of the threat: “In truth all they did was little more than Noise or it was impossible they could succeed, without a great deal more Treachery than they could with any assurance hope for.”¹⁰³

The Dissenting ministers were also conscious of the threat. Daniel Mayo was more discourteous than dismissive; the French King was a pharaoh, who had insolently “proclaimed a Pretender, whose Father is unknown.” However, there were enemies within: “who repine whilst we rejoice at our Successes and have yet a hankering towards the Garlic and Onions of Egypt as some of the Murmuring and Infatuated Israelites had, when at the same time they despised Manna.”¹⁰⁴

Joseph Stennett was altogether more strategic, realising that the Scottish attempt could have resulted in the diversion “of a great part of the Confederate forces” to England’s northern border, which would have allowed the French to execute “their great projects in the Netherlands.” He was even more astute in recognising that the target had been public confidence as much as territory. He reminded his listeners of: “the Shock which was given to the Publick Credit on that occasion, ought to put us mind how much we owe to the Hand of God for frustrating the main Design of our enemy’s at that Time.”¹⁰⁵

The clerics’ topics ranged from societies need for reformation to exhortations on the observation of a certain decorum in the aftermath of the thanksgiving services. George Conway focused on the immediate:

⁹⁹ Marston, Feb. 1709, p. 15.

¹⁰⁰ James Francis Edward was known at the Chevalier de St George, among less dignified titles: Edward Gregg, ‘James Francis Edward (1688–1766)’, *Oxford D.N.B.* [accessed 7 Mar. 2016].

¹⁰¹ Trimnell, Feb 1709, p. 4.

¹⁰² Pead, 1709, p. 8.

¹⁰³ Hare, Feb. 1709, p. 14.

¹⁰⁴ Mayo, Feb 1709, p. 11.

¹⁰⁵ Joseph Stennett, Feb 1709, p. 21. On 20 Mar. 1708, in the midst of the invasion scare, the Commons had resolved to charge “anyone who reduces public credit” with a high crime and misdemeanour. For a more detailed view of the impact of Jacobite invasion scares on Public Credit, see John Wells and Douglas Wills, ‘Revolution, Restoration, and Debt Repudiation: The Jacobite Threat to England’s Institutions and Economic Growth’, *Journal of Economic History*, lx (2000), pp. 418-41.

Our returns of gratitude too frequently sink into Formality, our Days of Thanksgiving are commonly filled up with large Harrangues of our Policy, Strength and Riches; and uncommon liberty taken for Persons to indulge themselves in Intemperance; as if gratitude only consisted in a cheerful Air, and pleasant discourses about our Victories, and drinking briskly to the Successes (as they term it) of the next Campaign.¹⁰⁶

The Whig-leaning Josiah Woodward¹⁰⁷ saw the other side of the coin: “But if our Divisions will admit no Cure, and our Wickedness of no Reformation, we shall yet be a miserable people.”¹⁰⁸ The combative Dissenter, Daniel Mayo, delimited the extent of unity which could be realistically expected, “by mutual Forgiveness and Forbearance, in Charity and Humility” but not at all costs: “Not by indulging vain Hopes of what will never come to pass, that all men should have the same Sentiments and Opinions in Religious or Civil Matters.”¹⁰⁹ It was indicative of a conception of national civil and religious unity which did not require a setting aside of existing commitments. Unity within the Church of England was on Thomas Manningham’s mind, who, before the Queen, sought to draw a warning from what he considered “the fatal distinction of High and Low Church, or a Jealousy that some had too much zeal and some too little, [which] was the most effectual step to the utter ruin of the Reform’d in France.”¹¹⁰

Manningham mournfully summed up the human condition in a way that the bereaved, invalided monarch must have found apt: “we are made with such Dependencies, blended with such Infirmities.” He was particularly conscious of Her Majesties “exemplary Piety” which enabled her to “procure for us... Ease and Happiness.”¹¹¹ Similarly, William Marston praised: “Her exemplary Goodness, Her Steddy and Sincere piety, her Unpresidented Charity ... [which] hath engaged Heaven on our side.”¹¹²

For the Whig Charles Trimmell, the Queen’s accomplishments had, at last, outshone those of: “the late King of Glorious Memory ... by placing One on the Throne that has overcome many things which He found too difficult for Him;”¹¹³ Josiah Woodward was somewhat less convoluted, feeling that the Queen had pursued the policy of: “that Royal Pair, King William and Queen Mary of blessed Memory” before running on to a most radical war aim: “[she] has already triumphed over him [Louis] in such Victories as may be reasonably hoped to be ominous of total Overthrow.”¹¹⁴ Francis Hare exhibited a military

¹⁰⁶ Conway, Feb 1709, p. 13.

¹⁰⁷ Woodward defended the societies for the reformation of manners against Henry Sacheverell, and was attacked as a fellow traveller of dissent and occasional attender of conventicles. *Oxford DNB* [accessed 16 Mar. 2016]. His sermon disparaged Louis’s treatment of his subjects, praised William ‘of blessed memory’ and questioned ‘Divine Right’.

¹⁰⁸ Woodward, Feb 1709, p. 22.

¹⁰⁹ Mayo, Feb 1709, p. 22.

¹¹⁰ Manningham, Feb. 1709, p. 13.

¹¹¹ Manningham, Feb. 1709, pp. 3, 4, 5, 13.

¹¹² Marston, Feb. 1709, p. 16.

¹¹³ Trimmell, Feb. 1709, p. 11.

¹¹⁴ Woodward, Feb. 1709, p. 21.

abruptness: “For it is not Her Piety and Goodness only we are indebted to ... She possesses not only the Female Virtues” but “Her Prudence and Skill in the Knowledge of Men and Things ... Her Courage and Firmness of Mind, which is inflexible in what is Right, we owe our Entrance into this just and necessary war.” As ever the upholder of Marlborough’s reputation, Hare called on the MPs before him to: “[r]egard which our Duty to God calls upon us to bear to those whom she has entrusted with the Chief Administration under Her. The ruining of the reputation of the Ministry in the end terminates in the Prince.”¹¹⁵

Dissenters Joseph Stennett and Daniel Mayo were less inclined to allow that the Queen’s reign was outshining that of her predecessor.¹¹⁶ Stennett underlined that the: “glorious Reign of the late King William ... [is]the foundation on which the present Government stands, under which we enjoy so many Privileges at present.”¹¹⁷ Daniel Mayo noted the Queen’s debt to William: “had it not been for him must have been excluded her right, by the Usurpation of a Pretender.”¹¹⁸ George Conway, perhaps due to being a happy remove from Westminster,¹¹⁹ opined the existence of “a pleasant Band of amity encompassing of late Years, our Representatives in Parliament, a good accord betwixt the queen and them.”¹²⁰ Stennett remembered Her Majesty’s loss, and prayed for: “the Support of Her Royal Mind under the Great Affliction lately befallen Her,” and in an extraordinary comment from a Dissenting minister, praised her for the reallocation of ‘first fruits’ and ‘tents’ to poverty-stricken Anglican ministers: “She has shewn her Piety and Zeal, in devoting another Part of the Revenue of her Crown for the more honourable Maintenance of a publick Ministry.”¹²¹

For the first time since the December 1706 Thanksgiving, some preachers once again felt the need to protect Marlborough’s reputation. Francis Hare gilded the lily, claiming that Marlborough had given up “the most substantial profits and Honours, which few Generals besides himself have ever had it in their power to accept.” He voiced indignation that: “one can’t but have to see so Great a Name treated with so much ingratitude.” In a portent of difficulties to come, he made an oblique reference to Harley’s propaganda skills: “who instead of employing mercenary pens to give him praises he has no rights to, has suppressed some of the most Glorious Truths.”¹²² The urban Dissenting preachers said little about Marlborough; however, the touchingly faithful George Conway berated his congregation in Wokingham,

¹¹⁵ Hare, Feb. 1709, pp. 29, 30.

¹¹⁶ Simon Browne’s sermon concentrated mainly on sin, and did not venture much into contemporary politics.

¹¹⁷ Stennett, Feb. 1709, p. 20.

¹¹⁸ Mayo, Feb. 1709, p. 3.

¹¹⁹ Conway preached in Wokingham, Berkshire.

¹²⁰ Conway, Feb, 1709, p. 15.

¹²¹ Stennett, Feb. 1709, p. 20.

¹²² Hare, Feb. 1709, p. 31.

Berkshire for murmurings and lamented how: “base and disingenuous is it for Persons to reflect upon such worthies, who for the good of their Country expose themselves to so many hardships and Dangers.”¹²³ William Marston gave way to hagiography, praising Eugene and Marlborough: “both Valiant in their Persons; wise in conduct; Great in council; in Deliberation Mature; Speedy and Resolute in Execution, both Fortunate, both Victorious.”¹²⁴ Before the Queen, Manningham praised Marlborough’s: “rare Conjunction of Piety and Valour” and his: “Wisdom, and Valour, and Conduct and Perseverance,” though adding that perhaps enough was enough: “What can be farther added, besides one more campaign, to finish this war, and his own great Character.”¹²⁵

The division of opinion in relation to the war, which had emerged after Ramillies, continued. William Marston was explicit that Louis was defeated and success was at hand, the: “Haughty and Ambitious Monarch has been compell’d to quit his Usurp’d Possessions, and retire to defend his own Frontiers.” He went on: “Never had we so fair a prospect of bringing this war to an Honourable and Speedy conclusion, as at this time.”¹²⁶ For other clerics, Louis’s duplicity continued to preclude any mention of peace. Deuel Pead stated the bald facts:

The French King hath occasioned this long and tedious War ... in order to attain a Universal Monarchy ... He can with the greatest of ease and Confidence break through” all Promises, Covenants, Obligations and Oaths, nay even Oaths which he enters into with the greatest Solemnity at God’s Altar.

The French practice of celebrating false victories was particularly galling to British sensibilities. Pead spoke of the “False Te Deum whereby he causes the Name of God to be blasphemed.”¹²⁷ Josiah Woodward invoked the enormities of the prince:

so as to arrogate to himself, or to accept from the Flatteries of others, any of the Divine attributes ... if any Prince for this Reason, has demolished above a thousand Protestant Churches, banished above a Hundred Thousand Protestant Families, buried many excellent Persons in nasty verminous dungeons, and torn other in Pieces by a cruel Bastonade in the Gallies, worse than that of the Turks.¹²⁸

Most preachers acknowledged that the balance of the war had shifted. The symbolism of the statue in the Place des Victoires was again used to illustrate Louis’s fall. Josiah Woodward asked: “is this the Man to whom Statues were erected in a Stile as exorbitant as his Ambition? Is this he that was stiled

¹²³ Conway, Feb. 1709, p. 11.

¹²⁴ Marston, Feb. 1709, p. 18.

¹²⁵ Manningham, Feb. 1709, pp. 8, 11.

¹²⁶ Marston, Feb. 1709, p. 16.

¹²⁷ Pead, Feb. 1709, pp. 4, 5, 6.

¹²⁸ Woodward Feb. 1709, p. 20.

the immortal and invincible Hero?”¹²⁹ Francis Hare used it to mock Louis: “Tis surprising to see what a Change a few Years have made in the Glory of the Immortal Man ... how little he is now the formidable man he was,” and saw the shuffling of generals between fronts as a sign of confusion as much as desperation: “who knew Flanders best, was sent to the Rhine, and he who was useful in Spain, if anywhere, was brought to Flanders, and he was so well acquainted with the Rhine, was sent to a country where he knew nothing.”¹³⁰

The Dissenter Daniel Mayo felt that Louis’s own subjects would put an end to the war: “the French would soon have consented to almost any Terms for the obtaining of Peace, which his impoverish’d subjects begg’d of him not in soft Murmurs only, but in Solemn Speeches.”¹³¹ He was realistic enough to acknowledge poor allied performance in Spain where the putative King Charles’s “affairs have been more perplexed and unprosperous”; nonetheless, he understood the capture of Port Mahon and its use as a permanent British base in the Mediterranean: “has deterred the Italian Princes from entering into the Proposed League with the Pope and the French King.”¹³²

If the prospect of imminent peace divided Anglican clerics, defining victory caused confusion among ministers who believed the war could not conclude yet, and this further divided them from Dissenting ministers. In the Lords, Bishop Trimmell escalated from national defence to international liberty within a paragraph:

As for the cause we are engaged in we fight with no other view than that of preserving of our own Constitution, and laying a firm Foundation for Peace, we fight not for our own Liberties only but those of Europe ... and to include and guard the State of Religion.¹³³

He believed there were: “great reasons to induce us to hope, that there does not much remain behind between us and a Peace.”¹³⁴ Marlborough’s chaplain, Francis Hare, wasted no time on definitions of peace. But he was clear that Britain needed to press the advantage: “the apparent weakness of the Enemy ... and the Vigorous Measures the Allies have taken now [give us reason to hope] the next Campaign will be of a piece with this,” causing the enemy to fall into a state where “they could neither

¹²⁹ Woodward, Feb. 1709, p. 7.

¹³⁰ Hare, Feb. 1709, p. 16. I surmise that Hare was referring to Villeroy, Vendome and Tallard respectively in this passage.

¹³¹ Mayo, Feb. 1709, p. 8. Mayo quotes a speech given by the Cardinal of Noailles, Archbishop of Paris, as President of the Assembly of the Clergy of France on 23 Mar. 1706.

¹³² Gibraltar, though captured in 1704, belonged at this time to King Charles of Spain, and did not come into English possession until the Treat of Utrecht.

¹³³ Trimmell, Feb. 1709, pp. 4, 10, 8.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 3, 12.

hope for a good Peace, nor bear the Continuance of the War.”¹³⁵ Such sermons would seem to indicate that it remained possible to articulate hopes of a speedy resolution through victory, given the scale of allied successes on the northern front.

For the Dissenting ministers, the relief of foreign Protestants continued to be an explicit war aim. Joseph Stennett was clear that: “if the present war should issue in the intire [sic] Restoration of the violated rights of Protestants, as well as of the common Liberty of Europe, it will render the Undertaking so much the more Glorious and Memorable.”¹³⁶ Daniel Mayo was, if possible, even more explicit: “May the Protestant Succession as it is by Law established, be secured by the Care of Providence; may persecuted Protestants and oppressed Nations be succoured and relieved.”¹³⁷ However, Simon Browne maintained a monochrome, discordant note: “We are within ken of a Safe, Honourable and lasting peace, if our own sins don’t intercept the pleasing prospect and sink our High but reasonable expectations.”¹³⁸

The election of a Whig-dominated House of Commons in 1708 and the elevation of increasingly effective members of the Whig Junto to the ministry coloured the political background to the thanksgivings of February 1709. One consequence of the Queen’s personal loss was the splintering of a single thanksgiving ceremony into three separate services. The separate sermons allowed for a fracturing of officially endorsed views: Manningham’s Tory-inclined views before the Queen, Trimnell’s orthodox Whig sermon before the Lords, and Hare’s personalised endorsement of Marlborough before the Commons. All three, in subtle ways, invoked the Hanoverian succession and made efforts to praise the Electress, her son and grandson, something not evident in the other published sermons of the day.

The victory at Oudenarde in August, the unprecedented length of the campaigning season, and the fall of the mighty fortress of Lille reassured clerics that providence was on the allied side and that the war was just. The fall of Lille also meant that the war had now reached French soil. Whether the war was necessary any longer was the subject of muted disagreement – though the phrase ‘just and necessary war’ introduced for the Oudenarde ceremony, had once again featured in the proclamation. Manningham and Marston were of the view that Louis was defeated and that at most one more campaign should be fought to ensure an honourable and permanent peace. Other clerics – Trimnell, Woodward, and Pead – while acknowledging progress, worried that Louis’s history of duplicitous diplomacy meant that no peace treaty with him could be considered honourable, and consequently they advanced nothing that would indicate a set of acceptable negotiating conditions for ending the war. The Dissenting ministers did at least define

¹³⁵ Hare, Feb. 1709, pp. 25, 12.

¹³⁶ Stennett, Feb 1709, p. 19.

¹³⁷ Daniel Mayo, Feb. 1709, p. 23.

¹³⁸ Simon Browne, Feb. 1709, p. 11.

one, ultimately unattainable, peace condition – remediation for wronged foreign, by implication including French, Protestants.

Praise for the Queen’s civil advisors, notably absent from the sermons of mid-1708, returned. Marlborough’s reputation as the pre-eminent military figure of the age was reaffirmed, though the emergence of Francis Hare as a personal partisan for Marlborough re-introduced the defensive condemnation of those who disparaged the general. Hare seemed to target Marlborough’s emerging opponents clustered around Harley, though the issue was also raised in a more general context by George Conway in rural Berkshire.

The Queen’s reputation was unassailable, though once again Anglican divisions are evident, some such as Marston and Manningham emphasised the Queen’s piety and her capability to: “engage Heaven on our side,” while for others – Woodward, Trimmell, Pead, Hare, Conway and Dissenters – her leadership skills and exemplary virtues proved her mettle. Whig-leaning Anglicans had come to the view that her accomplishments now outshone those of William, something not generally shared by Dissenting ministers, for whom William had laid out the policy which the Queen was expertly following. Curiously, for one so recently bereaved, only two preachers – Manningham, who was in her presence, and the Dissenter Joseph Stennett – mentioned her personal loss, though almost all preachers prayed for her continued life and health.

November 1709: “we should not, whilst we all stand engaged against so formidable an Enemy Abroad, thus irritate, provoke and exasperate our Friends at home.”¹³⁹

The events of 1709 brought to London many of the combustible elements which were later ignited by the reign’s most famous sermon, given by the volatile High Tory cleric, Dr Henry Sacheverell on 5 November at St Paul’s, three weeks prior to the year’s thanksgiving ceremonies.

Political persecution and the famine in Western Europe led up to 10,000 ‘poor Palatines’ migrating to and bivouacking in London, a significant increase in the grain price and a ban on its export from Britain. Though the allies continued to be victorious, the burden of paying for the war increased with the continuation of the four-shilling land tax and new taxes on necessities such as candles, beer and coal.¹⁴⁰

The winter of 1709 became known in England as the ‘Great Frost,’ in France ‘Le Grand Hiver’; three months of deadly cold that foreshadowed a year of famine and food riots. The Reverend William Derham of Upminster, a fellow of the Royal Society and one of the most prolific meteorologists of the era, stated that the “...Frost was greater than any other within the memory of Man.” His correspondence with a broad range of scholars noted the temporary freezing of the Thames from London Bridge “almost to the Temple”; in Copenhagen in April “the ice was frozen in the harbour 27 inches”; British sailors off Italian coast died of the Cold; in Florence “almost all the Lemon and Orange trees ... are destroyed ... by frost”; “above sixty men and many cattle [froze] near Paris”; “80 French soldiers near Namur, all killed on the road with the Cold.” England, he noted, was spared the worst: “many land of Wheat escaped tolerably well.”¹⁴¹

Famine conditions in France forced Louis to again sue for peace, his anxiety to finalise a deal emphasised by the formal dispatch to The Hague in early May 1709 of the Marquis de Torcy, secretary for foreign affairs.¹⁴² The Grand Alliance submitted forty articles – known as the ‘peace preliminaries’ – to the French as a basis for peace, one of which called for Louis to depose his grandson Philip V of Spain, should the latter refuse the yield the Spanish crown to his Habsburg rival. The articles, agreed in conjunction with an Anglo-Dutch barrier treaty, made no mention of restoration of the Edict of Nantes or the plight of French Protestants.¹⁴³ Marlborough, despite playing a lacklustre part in the negotiations, was

¹³⁹ Chapman, Nov. 1709, p. 13.

¹⁴⁰ Trevelyan, *England under Queen Anne*, iii, p. 69.

¹⁴¹ William Derham ‘History of the great frost in the last winter 1703 and 1708/9’, *Philosophical Transactions*, xxvi (1708-9) pp. 454-78.

¹⁴² Earlier contacts, via the merchant Hennequin, and the German intermediary Petkum, had been unofficial, deniable and semi-secret from a French point of view.

¹⁴³ The nearest the articles came to demanding toleration was article 13 which sought to revoke the fourth article of Ryswick, which had been used to favour both France and Austrian Habsburg Catholic powers at the conclusion of

so convinced of the prospects of concluding a peace that he wrote to his Duchess concerning the dispatch of the plate, formal chair and canopy which, as Ambassador Extraordinary to the United Provinces, he would need for the official signing of a treaty.¹⁴⁴ Nonetheless, despite France's predicament, Louis could not bring himself to commit to fight Spain, and in late May publicly rejected the allies articles.¹⁴⁵

The weather and the peace talks combined to delay the start of the 1709 campaigning season, which eventually resulted in the eventual fall of the towns of Tournai and Mons to Marlborough and Eugene.¹⁴⁶ Tournai fell in the first week of September 1709 after a seven-day siege and 5,000 allied losses and the march towards Mons entailed a battle and Pyrrhic victory at Malplaquet in September, with up to 20,000 allied troops killed, the bloodiest victory to date.¹⁴⁷ In a letter to Louis after the battle, Villars claimed that: "a few more such French defeats would destroy the Allied armies."¹⁴⁸ Mons itself fell in late October.

In Parliament and the ministry, the Whigs continued to increase their power. In March, a Naturalisation Act received royal assent, which allowed all foreign Protestants to become subjects of the Queen provided they took loyalty oaths, paid a shilling fee and received the sacrament in a Protestant church of any denomination. This last condition rekindled Tory fears for the primacy of the Church of England. By May, large numbers of Palatines began arriving in London.¹⁴⁹ The Queen reacted quickly to the Palatines' plight and issued a royal warrant to help support the refugees, her interest perhaps piqued by the fact that John Tribbeko, former chaplain to her late consort, Prince George, was one of the Lutheran ministers who assisted the Palatines. The ministry began tangible support for the Palatines in late July. Tory opinion opposed giving support, extreme Tories arguing that the Palatines had been invited to England to weaken the Church of England. Sir Charles Duncombe, Tory Lord Mayor of London,

the League of Augsburg: Arthur Maynwarding, *Three Articles of the Grand Alliance: With the Late Preliminaries ...*, Volume 15 (London, 1711). The plight of the Huguenots was subject to correspondence between the ageing William Bentinck, Lord Portland and Lord Somers, which underlined the impracticality of enforcing any guarantee of tolerance by Britain on the French King. See Trevelyan, *England under Queen Anne*, iii, p. 60.

¹⁴⁴H.L. Snyder, ed., *Marlborough-Godolphin Correspondence* (3 vols, Oxford, 1975) iii, pp. 1250-1.

¹⁴⁵ Joseph Klaitz, *Printed Propaganda under Louis XIV* (Princeton, 1976) pp. 208-12.

¹⁴⁶ This paragraph is a summary of Lynn, *The Wars of Louis XIV 1667-1714*.

¹⁴⁷ Fortescue lists allied campaign casualty figures as follows: Blenheim- 12,000 (2,200 British), Ramillies – 3,500 ("almost entirely the Dutch and Danes"), Oudenarde 3,000 ("British infantry, though early engaged suffering but little, while the cavalry ... hardly suffered at all"), Malplaquet ("not less than 20,000"): J.W. Fortescue, *A History of the British Army* (20 vols, London 1899-1930) i, pp. 444,473,502,525.

¹⁴⁸ 'Si Dieu nous fait la grâce de perdre encore une pareille bataille, Votre Majeste, peut compter que ses ennemis seront détruits' Abel Hugo, *France historique et monumentale: Histoire générale de France* (5 vols, Paris, 1836-43), v, p. 464.

¹⁴⁹ The rest of this paragraph summarises H. T. Dickinson, 'The Poor Palatines and the Parties', *E.H.R.*, lxxxii (1967) pp. 464-85.

subscribed £50 to Palatine relief, which attracted derision as he was reputed to be the richest commoner in England. His critics intoned he: “would scarce have done that but for the sake of his office.”¹⁵⁰

The gradual Whig takeover of the ministry was further demonstrated by the nomination of Lord Orford to head the Admiralty in November 1709, something the Queen had resisted throughout the year. In March, Marlborough presented the Queen with a request that he be made Captain-General for life, which drove the Queen to confer with the Whig Lord President Somers, to defuse and refuse the alarming request.¹⁵¹

Sacheverell’s sermon, given at St Paul’s on 5 November 1709, convulsed the city and rekindled political and sectarian divisions. The day, commemorating the dual deliverances of the foiling of the Gunpowder Plot and the safe landing of William of Orange in Torbay, was an occasion held in particular reverence by supporters of the revolution. However, Sir Samuel Garrard, the newly elected Tory Lord Mayor of London,¹⁵² choose to invite the vitriolic Tory divine, Dr Henry Sacheverell, to give the sermon. Sacheverell, a fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, had been recommended for a chaplaincy in Southwark the previous May by Sir Samuel’s Tory predecessor, Sir Charles Duncombe. Accompanied to St Paul’s by suspected Jacobites and “his Southwark myrmidons,”¹⁵³ Sacheverell denounced “False Brethren” in Church and State – Occasional Conformists, latitudinarian churchmen, office holders who defied the Queen’s will – in fact, all who held dear revolution principles and toleration. Narcissus Luttrell crisply noted that: “instead of speaking to the day, [he] turn’d his discourse upon the Presbyterians.”¹⁵⁴ Sacheverell rode in the Lord Mayor’s coach away from St Paul’s that afternoon to cheers,¹⁵⁵ though at their next meeting, on 8 November, the aldermen of London withheld both the customary vote of thanks to the preacher and permission to print the sermon.¹⁵⁶ Sacheverell, claiming that he had obtained the Mayor’s oral permission, published the sermon on 25 November, an action which brought upon him a

¹⁵⁰ Gentleman in London, *A view of the Queen and Kingdom's Enemies in the case of the Poor Palatines* (London, 1709) p. 6.

¹⁵¹ William L. Sachse, *Lord Somers: A Political Portrait* (Manchester, 1975) pp. 282-4, and Gregg, *Queen Anne*, p. 301.

¹⁵² When the monarch observed the thanksgivings privately, the Lord Mayor presided over the ceremonies at St Paul’s and the Corporation selected the preachers for the occasions. Farooq, *Preaching in Eighteenth-Century London*, p. 223. Hence the partisanship of the St Paul’s thanksgiving sermons in 1709 and 1710. Garrard, a wealthy merchant and landowner, succeeded Sir Charles Duncombe on 29 Oct. 1709. An MP from 1701-

10, he had supported the Tack and other High Tory causes. Godolphin, described him as the most “perverse man against us in the whole House.”: H.O.P. 1690-1715, iv, p. 5.

¹⁵³ *The cherubim with a flaming sword that appear'd on the fifth of November last, in the cathedral of St Paul, to the Lord Mayor, aldermen, and sheriffs, and many hundreds of people, &c. Being a letter to my Lord M --, with remarks upon Dr. Sa--ll's sermon;* (London, 1709) p. 8.

¹⁵⁴ Luttrell, *Brief historical relation*, vi, p. 508

¹⁵⁵ William Bisset, *Remarks on Dr. Sacheverell's Sermon* (London, 1710) p. 7.

¹⁵⁶ The refusal was uncommon, but not unprecedented. Francis Atterbury’s sermon at the election of Sir Charles Duncombe, Garrard’s predecessor, had been treated similarly in Oct. 1708: Holmes, *Trial*, pp. 70-2.

parliamentary impeachment; a process which, in addition to bringing about the reign's worst rioting in the capital and the fulminations of the ministry, enhanced Sacheverell's standing among High Church supporters and paved the way for the fall of Godolphin and the Whig ministers.

The thanksgiving ceremonies proceeded three weeks later, on Tuesday 22 November, the proclamation lauding the "just and necessary war" and in particular "the victories of Blaregnies near Mons in Hainault."¹⁵⁷ For the second time, the Queen held a separate thanksgiving service in the Chapel Royal in St James's Palace so the London crowds again missed the pageantry of a royal progress, and the *Lords Journal* tersely notes that their lordships convened, deferred business, and "went to Westminster Abbey to hear a Sermon."¹⁵⁸ Luttrell's observation about the London ceremonies was succinct to the point of abruptness: "This being the Thanksgiving Day, Dr Kennett preach before the queen, and at night were bonfires."¹⁵⁹ Outside of London, some the municipal formalities continued, though they are less commented upon in newsletters. In Worcester, Edward Chandler dedicated his printed sermon to the Mayor,¹⁶⁰ aldermen and common council and praised them for their "numerous, splendid and orderly procession" to the cathedral on the thanksgiving day.¹⁶¹

The non-juring clergyman, Thomas Hearne, echoed Sacheverell's views in the privacy of his diary: "The chief Design of it [the thanksgiving] is to amuse the People and make them to believe we have a wonderful success on purpose to get large Sums of Money from them that the War may still be prosecuted to ye Benefit of ye Duke of Marlborough etc."¹⁶² A more tangible measure of national war-weariness was the number – forty – of loyal addresses received prior to the thanksgiving, in contrast to more than 300 in 1706 and 1708.¹⁶³ Thanksgiving services took place in the eye of the hurricane unleashed by Dr Sacheverell, his sermon having given public – though as yet unpublished – voice to an undercurrent of unease which held that the war was being fought for the benefit of a particular interest in England.

While three of the formal services were addressed by Whig pastors – White Kennett, one of the most talented of Low Church advocates, before the Queen; the stolid Whig Bishop Hough of Lichfield

¹⁵⁷The battle has since been called after another village, Malplaquet: *London Gazette*, 6-8 Oct. 1709.

¹⁵⁸ *L.J.*, 19, p. 8.

¹⁵⁹ Luttrell, *Brief historical relation*, vi, p. 515

¹⁶⁰ The Mayor, Richard Lane, in 1747 would address Parliament "being in July 1710 mayor of the city of Worcester, I put a stop to the insolent progress of Dr Sacheverell and his deluded followers, who came here with ensigns of war, inciting the Queen's subjects to sedition and rebellion against her and legal successors in the Protestant line in favour of an abjured Popish pretender.": Romney Sedgwick, ed., *The History of Parliament: the House of Commons 1715-1754* (London, 1970) ii, pp. 197-8.

¹⁶¹ Edward Chandler, 1707. Dedication.

¹⁶² C.E. Doble, ed., *Remarks and Collections of Thomas Hearne*, ii, p. 313, [23 November 1709].

¹⁶³ Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain*, p. 116.

before the Lords; and Samuel Clarke, a protégé of the staunchly Whig John Moore, Bishop of Norwich, before the Commons – the fourth, at St Paul’s, allowed for publication of divergent, though somewhat chastened views. The preacher, the eloquent John Adams,¹⁶⁴ was the Lord Mayor’s¹⁶⁵ third choice, the High Church George Stanhope and Robert Moss¹⁶⁶ having refused to preach as a protest against the treatment Dr Sacheverell’s sermon had received.¹⁶⁷

White Kennett, recently nominated Dean of Peterborough at the request of the Whig Lord Steward, the Duke of Devonshire,¹⁶⁸ addressed the Queen in the Chapel Royal. Sacheverell had named and misquoted Kennett in his St Paul’s sermon, and by implication ranked him among the Church’s ‘False Brethren.’ Kennett had been one of the first to issue a pamphlet refuting Sacheverell on 20 November, and addressed to the aldermen of London.¹⁶⁹ Two days later, in the somewhat restrained atmosphere of the Chapel Royal, Kennett could not pass up an opportunity to identify the Queen with anti-Sacheverellite opinion. Preaching on the theme of the ingratitude of the nine cured lepers, he sycophantically established a connection between Christ, who “cur’d with the visible tokens of his Touching,” and the visibly ailing sovereign, whose revival of the regular audiences for touching for the King’s Evil was having an increasing impact on her own health.¹⁷⁰ Continuing the metaphor, Kennett acknowledged: “Yet a continued Series of Successes and Victories, a long Chain of Glories ... must be the Hand of God!” He went on to defend Marlborough: “When by God’s Help, any wonderful actions, are performed by a GREAT MAN: if some in the Nation to which he belongeth, could be content to diminish and detract from his Merits, yet Foreigners and Strangers shall judge impartially, and give the due Abundant Honour,” and bind the Queen, military and ministry into a seamless whole “under whose Wise

¹⁶⁴ Adams, a Boyle lecturer in 1703, was made prebendary of Canterbury in 1703 and canon of Windsor in 1708. The Tory Lord Chancellor Harcourt was a patron, having presented him as rector of St Bartholomew’s. A favourite chaplain of Queen Anne, in 1711 he was elected provost of Kings College: S.J. Skedd, ‘Adams, John (1662-1720)’ *Oxford D.N.B.* [accessed 7 Mar. 2016].

¹⁶⁵ Within three days of the thanksgiving, Sacheverell would publish his controversial sermon, dedicated to Garrard, beginning with the ominous: “By Your Lordship’s command” and describing him as “so bright an ornament to the Church.” On 14 Dec., 1709 testifying before a closed session of Sacheverell’s impeachment trial, Garrard stated “as to the printing of the sermon, [I] did not command it, nor order it, nor so much as desire him to do it.” His word was accepted, but Garrard’s reputation was damaged. For years afterwards in London society referring to someone as a ‘bright ornament’ was regarded as an insult: Holmes, *Trial*, pp. 90-3.

¹⁶⁶ C.E Doble, ed., *Remarks and Collections of Thomas Hearne*, ii, p. 320.

¹⁶⁷ Rebecca Louise Warner, ‘Stanhope, George (1660–1728)’, *Oxford D.N.B.* [accessed 7 Mar. 2016].

¹⁶⁸ William Cavendish, 2nd Duke, his father was one of the immortal seven who issued the invitation to William in 1688; his wife’s uncle was Lord Orford, another of the seven: Stuart Handley, ‘Cavendish, William, second duke of Devonshire (1670/71–1729)’, *Oxford D.N.B.* [accessed 7 Mar. 2016].

¹⁶⁹ White Kennett, *A true answer to Dr. Sacheverell’s sermon before the Lord Mayor, Nov. 5. 1709. in a letter to one of the aldermen* (London, 1709).

¹⁷⁰ Bucholz, *The Augustan Court*, pp. 203-04.

Administration and Excellent Example these great things are done? In the midst of other sorrows, to rejoice in the Prosperity and Gladness of Her People?”

Returning to his text, Kennett lamented that the Bible did not give a reason of the ingratitude of the nine. Kennett pondered whether, as the grateful leper was a Samaritan the nine “... cared not to join with that Stranger, in any address of Thanks, and were more averse, because they saw him so forward in it?” Tory opposition to the Palatines was well known to contrast with Queen’s concern for the welfare of foreign Protestants. Kennett, knowing the likelihood of publication, could not pass up the opportunity to denigrate Sacheverell, whose modest Church rank and scurrilous preaching¹⁷¹ style belied his notoriety:

Possibly they [the nine] expected more ... Riches and Honour, as well as Health and Strength, and so they were ... disposed to ... Discontent and Murmur. Or perhaps they envied the Glory that would redound to the worker of such a mighty Deed ... Or probably their ingratitude was meer Profaneness, Unthankful because Unholy.¹⁷²

Kennett’s sermon was transparent in its attempts to bind the Queen to one side of a controversy which was growing in seriousness by the day. The Queen’s actions over the coming months would show that not only was she not to be won over, but, if anything, her sympathies were opposite to those espoused by Kennett.

The Lords, assembled in Westminster Abbey, heard a sermon from John Hough, the reliably Whig, though rather pedestrian, Bishop of Lichfield.¹⁷³ Ignoring the controversies raging in London, Hough ploughed a patriotic furrow: “can any man pretend to love his country, and to understand wherein the Happiness of it consists, that would not joyfully hazard his Life in such a Cause?” He ruefully admitted that the present war entailed: “a vast expense of Blood and Treasure,” the last campaign in particular was: “Bloody on both sides ... [though] no Action could be more for the Glory of the Confederate arms.” Having railed against the evils of Popery, Hough attempted to resolve the ambiguity of Britain’s continued sacrifice for papist allies: “now Spain is for the most part in French hands; and if the remaining Branch of the House of Austria were subdued, what could stop the progress of French Arms?” Returning with more warmth to the common enemy, Hough observed that:

¹⁷¹ Holmes, *Trial*, pp. 49-51. Even Thomas Hearne, a sympathiser, comments “he is a man of little or no Learning, so he is remark’d for several Blunders and odd mistakes in this sermon.”: C.E. Doble, ed., *Remarks and Collections of Thomas Hearne*, ii, pp. 320-21.

¹⁷² Kennet Nov. 1709, pp. 7, 9, 10, 17, 25, 20.

¹⁷³ Julian Lock, ‘Hough, John (1651–1743)’, *Oxford D.N.B.* [accessed 7 Mar. 2016].

His [Louis'] ministers are wrack'd with distracting Cares ... his revenues fail and his people murmur ... Heaven itself declares against him, denies him fruitful seasons, makes his land abortive and deprives the miserable Inhabitants of a necessary subsistence.¹⁷⁴

The House of Commons, gathered in St Margaret's,¹⁷⁵ heard from Samuel Clarke, a noted philosopher, translator of Newton's work, correspondent of Leibniz, and prominent opponent of the theology of the nonjuror Henry Dodwell. In a sign that the pace of the war was losing momentum and its burden was becoming a popular preoccupation, Clarke acknowledged the "fatigue and Length of the foregoing Campaign," the "long, bloody and expensive war," though "[a] great and almost perpetual Series of Success has attended our Arms."¹⁷⁶ He warned about the artifices of the French, who by "deceitful Insinuations of their desire of Peace ... create any Divisions or Jealousies among the Allies." A typical example of their deceit was that: "they boasted of a Victory ... to have been able to make a Retreat after being beaten" at Malplaquet. Clarke urged that the war be pursued until a lasting peace would restore "the Rights and Liberties of ourselves and all Europe, and the preservation of the Protestant Religion among us." As with the Lords, the Commons' sermon ignored the controversial presence of the Palatines, and Clarke's sermon had only obliquely acknowledged Sacheverell's fulminations: "Could we in the midst of that Peace, which we enjoy even while War surrounds us, forbear unreasonable Contentions, and lay aside our Unchristian Heats and Animosities among ourselves." He encouraged his audience: "each in our proper Stations, to support a government so happily establish'd; and to make the executive part of it as easy, and as little burdensome as possible, in the Hands wherein it is lodg'd."

The Lord Mayor and the court of aldermen of London attended St Paul's for the thanksgiving, where Dr John Adams gave a sermon which was cautious in its rhetoric. Adams lamented the absence of the Queen who used to practice: "True and Fervent Praise in this Holy Place." In contrast to Clarke, for whom the Queen, was an example, Adams saw the Queen as actively engaged with God on England's behalf: "It is her continual Devotion, Her fervent Prayers that have fought for us." Adams forbore to mention the burden of the war, instead commenting favourably on: "the Friendship of the Two Generals ... [which] damps Envy and Jealousie, deserves our Admiration." Adams's war aims were bounded and Britain-focused: "secure from the Encroachments of Ambition, and at Perfect Ease, under the Free and impartial execution of Good Laws ... in the preservation of our Excellent Constitution, both in Church and State."¹⁷⁷

¹⁷⁴ Hough, Nov. 1709, pp. 7, 10, 6, 15, 13, 16.

¹⁷⁵ St. Margaret's stands between Westminster Abbey and the Houses of Parliament, and is commonly called the 'parish church' of the House of Commons.

¹⁷⁶ Clarke, Nov. 1709, pp. 15, 3, 15, 16, 22, 5, 23.

¹⁷⁷ Adams, Nov. 1709, pp. 23, 22.

The November 1709 Thanksgivings produced fifteen published sermons, a greater number than for Oudenarde or the fall of Lille. Excluding the formal ceremonies, five other sermons delivered in London on the thanksgiving were published – four by Dissenting ministers, and one by the Anglican Thomas Knaggs – a prolific preacher whose clashes with “passive obedience men” had led him to leave Newcastle for London. The Dissenters included one independent minister, Thomas Masters, of Queen Street, Lower Rotherhithe; one breakaway Presbyterian, Samuel Harris, who had formed a congregation in Mill-yard Goodman’s Fields, following a dispute with the main body of Presbyterians in 1705,¹⁷⁸ and two mainstream Presbyterians, Thomas Freke and Samuel Wright. Freke, well esteemed, but small in stature, preached in Bartholomew’s Close, London, a small, arched room “admirably adapted for the purposes of concealment,” accessible by a flight of several steps in an obscure corner of the former Priory of St Bartholomew.¹⁷⁹ Perhaps the most notable Dissenting preacher, both at the time and in later years, was Samuel Wright of Blackfriars. His ministry was very successful, not least because of his striking preaching style and communion services which were remarkable for their fervour. The meeting-house was twice enlarged and had the dubious honour of being a target of the Sacheverell mob in 1710.¹⁸⁰

The six published sermons delivered outside London were split between a single Dissenter – George Conway¹⁸¹ – and five Anglican ministers. Of the Anglicans, Edward Chandler, canon at Worcester Cathedral, later became a wealthy Whig bishop; Richard Chapman, vicar of Cheshunt and prebendary of Chichester, gave an avid defence of the ministry and episcopate; Samuel Baker, a preacher in the diocese of Winchester, and Gideon Hardinge, vicar of Kingston-upon-Thames, voiced views critical of war profiteers and the burden of the war. Hardinge and Chapman expressed qualms about the war’s impact on society. The remaining Anglican – Thomas Rivers, LLD,¹⁸² prebendary of Winchester and Fellow of All Soul’s, Oxford – spoke movingly of the yearning for peace without, unlike the other

¹⁷⁸ Harris became minister about 1697 of the Presbyterian congregation in Broad Street Wapping; owing to some dispute about differing concepts of Trinitarianism, he left (before 1705) to form a Presbyterian congregation in Mill-yard, Goodman’s Fields: Alexander Gordon, *Freedom after Ejection: A Review (1690-1692) of Presbyterian and Congregational Nonconformity in England and Wales* (Manchester, 1917) p. 279.

¹⁷⁹ Walter Wilson, *The history and antiquities of Dissenting churches and meeting houses in London, Westminster and Southwark* (4 vols, London, 1808), iii, pp. 371-7. Also E. A. Webb, 'The monastic buildings: The outer court', in *The Records of St Bartholomew's Priory and St Bartholomew the Great, West Smithfield* (2 vols, Oxford, 1921), ii, pp. 159-80.

¹⁸⁰ Alexander Gordon, 'Wright, Samuel (1683–1746)', *Oxford D.N.B.* [accessed 24 Mar. 2016].

¹⁸¹ Who had also published a thanksgiving sermon the previous February.

¹⁸² Thomas Rivers was, in 1715, labelled ‘a violent Whig’ by Hearne, Doble, ed., *Hearne’s Collections*, v, p. 134. November 1715. Hearne’s views on Rivers are typically intemperate, and I believe in relation to his Nov. 1709 sermon, false. River’s thanksgiving sermon of 1709 is the only one of the fifteen published sermons to mention Charles I’s “butchered Majesty, extinguish’d Monarchy” following which “our forefathers fell under the Suppression of their Liberties, the Subversion of their Constitution, by the madness of the People” [p5/6], though Rivers does acknowledge that 1688 was necessary due to “the Misguided Zeal of a Deluded Prince” [p6].

preachers, justifying the continuation of the conflict. Respectful of the Queen as God's vice-regent, Rivers was wistful in hopes of peace: "To secure a quiet enjoyment of what we already have."¹⁸³

All six of the Dissenting preachers – both in and out of London – demonstrated an informed view of events on the continent. Samuel Wright praised Anne for espousing the cause of Silesian Protestants; George Conway, in rural Wokingham, was knowledgeable about the details of the Battle of Malplaquet; Samuel Harris expressed an informed view of the Swedish king's setbacks in his battles with Peter the Great.

All the preachers felt that God's providence was evident in that the famine conditions that had wracked France, had spared Britain. All conveniently ignored the fact that the severe weather had affected most of Europe, including Britain's allies, and France's predicament was exacerbated by hostile neighbours and naval blockades. If British taxes and grain prices had risen this was the work of man, not God, and overall: "were ever Treasures better laid out, more prudently disposed, or more carefully apply'd to the pressing occasions of so long and necessary a War?"¹⁸⁴

The most striking new note among the November thanksgiving sermons was the exasperation expressed by some preachers at what they perceived as the public's lack of enthusiasm for the momentous victories on France's northern border. For some this smacked of ingratitude and the influence of the ever-useful scapegoat – the enemy within. Thomas Knaggs was aghast at the: "monstrous Ingratitude [which] is it to murmur and repine at our Deliverances, to grumble and look sour upon our Victories ... As if they would be willing to sell all these blessings to have the Pretender reign over us."¹⁸⁵ Gideon Hardinge was closer to naming the cause of the disquiet, but no less annoyed: "that there are, among ourselves, who more like Frenchmen, have said, that we have but little Reason to boast of the two Battles fought the last and the present Year, which cost us so many brave Men's lives to maintain."¹⁸⁶ Samuel Baker of Winchester condemned those who would sour the people's tempers against their rulers, as: "uneasie Jacks, and affectionate well-wishers to the Pretender" and, as condemned them as being in league with: "enemies abroad, as well as the base brood of Clandestine ones scattered up and down amongst us at home, been striving to ... Destroy both the State and Church."¹⁸⁷

¹⁸³ Rivers, Nov. 1709, p. 10.

¹⁸⁴ Hardinge, Nov. 1710, p. 14.

¹⁸⁵ Knaggs, Nov. 1709, p. 12.

¹⁸⁶ Hardinge, Nov. 1709, p. 13.

¹⁸⁷ Baker, Nov. 1709, p. 5.

Dissenting preachers also condemned murmurers as traitors. To Thomas Masters in London:

‘Tis undeniable evident, that such as the chagrin and sad, who bite the Lip, and hang the Head and fret at the victorious Arms of our glorious Queen ... do openly betray themselves, and too palpably discover, that their Inclinations and Hearts do centre in a foreign Prince, whom the Nation, in joint concurrence with Heaven, hath rejected with abhorrence.¹⁸⁸

John Hough pitied the enemy: “his land abortive and deprives the miserable Inhabitants of a necessary subsistence ... And tho’ they hate us, they are proper objects of our pity.”¹⁸⁹ The Presbyterian Samuel Wright exhibited the best information on the plight of Europe when he informed his flock in Blackfriars: “In Savoy, we are told ... that the whole Quantity of corn was hardly enough to subsist the inhabitants half a year... and the French have so much suffered in their vines, and Fruit-Trees, as well as their Grain.” Wright spoke of “a Bloody Flux sweeping... the Southern Provinces of France and in Koningsburg,” of a “spotted Fever raging ... in Hungary” and “Plague prevailing ... in Dantzick.”¹⁹⁰

Gideon Harding had been critical of war-profiteers in general lamenting that they desired the war “to continue yet many years” the better to “make their fortunes by it.”¹⁹¹ Richard Chapman, vicar of Cheshunt in Hertfordshire, specifically excoriated grain hoarding: “that Spirit of Self-Interest and Covetousness, of Fraud and Over-reaching, of Extortion and Oppression that reigns too much both in city and country ... By withholding their Corn in such times of Scarcity.”¹⁹² Samuel Wright, perhaps more worldly, was keen to reassure his Londoners that there was no shortage: “many of our Garners and Barns being even now full,” even if the supply was being manipulated, which he “ascribed to the Management of such who have been pursuing their own private interest, and not to a general common Disappointment in our late harvest.”¹⁹³ Though Wright’s words had been an attempt to reassure, the corruption associated with the provision of supplies increased the general Tory suspicion of financiers and projectors. In St Paul’s, John Adams was more agitated and more theatrical: “that Barbarous Extortion, that Ruining of many sober and industrious families, to draw excessive sums from the poor Honest debtor.”

¹⁸⁸ Masters, Nov. 1709, p. 20. Perhaps indicative of the emphasis he wished to put on the murmurers’ ingratitude, Masters, unusually for a Whig or Dissenting Minister, used the term glorious to describe the Queen.

¹⁸⁹ Hough, Nov. 1709, p. 16.

¹⁹⁰ Wright, Nov. 1709, p. 27.

¹⁹¹ Hardinge, Nov. 1709, p. 14.

¹⁹² Chapman, Nov. 1709, p. 5; on 15 Oct., a proclamation had been issued forbidding the export of corn. In Nov. parliament debated a bill to forbid the export of corn. *By the Queen, a proclamation, for putting the laws in execution against forestalling, regrating, and engrossing of corn* (London, 1709).

¹⁹³ Wright, Dec. 1709, p. 28.

Grumbling due to price rises as a result of scarcity and increased taxes on commodities was exacerbated by the arrival of the Palatines. The Queen's charity towards the Palatines was mentioned only in the London sermons; for the sermons delivered outside London Anne's general charity commingled with her piety in the view of the preachers. Despite the great numbers of Palatines camped about the Tower, in ropeyards and warehouses along the Thames, in Wapping, Stockwell and Greenwich,¹⁹⁴ John Adams at St Paul's did not mention them, restricting himself to requesting charity for: "the sick, the Poor, and the Prisoner."¹⁹⁵ White Kennett, preaching before the Queen, used their plight as an opportunity to label opponents of Palatine aid not just as uncharitable, but unchristian: "the late Royal Hospitality and Charity, in receiving Strangers; and suffering many miserable Exiles to find this Kingdom, as it us'd to be, a refuge and sanctuary to Distressed Foreign Protestants ... shew[s] we are in earnest with the Religion we possess."¹⁹⁶

The thanksgiving on 22 November was three weeks after the delivery of the incendiary sermon, but days before its publication. Its impact – both via word-of-mouth and publication – convulsed the ministry into impeaching Sacheverell and the Lord Mayor. Evidence of ill-considered over-reaction was evident in White Kennett's use of his thanksgiving sermon before the Queen to implicitly attack Sacheverell. Word of mouth reaction had spread around London and beyond: In Cheshunt, fourteen miles north of St Paul's, Richard Chapman explicitly indicated that he published his sermon: "with some Cursory Reflections upon Dr Sacheverell's two late Sermons." Chapman loyally fulminated against the:

venting and belching out such unmerciful Invectives and invidious Libels (as a certain author has lately done in his ... St Paul's Sermon) against the present Establishment, against our Metropolitan, and other Bishops of the church.

He returned the invective in kind: "'tis most certain, that Pride, Prejudice, Ill-nature, and want of Humility, are at the bottom."¹⁹⁷ In Knightsbridge, the Anglican Thomas Knaggs, without naming Sacheverell, used the already-famous phrase to accuse the preacher of treachery: "[we] have many uncertain Friends at Home, and too much to be fear'd many false Brethren among our own Selves."¹⁹⁸

The Dissenter Thomas Masters accused Sacheverell of Jacobitism: "[those who] have no hearts to rejoice in the Prosperity of the present Establishment ... their inclinations and hearts do centre in a foreign Prince, whom this nation ... rejected with abhorrence."¹⁹⁹ Richard Chapman raged: "what Peace

¹⁹⁴ Dickinson, 'Poor Palatines'.

¹⁹⁵ Adams, Nov. 1709, p. 21.

¹⁹⁶ Kennett, Nov. 1709, pp. 18, 27.

¹⁹⁷ Chapman, Nov. 1709, pp. 7, 9.

¹⁹⁸ Knaggs, Nov. 1709, p. 6.

¹⁹⁹ Masters, Nov. 1709, p. 20.

can be expected, when they whose business it is to preach the Gospel of Peace, proclaim War against, and bid defiance to the Government, even in the Pulpit.” Chapman adopted the time-honoured tradition of accusing Sacheverell of attempting to carry on the work that “the Jesuits failed in,” and used the rather apt analogy of the gunpowder treason in accusing him of attempting to blow up the constitution in church and state. He threw Sacheverell’s label back: “those persons whom he has so basely aspes’d and traduc’d as traitors, villains, double-dealers, false brethren are the truest and best friends to Monarchy and Episcopacy.” Having thus appealed for unity, Chapman acknowledged public disputes, and appealed for calm: “but the pubick national distempers of this time, require rather Balsamicks than Corrosives ... we should not, whilst we all stand engaged against so formidable an Enemy Abroad, thus irritate, provoke and exasperate our Friends at home.”²⁰⁰

In St Paul’s, in front of the Lord Mayor, who had encouraged Sacheverell and who would soon face a parliamentary inquiry, John Adams broadened out the problem, urging his audience to condemn: “Rancor, Malice and Detraction! What subdivisions of Parties!” He attempted to respond and reflect criticism on those “open and confident attempts ... against the very fundamentals of our Religion (in which most of those that Dissent from us are equally concen’d) and Undermining the Foundation of all Government.”²⁰¹

Perhaps the most incongruous reaction to Sacheverell’s sermon was that of Samuel Wright, preaching in Blackfriars, about a fifth-of-a-mile southeast of St Pauls. The meeting-house consisted of “four rooms opening into each other, with lattice partitions; each room being conveniently fitted up with benches and forms”²⁰² – benches which four months later would be cut into pieces and put on a bonfire ready for incineration by the mob, enraged at Sacheverell’s impeachment.²⁰³ In his sermon, Wright gave what in the event were premature thanks, that “[t]here is no complaining in our Streets” and that:

these few Malecontents ...[are] look’d upon rather as the Objects of Contempt, or Pity, than of Esteem, and Regard’, indeed he would not have ‘taken notice of these, if the Cathedral of this City (contrary to the declared judgement of the Magistrates and the prevailing sense of the common auditory) had not lately rung with the Clamours of one of this number.²⁰⁴

Anne’s absence from public ceremonial had the paradoxical effect of increasing her influence among a public becoming increasingly uneasy about the length and cost of the war. The Queen was, as ever, universally praised, and, as ever, the reasons given demonstrated the differing views of the role of

²⁰⁰ Chapman, Nov. 1709, p. 13.

²⁰¹ Adams, Nov. 1709, pp. 8, 13.

²⁰² Wilson, *History and antiquities of Dissenting Churches and Meeting Houses*, ii, p. 172.

²⁰³ Holmes, *Trial*, p. 174.

²⁰⁴ Wright, Nov. 1709, p. 26.

the monarch. In St Paul's, John Adams managed to combine a Tory view of the monarch's interaction with God – "It is her continual Devotion, Her fervent Prayers that have fought for us" – with a rather acute commentary on the political advantage of the Queen's use of mourning:

she, who us'd to be the bright Example of True and Fervent Praise in this Holy Place, and would have been so now had God not seen fit to mingle Afflictions with her Triumphs, to compleat [sic] Her character ... Never has so much Retirement so vast an Influence.²⁰⁵

Thomas Rivers also emphasised the Queen's part in: "contending with Heaven for a special Blessing ... And piety is ... the only thing that can ingage [sic] the Assistance of Him, who alone is Almighty and Invincible." He urged his audience to "resolve to follow, tho' at a great distance, that heavenly example which she sets before us."²⁰⁶

Another way to praise the Queen was as a model of conduct and a sage leader – "wise, experienced, and consummate,"²⁰⁷ "pious, excellent."²⁰⁸ White Kennett lauded the year's victories and the monarch "under whose Wise Administration and Excellent Example these great things are done?"²⁰⁹ For Samuel Clarke: "the example of Piety set us from the Throne, will, we hope, so effectually discourage all Immorality and Profaneness."²¹⁰ In their opinion, the Queen continued the process of transcending the accomplishments of William. In retrospect, Edward Chandler had come to the view that William's war against Louis was "a sort of reprisal War. What we lost one Campaign, we retrieved another, without being much gainers in the End ... Not thro' any fault of the Great General (William), whose cares and labours, and hazards for the publick good, deserved better Fortune."

Indeed, it was "the mistaken Principles, of trusting only to a Fleet, and neglecting a Land Army,"²¹¹ since rectified, that had resulted in the Williamite stalemate. Gideon Hardinge, rector of Kingston-upon-Thames was more forgiving of the English public, though no less cognisant of William's martial shortcomings: "perhaps we plac'd too much confidence in the personal Valour of our late Prince to the neglect of a closer and wiser Dependence on the Lord of Hosts."²¹²

²⁰⁵ Adams, Nov. 1709, pp. 23, 8.

²⁰⁶ Rivers, Feb. 1709, pp. 13, 2. Though Whigs too praised Her Majesty as an exemplar of piety, it is clear from their sermons that they saw each person's piety as necessary to their personal salvation; whereas Tories saw the monarch as an interlocutor with God for the nation's temporal and spiritual salvation.

²⁰⁷ Chandler, Nov. 1709, p. 22.

²⁰⁸ Hardinge, Nov. 1709, p. 6.

²⁰⁹ Kennett, Nov. 1709, p. 25.

²¹⁰ Clarke, Nov. 1709, p. 22.

²¹¹ Chandler, Nov. 1709, p. 19. The arguments about resourcing a standing army versus the navy had been a source Whig/Tory division in William's reign.

²¹² Hardinge, Nov. 1709, p. 17.

White Kennett now conflated Anne's image with that of Gloriana herself, for an immediate political point: "Such Protection and Support of the Afflicted Protestants Abroad, is well known to have been the Glory of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth."²¹³ Gideon Hardinge ruminated that: "since Queen Elizabeth's Reign, not all our Kings have done so much for honour of the Great Britain, as has been done within these eight years," and God has chosen "a woman, a Queen of England, the glorious Instrument of [Louis's] utter Ruin."²¹⁴ The invocation of Elizabeth had, at the start of the reign, been an image more usually associated with Tory rhetoric, having been given impetus by Anne's coronation speech in which she differentiated herself from her immediate predecessor by declaring herself to have a heart that was "entirely English."²¹⁵ Kennett showed that the Whigs were not above appropriating the phrase to their own ends. Mention of Elizabeth raised the changed status of Spain. For Thomas Rivers, in Winchester, Spain was: "now as Low, as it was Lofty; and which needs the Protection of those, it once thought fit to Insult."²¹⁶ In Westminster Abbey, the Whiggish John Hough made a valiant attempt to justify the contradictions involved in Allied exertions in support of a Habsburg succession to a Catholic throne. Hough conceded that the Spanish "[p]eople were universally abandon'd to Superstition, Ignorance and Pleasure"; nonetheless he intoned that it was necessary to defend Spain as it formed a bulwark against Bourbon expansionism: "But now Spain is for the most part in French hands; and if the remaining Branch of the House of Austria were subdue'd, what could stop the progress of French Arms?"²¹⁷

None of the Dissenting ministers chose the Elizabethan comparison, nor did they concede any diminution in William's legacy; indeed, Thomas Freke mingled nostalgia and regret in respect: "Our late Sovereign, to be sure cannot be so easily forgotten, as to be denied the Glorious Retriever of the British Honour; a Prince who deserved to be beloved." Nonetheless, he praised the "Auspicious Reign" of "The Queen whose Glory consists of Ruling a Free people according to Law." Freke expressed concern for her "distressing Sorrow and Grief ... Our Queen will wear away," he concluded, with the ardent, if rather disconcerting wish, "May she die late!"²¹⁸ In Goodman Fields, Samuel Harris noted the "burden of the war lies much on the Spirit of our Most Gracious Sovereign," and asked his breakaway Presbyterian congregation to pray that:

²¹³ Kennett, Nov. 1709, p. 18.

²¹⁴ Hardinge, Nov. 1709, pp. 17, 12.

²¹⁵ Anne's first speech to Parliament, from Cobbett's *Parliamentary History of England*. (36 vols., London 1810), vi p. 1661. The phrase was inserted into the speech on Rochester's insistence: Henry Horwitz, *Revolution Politicks: The Career of Daniel Finch Second Earl of Nottingham, 1647-1730* (Cambridge, 1968), pp. 181-2.

²¹⁶ Rivers, Feb. 1709, p. 3.

²¹⁷ Hough, Nov. 1709, pp. 8, 13.

²¹⁸ Freke, Nov. 1709, pp. 11, 20, 3, 21.

she long may live, to be a zealous assertor, and Maintainer of our rights, a friend to the Oppressed, a Terror to Her Enemies ... A Prince who, at once, resolves to maintain inviolably the Liberties of her own People and appears also as the Assertor and promoter of the Liberties of others.

Harris noted in particular: “Her espousing the Cause of the Protestants in Silesia.”²¹⁹ The published grumbling about war profiteers and grain hoarders had not yet impinged on Marlborough or the ministry. Marlborough still rated the praise through the range of Anglican clerics, with Thomas Rivers rather alarmingly praising: “that Illustrious Prince who Heads our Armies.”²²⁰ Adams made best advantage of the fact that Marlborough, overcome in the aftermath of Malplaquet with the sheer scale of the casualties, had released wounded French officers to the care of their own, retreating, medical teams. He had: “Demonstrated most Gloriously in the Care of so many wounded Enemies! ... this proceeding ought to lead us to something of the like Nature at Home.”²²¹ White Kennett found Marlborough to have: “unblemish’d and uninterrupted Honour,”²²² though increasingly Marlborough and Prince Eugene were spoken of together. Samuel Clarke praised the “Prudence and Vigilance of our Generals,”²²³ and Richard Chapman: “The Bravery, Conduct and Courage of our generals.”²²⁴ Nonetheless, the re-emergence of murmurings about Marlborough was evidenced by its renewed condemnation in some of the published sermons. In Wokingham, the Dissenter George Conway echoed White Kennett, and praised Marlborough and attempted to silence his critics: “fresh laurels which he has annually brought to this island, may justly stop the Mouth of Envy itself, and make those whose Rancor won’t allow ‘em to speak well, for the future to be silent.”²²⁵

Despite the war weariness, Whiggish Anglican preachers were at last agreeing with their Tory counterparts that Louis was defeated. Samuel Clarke felt: “Strength of the potentest [sic] Monarch upon Earth has been almost entirely broken.”²²⁶ Of all the day’s preachers, only Thomas Knaggs expressed any doubt that the French King had been vanquished. “The Haughty French Monarch is humbled by a woman,

²¹⁹ The complaint to the Emperor about the treatment of the Silesians was made by, among others, Sir Philip Meadows, Anne’s envoy to Vienna. He had previously held the position of Knight Marshall, and had organised the procession to St Paul’s for the Jun. 1706 Thanksgiving.

²²⁰ Rivers, Feb. 1709, p. 13. Rivers was presumably referring to the Imperial Principality which was bestowed on Marlborough. During late 1710 Tory propaganda started to use the term ‘King John’ to disparage Marlborough as a warmonger and potential dictator.

²²¹ Adams, Nov. 1709, p. 22.

²²² Kennett, Nov. 1709, p. 22.

²²³ Clarke, Nov. 1709, p. 25.

²²⁴ Chapman, Nov. 1709, p. 12.

²²⁵ Conway, Nov. 1709, p. 10.

²²⁶ Clarke, Nov. 1709, p. 18.

he falls, but she stands upright, and may He never rise more. If he does we may expect he will return upon us with more Malice, Rage and Fury than ever.”²²⁷

There was little magnanimity shown, once again the “Blasphemous inscriptions”²²⁸ of the “invincible man”²²⁹ were recalled. Added to Louis’s personal perfidy was the perceived general duplicity of French military spirit: “they never once attempted to Disturb the siege of Mons ... tho’ they lay in sight of it all the while,”²³⁰ and “[t]he French pretended (as is Customary ...) that they had by much the better of us in the Action, Te Deum was appointed to be Sung for their pretended Victory.”²³¹ Dissenting ministers, on the other hand, were in no mood even to concede that Louis was defeated, their fear and aversion are palpable: “Is not his Ambition boundless? He has study’d to ruin our nation, to deprive us of our Liberties, to overthrow our holy Religion, and make us Slaves to his boundless Rage.”²³²

Even for those who did condemn the murmurers, a mood of grim perseverance in relation to the war pervaded the published sermons. Samuel Clarke, in the sermon to the Commons, encapsulated the dichotomy: “A great and almost perpetual Series of Success has attended our Arms, through the various events and hazards of a long, bloody and expensive war.”²³³ There was general agreement that the year’s battles and sieges had been draining. Edward Chandler in Worcester acknowledged: “We have fought a Battle, the most difficult, and Unequal, Obstinate and Bloody, that has happen’d these hundred years.”²³⁴ In Kingston-on-Thames, Gideon Hardinge lamented the: “vast Expense of Blood and Treasure,” and indicated a frustration at the existence of a class of people who may desire the war: “to continue yet many years, by those who make their fortunes by it.”²³⁵ Dissenting ministers continued to alert their flock to the threat of extirpation at the hands of the great enemy. “All that is truly valuable to us in this World, is hereby in danger, and intirely lost if the enemy prevail, and only secure as we are victorious.”²³⁶

In contrast, Thomas Rivers, in Winchester Cathedral, voiced the thoughts of those who saw little more to gain:

who can think themselves completely Happy, who are in a state of War?... the present has been so long, and so severe a Contest, as even to weary the very conquerors, and make them wish for Breath and Respite: and

²²⁷ Knaggs, Nov. 1709, p. 12.

²²⁸ Rivers, Feb. 1709, p. 2.

²²⁹ Kennett, Nov. 1709, p. 26.

²³⁰ Chandler, Nov. 1709, p. 24.

²³¹ Conway, Nov. 1709, p. 10.

²³² Conway, Nov. 1709, p. 7.

²³³ Clark, Nov. 1709, p. 3.

²³⁴ Chandler, 1709, p. 18.

²³⁵ Hardinge, Nov. 1709, p. 14.

²³⁶ Masters, Nov. 1709, p. 18.

Peace is the very thing we of this Nation profess to Fight for... To secure a quiet injoyment of what we already have, and have for many Ages contentedly and rightfully possest.²³⁷

None of the preachers acknowledged the severity of the allied peace terms which the French had so reluctantly rejected the previous May. If Thomas Rivers wanted peace now, John Adams cautiously proposed that victory would force France to: “retire so far towards its former bounds ... we have so fair a prospect of a firm Establishment of the just Rights and Liberties of Europe, as well as our own,” leaving Britain: “secure from the Encroachments of Ambition, and at Perfect Ease, under the Free and impartial execution of Good Laws ... in the preservation of our Excellent Constitution, both in Church and State.”²³⁸ Among those Anglicans and Dissenting ministers who did not advocate an immediate cessation, there was on ongoing a lack of clarity about how the hostilities should be ended. White Kennett was expansive, desiring “a Safe and Honourable Peace, with the Happiness extended to all Europe, and the chief Glory of it dwelling in our Land.”²³⁹ Richard Chapman looked forward to “a happy peace.”²⁴⁰ The Dissenter Thomas Masters expressed an almost whimsical faith in the Queen: “Her Majesty seems to predict in her speech from the Throne to both Houses of Parliament, that they may put the last hand to the finishing this bloody War. May our gracious Queen prove a true prophetess.”²⁴¹

The fact that the French continued to provide opposition, and could be blamed for the failures of negotiation, meant that the ambiguity of the stated war aims remained unaddressed. Edward Chandler’s sermon led his listeners to believe that Louis’s continued misguided intransigence was the reason for the continuation of hostilities: “That Haughty Monarch must at last accept Peace, and every year that he is infatuated to delay it, will render him, more and more Feeble and Helpless.”²⁴² Both the cerebral Samuel Clarke and the visceral Thomas Knaggs expressed the view that peace terms would continue to be dictated to the French, Knaggs indicating this should perhaps take place amid the ruins of Versailles.

Let us endeavor to maintain such unanimity among ourselves, as may convince our Enemies they can have no Hopes of putting an end to the War, but by consenting to such a Peace, as may be safe and lasting²⁴³; force and compel him to embrace such a Peace as our Gracious Queen and Her Allies shall think fit to give him.²⁴⁴

²³⁷ Rivers, Nov. 1709, p. 10.

²³⁸ Adams, Nov. 1709, pp. 3, 19.

²³⁹ Kennett, Nov. 1709, p. 26.

²⁴⁰ Chapman, Nov. 1709, p. 1.

²⁴¹ Masters, Nov 1709, p. 23.

²⁴² Chandler, Nov. 1709, p. 25.

²⁴³ Clarke, Nov. 1709, p. 22.

²⁴⁴ Knaggs, Nov. 1709, p. 10.

It was the Presbyterian Samuel Harris, in Goodman's Fields, who cautioned against maximalist aims – using the example of the defeat the previous July at the battle of Poltava²⁴⁵ of Swedish King Charles XII – to point out that if combatants act: “with a Spirit of Revenge and seek at nothing less, than the Destruction of the Countries and Kingdoms we war with, we push the matter too far,” with the result that: “Most High has caused him to fall under a most severe Rebuke, in the Total defeat of his army.”²⁴⁶

The period of mourning for the Queen's consort, Prince George, lasted from 7 November 1708 to Christmas Day 1710, during which time Anne withdrew from social and ceremonial engagements.²⁴⁷ This withdrawal enhanced the Queen's stature among the public, both by increasing public sympathy and by reducing occasions which identified her with an unpopular ministry – in John Adams words at St Paul's: “Never has so much Retirement so vast an Influence.” However, one impact was the sundering of the message of formal thanksgiving, conferring an official imprimatur on the divergent opinions veiled within the separate sermons. At one end of the metropolis, White Kennett was able to give thanks for the Queen's defence of Religion by her solidarity with the Palatine refugees and her vigorous pursuit of the war “for the Liberties and Rights of Mankind,” and to use the sermon as a veiled smear against Sacheverell. At the other end of the metropolis, John Adams managed to ignore the plight of the Palatines, defend the war insofar as it would “fix the Balance of Power” and attempt to deflect attention from Sacheverell's fulminations by attacking party divisions.

Nonetheless, by November 1709, in addition to the usual area of agreement with respect to providence favouring the allied cause, there was near unanimity among Anglican preachers that the French threat was significantly depleted and the burden of the war had become onerous. It is perhaps too much to expect that any published sermon would be so bold as to state the balefully obvious – the French had not collapsed. France, known to be in a parlous state of near famine for much of the year, had nonetheless fielded yet another large army and, retreated in good order, while at Malplaquet inflicting the heaviest casualties on the Allies. Adams and Rivers felt the war should have been ended long since, but their voices found no reflection in ministerial policy. Kennett and Hough felt that Louis was humbled and defeated, and shared a belief in his untrustworthiness with Clarke and Chapman, while Thomas Knaggs warned against Louis's continued malice, a view shared by the Dissenters Samuel Harris, Thomas Masters and Samuel Wright. All this, just as Louis was tapping French national spirit (and Vendome's

²⁴⁵ The battle of Poltava marked the turning point in the Great Northern War, where Sweden's Charles was defeated by Russian forces under Peter the Great. Charles's invasion of Russia was seen as overreach by Sweden, and Poltava marked the beginning of the decline of Sweden as a major European power.

²⁴⁶ Harris, Nov. 1709, p. 20.

²⁴⁷ Bucholz, *Augustan Court*, pp. 220-3. The queen was, however, assiduous as ever in attending Parliament. She had attended the Lords on 15 Nov., a week prior to the Thanksgiving, and would be a frequent attendee at Sacheverell's impeachment proceedings.

defences) to make the cost of invasion untenable. Edward Chandler clung to the hope that one more campaign might bring about a collapse: “Now every Frontier Town gain’d from an Enemy is like taking a Rib from the Body, which not only causes Pains, but lays the Vitals open.”²⁴⁸

As all fifteen sermons support the policy of the Ministry – Adams ambiguously, Hardinge tenuously – a pattern emerges about sermon publication, at least in relation to thanksgivings. The decision to publish involved a judgement on the part of the preacher as to what constituted acceptable opinion, and the range of opinion expressed in published sermons illustrated a measure of the limits of acceptable contemporary public opinion. The preachers who did not publish – Benjamin Loveling, Nicholas Brady and the fiery Luke Milbourne – are examples of those who had published in more Tory-friendly days and would only next return to printing thanksgiving sermons at the celebration of the Peace of Utrecht, are telling by their silence.

The London-specific nature of the Palatine problem is evident by its absence from non-metropolitan preachers, and it is tempting to take the preachers reaction to Sacheverell’s sermon as a measure of the speed with which news spread in early modern England. With the exception of Richard Chapman, in Cheshunt, nine miles north of St Paul’s, none of the five remaining non-metropolitan sermons mentions Dr Sacheverell’s calumny – Gideon Harding was twelve miles from St Paul’s, George Conway sixty, Samuel Baker and Thomas Rivers sixty-seven, Edward Chandler, 130.²⁴⁹ It is perhaps instructive to think that if the ministry had not taken the step to impeach Sacheverell, the Tory undercurrent might not have burst forth in the riots of March 1710.

The Queen’s withdrawal would prove fortuitous in allowing her to avoid the opprobrium of being associated with the actions of a ministry which had imposed significant extra taxation, which showed no prospect of ending the war and which, by its pursuit of Dr Sacheverell, was on the brink of sundering public opinion along partisan lines. The Queen’s charity earlier in the year in support of the Palatine refugees had implied, though likely not intended, partisan support for the ministry’s naturalisation policies. Some thanksgiving sermons indicated how this assistance could be further interpreted as unstinting support for the rights of foreign Protestants and therefore a maximalist interpretation of the aims of the war. It was in neither party’s interest to besmirch the Queen; however, the appropriation by the ministry-supporting preachers, of the ‘entirely English’ Elizabethan imagery to promote increasingly Whig-influenced policy held dangers for the Queen as the public mood leaned more towards war-weariness and Britain-first policies – evidenced not just by the fevered reaction to the impeachment of

²⁴⁸ Chandler, Nov. 1709, p. 23.

²⁴⁹ This argument is based on Geoffrey Holmes’ contention that “if the offending sermon... had remained unprinted it is highly unlikely the matter would have gone any further,” Holmes, *Trial*, p. 72.

Sacheverell, but, on a more mundane level, by the efforts to prevent the export of corn. The Queen proved quite adept at balancing these changing currents of public opinion, as well as the ambitions of those contending for ministerial and military power.

On Friday 25 November, three days after the thanksgiving services, the *Daily Courant* carried advertisements for the sale of the published version of Sacheverell's '*The Perils of False Brethren*.' The first edition had a print run of 500 copies; the second edition, available on 1 December, ran to "betwixt 35,000 and 40,000."²⁵⁰ The ministry's decision to pursue Sacheverell's impeachment would unleash the partisan and sectarian forces which would ultimately demonstrate a sea-change in public mood which would sweep the ministry from power and bring about the end of the war.

²⁵⁰ Holmes, *Trial*, pp. 74-5.

1710: “just and necessary, tedious and bloody” war²⁵¹

1710 saw the suffocation of the alliance’s military plans against the Bourbons, a significant change in the concurrent peace negotiations and domestically, the remorseless removal of the Godolphin-Whig ministry from power.

Marlborough’s overall plan of campaign for 1710 envisaged attacks into north-west France, attacks from Savoy, landings in Languedoc to encourage uprisings in Dauphine, and offensives in Spain from Portugal and Barcelona.²⁵² Allied numbers along the Rhine had been reduced to a minimum to support the thrust into France, to the disgust of the Elector of Hanover who departed for home. The theatre consisted of a sixty-mile front from Aire-sur-la-Lys to Arras. The campaign was one of manoeuvre and sieges. Marshall Villars refused to commit to a pitched battle, the loss of which might open the road to Paris. Marlborough and Eugene managed to besiege and capture the relatively obscure towns of Douai in June, Bethune in August, St Venant in September and Aire in November. The campaign as a whole resulted in 15,000 Allied casualties,²⁵³ an advance by allied forces of approximately twenty miles, and resulted neither in French capitulation nor changes in negotiation. Victor Amadeus, the Duke of Savoy, again refused to campaign in 1710. His lack of co-operation depleted the Empire’s forces in attacks from Savoy which were easily defeated by the Duke of Berwick, whose presence also deterred an uprising by the Cevennois following an allied landing in Cette in July. The allied force re-embarked after a few days.

The allies made their most significant advance of the fighting season in Spain. Allied forces broke out from Catalonia, had significant victories over Philip’s forces at Almenara in July, and Saragossa in August. In September, Charles, the Habsburg claimant, entered Madrid for the second time in the conflict. Charles received no more popular support while in Madrid than he had in 1706. Philip’s forces in the early part of the year had been without French support as Louis XIV tried to persuade the allies of his *bona-fides* at the peace conference. With the failure of the Gertruydenberg talks, Louis renewed his support for Philip, sending forces under Vendome and Berwick into Spain in the latter part of the year. Renewed pressure on the long supply lines from Catalonia forced the allies to abandon Madrid in mid-November and retreat towards Barcelona. Harassed all along the retreat, in mid-December Spanish/French forces defeated the British at Brihuega, and captured the British Commander, Major General James Stanhope. The humiliation of Stanhope, a major contributor to the impeachment

²⁵¹ *By the Queen, a Proclamation, for a General Thanksgiving* (London, 1710).

²⁵² The paragraph summarises William Coxe, *Memoirs of John, duke of Marlborough* (5 vols, London, 1820), v, pp. 200-2, 278-91 and Francis, *First Peninsular War 1702-1713*, pp. 302-30.

²⁵³ Fortescue, *A History of the British Army*, i, p. 357.

proceedings against Sacheverell the previous March, was a boon to the Tories, who later accused him of undertaking the long march to Madrid to bolster the declining fortunes of the Whigs.

Dutch representatives met with French in Gertruydenberg between March and July. Britain and the Holy Roman Empire refused to attend and were apprehensive about Dutch participation. Dutch public opinion had been shaken by the heavy losses at Malplaquet in 1709, but they held firm to allied demands, bolstered perhaps by the generous terms of the Anglo-Dutch barrier treaty agreed the previous year. The French once more balked at the demands made of Louis to depose his grandson, Philip. In July, Torcy, Louis's foreign minister, noting the declining fortunes of the Whig ministry, urged his London agent Gaultier to make contact with the Duke of Shrewsbury, to see if the newly influential Duke was ready to discuss peace terms. By the end of December, messages through Lord Jersey²⁵⁴ and Gaultier had informed Torcy that new favourable terms could be secured from the British.²⁵⁵

In Britain, by now the indispensable allied power,²⁵⁶ 1710 saw a remorseless and accelerating fall from power of the Whig-Godolphin ministry.²⁵⁷ Queen Anne moved to free herself of her thirty-year relationship with the Marlboroughs by dismissing the Duchess, her Groom of the Stole. This gruelling process stretched from their final face-to-face interview in April through acrimonious correspondence for the remainder of the year. Anne also asserted herself in promotions within the army, previously the purview of the Duke of Marlborough. In particular, the promotion of Abigail Masham's brother – Abigail having replaced Sarah as Queen Anne's new favourite and Harley's conduit to the Queen – led the Duke to write to the Queen demanding Mrs Masham's resignation and threatening his own. Godolphin's ministry backed the Duke, with the Earl of Sunderland – Marlborough's son-in-law – threatening to introduce a petition in the House of Commons requiring Mrs Masham's removal.²⁵⁸ The demands,

²⁵⁴ Edward Villiers, former negotiator at Ryswick and in 1698 ambassador to France: Stuart Handley, 'Villiers, Edward, first earl of Jersey (1655?–1711)' *Oxford D.N.B.* [accessed 7 Mar. 2016].

²⁵⁵ Torcy was well informed about English affairs. In his letter, he noted the troubles of the Bank of England. As well as Shrewsbury, Torcy asked Gaultier to seek out '*la nouvelle favourite de vostre regne*' [Mrs Masham]: G.M. Trevelyan, 'The "Jersey" Period of the Negotiations Leading to the Peace of Utrecht', *E.H.R.*, xix (1934), 100-105.

²⁵⁶ For example, through 1710, the Emperor Joseph finally agreed to British urgings and increased his forces in Spain to over 12,000. However, the Emperor held both Britain and the United Provinces to their 1703 pledge – as part of the Methuen Treaties – to bear the full cost of the war in Spain. By separate treaties the United Provinces limited their contributions to a third of the total cost of naval operations and no ground troops, and even this contribution was under strain as the war progressed: Ingrao, *In Quest and in Crisis*, p. 211; Francis, *First Peninsular War*, pp. 21-22, 87-89.

²⁵⁷ Unless otherwise stated the following paragraphs summarise Gregg, *Queen Anne*, pp. 305-28.

²⁵⁸ This was typical of Sunderland's volatility and alarmed Marlborough and Godolphin with its potential to provoke the sovereign by having Parliament publicly question her household appointments.

coming within six months of Marlborough's request to be appointed Captain-General for life,²⁵⁹ left the Queen in little doubt of her need to be free of the Marlborough family.

Sacheverell's impeachment exploded into the most significant exhibition of popular anti-ministry sentiment of the decade. From the outset it was a very much a parliamentary event, initiated in Parliament, conducted in Westminster Hall, the verdict debated and decided in the House of Lords. It turned into a major debate on 'Revolution Principles' in addition to the policies and legitimacy of the current ministry. The prosecution featured rising Whig parliamentarians such as Sir James Montagu, the Attorney-General, Sir Joseph Jekyll, James Stanhope, Robert Walpole and their opponents included rising stars of the newly resurgent Tories, Simon Harcourt and Constantine Phipps. The discussion of the verdict drew contributions from Tory veterans such as Danby, Rochester and Nottingham. The trial's result and the public reaction led to the break-up of the ministry, a general election in which the Tories won a substantial majority and ultimately the end of the war.²⁶⁰

The trial was accompanied by fevered public debate and tumult. On the first day – 27 February – in an echo of the now-defunct thanksgiving processions to St Paul's, Sacheverell was transported to Westminster Hall in a glass-lined coach, accompanied by a cavalcade of eight gentlemen's coaches, through an adoring throng.²⁶¹ Along with the published version of Sacheverell's offending sermon, the debate created a deluge of published argument and counter-argument.²⁶² The tension sparked the reign's most serious rioting in London on 1 March, in which a mob chanting "High Church and Sacheverell" attacked many Dissenting meeting houses,²⁶³ attempted to burn the Bank of England and Lord Wharton's residence. The Queen dispatched her own guard to quell the rioters, dismissing her minister's concerns with the words that: "God would be her guard."²⁶⁴

The Lords found Sacheverell guilty of: "a wicked, malicious and seditious intention to undermine and subvert Her Majesties Government,"²⁶⁵ but attached a light sentence of burning the offending sermon and a three-year preaching ban. The sentence and verdict were in line with the Queen's expressed

²⁵⁹ H.L. Snyder, 'The Duke of Marlborough's Request of His Captain-Generalcy for Life: A Re-examination', *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research*, xlv (1967), pp. 67-83.

²⁶⁰ Mark Knights, 'Introduction: The view from 1710' in Mark Knights, ed., *Faction Displayed: Reconsidering the Impeachment of Dr. Henry Sacheverell* (London, 2012), pp. 1-15.

²⁶¹ Holmes, *Trial*, p. 128.

²⁶² See F.F. Madan, *A Critical Bibliography of Dr. Henry Sacheverell* (Lawrence, Kansas, 1978).

²⁶³ Including those of Thomas Bradbury, who had published a thanksgiving sermon in Jun. 1706 and Samuel Wright who had published a thanksgiving sermon in Nov. 1709 and would do so on this occasion.

²⁶⁴ Ironically, the minister who advised her not to send the guard, the normally impetuous Earl of Sunderland, was himself soon dismissed: Holmes, *Trial*, pp. 161-71.

²⁶⁵ Preamble to articles of impeachment.

wishes.²⁶⁶ The Lords voted largely on Tory/Whig lines. However, the Dukes of Shrewsbury and Argyll²⁶⁷ broke with their Whig colleagues and voted against the verdict, which convinced Marlborough: “that he knows he [Shrewsbury] makes his court with the queen.”²⁶⁸ The light sentence was popularly greeted as a victory with bonfires and supportive crowds in London, Oxford, Salisbury, Exeter, Shropshire, Shrewsbury and Wrexham, though Sacheverell was hanged in effigy in Nottingham, a stronghold of Dissent.²⁶⁹

Sacheverell was feted in London throughout April and was invited to dine with Sir Charles Duncombe, the former Tory Lord Mayor, at his house in Richmond. Early in May, he began a tour of the country, accompanying Francis Atterbury to Devon, and thence travelling to Oxford and Shropshire where he was flanked by a cavalcade of sixty-six horsemen. The tour took on the characteristics of a royal progress – involving ten civic receptions, fifty public dinners and at least twenty-two private dinners with Tory grandees. A stream of addresses pledging loyalty to the Queen and urging support of the Church descended on the court.

The Queen prorogued Parliament on 5 April. Nine days later, she appointed the Duke of Shrewsbury as Lord Chamberlain, replacing the malodorous Earl of Kent, who was placated with a dukedom. The Lord Chamberlainship was a post within the Queen’s household, and did not automatically entitle the holder to a seat at the cabinet, though the Duke was a major political figure – a signatory of the 1688 invitation to William and retained first-rank political acumen – and Anne immediately summoned him to attend cabinet.²⁷⁰ Godolphin and the Whig lords, though discomfited, did not react. A more overt attack on the Junto occurred on 14 June when the Queen replaced the Earl of Sunderland, a leading member of the Junto, with Lord Dartmouth, a moderate Tory. Again, the Whigs in the ministry remained mute as one of their own was dropped. To assuage the largely Whig monied-interest and to assure continued public credit, the Queen met the governor of the Bank of England, Sir Gilbert Heathcote, on the day following Sunderland’s dismissal and indicated she intended no further change in the ministry.²⁷¹

²⁶⁶Just prior to the verdict, the Queen told the Earl of Kent, ‘Bug’, that she thought “the mildest punishment inflicted upon the Doctor best”: Peter Wentworth to Lord Raby, 30 Jun. 1710, in Cartwright, ed., *Wentworth Papers*, 1705-1739 (London, 1883), pp. 146-8. The Earl ignored the advice, voted for the impeachment and within a month the Queen replaced him by Shrewsbury as Lord Chamberlain.

²⁶⁷ John Campbell, 2nd Duke of Argyll, who had been a major general in Marlborough’s campaigns in 1708-1710 and now felt himself an equal military talent. Alexander Murdoch, ‘Campbell, John, second duke of Argyll and duke of Greenwich (1680–1743)’ *Oxford D.N.B.* [accessed 7 Mar. 2016].

²⁶⁸Marlborough to Sarah, 25 Mar. /4 Apr. 1710, Snyder ed., *Marlborough-Godolphin correspondence*, iii, p. 1445.

²⁶⁹ Holmes, *Trial*, pp. 233-36,240. See above p. 164164 n. 160 for the reaction in Worcester.

²⁷⁰Gregg, *Queen Anne*, pp. 309-311.

²⁷¹Peter Wentworth to Lord Raby, 30 Jun. 1710, in Cartwright, ed., *Wentworth Papers*, p. 120.

On 8 August Anne dropped the pilot, dismissing Godolphin, and placing the Treasury in commission – John, Earl Poulett, Robert Harley, Sir Thomas Mansell, Bt, and Robert Benson.²⁷² Harley had returned to power. He worked effectively to defuse the threat to the public credit by city financiers²⁷³ and Shrewsbury was dispatched to assuage the Dutch and Imperial ambassadors of the Queen’s continued support for the war. On 16 September, Sir James Montagu, the Attorney General who had brought the case against Sacheverell, was replaced by Simon Harcourt, who had led the defence. Four days later at a Privy Council meeting, Anne announced that Parliament was to be dissolved and new elections called. She also announced that Lord President Somers was to be replaced by her uncle, the veteran Tory Lord Rochester. Finally, the Whig ministers acted – Wharton, Cowper, Orford, Devonshire and Boyle resigned *en-masse*. However, it was too late to be effective. In the election held in October and November 1710, the Tories obtained a landslide result, the new House of Commons (in relation to England and Wales) comprising 329 Tories and 168 Whigs, with a further fourteen MPs unclassified by historians. The new Tory members favoured High Church policies and the absence of experienced Whigs who would participate in the ministry put paid to Shrewsbury’s and Harley’s attempt to put together a moderate administration.

Marlborough did not return to Britain until 26 December and had his first audience with the queen – newly divested of her mourning attire – two days later. In a blunt testament to the turnabout of fortune, the queen told Marlborough not to expect a vote of thanks from Parliament.²⁷⁴ When the possibility of a vote was mooted in Parliament, the Duke of Argyll raised sufficient objections that the proposal was dropped. The Whig journalist John Oldmixon spotted the contradiction:

the Earl of Scarborough making a motion in the House of Peers for returning thanks to the duke of Marlborough, some objections were made to it, even tho’ a Day of General Thanksgiving had been so lately solemnized for his eminent Services the last Campaign. His Grace’s friends could not but be surprised at such an Opposition, and there was too much Delicacy in the Affair to pretend to think any more of it afterwards.²⁷⁵

The Queen dissolved Parliament on 26 September, and on the same day proclaimed a public thanksgiving to be held on 7 November.²⁷⁶ The proclamation confined itself to a terse twenty-one lines,²⁷⁷ though it did acknowledge: “the wonderful Success this Campaign, and particularly the glorious Victory

²⁷² To whom John Bradley dedicated a thanksgiving sermon in 1713.

²⁷³ B. W. Hill, ‘The Change of Government and the “Loss of the City”, 1710-1711’, *Economic History Review*, xxiv (1971) pp. 395-413.

²⁷⁴ Philip Roberts, ed., *The Diary of Sir David Hamilton, 1709-1714* (Oxford, 1975) p. 23.

²⁷⁵ Oldmixon, *The History of England*, p. 445.

²⁷⁶ *By the Queen, a proclamation, for a publick thanksgiving* (London, 1710).

²⁷⁷ 1707 was 35, 1708 was 31.

in Spain.” An undertone of criticism of Marlborough’s attrition in Flanders was covered by the praise of Stanhope’s occupation of Madrid. By November when the form of prayer for the thanksgiving was published, the prayers barely covered the contradictions between the “Just and Necessary War” and the “miserable calamities of a tedious and bloody war,” and between an openly expressed desire for a “just, honourable and lasting peace” and invoking God’s aid to “our gracious Queen the Blessed Instrument of bringing destruction to a perpetual end.”²⁷⁸

Once again, the Queen did not attend St Paul’s for the thanksgiving. The reasons given for her non-attendance give some indication of the febrile atmosphere of the times; Abel Boyer explained that: “it was reported that the Queen did not go to the Cathedral of St Paul ... to avoid giving the Mob an opportunity to assemble and commit Riots.”²⁷⁹ That it was fear of a Tory-Church mob was not in doubt. Boyer explained that in the weeks before:

On the 30th October, Sir Gilbert Heathcote, [the newly elected] Lord-Mayor of London, was according the custom, sworn at the Exchequer in Westminster; but the Pageantry, some other parts of the usual Solemnity, were omitted, his Lordship well known that he was not acceptable to the Common People, some of whom were so audaciously insolent, as to insult him in his Cavalcade.

However, Henry St John, the recently appointed Tory Secretary of State for the Northern Department struck back, two days [after the thanksgiving] later, a remarkable advertisement, signed St John, was published in the *London Gazette*, asserting:

that some evil-designed Persons having unscrewed and taken away Iron Bolts, out of the great Timbers of the West Roof of the Cathedral Church of St Paul ... This Advertisement occasioned the report of a Plot to destroy the Queen and the Court by the fall of the Roof of St Paul’s on Thanksgiving Day; when it was supposed Her Majesty would have gone thither. Which pretended Screw-Plot (as it was afterwards called) many of the Tories and the Imissaries [sic] of the New Ministry, were near enough to charge upon the Whigs.²⁸⁰

The summer’s swelling tide of High-Church enthusiasm had reached the Chapel Royal. In July Shrewsbury had attempted to moderate the clamour, dismissing a chaplain²⁸¹ for preaching: “a very high

²⁷⁸ *A Form of Prayer and Thanksgiving to be Used on Tuesday, the Seventh Day of November* (London, 1710).

²⁷⁹ Boyer, *The History of the Reign of Queen Anne, Digested into Annals* (London, 1703), ix, p. 255.

²⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 480.

²⁸¹ Named by Peter Wentworth as ‘Dr. Hescrout, an old Chaplain’, actually Dr Henry Hesketh, Jennifer Farooq, ‘Preaching for the Queen: Queen Anne and English Sermon Culture, 1702-1714’, *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, xxxvii (2014) pp. 159-69. Dr Hesketh was 73, had been appointed chaplain to Charles II and published thanksgiving sermons celebrating the failure of the Rye House Plot (1683) and Monmouth’s Rebellion (1685). His sermons castigated Dissenters for committing the sin of schism, and, in James’s reign he upbraided his colleagues for passive obedience, which he found unwholesome. Though clearly High Church, he nonetheless took the oaths to

and foolish Sermon, before the Queen,” and had given orders to: “all the parsons that preach before the Queen not to entertain her with politicks ... they are all told it before they have leave to go into the pulpit.” Peter Wentworth, the Queen’s equerry, felt that the High Church might be “provok’t” by Shrewsbury’s attempt at moderation.²⁸² The Queen held her thanksgiving service at the Chapel Royal, and there was a significant attendance of the nobility. Swift noted that only Tories accompanied Her Majesty: “[yesterday] was a Thanksgiving Day, and I was at Court where the Queen passed us by with all Tories about her; not one Whig: Buckingham,²⁸³ Rochester,²⁸⁴ Leeds,²⁸⁵ Shrewsbury, Berkeley of Stratton,²⁸⁶ Lord Keeper Harcourt, Mr Harley, Lord Pembroke.²⁸⁷” The *British Apollo* was less overtly partisan:

Tuesday last being appointed a Day of Thanksgiving, Her Majesty was at Her Royal Chappel at St James’s, where the Rev. Dr Stanhope Preach’d a most excellent Sermon. There was the greatest appearance of the Nobility and Gentry that has been known for a long time: His Grace the Duke of Leeds carrying the Sword of State before Her Majesty.²⁸⁹

The symbolism of the Duke of Leeds, a defender of the High Church, and twice impeached by Parliament for corruption,²⁹⁰ occupying a place of honour in the ceremonial had clear resonances to the contemporary audience.

George Stanhope gave the thanksgiving sermon at the Chapel Royal. He had strong links with High Churchmen and would later become a member of the October Club, a Tory ginger group. He was a popular preacher.²⁹¹ The previous year, on the same day as Sacheverell’s infamous ‘false-brethren’ sermon, Stanhope, in a sermon given before the Queen, had disparaged enthusiastic Dissenting preachers

William. He died in Dec. 1710: Edward Vallance, ‘Hesketh, Henry (1636/7–1710?)’, *Oxford D.N.B.* [accessed 7 Mar. 2016].

²⁸² Peter Wentworth to Lord Raby, 18 Jul., 31 Oct. 1710, in Cartwright ed., *Wentworth Papers*, p. 123, 152.

²⁸³ John Sheffield, in 1710 created Lord Steward, and following Rochester’s death Lord President of the Council

²⁸⁴ The Queen’s uncle, a High Tory: in contrast to his earlier stint at the beginning of the reign, he had a moderating influence as Lord President of the Council until his death in May 1711.

²⁸⁵ Thomas Osborne, Earl of Danby and Duke of Leeds, statesman and courtier to King Charles II; humiliated Wharton during the ‘Church in Danger’ Lords debate in Dec. 1705. On 29 Nov. 1710, he was granted a renewal for life of a twenty-one-year annual pension of £3,500 from post office revenues granted in 1691. Leeds died in Jul. 1712, age 81: Andrew Browning, *Thomas Osborne Earl of Danby* (3 vols., Glasgow 1951) i, pp. 556-65.

²⁸⁶ William Berkeley, 4th Baron Berkeley of Stratton, sworn of the Privy Council in Sept. 1710, appointed Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster

²⁸⁷ Thomas Herbert, 8th earl of Pembroke, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland from Apr. 1707 to Dec 1708. A moderate Hanoverian Tory, he was learned, a patron of the Arts, and a friend of Swift, and a Fellow of the Royal Society.

²⁸⁹ *British Apollo*, 8-10 Nov. 1710.

²⁹⁰ The inference was that parliamentary impeachment need not be a bar to the Queen’s favour.

²⁹¹ In addition to being a Queen’s chaplain, he was selected as a Boyle lecturer and sales of his published sermons generated large collections: Farooq, *Preaching in Eighteenth-Century London*, pp. 170-1, 190.

as ‘Sons of Slander.’²⁹² On this occasion, Stanhope avoided an attack on Dissent and rather gamely addressed issues which his newly reinvigorated Tory listeners would find disagreeable.

Stanhope began, conventionally enough, with a dolorous incantation on the “Tedious and Bloody War.” He decried “The lamentable Effusion of the Blood of our Brethren and Fellow-Subjects.” In an unexpected twist, however, he exhorted his audience to thank God and: “the Vigilance, Wisdom and Temper of our Governours” – most of whom had been purged within the preceding months – for having preserved the country from the “many dire effects of a Long war.”²⁹³ Stanhope did not ignore Marlborough – though his circumlocutions to avoid mentioning his name gives an indication of how fast Marlborough was becoming a non-person – “yet the British Valour hath in no Age more nobly distinguished itself; nor was at any time a firmer Support of Our Friends.” He urged people to recollect “[t]he Laurels gathered at Blenheim and Ramillies, Oudenarde and Blaregnies [Malplaquet].”²⁹⁴ He was even more forward in mentioning the exploits of his distant cousin²⁹⁵ General James Stanhope in Spain. Given James Stanhope’s role in prosecuting Sacheverell, praising him would have been no more welcome to the partisan audience in St James’s Chapel than praise of Marlborough. Presaging some of the bitterest partisan disputes that were to be fought out in the coming year, Stanhope pleaded: “Can we this Day rejoice, that the Disasters of Almanza, are not only retrieved, but amply revenged at Almanira and Saragossa?”²⁹⁶ Nonetheless, George was not going to deny James his place in the Sun: “To one of these Gallant men, so welcome, and indeed so surprising a part of this Solemnity is owing; that Silence today were injurious to his Merit,” though he coyly invoked familial modesty as a pretext for the absence of further elaboration: “And yet I am apprehensive, it will be thought, Another in my place, might with more Decency, enlarge upon his Praise.”²⁹⁷

As Parliament was prorogued there were no thanksgiving ceremonies in Westminster Abbey or St Margaret’s, so the day’s other formal thanksgiving ceremony took place in St Paul’s Cathedral before the newly elected Lord Mayor, Governor of the Bank of England and Whig stalwart, Sir Gilbert Heathcote together with the aldermen and citizens of London. If George Stanhope’s sermon had, however tenuously, spoken truth to the newly powerful, Richard Chambre’s sermon in St Paul’s brimmed with the frustration of the newly deposed.

²⁹²George Stanhope, *The Common Obstructions to Faith and a Good life Considered. A Sermon preached in the Chapel-Royal at St James’s November the 6th 1709.* (London, 1710) p. 16.

²⁹³ George Stanhope, 1710, pp. 16-17.

²⁹⁴ Stanhope, 1710, p. 20.

²⁹⁵ James Anderson Winn, *Queen Anne: Patroness of Arts* (Oxford, 2014) p. 540.

²⁹⁶ Stanhope, 1710, p. 20.

²⁹⁷ Stanhope, 1710, p. 21.

Like Stanhope, Chambre took the phrase: “tedious and bloody war” from the form of prayer.²⁹⁸ However, from the outset he was emphatic that it was a “[j]ust and necessary War... against the Ambition and Usurpation of the Grand Oppressor.” Not alone was it necessary but, Chambre argued, it was going rather well. In France “[m]any great and strong towns should be delivered into our hands in the compass of a few months,” while the enemy “hastily retreat before us.” While discussing events in Spain, Chambre noted the emergence of James Stanhope “another of our English heroes,” who had achieved: “a Signal and Seasonable Victory”; all of which: “seems to give us the most promising Hopes of reducing that whole Nation under the Obedience of its Rightful Sovereign.”

Chambre bristled at the outrageousness of the High Church mob, in theory adherents of passive obedience, who demonstrably were neither passive, nor obedient. “We must ... express our Gratitude and Obedience to Almighty God, by a dutiful and Hearty submission ... under whose Auspicious Government, we have enjoy’d so many, and so great Blessings.” The treatment of Marlborough – again not explicitly named – was similarly outrageous: “to deny them those Praises which their actions deserve, is an Argument of a Littleness of Soul, unbecoming us as Men.” Chambre did not go so far as to call the High Church party a French faction, but he makes clear that their: “unwarrantable Heats and Animositities” may: “give the enemy an advantage against us, and even invite and tempt him to break in upon us, and destroy us. We should lay aside all odious Names and Distinctions of Parties.”²⁹⁹

In addition to the two sermons already mentioned, eight further sermons were published. The sermons were split evenly between Anglicans – one delivered in London, three outside London, and Dissenters – three within London, one in Portsmouth. Of the Anglicans, Samuel Clarke and Bishop Burnet had previously published thanksgiving sermons, though Burnet’s 1710 sermon was markedly more restrained than his previous effusions. Samuel Clarke preached at his parish church of St James’s Westminster,³⁰⁰ a sermon which though less vehement in tone, was indistinguishable in outlook from Richard Chambre’s at St Paul’s. Both Thomas Swift, first cousin of Jonathan and Thomas Goddard, published their first thanksgiving sermon. Goddard was a canon of St George’s Chapel in Windsor, the mother church of the Order of the Garter, resting place of Charles I and one of Queen Anne’s stillborn

²⁹⁸Richard Chambre, *A Form of Prayer and Thanksgiving to be Used on Tuesday, the Seventh Day of November next...* (London, 1710).p. 4.

²⁹⁹Quotes from Chambre’s sermon in this section pp. 1,3,4,4,14,16,6,7,16.

³⁰⁰ Now called St James’s, Piccadilly.

children.³⁰¹ Goddard's previous publications had been lauded by Defoe and, as a result, lampooned by High-Church pamphleteers.³⁰²

The Dissenting ministers too were familiar, Samuel Wright and 'Bold' Thomas Bradbury³⁰³ were prominent, had previously published thanksgiving sermons, and their conventicles had been the targets of Sacheverellite mobs. Simon Browne in Portsmouth had published a sermon in 1709; only John Billingsley had not published a thanksgiving sermon previously,³⁰⁴ but was a noted London nonconformist, preaching in Crutch'd Friars and Old Jewry.

George Stanhope was rather subdued about providence, perhaps in keeping with the mood at St James's. His discussion included a rather half-hearted call for support for Marlborough: "God generally works by ordinary Means ... but we who have no warrant to depend upon, must tarry for a Blessing upon common Methods."³⁰⁵ The Dissenting ministers, acknowledging the fruits of providence, were concerned that the nation continue to deserve it. Samuel Wright in Blackfriars, recently attacked by a Sacheverellite mob, was not unnaturally concerned with the enemy within: "when Nature and Providence have done so much to deliver us from foreign Enemies, shall we prove our own disturbers and Destroyers?"³⁰⁶ Whereas in Portsmouth, Simon Browne, took a more general view: "Hath not a long continuance of Plenty at Home, and Success Abroad, been attended with the loudest contempts of God. and begot a general hatred of Spiritual Religion."³⁰⁷

Just as all preachers decried the internal divisions among their countrymen, a number continued to define the divisions and attempt to solve the separation. In Surrey, Thomas Swift used the Judah and Ephraim analogy, which had caused such contention when deployed by Richard Willis in the 1705 thanksgiving. Swift's sermon was even more patronising – "The noble Judah ... his gentle, his fraternal

³⁰¹ Buried in the vault beneath the Chapel's Quire. Thanks to Ms Gemma Martin, Archivist, and St George's Chapel Archives & Chapter Library for this information.

³⁰² "[T]o those who were carried away by the foolish notions of Sacheverell, our author recommends an excellent sermon" by Rev. Thomas Goddard, M.A. Canon of Windsor, quoted in Walter Wilson, *Memoirs of the Life and Time of Daniel De Foe: Containing a Review of His Writings and His Opinions Upon a Variety of Important Matters, Civil and Ecclesiastical* (3 vols, London, 1830) iii, p. 138. Goddard was lampooned by Dr William King, a minor poet in pamphlets entitled *Two Friendly Letters from honest Tom Boggy to the rev. Mr. Goddard, Canon of Windsor*, in Samuel Johnson, 'The Works of the English Poets' (75 vols, London 1790) iii, p. 203.

³⁰³ Bradbury's practice of resorting to a tavern after preaching each 5 November to eat, drink, and sing raucously 'The Roast Beef of Old England' attracted the criticism of both Isaac Watts and George Whitefield, who thought his behaviour unbecoming in a minister. But Bradbury, whose motto was '*Pro Christo et patria*' (for Christ and country), had made his mark. Queen Anne was said to have called him Bold Bradbury: John Handby Thompson, 'Bradbury, Thomas (1676/7–1759)' *Oxford D.N.B.* [accessed 7 Mar. 2016].

³⁰⁴ Though he would publish a sermon in thanksgiving for the accession of George I in Jan. 1715.

³⁰⁵ George Stanhope, *The Common Obstructions to Faith, and a Good Life Considered. A Sermon Preached in the Chapel-Royal at St James's, Novemb. The 6th, 1709* (London, 1710) p. 12.

³⁰⁶ Wright, 7 Dec. 1709, p. 29.

³⁰⁷ Browne, 1710, p. 22.

Government ... on the other hand Ephraim now long since tainted with Republican Principles.”³⁰⁸ He argued for a restricted latitudinarianism. The Dissenting community – Ephraim – should not “be consider’d as Enemies irreconcilable.” Rather:

we should endeavor calmly to draw from their wrong Notions, by dint of Argument by Force of Reason, by the Precedents of the Primitive Christians, and the authority of Scripture (all these lying so fairly on our side)... [if they are not receptive] we should not therefore harden them in their Obstinacy by using them as Enemies; for if they submit to the Government of Judah, they may also in time be drawn into the Temple.

Swift moved beyond Dissenters to list Judah’s actual irreconcilable enemies – “Socinians, or Deists ... Atheists Speculative or Practical ... they are Selfish, Designing, Irreligious, Covetous, and what follows, False Accusers; those that raise false Reports, which in the State may be terms incendiaries.”³⁰⁹

In Westminster, Samuel Clarke gave a latitudinarian view which most Dissenters also espoused: “to unite heartily in pursuing the Things wherein we all agree; and then to wait with Charity in those wherein we differ, till even in these also God shall reveal the Truth unto us.”³¹⁰

As might be expected the London-based Dissenting sermons concentrated on the threat from supporters of Sacheverell. Samuel Wright, with understandable cause, saw the rising High-Church tide as: “a very great Infatuation and Madness, and commonly does produce very dismal and fatal Effects.”³¹¹ Wright prefaced the printed version of his sermon by stating that:

It is far from being the intent of these sermons to say anything that should make Persons easy and quiet under the Apprehensions of a Popish or a French party gaining ground in this land” before excoriating those who “with mighty Zeal have been persecuting those whom they call Schismatics,

who themselves:

certainly shew a very great Infatuation and Madness, and commonly does produce very dismal and fatal Effects ... Tis further also urged against us that we preach up Schism from the Church, as well as Sedition in the State ... so that upon the whole, the Cry of the church of England’s being Endanger’d by the Dissenters, we may conclude to be certainly one of the wildest Suggestions that every gained ground in the midst of us.³¹²

³⁰⁸ Swift, 1710, p. 9.

³⁰⁹ Swift, 1710, pp. 6, 7, 9, 19.

³¹⁰ Clarke, Nov. 1709, p. 18.

³¹¹ Wright, Dec. 1709, p. 28. ‘Infatuation’ was a key word, associated with providentially-inspired confusion, usually of God’s enemies, which occurs just prior to, and is a cause of, their entire defeat. For infatuation of French (see above p. 52).

³¹² Wright, [5 Nov.] p. 9, 18; 7 Nov., p. 28.

Among most the of day's Anglican preachers, there was apprehension of the resurgent Tories. Burnet was at his most political: "A perfidious party at home ever endeavouring to betray and ruine us."³¹³ Samuel Clarke in Westminster cited the book of Ezra: "to take great Care, that we are not deluded insensibly to fall back again and join in affinity with the people of these Abominations."³¹⁴ Thomas Goddard, sensing victory abroad, warned that "[being] deliver'd by God [out of papists'] merciless Hands, ought not to make us less sensible of the Danger we were brought into by our Division."³¹⁵

The Dissenter, John Billingsley, warned about a French party: "They know not what Popery is, who can suffer themselves once to imagine, that they may continue Protestants of any Denomination, and yet make a tolerable Shift under it." He disparaged those who mocked: "King William, whose name and memory will flourish (in spite of Envy) as long as there is one Grain of Gratitude, or Love of God and their Country left among Englishmen."³¹⁶

Descriptions of the Queen had altered. Her piety and dedication were enumerated as before, but now there was an air of awed respect for a sovereign who had replaced the most powerful courtiers in the land. George Stanhope saw her bestriding Europe as "the only Arbiter between contending Princes, and the Giver of all Victory."³¹⁷ Thomas Swift found that "[her] Happiness in the midst of her Glorious Success abroad, has been interrupted by nothing so much as our Differences at Home."³¹⁸ Gone, however, were the comparisons with Elizabeth, only Thomas Goddard made mention of Elizabeth in a lengthy recounting of the history of the English Reformation, which, unusually included reference both to the "Blessed Martyr" and "his Highness William Prince of Orange ... our rightful and lawful Sovereign."³¹⁹

Gilbert Burnet hoped that: "those scandalous and unreasonable Divisions and Feuds among us, be at least calmed, if not quite extinguished!" and, in a veiled hope that the Queen would revert from her course, prayed that Her Majesty "be blessed with a Spirit of Discerning, to see wherein the Happiness and Safety of her Person and Government of Her people consists."³²⁰ In Silver Street, the Dissenter John Billingsley contented himself with acknowledging Anne's successes; those of: "that Illustrious Protestant

³¹³ Gilbert Burnet, 1710, p. 7.

³¹⁴ Clarke, 1710, p. 10. Ezra (9:14) 'Should we again break thy commandments, and join in affinity with the people of these abominations? wouldest not thou be angry with us till thou hadst consumed us, so that there should be no remnant nor escaping?'

³¹⁵ Goddard, 1710, p. 13.

³¹⁶ Billingsley, 1710, pp. 20, 10.

³¹⁷ Stanhope, 1710, pp. 22, 23.

³¹⁸ Swift, 1710, p. 21.

³¹⁹ Goddard, 1710, pp. 8,14. Perhaps the reference is less unusual in that Charles I's tomb is in St George's. However, explicit mention of one of the two in a sermon usually indicated a party preference, and sermons which venerate both are rare.

³²⁰ Burnet 1710, p. 8.

Family (the House of Hanover) on whom the Succession is fix'd by a legal Entail," and giving a wistful nod towards: "the Memory of our late Glorious Deliverer, King William, never be forgotten or mention'd without Honour, by Englishmen and Protestants."³²¹

Five of the ten sermons made no mention of Marlborough whatsoever,³²² illustrating the extent of the decline of his reputation during the year. The attrition in Flanders, the war weariness at home and the changes in the ministry were diminishing Marlborough's influence. Stanhope had bravely contended in the Chapel Royal that: "Silence to Day were injurious to his Merit,"³²³ while Burnet robustly praised Marlborough's ability to compel the French "to fly before him, tho' they seemed to have on many occasions all the advantages on their Side."³²⁴ Thomas Goddard in Windsor took a rather bemused view of the year's victories in France, seeing them as a result of the passivity of the French: "[the fallen cities] contribute to the Glory of the Campaign, add little to the Triumphs of her Majesty's renown'd General, who has been all this summer pressing into the Heart of France, while the Army of that Kingdom lay quietly by."³²⁵

The Dissenter Thomas Billingsley was indignant on Marlborough's behalf, telling his rather well-to-do Presbyterian congregation in their cramped meeting-house in Silver Street:³²⁶ "May the God of Grace and Peace save us from vile Ingratitude against ... those Worthies whom He hath raised up, to be the successful Instruments of our marvellous and repeated Deliverances."³²⁷ Thomas Bradbury marked the downfall of one hero by his silence, but adroitly moved on to praise a rising star, Stanhope, the scourge of Sacheverell and the Spanish, "who has bin [sic] mighty both in Deed and Word ... and having so nobly defended a Revolution in Britain, has had the Success to begin one in Spain. A person equally happy at his Pen and Sword, to convince Gainsayers, and put to silence the Ignorance of foolish Men."³²⁸

Indeed, Stanhope was the man of the hour, praised from the Presbyterian John Billingsley's meeting-house near Crutched Friars, where it was: "no small addition to our joy, that we see a young

³²¹ Billingsley, 1710, p. 22.

³²² Samuel Clarke (Church of England), Thomas Bradbury (diss.), Gilbert Burnet (Church of England), Thomas Swift (Church of England), Simon Brown (diss.).

³²³ Stanhope, 1710, p. 21.

³²⁴ Burnet, 1710, p. 7.

³²⁵ Goddard, 1710, p. 17.

³²⁶ "Small oblong building with three galleries, and plainly fitted up; shut in from the street, concealed from observation, as with most of the Dissenting places of worship, built in the reign of Charles II Congregation was numerous and consisted of many persons who were distinguished by their rank and property, or by filling important stations in society. ... That ornament to religion and true patriotism, Sir Thomas Abney, Knt. Alderman and Lord Mayor of London [in 1700], attended regularly with his family at the meeting house in Silver Street.": Wilson, *History and Antiquities of Dissenting Churches and Meeting Houses*, iii, p. 4.

³²⁷ Billingsley, 1710, p. 22.

³²⁸ Bradbury, 1710, p. 13.

General so well formed, and so eminently signalised, as to bear a particular share in this day's solemnity,"³²⁹ to the vaulted Hall of St George's Windsor, lined with the pendants of the Garter Knights, where:

Most Honourable Mention is due to the brave British Hero in Spain, who first made way to the most compleat Victory that ever was gain'd by routing and breaking in Pieces the Enemies Cavalry and afterwards had a great Hand in obtaining that which will probably produce a Revolution, and set the King upon his Throne.³³⁰

In the Chapel Royal, Stanhope foresaw that Louis: "that Haughty Insulter of Treaties" would be forced to "in very good earnest, seek and court that Friendship, which he hath hitherto asked, for mere Stratagem and Amusement."³³¹ Notwithstanding Louis's past chicanery, Thomas Swift espoused the position that time had come to "make a lasting peace now whilst it lies in [our] Power to give it!"³³² Bishop Burnet surveyed the continent and found much for which to be thankful:

Germany and Italy, that were scenes of War, are now in full Quiet. The Netherlands are safe, and Spain itself we hope will soon feel the happy Effects of our Counsels and Arms. Thus we are rendered safe, much out of danger of any breaking in upon us, under our gracious Queen.³³³

However, for most clerics, Louis's duplicity remained an impediment to an honourable peace. Samuel Clarke warned against being deluded "with the pretences of a false and deceitful Peace ... might possibly have been much more fatal, than the continuance even of the bloodiest and most expensive War."³³⁴ At St Paul's, Richard Chambre reminded his audience that earlier in the year: "the Enemy was amusing Us, and the World, with a formal Talk and Overture of Peace." He speculated that the defeats of the year were: "a Reward of their Insincerity and deceitful Dealing."³³⁵ Gilbert Burnet's war aims were less universal than usual, confining himself to the same hopes about Spain: "where the war Seemed to languish, does not see a Great Turn ... [which] we may hope to see brought soon to Perfection."³³⁶ Given the gains of the year, for Thomas Goddard, speaking in St George's, Windsor, nothing remained to be done "towards restoring the Balance of Power in Europe, but to reduce Spain to Obedience of its lawful King, which it is hop'd is now effected chiefly by the valour of the Troops of this Nation."³³⁷

³²⁹ Billingsley, 1710, p. 3.

³³⁰ Goddard, 1710, p. 18.

³³¹ Stanhope, 1710, p. 23.

³³² Swift, 1710, p. 21.

³³³ Burnet, 1710, p. 1.

³³⁴ Clark, 1710, p. 16.

³³⁵ Chambre, 1710, pp. 1, 5.

³³⁶ Burnet, 1710, p. 8.

³³⁷ Goddard, 1710, p. 18.

To the Dissenting ministers, Louis remained a: “Bloody Insatiable Tyrant,”³³⁸ “another Pharaoh in Spirit and Temper.”³³⁹ Thomas Bradbury was clear that Spain had been key to the breakdown of peace talks, but optimistically felt that the year’s campaign had abolished by force what could not be detached by negotiation:

Providence seem’d to remove the only Impediment to a General peace. The Article that came most into debate, appear’d in a fair way of being answer’d, when the French were preparing to receive the Man, whom they would not agree to recall. Obliging him to quit that Kingdom, which they objected against, was a work put into other hands, and the difficulty almost over.³⁴⁰

The official preparations for the thanksgiving provide a calendar of the acceleration of Tory acquisition of power in the latter half of 1710. In September, though the Godolphin/Whig ministry was gone, the proclamation noted the “Wonderful Successes” of the “just and necessary war.” By November, when the ceremony was held, Tories were sufficiently confident of electoral success and ministerial position to seize control of the ceremonial, and, later in the month, following the reversal of fortune in Spain, to negate its purpose by unprecedentedly declining to vote thanks to Marlborough in Parliament.

As before, the sermons published expressed support for continuing the struggle. Even Thomas Swift’s sermon – the most distinctly in favour of the new ministry, dedicated as it was to Harley – urged a resolution of domestic differences and a pursuit of the conflict until: “this most Potent Monarchy of Great Britain ... hold the Balance of Europe, be the Centre of Liberty, the Curb of Tyranny, and the Relief of the Oppressed.”³⁴¹ Though secret, unattributable diplomacy had started with the French, via the Earl of Jersey and Gaultier, the Whigs were levelling accusations of Jacobitism and Tory propagandists had started to denigrate Marlborough obliquely in print.³⁴² The news of the defeat at Brihuega, the capture of Stanhope and the collapse of the Habsburg occupation of Aragon, did not reach London until 23 December, two weeks after the ceremonies.³⁴³ This latest collapse of the military effort to dethrone Philip meant that peace negotiations would have to accommodate Bourbon requirements in regard to the Spanish monarchy – the initial cause of the war – or last until Louis could be forced to turn on his grandson,

³³⁸ Samuel Wright, [5 Dec., p. 10] Dec. 1709.

³³⁹ Billingsley, 1710, p. 9.

³⁴⁰ Bradbury, 1710, p. 13.

³⁴¹ Swift, 1710, p. 26.

³⁴² The second volume of Mrs Manley’s Novel *‘Memoirs of Europe towards the Close of the Eight Century’* appeared in November 1710 and featured a ruthless Stauracius (Marlborough) whose ambition is a threat to the crown.

³⁴³ Which effectively ended ‘No Peace without Spain’ as a practical policy objective, though not as a partisan slogan: Hill, ‘Change of Government’.

something he had refused to do for the last four years, even in the face of military invasion and domestic famine.

Movements in the centre of gravity of the polity were evident in the complete absence of comment about the plight of foreign Protestants. Wright and Bradbury, popular Dissenting preachers, limited themselves to discourses about Britain's domestic turmoil, even Gilbert Burnet, whose 1706 Thanksgiving sermon in St Paul's had so excited Huguenot hopes, was content to survey the various fronts – Germany, Italy, Netherlands – and declared all quiet, save Spain. He also returned to the rather patronising hope that domestic Dissent could be defused by the beauty of the ceremony and practice of the Church of England. Perhaps the fact that the Whig ministry's peace articles of March 1709 had not included anything in relation to the conditions of French subjects, as well as the current apprehensions following the change of ministry, had refocused their thoughts.

Another shift notable in the sermons is the decline in fortunes of the Duke of Marlborough. Those preachers who were indignant on his behalf – Chambres, Wright and Billingsley – described a new level of dishonourable ingratitude, more ominous than the 'murmurings' and envy mentioned in previous years. More alarming was the silence of fully half the preachers with respect to Marlborough, and the effort by some to summon up a new hero in Stanhope.

The thanksgiving ceremonies of November 1710 show how far the Queen's new Tory ministry had come in terms of position and office, but how far they were from changing accountable opinion. It is, of course possible, that Shrewsbury, Harley and St John hoped for a French military collapse which would change the peace terms. Nonetheless, the road to achieving a peace deal would progressively entail the destruction of Marlborough's reputation, secret agreements with the French and the rupturing of the Grand Alliance. In November 1710, accountable opinion, as represented by the thanksgiving sermons, was prepared for none of these policies.

Chapter Five: 1711-13

The Authority of Princes, “tis true, is founded in their Commission from God, and Obedience is a necessary Duty of the Subject”¹

The change in attitude within the ministry towards the war was evidenced by the lack of thanksgiving ceremonies from November 1710 until the Peace of Utrecht in July 1713. Fast sermons and ceremonies continued at the outset of each year’s campaign, and in March 1710, the moderate Tory divine Phillip Bisse² alluded to the slow pace of gains from the current campaign and the complexity of agreeing peace: “the pretensions of the several States engaged [in war] ... are so various to be provided for, and so difficult to be satisfied, that no human wisdom seems sufficient to retrieve us out of this perplex’d Condition, and restore to All a Safe and Reasonable Peace.”³ A year later, the headmaster of Eton, Andrew Snape,⁴ in a Fast Day sermon before the Commons, lamented the: “unexpectedly long and tedious, bloody and expensive” war, and warned against “unsubdu’d Obstinacy”⁵ in seeking ways to resolve it.

The chief engagements of the campaign of 1711 were in Flanders, where Marlborough waged a tactically brilliant campaign of feint and false marches, outmanoeuvring Villars, crossing the *ne plus ultra* entrenchments and, in September, capturing Bouchain, a crossing-point on the Scheldt. However, the casualty figures were 16,000 and at the end of that year’s campaign, allied lines were only about twelve miles closer to Paris than they had been at the end of the 1710 campaign.⁶

¹ William Law, 1713, p. 20.

² Bisse was Robert Harley’s cousin and son-in-law of Thomas Osborne, Duke of Leeds. His connection with Harley secured him preferment as Bishop of St David’s, in 1710 and translation to the see of Hereford in 1713: William Marshall, ‘Bisse, Philip (*bap.* 1666, *d.* 1721)’, *Oxford DNB* [accessed 7 Mar. 2016].

³ Bisse, 1710, p. 7.

⁴ Snape had been chaplain to Duke of Somerset. A High Churchman, he was central to the Bangorian controversy and attacked Bishop Hoadly’s latitudinarian principles. He replaced Dr John Adams (who gave the Nov. 1709 Thanksgiving sermon in St Paul’s) as provost of King’s College Cambridge on death in 1720. He was fêted by High-Churchmen and was instrumental in uniting the Tory interest at Cambridge at the parliamentary election of 1720. Thomas Hearne wrote that King’s had lost the support of the court by electing so unpopular a provost: Thompson Cooper, ‘Snape, Andrew (1675–1742)’, rev. William Gibson, *Oxford DNB*, [accessed 7 Mar. 2016].

⁵ Andrew Snape, *A Sermon Preach’d before the Honourable House of Commons, on Wednesday the 28th of Mar., 1711* (London, 1711), pp. 7, 26.

⁶ On 4 Jun. 1706, after the battle of Ramillies, the allied camp at Aersele was 140 miles from Paris. Bethune, the prize of the 1709 campaign is 126 miles from Paris, Bouchain is 114 miles. See Jamel Ostwald, ‘The “Decisive” Battle of Ramillies’, *The Journal of Military History*, lxiv (2000) pp. 649-77.

The Holy Roman Emperor Joseph died of smallpox in April 1711, throwing the Imperial war effort into chaos. Prince Eugene withdrew Imperial troops from Flanders to protect the various German Princes along the Rhine, who were threatened with a renewed invasion by Max Emmanuel of Bavaria at the head of French troops. In Savoy, Victor Amadeus agreed to renew fighting on the allies' behalf, but little was accomplished. In Spain, some desultory fighting occurred in Catalonia, but in general, Philip consolidated his hold on the rest of the country. Charles left Catalonia in September to become the Emperor Charles VI in October 1711.⁷

On 11 September, in something close to a parody of previous thanksgivings, St John ordered the Tower guns to be fired on receipt of the news of the taking of Bouchain.⁸ However, no general thanksgiving services were ordered. On 9 September, Dr Francis Hare, chaplain-general to the army in Flanders and a long-time Marlborough acolyte, gave a thanksgiving sermon at Avenes Le Sec, about six kilometres east of Bouchain, which was published in London on 25 September at the behest of the Whig propagandist, Arthur Maynwaring.⁹

Hare's sermon was entitled *The Charge of God to Joshua* and was a plea for constancy of purpose. Using a common analogy, Hare identified Britain with the Israelites taking possession of the 'promised land' and there was no doubt as to the identity of the contemporary Joshua as God's instrument. Speaking on the banks of the Scheldt, Hare noted:

[Joshua] whose arms he had so signally prosper'd against the Amorites ... [The Israelites who] Were now brought to the very banks of Jordan, could not be so fearful as to stop there, or doubt with themselves whether or no they should try to pass the River, and get possession of the Land which God had promised them.

Indeed, to give up the fight prematurely would be to defy God's plan:

we should seem to betray the Cause of God; for the Cause of our Country he has made his own ... We defeat the End he seems to design in the many successes he has given us.

⁷ Ingrao, *In Quest and Crisis*, pp. 215-219. Charles was unanimously supported by the German electors, Ingrao makes the point that such support would have been unlikely had the Electors felt there was a realistic chance that he would ascend the Spanish throne. It was not just English Tories who worried about Habsburg hegemony.

⁸ "I have sent an express to Windsor with your Grace's letter to the Queen, the tower guns I have ordered to fire, and I beg you to believe that I take such part in this success as becomes an honest man": St John to Marlborough, 11 Sept. 1711. *Letters and Correspondence, Public and Private of the Right Honourable Henry St John, Lord Viscount Bolingbroke*, Gilbert Parke, ed., (4 vols., London, 1798)i, p. 353. If it occurred at all, it was a muffled fusillade, the Tower's salute is not mentioned by Luttrell, Peter Wentworth, or in the *Gazette*.

⁹ J. Oldmixon, ed., *The Life and Posthumous Works of Arthur Maynwaring, Esq.*, (London, 1715), p. 324. Hare and Maynwaring were to become the principal propagandists on the Whig point of view of the next two years. Hare had published a thanksgiving sermon, given to the members of the House of Commons, in 1709.

Hare appealed to his audience to:

persevere bravely in the just and necessary War we are engag'd in, till we obtain such a Peace, as the many successes he has given us naturally lead to, and by the Continuance of the Divine Favour, must end in, if we can be content to wait his leisure.

Hare made no direct mention of the Queen or of Marlborough. However, he did acknowledge the gloom surrounding the war effort:

The Clouds have never this War thickened more, or look'd blacker than this Year ... we apprehended nothing less than the Dissolution of the whole Alliance ... Add to this the low Condition of Affairs in other parts, and the Violence of our unhappy Divisions at Home, which not only weaken our own Hands, but dishearten our Allies, but give the common enemy new Heart, in hopes he may still turn the Fortune of the war.

He blamed the lack of British, and hence allied resolution on: “a misfortune which free Assemblies and popular or mixt Governments are almost unavoidably expos'd to,” and wondered if:

we excel the Israelites in that which is the only sure Principle of Constancy, a firm Confidence in God? Are not we guilty of Impatience and Distrust? ... the Justice and Necessity of our Cause is little short of the force of a Command.¹⁰

In conjunction with the sermon, Hare published a pamphlet attempting to counteract Tory propaganda denigrating Marlborough's achievements, and, along with Maynwaring, was the most active Whig pamphleteer in this period. The pace of the controversy quickened, and Hare's published sermon soon faced a counterblast from the pen of Mrs Delarivier Manley called *A Learned Comment upon Dr Hare's Excellent Sermon*.¹¹

A Learned Comment was a direct attack on the Whig view of the war, on Marlborough and on the assumptions underpinning Hare's sermon. However, in order to begin its assault, it was first necessary to desacralise the preacher, the better to bring the sermon into the propaganda arena: “If a colonel had been to preach at the head of his regiment, I believe he would have made just such a sermon.” No part of the sermon was untouched. Even the rather conventional false modesty of Hare's introduction was

¹⁰ Quotes from Hare's sermon in this section are from pp. 16, 7, 20, 6, 17-18, 14-5.

¹¹ The tract is sometimes attributed to Jonathan Swift, who did admit to giving ‘some hints’ during its composition (Abigail Williams, ed., *Journal to Stella*, (Cambridge, 2013), Letter 33, 3 Nov. 1711, p 315). Up to this point Mrs Manley had been noted for scurrilous, though veiled, attacks on Marlborough and the Whig ministry. See above p. 195 n.342.

mocked: “But the good doctor’s zeal for the continuation of the war must atone for the rest of his defects. His politics and his divinity seem to be much of a size.”¹²

Marlborough was mocked for self-aggrandisement to the point of deification. Where Hare scolded Britain to “be content to wait his leisure” for a final victory, Mrs Manley wondered whether “it be God’s or the Duke of Marlborough’s leisure he would have us wait?” In startlingly direct terms the pamphlet both issued a clear refutation of the analogy of Britons as Israelites and named Britain’s allies as sole beneficiaries of the expenditure of British blood and treasure:

Our case and the Israelites is very different. What they conquered, they got for themselves; we take a view of the land, as they did, and ‘behold it to be exceeding good,’ but good for others. If Joshua had spent many years in conquering the Amorites (with the loss of infinite blood and treasure), and then delivered the land over to the Gibeonites, the Israelites might have had good reason to murmur; and that has been our case.¹³

The pamphlet proceeded to level very pointed accusations at the Duke, presaging ministry-sponsored criticism to come:

If the Duke of Marlborough be Moses, what Promised Land is he bringing us to, unless this sermon be preached only to the Dutch? He may have promised them land, and they him something else, and both been as good as their word.

Hare’s superficial lament about the lack of constancy of “popular or mixt governments” was hurled back with a concern about overweening ambition, in one of the first public mentions of Marlborough’s March 1709 request to be made Captain-General for life: “A very good argument for this war; a good overture and warning, to make a general for life.”

Marlborough, as the British Moses, had reversed the Biblical journey – Britons had been taken from a land of milk and honey into a wilderness: “that is poverty and misery, and are like to be kept in the wilderness till this generation and the next too are consumed, by mortgages, anticipations.” The pamphlet spoke of the illogicality of the war of attrition in Flanders:

According to the doctrine laid down by our author, we must never be inclined to peace till we lose a battle: every victory ought to be a motive to continue the war. Upon this principle, I suppose, a peace was refused after the battle of Ramillies.

Manley then returned to the theme of weariness and futile impoverishment: “We have pretty well mortgaged posterity, by the expenses of this devouring war: and must we never see an end to it, till there

¹²Delarivier Manley, *A learned comment upon Dr Hare's excellent sermon preach'd before the D. of Marlborough, On the Surrender of Bouchain. By an Enemy to Peace* (London, 1711).

¹³ *Ibid.* p. 3.

is not an enemy left to contend with, for so our author would intimate?" She even managed to daub Dr Hare with the unpopularity of the Palatine immigrants:

what avails our miseries at home; a little paltry wealth, the decay of trade, increase of taxes, dearness of necessaries, expense of blood, and lives of our countrymen? are there not foreigners to supply their places? have not the loss of so many brave soldiers been offered to the legislature as a reason for calling in such numbers of poor Palatines.¹⁴

The defeat of Stanhope at Briheuga in December 1710 had ended the practicality of the 'No Peace without Spain' policy – though not its advocacy by the Whigs. The cost and fruitlessness of the 1711 Flanders campaign marked a turning-point in British policy towards support of the war as a whole. While the victory at Bouchain gave the pro-war party a boost, it became clear to the ministry and its propagandists that in order to achieve peace it would be necessary to denigrate the war's main advocates as stakeholders in its continuation. Marlborough, the former Whig ministers, and Britain's allies in the common cause would increasingly become targets of publicly expressed vilification. Envy of Marlborough's private wealth, always the cause of murmurings, became an effective source of discredit. As early as March 1711, in his fast day sermon before the Commons, Andrew Snape made clear references to private enrichment: "self-interest and guile ... Greedy and rapacious humours."¹⁵

The revelation in October of the secret Prior-Mesnager negotiations, resulting in the publication of preliminary articles for a peace,¹⁶ temporarily embarrassed the ministry but the relative lack of outcry indicated a widespread desire for peace. Defoe's pamphlet *Reasons why this Nation Ought to put a Speedy End to this Expensive War*¹⁷ linked England's high-handed terms at the Gertruydenberg negotiations with the futility of the attrition in Flanders. Defoe also introduced the argument that, with the accession of Charles as Holy Roman Emperor, an allied victory in Spain would have the effect of creating a Habsburg hegemony, which had the potential to be as threatening to the balance of power in Europe as a Bourbon behemoth. It was Swift's pamphlet, *The Conduct of the Allies*, published in November 1711, which claimed to fully reveal the ministry's methods for achieving its aims. In it he castigated Marlborough and his family, whose private interests threatened the wellbeing of Britain and authority of the Queen. He decried the previous ministry as being in thrall to the allies, particularly the Dutch, who used British resources to further their own aims while reneging on commitments to the common cause. In

¹⁴ *A Learned Comment*, pp. 2, 3, 5, 4, 5, 6,7,7-8.

¹⁵ Snape, *A Sermon preached before the Honourable House of Commons* (London, 1711) pp. 20, 21.

¹⁶ J.D. Alsop, 'The detection of Matthew Prior's Peace Mission of 1711', *British Journal of Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vii (1984) pp. 61-7. Matthew Prior's mission was a further tentative step in the strand of Anglo-French negotiations which had begun with the deniable Jersey-Torcy talks.

¹⁷ Daniel Defoe, *Reasons Why This Nation Ought to Put a Speedy End to This Expensive War; with a Brief Essay, at the Probable Conditions on Which the Peace, Now Negotiating, May Be Founded ...* (3rd edition, Edinburgh, 1711).

early December, just prior to the re-opening of Parliament, Baron von Bothmer, the Elector of Hanover's representative in London, published a rejoinder to Swift's *Conduct*. The document aligned the Elector with the Whigs and against the ministry, accusing Britain of breaking the alliance by negotiating a separate peace with the French and of supporting the Pretender.

On 8 December, the Lords shocked the ministry and the Queen by voting that: "No Peace could be safe and honourable to Great Britain or Europe, if Spain and West Indies were allotted to any branch of the House of Bourbon."¹⁸ The Queen showed her determination to end the war by creating twelve new Lords on 31 December to re-establish a pro-peace majority in the House. She simultaneously dismissed Marlborough, setting in train the cessation of British military activity in Flanders. By February, the House of Commons passed resolutions accusing the Dutch of insufficient contributions to the war effort. The Whigs and the allies – most significantly the Elector – were vehemently opposed to the ministry's policy, which they viewed as short-sighted and disreputable. The Commons, the ministry and the Queen pursued a single-minded policy of ending the war. However, the need to preserve the pretence of honourable dealings meant that significant efforts were made to appear to include, or induce, the allies towards an accommodation with Louis XIV.

¹⁸ *L.J.*, 19, pp. 337-9 (8 Dec. 1711).

Chapter Six: The 1713 Peace

“no Praises of the present Ministry, and no Reflexions on the former; no Invective against our Allies, no Detraction from our General, no Dangers of the Church.”¹

On 9 April 1713, the Queen addressed the Lords and Commons on the opening of the last session of the Tory-dominated Parliament which had been returned in the heady, Sacheverellite days of autumn 1710. The Queen had prorogued Parliament eleven times since its last sitting in June 1712, in anticipation of being able: “to communicate to you, at your First Meeting, the Success of this important Affair. It is therefore with great Pleasure I tell you, the Treaty is signed; and, in a few Days, the Ratifications will be exchanged.”

The Queen began by thanking the Lords for the: “solemn Assurances you had given Me, by which I have been enabled to overcome the Difficulties contrived to obstruct the general Peace.” She further assured the house that: “The Negotiation has been drawn into so great a Length, that all our Allies have had sufficient Opportunity to adjust their several Interests” and, with a view to the ever-present apprehension about the Succession, added that a “perfect Friendship there is between Me and the House of Hanover.”² A formidable block of those seated before her was contriving to obstruct the peace. She “delivered her speech very well, but a little weaker in her Voice.”³ That summer and autumn the Queen was enjoying an increasingly rare period of good health,⁴ so any equivocation in her voice may have been caused by the enormity of the fabrications which Harley’s ministry had included in her speech.

The most egregious falsehood promulgated in the proclamation of peace was that the peace was general and accommodated the interests of the allies. Though the Queen had uttered those words to Parliament, she was keenly aware that the Emperor, and perhaps more importantly for Britain, the Elector of Hanover had not signed the peace treaty and were resolved to fight on. Swift’s November 1711 pamphlet, *The Conduct of the Allies*, had been xenophobic in its disparagement of Britain’s allies, their apparent shirking of their share of the war’s burden and their disproportionate gains from its successes. Among the Whig responses had been a memorial circulated in December by Baron de Bothmer, the

¹ White Kennett, *The Wisdom of Looking Backward, to Judge the Better of One Side and T’other* (London, 1715), p. 296.

² *L.J.* 19, pp. 423-4 (9 Apr. 1713).

³ Abigail Williams ed., *Journal to Stella* (Cambridge, 2013), Letter 63 7 April 1713, p. 527. Swift is passing on snippets of a conversation of Sir Thomas Hanmer at a dinner in Lord Orkney’s. Swift dates the conversation as 7 Apr., though the *Lords Journal* dates the Queen’s speech as the 9 Jul.

⁴ Gregg, *Queen Anne*, p. 368.

Hanoverian minister in London, in the name of the Elector. The memorial received widespread distribution, being published in the *Daily Courant*,⁵ *British Mercury*,⁶ and *Evening Post*.⁷ The Elector concluded the memorial by proclaiming that it could not be God's will that:

an enemy so exhausted and vanquished ... should at last accomplish his designs by this war, and conclude it by a peace, glorious to himself, ruinous to the victorious allies, and destructive to the liberties of all Europe, in acquiring the power to give a monarch to Spain, of imposing another on Great Britain, and of making the validity of the election to the crown of the empire depend on his approbation.⁸

The Holy Roman Emperor, Joseph II, had died of smallpox in April 1711 without issue. His brother Charles, beleaguered in Barcelona, was his heir. The same European smallpox epidemic took Louis, le Grand Dauphin, the only surviving child of Louis XIV. In February 1712, the Dauphin's eldest son, the Duke of Burgundy, who had been so divisive at Oudenarde, died of measles. His wife and eldest son also succumbed.⁹ The heir to the French throne was now Burgundy's other, sickly two-year-old son.¹⁰ Should he die, the next in line was Philip, second son of le Grand Dauphin,¹¹ currently *de-facto* King of Spain. To facilitate ongoing negotiations, in May 1712, Philip renounced any claim to the throne of France, which had the effect of making the Habsburgs appear the more potentially hegemonic power. It appeared as if providence was reconstructing the Bourbon-Habsburg hegemony over Europe that the war and the negotiations were trying to limit.¹²

While those opposed to the peace terms were in a minority in the House of Commons, in December 1711 it had been necessary to create, amidst general outcry, 12 new Lords to overcome opposition to the ministry's policy in the Lords. Marlborough's reputation was besmirched by accusations of corruption and he had been replaced as Captain-General of British forces by the Duke of Ormonde on 31 December 1711. A peace conference was convened in Utrecht in January 1712. In May, the British plenipotentiaries at Utrecht had conveyed to the allies that: "Her Majesty, will look on herself as under no obligation to them, and will proceed to make the peace, either with or without them."¹³ By summer, it became clear that British forces under Ormonde were finding excuses not to fight; in July the

⁵ *Daily Courant*, 5 Dec. 1711.

⁶ *British Mercury*, 5-7 Dec. 1711.

⁷ *Evening Post*, 4-6 Dec. 1711.

⁸ Coxe, *Memoirs of Marlborough*, vi, p. 134.

⁹ The Duchesse de Burgundy was Marie Adelaide of Savoy, eldest daughter of Victor Amadeus. She had three sons with the Duke, however one had died in 1705.

¹⁰ The two-year -old would survive to become Louis XV and reign until 1774.

¹¹ Married to Marie Louisa of Savoy, another daughter of the wily Victor Amadeus.

¹² Though at least one preacher, Joseph Harrison, vicar of Cirencester, interpreted the deaths of French royalty as the spur for Louis to become serious about peace negotiations. Harrison interpreted Charles's accession as a positive development.

¹³ St John to Harley, 17 May 1712, *Correspondence of Bolingbroke*, ed. Parke, ii, p. 327.

French defeated the Dutch and Imperial forces at Denain, and reversed the allied gains of 1711 by recapturing Bouchain, while British forces refused to deploy. While the Queen was correct to say the negotiations were long drawn out, it was untrue to say the peace was general or that the allies were satisfied. The Dutch signed the Treaty reluctantly, and the Emperor and the Empire – including the Elector of Hanover – refused to sign and continued the war against the French and Spanish.

In a speech to both Houses the Queen enjoined the Commons specifically to vote supplies for whatever they felt necessary: “for securing our Commerce by Sea, and for Guards and Garrisons,” and urged all assembled: “to think of proper Methods for improving and encouraging our Home Trade and Manufactures, particularly the Fishery,¹⁴ which may be carried on to employ all our spare Hands,” especially: “those brave Men, who have served well by Sea or Land this War, and cannot be employed in Time of Peace.”

In words which were to find echoes in the thanksgiving sermons in July, the Queen deplored: “blaspheming every Thing sacred, and the propagating Opinions tending to the Overthrow of all Religion and Government” and urged her people: “Let not groundless Jealousies, contrived by a Faction, and fomented by Party Rage, effect that which our Foreign Enemies could not.”¹⁵

George Ridpath, the Scottish journalist who was the driving force behind the Whig-oriented *Flying-Post* newspaper, issued an anonymous pamphlet purporting to be a letter from an elder to a minister of the Church of Scotland. Ridpath was a noted Presbyterian polemicist. In February 1713, having been found guilty of libel in a politically divisive trial, he fled first to Scotland and then to Rotterdam. Noting that the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland had “declined giving Thanks to the Queen for the Peace,” he went on to disparage the “new governing Faction who did by Mobs and Tumults etc. seize the Administration, pack a Parliament to their purpose and have since imposed upon Her Majesty, [who] do by this Treaty think to secure themselves of a power by the assistance of the House of Bourbon.” He lamented that the ministry had:

pressed for a Congress with the French at Utrecht, which very much disgusted the whole confederacy... Our Allies in General complain'd of the conduct of our Plenipotentiaries, as being more like Ministers of France than those of Great Britain.

¹⁴ The mention of the Fishery was presumably to accommodate demobbed seamen. Scotland's fishery resources had been almost an obsession among preachers in the Union Thanksgiving (see above page 131).

¹⁵ *L.J.*, 19, pp. 422-3 (9 Apr. 1713).

He was revolted that the Dutch fell under the “charge of Deficiency” and the Duke “was publicly libeled, as having continued the War with no other View but to aggrandise himself and his Friends, with a design to usurp the Throne.”¹⁶

The proclamation of the thanksgiving, issued on 18 May, declared the need to give thanks that God had: “put an end to the late Bloody and Expensive War ... by the conclusion of a Just and Honourable Peace.” Moreover, to signify the fundamental change, Louis, previously referred to only in terms of boundless ambition was now given his title as “His Most Christian Majesty.”¹⁷ Originally scheduled to take place on 16 June, the thanksgiving was postponed to 7 July, ostensibly to give more time for preparations,¹⁸ among the more elaborate of which was the erection of scaffolding in the Strand to accommodate 4,000 charity-children, to sing hymns for the passing procession.

If the pageantry was more elaborate, there was a familiarity about the preparations for the procession and service. The *Daily Courant* advertised: “Places, Rooms Entire or the whole House to be Let, on the day of the Thanksgiving,”¹⁹ while the *Evening Post* carried a somewhat more enigmatic offer: “There is an empty house to be let, for gentlemen and Ladies, with a first, second and third floor, to see the Queen go to St Paul’s ... there being a Bill upon the Door where to Enquire.”²⁰ The effort to curtail competitive equipage among the nobility continued as ever. On 3 July Peter, Wentworth noted: “the Queen hath sent a message to the house today that she would goe on Tuesday to Paul’s, and they have resolv’d to attend her in robes, with only two horses, to avoid confusion.”²¹

On the evening of 4 July, the Duc D’Aumont, the French Ambassador, presented his credentials to the Queen. Though having been in London since the preceding December, the Duke had waited until now to perform his public entry into the City. The *British Mercury* was awestruck by the Duke:

being attended by many of his Trades-men on Horseback, 4 Swissers on Horseback, 30 footmen in extraordinary rich Liveries, 12 Pages and Gentlemen on Horseback. His Excellency was in Her Majesty’s Coach²²; after which follow’d the said Ambassadors State-Coach, the richest that has been seen, a Chariot

¹⁶ George Ridpath, *Some thoughts concerning the peace and the thanks-giving, appointed by authority to be observed for it. In a letter from an elder, to a minister of the Church of Scotland.* (Edinburgh? 1713), pp. 17, 19,5,8,6.

¹⁷ *By the Queen, a proclamation, for a publick thanksgiving* (London,1713).

¹⁸ James Anderson Winn speculates that the delay, like the repeated prorogation of Parliament the previous year, was to allow time for the Empire to come to terms with France and Spain: Winn, *Queen Anne Patroness of Arts*, p. 613.

¹⁹ ‘...at the Cross-Keys next the Fountain Tavern in the Strand, being furnished, and fitting Entertainment for People of any Rank’ *Daily Courant*, 4 Jul. 1713.

²⁰ *Evening Post*, 2-4 Jul. 1713.

²¹ Peter Wentworth to Lord Berkeley of Stratton, [3 Jul. 1713] in Cartwright, ed., *Wentworth Papers*, p. 342.

²² The Duke presented the Queen with nine grey Flemish horses – presumably hitched to the royal coach on this occasion – with which he had made his public entrance into London. Sir David Hamilton, the Queen’s physician

suitable to it, and two other Coaches, four with eight horses each, then 5 more of his or his Retinues Coaches, with 6 Horses each ... His Excellency threw Money to the People all the Way.²³

The ambassador did not lack grandiosity; Peter Wentworth noting that upon his entry, he had been met by Lord Scarsdale and Lord Windsor,²⁴ but “[t]hey say he insisted upon being met by a Duke.”²⁵

Perhaps exhausted by the challenge of meeting the gallant ambassador on the following day the Queen wrote to Harley:

I find myself soe much tyerd with the little fatigue of yesterday that it will be impossible to undertake to go St Paul’s; but however I think both Houses should go tither and I will perform my devotions at St James’s and be contented without a sermon.²⁶

So, on Tuesday 7 July:

About Noon, the Rt. Hon. Speaker of the House of Commons went from Parliament House to St Paul’s Cathedral, his Coach being followed by near 200 others of the Members of that Honourable House, who were richly dressed upon this Occasion. After them came the Judges in their proper Habits, then the Barons, Bishops, Viscounts, Earls, Marquesses and Dukes, all in their Robes; the Lord-President, Lord-Treasurer and Lord-Chancellor closing the Procession, which was very solemn and magnificent.²⁷

The open-air choir in the Strand had the desired effect: “between the Maypole and the Exeter-Exchange above 4,000 Charity-Children were plac’d on Scaffold, singing Hymns as was done by the Blue-Coat Boys in St Paul’s Church Yard, as the Members of Parliament passed by.”²⁸

George Hooper, the scholarly Bishop of Bath and Wells, gave the sermon in St Paul’s. Hooper was a reliable High Church Tory, having in 1705 maintained that the Church was in danger, had voted against the union between England and Scotland, and spoken for the rights of the Scottish Episcopal church. In 1709-10, he had considered and found that Dr Sacheverell’s sermon contained “no Reflections

commented rather sniffily that the horses should have been presented to her “when they had first come over, and not after He had Us’d them”. : Philip Roberts ed., *The Diary of Sir David Hamilton, 1709-1714* (Oxford, 1975), p. 57.

²³ *British Mercury*, 8 July 1713.

²⁴ Lord Scarsdale, was Sir Nathaniel Curzon, Baronet; Lord Windsor was self-styled, actually Other Windsor, Earl of Plymouth. At the time, he was Lord Lieutenant of Cheshire and North Wales. Other, an unusual first name, is a variant of Otho.

²⁵ *Wentworth Papers*, ed. Cartwright, p. 342.

²⁶ Queen Anne to the Earl of Oxford, 5 July 1713 in H.M.C. *Bath*, i, p. 235.

²⁷ *Post Boy*, 7-9 Jul. 1713.

²⁸ *British Mercury*, 8 July 1713.

... on the Memory of the late King William, nor the Revolution,”²⁹ and signed the protest in the House of Lords against the impeachment.

Hooper’s sermon attempted to be conciliatory, though his audience were not the disaffected. Boyer noted that most of the Whig members of Parliament boycotted the thanksgiving: “Indeed it would have been a downright mockery of Religion for them to return God Almighty thanks for a Peace, which they had strenuously opposed and still loudly condemned.”³⁰

Hooper began by asserting divine intervention and mass popularity: “It has pleased God ... to put a happy End to a Necessary and Victorious, but Tedious Consumptive War.” He noted that news of the signing of the treaty had elicited: “a general Joy which the People have everywhere conspired to express at its Publication.” Much as the ministry had used the authority of the Queen to back the acceptance of the Peace, so Hooper invoked the Queen’s piety in aid of a dubious process: “the piety of Her Majesty has thought it fit and dutiful that the thanks to God for this Great Blessing should be paid with the greatest Solemnity.”³¹ He attempted to acknowledge the disappointment of those, including the Elector or Hanover, who felt that total victory was at hand:

Some ... may have still entertain’d vast impracticable Hopes; without any consideration of the many Dangers, and great Inconveniences, that might much more probably have attended us: like hot, eager Pursuers, in a Successful wing of an Army, commanded to make a Halt; who may speak of nothing, but lost Advantages.

However, he was quick to laud the moral superiority of peace and peacemakers, by implication casting Marlborough and the Whig ministry as warmongers. In a note which had explicit echoes of George Stanhope’s 1706 sermon, and Manningham’s in February 1709, he exclaimed: “it is a kind of Blasphemy ... Even in a Just war ... to persist longer in it than necessary, is to change the Side; to begin to War against the Gospel.”

In Hooper’s view, the British were overly generous in support of the common cause: “The natural courage of our People pushes them on to mingle in the quarrels of our Neighbours.” However, “enough has been sacrificed to those considerations ... so many Thousands of Lives, and Millions of Money ... [in] so ample a Demonstration of our Good-Nature, Valour and Riches.” Hooper echoed a specifically populist Tory complaint that the burden was not shared fairly among Her Majesty’s subjects: “The common burthen ... had in the process of Time, and by various Movements, so shifted its Situation, and

²⁹ *L.J.* 19, pp. 108-110.

³⁰ Abel Boyer, *The History of the Life & Reign of Queen Anne. Illustrated with all the Medals Struck in this Reign* (London 1722), p. 641.

³¹ Hooper, 1713, p. 3.

came to press so unequally ... the only consolation was, that our enemies suffered more"; and so, in an echo of the Queen's exhortation to Parliament to secure the nations commerce, trade and manufactures, if needs be to the disadvantage of our allies:

It was high Time that we should have leave at last to think of ourselves; and we should remember, we too were a Nation depending upon Commerce, and that ought to look to our own Balance, and Merchant-like to consider in what End a long ceasing of Profit and vast Increase of Loss must necessarily determine.

Hooper did reveal significant partisanship in the closing part of the sermon, praising: "[t]hose prudent, and Gentle, and Patient, Methods which have prevailed upon Princes and States, and brought them to Concord ... And the great Affair of Reconciliation, which has been so dexterously managed Abroad," and the hope that such gentle effective methods can be brought to bear on dissension at home. He went on to reveal his utter incomprehension at the principles, motivation and behaviour of those who held a Whig worldview:

why, under the most legal, and Regular, and mildest Reign, actually enjoy'd; were our Imaginations to be filled with odious Unlikely Suppositions; with the Possibility, of the utter subversion of our Laws, and of Absolute Tyranny? Why, instead of the Rules of Submission, and Obedience, and Conservation of the Publick Quiet; are Cases ready put, of the Lawfulness of Resistance, and Duty of Rebellion? And instead of letting Sociableness be one of the Properties of Human Nature; why is Mankind declared to be Wild and Savage, and originally in a State of War: and born to the Liberty of returning to it ... The Tares of the Gospel were sown in the Night and when the Husbandmen slept ... But these Seeds of Sedition ... they are a Noisome Seed, that Poisons the Ground, and will Kill the Corn.

The evening's revelry surpassed previous occasions:

The Crowds of Spectators ... were prodigiously great, as they were afterwards to see the Playing off of the Fireworks. Those in Smithfield began about Ten at Night, and ended about Eleven; when those upon the Thames over-against White-Hall, began and lasted till after Midnight ... The Night concluded with Ringing of Bells, Bonfires, Illuminations, Drinking Loyal Healths etc.³²

Given the tension of the times and the invective in other sermons and publications, Hooper's sermon was mild and, in its way, conciliatory. Two weeks later, the Queen let it be known that: "She heard there were some Whig Lords who heard, and liked the Thanksgiving Sermon and said it was no Party One."³³ White Kennett was more realistic, though still measured. In a series of notes which he kept

³² *Post Boy*, 7-9 Jul. 7, 1713.

³³ Roberts, ed., *Diary of Sir David Hamilton*, p. 57.

on various sermons which he had read, Kennett noted that Tory high-flyers would likely have been disappointed with Hooper's sermon:

for there were no Praises of the present Ministry, and no Reflexions on the former; no Invective against our Allies, no Detraction from our General, no Dangers of the Church, but only in General the Miseries of War, and especially the Calamities of a Civil War; the common Blessings of peace and Commerce, with Charity and Unity among ourselves.³⁴

Hooper's relative moderation was not shared by the other printed sermons. In fact, the level of uniformity of opinion in the 1713 thanksgiving sermons was unprecedented in the reign of Queen Anne. Of the eighteen published sermons, all but one were from Church of England ministers who were pro-ministry in tone, most of them High Churchmen. This represents an almost total reversal of the November 1710 Thanksgiving – reflective, no doubt, of the changed parliamentary and ministerial order. This absence of Whiggish sentiment is unique among the thanksgivings in Anne's reign, and perhaps is representative of both alienation and apprehension felt by those of a Whiggish ideology. Andrew Hill,³⁵ a Newcastle-based Dissenting minister, was the sole proponent of an alternate view. His sermon is suffused with bitter resentment against perceived High Church dominance even as he reluctantly accepts peace.

Notwithstanding their uniformity, a spectrum of opinion is still represented within the published sermons. While almost universally disparaging Whigs, a small number were concerned to praise the House of Hanover. Most were happy to condemn "Popery, Atheism and Phanaticism,"³⁶ but a few advocated guarded tolerance. While all welcomed the peace, some enumerated the material prosperity that the invigoration of trade would bring, and, in a new and somewhat startling note, quite a number declaimed the profanity associated with war: "[b]ut in time of war and Tumults, Profaneness and Immorality do sadly prevail."³⁷ While most declared the peace to be general, a number of clearly understood that not all the allies were satisfied or even at peace.

Only three of the published Anglican sermons were delivered in London (including Hooper's at St Paul's) and only three preachers had previously published thanksgiving sermons. Benjamin Loveling had not been tempted to publish since the Blenheim Thanksgiving. His anti-Dissenter vehemence was undimmed, though he was careful to avoid accusations of Jacobitism by welcoming: "the succession

³⁴ Kennett, *The wisdom of Looking Backward*, p. 296.

³⁵ Hill's sermon (ESTC citation no. T180535) is bound into *Sermons Preached upon days of Thanksgiving A. D. 1705-46*, part of Newcastle Library's Thomlinson Collection: 4332 (1st Size). Thanks to Ms Sarah Mulligan of the Newcastle Library's Heritage Team for her diligent pursuit of this reference.

³⁶ Milbourne, 1713, Preface, p. 2.

³⁷ Bear, 1713, p. 12.

settled in the Protestant Line.”³⁸ Luke Milbourne and Philip Stubbs were vehement political Sacheverellites, Milbourne not having published a thanksgiving sermon since Blenheim, Stubbs since Ramillies. Nicholas Brady of Richmond published his first sermon since 1707. Notable new publishers were William Law, a fellow of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, whose Jacobite conscience was long suspected and revealed two years later by his inability to swear allegiance to George I.³⁹ Canon Richard Eyre’s sermon, in Bishop Burnet’s episcopal seat of Salisbury, was described by White Kennett as: “condemning the War, arrainging the General and running down the Bishop of the Church wherein he preached.”⁴⁰ Patrick Delany, chaplain to the Lord Chancellor of Ireland, Sir Constantine Phipps,⁴¹ gave a sermon in Christ Church in Dublin. In later years, Swift would call Delany the: “most eminent preacher we have.”⁴² Jacob Prosser, chaplain to the Portsmouth garrison, had conformed to the Church of England, having previously been an instructor at a Dissenting academy in Maidenhead. His sermon brims with the zeal of the convert. Perhaps the most clear-eyed sermon was given by Joseph Harrison, minister at Cirencester in Gloucestershire, of whose biography only the sketchiest fragments remain.⁴³

The Church of Scotland again declined to celebrate the thanksgiving,⁴⁴ while the level of threat felt among Low-Churchmen and Dissenters was evidenced by the fact that in May, Jean Armand Dubourdieu, Huguenot minister at the Savoy, was summoned before Bishop Compton of London, under whose jurisdiction the Savoy church fell, to answer charges that Dubourdieu had insulted Louis XIV. The summons had followed upon a request by D’Aumont, the influential French Ambassador, that the Queen: “inflict an exemplary punishment on those who have set no bounds to their malice, and have abused the Ministry of the Pulpit, to disperse their bitterness and animosity against the King.”⁴⁵ The French request named Dubourdieu specifically, and was included as a *quid pro quo* for the release from the galleys, following Anne’s expressed concern, of those French subjects: “who were least guilty ... of contravening His [Majesty’s] ordinances in relation to Religion.” Dubourdieu had indeed been vitriolic in his condemnation of Louis, comparing him to heathen potentates, his invective made all the more stinging by the specific details available to his Huguenot congregation. However, in the preface to his post-Ramillies thanksgiving sermon, Dubourdieu had cited Bishop Burnet’s incendiary thanksgiving sermon before the

³⁸ Benjamin Loveling, 1713, p. 10.

³⁹ For reference to Law as a second-generation non-juror. Isabel Rivers, ‘Law, William (1686–1761)’, *Oxford DNB* [accessed 16 Mar. 2016].

⁴⁰ Kennett: *The wisdom of Looking Backward*, p. 295.

⁴¹ Phipps had been one of Sacheverell’s defence counsel. *Oxford DNB* [accessed 16 Mar. 2106].

⁴² Leslie Stephen, ‘Delaney, Patrick (1685?-1768)’, in *Dictionary of National Biography*, xiv (London, 1909).

⁴³ See Appendix 3.

⁴⁴ Ridpath, *Some thoughts concerning the peace and the thanks-giving*, p. 19.

⁴⁵ The account of Dubourdieu’s travails comes from David C. Agnew, *Protestant Exiles from France in the Reign of Louis XIV* (London, 1886), pp. 241-143.

Queen at St Paul's. He restated as much to Compton, namely: that he "had followed the example of several ministers and clergymen of the Church of England." However, given the prevailing political dispensation, Dubourdieu's most effective defence in 1713 was that, while he could not deny having made and published his remarks during wartime, he had refrained from such disparagement since the peace treaty had been signed. It was enough to avoid punishment.

While all the sermons welcomed the peace, a significant number took the opportunity to identify the moral superiority of peacemakers. Luke Milbourne, a prominent Sacheverellite, expressed incredulity: "Nothing can be more surprising, than to see so many dissatisfy'd with it."⁴⁶ Samuel Hilliard laid the blame for opposition at: "the Infatuation of Faction and Party Rage." The party in question, of course, could be tainted with "asserting and maintaining Atheistical, Antimonarchical and Republick Principles and that too to the very Face of the Monarch."⁴⁷ Joseph Harrison in Cirencester was explicit:

I do really think that this Nation will never Flourish any longer than this Church does. Witness, for the Truth of the Observation, the sad Consequences of the Subversion of it before the Restauration by one Party, and the Convulsions the State was thrown into by the Attempts upon it before the Revolution by another.⁴⁸

Some preachers felt the Junto's pique at exclusion from power was at the root of their discontent: "they are only angry because their own scheme is neglected."⁴⁹ Richard Eyre was emphatic that the Junto's hubris went as far back as 1709: "When we saw the offers made by the French at Gertruydenburgh [sic], we were surprised to see so much offer'd on the one part and Rejected on the other."⁵⁰ The motives of the Junto were not above suspicion: "So many amongst us publish pretended Concerns for the Nations Safety, but were there not some fruitful Vineyard which they wanted, they would no more appear in the Care of their Country, than Jezebel in the Cause of Piety."⁵¹

More generally, the sermons opined that the fault lay in the ideology of a party which encouraged: "a Factious nature, and Rebellious Principle."⁵² This rebelliousness was incarnated by: "those that despise Dominions and speak Evil of Dignitaries ... a Set of People amongst us should dare to calumniate the Administration of their Earthly Prince."⁵³ Richard Eyre was clear, concerning: "the Rage of some of them hath been so Furious and Frightful ... But that unnatural Doctrine, which teaches the

⁴⁶ Milbourne, 1713, Preface p. 1.

⁴⁷ Hilliard, 1713, pp. 23, 24.

⁴⁸ Harrison, 1713, p. 17.

⁴⁹ Law, 1713, p. 6.

⁵⁰ Eyre, 1713, p. 7. Though no published thanksgiving sermon had explicitly said so at the time or up to 1713.

⁵¹ Law, 1713, p. 12.

⁵² Cummings, 1713, p. 11.

⁵³ Delany, 1713, p. 16.

People to Govern their Governours [sic], and makes the Prince subject to his Subject,” was a rebelliousness which extended to absenting themselves from the day’s ceremonies: “There may be some so Inconsiderate, as not to joyn [sic] with us in the Duty of This Day.”⁵⁴ For Joseph Harrison the boycott was gross ingratitude: “If ingratitude, whether towards God, or Man, be so odious in the Eyes of both, then certainly it would be much more so in whomever should be guilty of it on this Occasion, when all Good Christians and Honest Britons, are Assembled together to Thank God.”⁵⁵

In Stokegurse, Somerset, the vicar Matthew Hole summed up the differences between parties: “Upon the whole then, we see who the true Friends are, and who are the real Foes and Enemies of their Country: they who desire Peace, tender the lives and Welfare of Mankind; but they that delight in War, thirst for the Blood and Treasure of a Kingdom.”⁵⁶

The downfall of Marlborough was complete. In the winter of 1711, he had been the target of innuendo and a parliamentary inquiry into the various logistical expenditures during his time as Captain-General. Marlborough was dismissed from all his posts in December 1711, and went into self-imposed exile in Holland in November 1712 and was joined there by the Duchess in February 1713. The Utrecht Thanksgiving sermons were the first which directly contrast the character of Marlborough to that of the Queen, and explicitly accused Marlborough of corruption and overweening ambition. Samuel Hilliard commented: “Hardly a Morsel of Bread has been to be provided for the Publick, without turning to the Benefit so some private account.”⁵⁷ Luke Milbourne could not have been clearer:

The Statesman, while he’s obliged by his office to be always gathering Money together for the Payment of Armies, has many admirable Opportunities of Feathering his own Nest, without being observed and any Man who considers the prodigious Estates rais’d of Late Years by those who have had the handling of the Publick Revenue and were worth little or nothing before must believe that something more than the Lawful Perquisites of the Places went to raising of such mighty Banks. ⁵⁸

⁵⁴ Eyre, 1713, pp. 16, 11. The boycott extended to the clergy. The preface to Thomas Good’s sermon deprecated a Worcester colleague, “who upon this occasion took a right way to secure himself and his Curate from any Criticisms, by not preaching at all on the Thanksgiving Day himself, nor allowing anything to his Curate to do it for him.”

⁵⁵ Harrison, 1713, p. 11.

⁵⁶ Hole, 1713, p. 35.

⁵⁷ Hilliard, 1713, p. 21. The Parliamentary commissioners appointed to inquire into the abuses of the expenditure in winter 1711 examined, among others, Sir Solomon Medina, contractor for the supply of bread and bread-wagons for the forces in the Netherlands, in the pay of the Queen. Sir Solomon swore that he had privately paid into the hands of the Duke of Marlborough, for his own use, an annual sum, which from 1707 to 1710, inclusive, amounted to £63,319. Marlborough responded that such sums were customary perquisites and used by him for “keeping secret correspondence, and getting intelligence of the enemy’s motions and designs.” Coxe, *Memoirs of Marlborough*, iii, pp. 459-61.

⁵⁸ Milbourne, 1713, p. 13.

Richard Eyre referred to the ‘family,’ a term embracing the Duke and Duchess, Lord Sunderland and their various children who had seemed to weave a web in the Establishment and, in Milbourne’s words: “keep her [the Queen] as a Minor under their management.”⁵⁹

For there are few families in England, even of those, which are rank’d among the rich, but have long groan’d and languished under the Burthen of the War: tho’ we know there are some, who have made their Advantage of Common Calamity... such as found means of enriching themselves with Spoil and Plunder in that Dreadful Calamity.⁶⁰

Just as they had with the Whig ministry in general, the sermons accused Marlborough of overweening ambition. George Cummings warned of the dangers of “any one Man, or Juncto of Men, rising too high, or threatening to overtop their Sovereign.”⁶¹ William Hartwell worried that: “by length of Time we may make Masters of our Captains.”⁶² Jacob Prosser noted: “some persons of considerable Rank in the World, imploy’d in the Service of their Country, set too great a Value upon themselves, and seize upon the management of Affairs.”⁶³ Eyre went on to attack the General himself: “Instead of hearkening to any terms of Peace, an Inclination was then shewn to have a General for Life; had that been, ‘tis natural to think the War would have been so too when we can’t see any reason, there could be for One, without the Other.”⁶⁴

In direct contrast to the rebellious faction, the preachers urged obedience: “It’s our duty to study to be quiet, and mind our own Business, to leave all to God and our Governours.”⁶⁵ For William Law, the subject “must seek for Help, not by passionate Resentments, but in Meekness, by Supplications and Prayers, that God would please either to divert or sanctify the common Calamity,” and there could be no doubt “concerning the Divinity of our Sovereign’s Authority, and the absolute Passive Obedience we owe her.”⁶⁶ In York Minster, John Bradley was more prosaic, but no less definite, though he overstated the gratitude of Britain’s allies: “The Peace is, what our Governors thought Proper, what our Senate, with one

⁵⁹ Milbourne, 1713, p. 16. The phrase is a curious echo of the Duke of Buckingham’s assertions during the Regency debates of Nov. 1705. See above p. 77.

⁶⁰ Eyre, 1713, p. 6.

⁶¹ Cummins, 1713, p. 13.

⁶² Hartwell, 1713, p. 10.

⁶³ Prosser, 1713, pp. 6,7.

⁶⁴ Eyre, 1713, p. 6.

⁶⁵ Hilliard, 1713 p. 28.

⁶⁶ Law, 1713, pp. 22, 37, 28. Unfortunately, for Law, he held some doubt about the authority of the Queen’s successor.

voice, has approved, and what our Best Allies have Received with Publick Thanksgivings to God and the Queen.’⁶⁷

Benjamin Loveling was pleased, if somewhat surprised that: “[o]ut of the no less Primitive than Peaceable Doctrine of Passive Obedience ... Unexpectedly Triumphant, was produced this Peace, to the Satisfaction of some, the Indignation and Envy of others.”⁶⁸

As loyal subjects, the preachers saw the Queen as the font of this moral superiority. William Bear, vicar in Abbotsham, Devon, asserted that: “She knows when ‘tis enough and can be as ready to give Peace to a Reduc’d Enemy, upon Fair and Honourable Terms though Bear repeated the notion that the terms extended gave “large Assistancess to injur’d Allies.”⁶⁹ Benjamin Loveling was perhaps overcome with lyricism, celebrating a Queen: “Exemplary in Her Morals, Primitive in Her Principles, Devout and Constant in Her Worship, Compassionate in Her Charity, Wise in Her Administration, Peaceable in Her Temper, Affable in Her Deportment.”⁷⁰

A significant number of ministers acknowledged the Queen as the driving force in the decision-making which ended the war: “[she] labour’d hard for a General Peace, having lent her Counsels, her Treasure and her Ministers for the accomplishing so great a Work.”⁷¹ In Cirencester, Joseph Harrison saw her as: “the Stay, and Hope and Arbiter of Europe.”⁷² For Nicholas Brady, she: “gracious Nursing Mother both of our Church and State ... was willing to sacrifice the Opportunity of making herself great, to that of rendering Her People Happy.”⁷³ Only two sermons mention the fate of foreign Protestants, never a significant Tory concern. Richard Eyre, mindful of his bishop’s enthusiastic espousal of the Huguenot cause, indulged in one-upmanship on a number of levels, noting: “those Protestants of France, whose Release from the Gallies, we are told Her Majesty hath obtain’d; for which the King of Sweden in his most flourishing Condition could not Prevail.”⁷⁴ In St James of Garlickhythe,⁷⁵ about a mile east along the

⁶⁷ Bradley, 1713, p. 14. Ridpath commended the Church of Scotland for not recommending a thanksgiving, and noted ‘the Dutch have observed a Thanksgiving for the Peace.... justly according to their own Proverb “thank God when their leg is broken, that ‘tis not their neck.” Ridpath, *Some thoughts concerning the peace*, p. 20.

⁶⁸ Loveling, 1713, p. 5.

⁶⁹ Bear, 1713, p. 4.

⁷⁰ Loveling, 1713, p. 20.

⁷¹ Hole, 1713, p. 36.

⁷² Harrison, 1713, p. 7.

⁷³ Brady, 1713, pp. 10, 11. By ‘Making Herself Great’ Brady means the further subjugation of France and the immortal fame that might have won for the Queen. Richard Eyre made similar points (see below, p. 227).

⁷⁴ Eyre, 1713, p. 18.

⁷⁵ The name of the church is derived from the word ‘hythe’, a Saxon word for a landing place or jetty. The stretch of river close by St James’s was London’s most important hythe since Saxon, or possibly Roman, times. Garlic, a vital preservative and medicine in the Middle Ages, was unloaded here and probably traded on Garlick Hill, where the church now stands. St James Garlickhythe is a Church of England parish church in Vintry ward of the City of London, nicknamed ‘Wren’s lantern’ owing to its profusion of windows. The church interior at forty feet, is the

Thames from Dubourdieu's base at the Savoy, Phillip Stubbs praised the Queen as liberator and blamed the Emperor for not taking up the protections afforded at Utrecht:

Our Brethren indeed of the Reformed in France, who were doom'd to the Gallies, some of them for perpetuity, Thro' the tender Compassion of a true Nursing Mother to the Churches of God, have such Redemption procured for them, That they now no longer sit weeping by the Waters of Babylon; and the Protestants in Germany would have felt the like Comfort of Her Influences ... in a Restauration of their lost Places of worship.⁷⁶

The sermons did little to ally apprehensions of Jacobitism. Only four of the seventeen sermons mention the security of Protestant Succession or praise the House of Hanover: Patrick Delany in Dublin, constantly aware, as were all Irish Protestants, of the danger of inflaming the Catholic majority; Richard Eyre in Salisbury, perhaps needing to find some areas of agreement with his bishop; Benjamin Loveling, more a religious than a political partisan; and John Bradley in York Minster. A further three sermons⁷⁷ condemned the Pretender, though George Cummings, while disparaging the Pretender as the Pope's vassal, left the door ajar for a Jacobite conversion: "What Man in his Senses, can ever suppose, that the best Protestant upon Earth, will ever deliver us over, into Popish Hands?"⁷⁸

While there was no warmth for Louis – "The haughty Monarch"⁷⁹ ... "Who was wont to Talk Presumptuously of Giving peace to Europe; has been forced to Sue, and Beg for it"⁸⁰ – there was a grudging respect for his countrymen. "France has received such Blows, as no other Nation in the world could have born [sic]."⁸¹ Ignoring the fact that Louis had publicly offered peace terms for at least four years, William Bear felt it was providence that "hath turned the heart of a prince (who hath been so long an Enemy of Peace) at last to hearken to the Cries and Groans of his People."⁸² Philip Stubbs called on his congregation: "to amaze ourselves with the Judgments that an angry and avenging God could inflict for the Chastisement of an Immortal Man vainly so called, by the hand of a Woman."⁸³ Benjamin Loveling too felt that even those "Arrogant Princes, who have been a long time immovably Bent upon Universal

highest of any Wren church. As it was originally surrounded by other buildings, Wren created tall main windows, as well as clerestory windows: <http://www.stjamesgarlickhythe.org/history> [accessed 7 Mar. 2016].

⁷⁶ Stubbs, 1713, p. 23.

⁷⁷ Stubbs, Hartwell and Cummings.

⁷⁸ Cummings, 1713, p. 20.

⁷⁹ Milbourne, 1713, p. 6.

⁸⁰ Bradley, 1713, p. 11.

⁸¹ Eyre 1713, p. 6.

⁸² Bear, 1713, p. 15.

⁸³ Stubbs, 1713, p. 16.

Empire, shall, at last, by some Secret Over-ruling Influence, become the most Importunate Solicitors for Concord and Amity”⁸⁴

Joseph Harrison was more realistic, though clear that God had taken a direct role in breaking the stalemate and ending the war:

When He saw that neither of the contending Parties were influenced thereby to make Proper Steps towards Peace, He took the Cause yet more immediately into His Own Hand; and, as on the one side, He made such a violent Inroad by Death into the Family of that Great Monarch that was our Enemy ... And render him desirous of leaving his Kingdom in Peace to an Infant Successor; so, on the other side, by taking away two Emperours successively, He placed the Imperial Diadem upon the Head of him, to whom we would have given that Kingdom, which was the Ball of Contention. And then the Balance of Power, which was the Foundation of the War, seem'd to make it necessary for the Princes of Europe to change their Schemes.⁸⁵

There was a conflation of political and religious Dissent, though some preachers exhibited varying degrees of tolerance of religious Dissenters. William Bear felt that: “Principles of Rebellion and Irreligion do naturally produce one another.”⁸⁶ In an echo of the 1640s, Luke Milbourne attacked Dissenters as a Trojan Horse for papists: “If ever Popery get the Mastery of these Kingdoms again, it must enter in at those wide Gates set open for them by those of the Separation.”⁸⁷ For William Law, those who criticised the Peace were wont to “murmur at the saving hand of Providence ... A fanatic Impetuosity has usurped their Souls.”⁸⁸ In rural Wales, James Davies was even more sweeping, condemning: “Deists, Libertines, Anti-Scripturians, Unitarians, Socinians, and I know not what, yea, mere Atheists, such Evil Spirits as Hell can’t produce the like?”⁸⁹ The war itself was blamed for the spread of Dissent: “in a Time of Tumult and War, Faction and Infidelity have leisure to form and Perfect their Projects unobserved; and the several Sectaries among us, to swarm and divide anew.”⁹⁰ Richard Eyre opined: “War was scarce ever known to continue long, but it gave Occasion to the Growth of Impiety and Irreligion.”⁹¹ William Bear concurred: “in time of war and Tumults, Profaneness and Immorality do sadly

⁸⁴ Loveling, 1713, p. 4.

⁸⁵ Harrison, 1713, p. 7.

⁸⁶ Bear, 1713, p. 16.

⁸⁷ Milbourne, 1713, p. 18.

⁸⁸ Law, 1713, p. 14.

⁸⁹ Davies, 1713, pp. 6, 8.

⁹⁰ Delany, 1713, p. 11.

⁹¹ Eyre, 1713, p. 8.

prevail ... Then the Atheist, Deist and Free-Thinker, the Socinian and Arian, the Papist and Enthusiast, take their Opportunities of propagating their cursed Tenets.”⁹²

The spectrum of enemies-within extended to Scottish Presbyterians, who encouraged English Dissenters and who in turn were supported by “Atheistical, Antimonarchical and Republic[an]”⁹³ forces. The venom previously directed at the French was now directed inwards, juxtaposed with rhetorical appeals for unity and charity. George Cummings viewed the Scots Presbyterians in the same way as Whigs had viewed the newly evicted court at St Germain:

the Scotch Presbyterians gave great Countenance and Encouragement to the English Dissenters, but with no other design, than that England being thereby divided, might be the sooner brought to allow their Nation better Terms ... nor, that they looked upon the Body of the English Dissenters to be their true Friends in any National Respect ... so that the Dissenting Faction in England may expect to be carefully look'd after, by the Scotch Presbyterians too, that the Power and Government of England, may never fall altogether into their hands again, for fear of another Sectarian Army, which ruin'd their Kirk in Scotland, and together with it, their Civil Liberties.”⁹⁴

Benjamin Loveling was happy to report that the new ministry was not to be taken in by subversion from Dissenters. In addition to the suppression of heterodox and rebellious publications:

they [the ministry] have taken all imaginable Care to put a stop to the Atheistically Hypocrisy of Occasional Conformity for Secular, and even Seditious purposes. The Apostolical order of Bishops, that has been for some time, most undutifully rejected in North-Britain, by their Pretended one of Presbyters, whose Spiritual Fathers they really are, is now by the Authority of the British Legislature zealously Indulg'd.⁹⁵

For some ministers, there was a vindication that the Church had been in danger under the Duumvirate. Thomas Good put it relatively mildly: “The Church, it is never is so happy a Condition ... when there is Unity and Verity in the Church of God, without Heresy, Schism and Division.”⁹⁶ Benjamin Loveling was more confrontational: the “Church of England is now in far greater safety, under the Affectionate and Zealous Influence of the Promoters of Peace, than ever she was in the Rugged Hands of those that delight in War,” who had not only “declared she was not in Danger, but threaten'd those that should dare assert the contrary, with marks of their publick Displeasure!”⁹⁷ There was no doubt in the

⁹² Bear, 1713, p. 12.

⁹³ Hilliard, 1713, p. 24.

⁹⁴ Cummins, 1713, dedication p. 3.

⁹⁵ Loveling, 1713, p. 19.

⁹⁶ Good, 1713, p. 10.

⁹⁷ Loveling, 1713, p. 10.

preachers' minds who had been chosen to turn the tide against the plague of irreligion and corruption. The mellifluous⁹⁸ Philip Stubbs, who had deputised for Sacheverell during the latter's parliamentary-imposed preaching ban, could not but wonder:

How one of the Sacred Order, and He a Person of inflexible Resolution and uncommon Abilities, at the Head as it were of his deserving Brethren, became the fortunate Instrument of furnishing out a lucky Incident in the wonderful Progress of a good Cause; We cannot sufficiently adore the mysterious Providence of God, in choosing the foolishness of Preaching, as some were pleased to call it in a literal Sense, to confound the Wise.⁹⁹

Such tolerance for Dissent as was advocated was cold: "Whilst you are Civil and Neighbourly towards Dissenters, you do not suffer yourselves to be wheedled by them, into a Separation with them, or that you should Countenance or Encourage their Schism so far, as at all to join with them."¹⁰⁰

The peace was unanimously welcomed as: "solid and well grounded,"¹⁰¹ "just and honourable,"¹⁰² indeed "glorious."¹⁰³ A conciliatory minority – Richard Eyre, Hooper and Delany – were prepared to acknowledge that the war had been necessary. However, Hooper tempered his justification by stating that persisting with war longer than necessary "is a kind of Blasphemy."¹⁰⁴ Luke Milbourne was similarly cautionary: "neither the Gospel nor the Author of it, forbade Princes making War ... But they are not allow'd to let the Sword devour forever."¹⁰⁵ William Bear praised the Queen's piety and virtue: "Repeated Victories, and Successes, could not tempt a Just and Merciful Princess, to keep a Bloody and Devouring Sword unsheathed any longer."¹⁰⁶ For Richard Eyre the war had gone on too long: "after Reasonable Conditions of Peace offered us; they are of weight enough to turn the balance, and cast the justice of War on the other side." He explicitly noted: "the great change in the King of Sweden's fortune," and implicitly criticised Marlborough:

The Glory of Success in war is commonly too Powerful a temptation with Princes to pursue it as far, as it will go and to suffer no bounds to their Conquests ... but Religion can make a soul truly Great ... the

⁹⁸ Richard Steele had praised Stubbs's preaching style as "[having] due Emphasis, and apposite Rising and Variation of Voice, the Sentence concluded with a gentle Cadence" when he attended St James's in 1711: *The Spectator*, 18 Aug 1711.

⁹⁹ Stubbs, 1713, p. 19. Even Sacheverell's supporters did not deny his limitations as a preacher (see p.166 n.171 above).

¹⁰⁰ Harrison, 1713, p. 17.

¹⁰¹ Milbourne, 1713, p. 1. In this he echoed the much more levelheaded Manningham's sermon before the Queen in 1708.

¹⁰² Bear, 1713, p. 3.

¹⁰³ Good 1713, p. 8.

¹⁰⁴ Hooper, 1713, p. 6.

¹⁰⁵ Milbourne, 1713, p. 1.

¹⁰⁶ Bear, 1713, p. 4.

Queen's character above Caesar's or Alexander's, 'tis that the enables her to conquer that Ambition, they were slaves to.¹⁰⁷

A surprising number of clerics saw the return of international trade as one of the benefits of peace. In St Paul's, George Hooper looked forward to the "the Reparation of our Losses, and Restauration of our Plenty."¹⁰⁸ Nicholas Brady was excited that: "Peace has opened to us the most distant Seas, Peace has unlocked for us the remotest Lands."¹⁰⁹ In Abbotsham, North Devon, William Bear was delighted that: "[i]n time of Peace, the rich Merchant may boldly send forth his Ships to Sea, and expect their safe return."¹¹⁰ In York Minster, John Bradley was more explicitly materialistic: "The Busy Trader may now Pursue his Traffick, and make the Wealth of Both Indies Meet."¹¹¹ In Richmond, Nicholas Brady was rhapsodic on the wealth of the Indies: "Now the adventurous Merchant may pursue his Traffick, and make the Wealth of both Indies meet together in the Coffers, without running any Hazard from Man his fellow Creatures."¹¹² In Dublin, Patrick Delany looked forward to prosperity: "that brings home the spices of Arabia, the Silks of Persia and the Gold of Peru and unites the ends of the Earth, and makes both the Indies minister to our Health and our Enjoyments."¹¹³ Matthew Hole had made a list: "we want sometimes the drugs and Spices of the Indies, the Gums of Arabia, the Balm of Gilead, and the Bark of Peru."¹¹⁴

The miseries of the long war were uncontroversial. In St Paul's, George Hooper had referred to the "Necessary and Victorious, but Tedious Consumptive War."¹¹⁵ Luke Milbourne and Samuel Hilliard used identical terminology in adding to the words of the Proclamation: "long, bloody and expensive war."¹¹⁶ William Bear complained: "what a vast deal of Blood and Treasure hath been spilt and spent in this tedious cruel and expensive War: What complainings have we heard in our Streets for the Decay of Trade."¹¹⁷ Richard Eyre lamented: "the Many Sieges that have cost us more Blood, than the greatest Battles."¹¹⁸ Joseph Harrison expressed a general opinion that Britain's material burden was excessive: "Yet notwithstanding such unexampled and Glorious Triumphs of our Arms ... we still lay Languishing

¹⁰⁷ Eyre: 1713, pp. 14, 16.

¹⁰⁸ Hooper, 1713, p. 12.

¹⁰⁹ Brady, 1713, p. 5.

¹¹⁰ Bear, 1713, p. 8.

¹¹¹ Bradley, 1713, p. 16.

¹¹² Brady, 1713, p. 5.

¹¹³ Delany, 1713, p. 6.

¹¹⁴ Hole, 1713, p. 29.

¹¹⁵ Hooper, 1713, p. 3.

¹¹⁶ Milbourne, 1713, p. 1; Samuel Hilliard, 1713, p. 7.

¹¹⁷ Bear, 1713, p. 12.

¹¹⁸ Eyre, 1713, p. 4.

under a vast Profusion of blood and Treasure.”¹¹⁹ John Bradley in York bemoaned: “Taxes ... which have been Greater than were ever laid on us, since we were a Nation,”¹²⁰ while William Bear more explicitly illustrated the clergy’s sympathy with the landed interest, which was felt to bear a disproportionate share of war taxation: “what burdens it must for some time lay upon our Estates.”¹²¹ Not only was the burden onerous to contemporaries, but many echoed Swift’s complaints that its immensity would transfer to future generations: “but our Posterity will be convinc’d that our Expence was Greater, than could be discharged in one Generation, by the Debt, it will Entail upon Them.”¹²²

A division existed in the published sermons between those, like Hooper,¹²³ who blithely ignored the fact that the allies either continued to fight or reluctantly signed the treaty and those preachers who were cold-eyed in their assertion of Britain’s interests. In Dublin, Patrick Delaney was more aware of Britain’s newly acquired power and influence but acknowledged that some of the allies were ruffled. The Queen was: “not only the Arbiter, but the Protector also of all the Powers in Europe: to whose Wisdom they with almost one Consent, Commend their Interests, and submit their claims.”¹²⁴ In York, John Bradley seemed delusional: “What wisdom less than God could have united so many different interests as One and made them jointly agree in Conditions of Peace?”¹²⁵

For the realists, George Cummings prefigured Palmerston¹²⁶ in his statement that: “every foreign State, is always supposed to intend its own Good; and so whatever it does impose upon another, is not for that Other’s, but its own Advantage.”¹²⁷ In Radnor, James Davies decried the fact that: “while we trouble ourselves with Nations and Kingdoms, States and Governments, our own Chief Concerns are miserably neglected.”¹²⁸ In Salisbury, continuing to contradict his bishop’s known views, Richard Eyre was scathing about the contribution of the allies: “the English took upon them in the War, must be allow’d to be above

¹¹⁹ Harrison, 1713, p. 6.

¹²⁰ Bradley, 1713, p. 17.

¹²¹ Bear, 1713, p. 10. Between 1688 and 1697 the land tax provided 42 per cent of all tax revenue; during the War of Spanish Succession it provided 37 per cent: John Brewer, *The Sinews of Power, War, Money and the English State 1688-1783* (London, 1990) p. 95. “The parson who lived mostly off the profits from land, by his tithes and glebe, had to pay a major part of his income [in taxes]. By 1697 beneficed clergy were paying between a quarter and a third of their income in some kind of tax or levy.”: G.V. Bennett, ‘Conflict in the Church’, in Geoffrey Holmes ed., *Britain after the Glorious Revolution, 1689-1714* (London, 1969) p. 164.

¹²² Eyre, 1713, p. 4.

¹²³ Hooper, 1713, p. 20.

¹²⁴ Delaney, 1713, p. 12.

¹²⁵ Bradley, 1713, p. 11.

¹²⁶ “We have no eternal allies, and we have no perpetual enemies. Our interests are eternal and perpetual, and those interests it is our duty to follow.” Henry Temple, 3rd Viscount Palmerston, Aug. 1844.

¹²⁷ Cummings, 1713, p. 9.

¹²⁸ Davies, 1713, p. 10.

our proportion with regard to the several interests concerned in it ... when other of the Principal Allies always came short of their Engagement, and We exceeded Ours by twenty Millions.”¹²⁹

In Durham Cathedral, William Hartwell claimed that Dutch intransigence was fanned by the continuation of the war:

what imaginable reason could there be for them to demand so extensive a Barrier ... Half of which they would have gladly accepted before the War ... If they are allow'd to stretch themselves upon the Continent, and to grow great by the Sword, as well as by Trade, of Allies we make them Sovereigns, and must Pay them Homage accordingly.

And if the Dutch had at least signed the Treaty, Hartwell shared Defoe's views¹³⁰ about the dangers of Habsburg hegemony:

The Virulence of Popish Zeal Reigns no less at Vienna, than at Versailles ... Has not the Emperor bin a vast Gainer by this War? And have we not been all along doing his Business in Spain, and Portugal and making him Great, and Ourselves Little? Did we not fight his battles in Italy and Germany, where we had no other Honor, or Advantage, but Furnishing our Men, and Money ... Can we answer this to Posterity, to Take the Weapons of War from one Prince, and give them to Another, who may be altogether as dangerous.¹³¹

Joseph Harrison summed up the 'take-it-or-leave it' diplomacy of Europe's newly arrived indispensable power, praising Her Majesty's "Great and Pious Design of restoring Tranquillity to Her own People, and to as many of Her Allies as would accept it upon the Reasonable terms she had procured for them.”¹³²

Andrew Hill, a Dissenting minister from Newcastle, published the solitary sermon which contradicted the overwhelmingly pro-government, High Church tide. Focusing most of his criticism on Popery and giving a cautious welcome to peace, he nonetheless warned of Louis: "whose cursed Treachery is such, that whom he cannot Ruin by War, He will strive to destroy by Peace.”¹³³ In a mixture of defiance and plaintiveness, he warned those who then held the upper hand: "Those who love our late

¹²⁹ Eyre, 1713, p. 4.

¹³⁰ As expressed in Defoe's *Reasons why this Nation Ought to put a Speedy End to this Expensive War* (London, 1711) (see above p. 201200).

¹³¹ Hartwell, 1713, p. 17.

¹³² Harrison, 1713, p. 8.

¹³³ In an echo of the moderate Tory, bishop Edward Smyth's 1702 sermon which lamented that, post-Ryswick Louis had made "peace more destructive than War for us"(see above p.37 n.86).

enemies so heartily, I would have them learn to love their Old Friends better ... I would have all of us ... keep awake our Caution, where Our Interest most requires it.”¹³⁴

The uniformity of outlook in the Anglican thanksgiving sermons of 1713 demonstrates the resurgence of Tory feeling unleashed by Sacheverell’s trial and the subsequent elections. The preachers demonstrate, with varying degrees of vehemence, a belief that the war was extended beyond reason, by a ministry and a family guided by avarice and hubris. Foreign powers had exploited the willingness of Britain to fight and finance on their behalf. The enemies of peace were the familiar enemies of authority and the Established Church. The sermons express a worldview which saw nation and church as a seamless whole, and internal enemies who sought to undermine either, undermined both. Some preachers – Milbourne, Eyre and Hilliard – focused mainly on those who undermined the Queen and her ministry, while others – Loveling, Harrison and the now-conformist Jacob Prosser – concentrated their sermons on Dissenters, Socinians and Atheists. But all saw the lines of authority stretching from God’s providence, through his vice-regent on Earth, who contested directly with him on Britain’s behalf, to an Established Church which regulated the reformed faithful.

Most preachers called for unity, but it was a unity of Judah and Ephraim, where Ephraim would come to understand his error and appreciate the beauty, piety and authority of Judah. Benjamin Loveling was less than subtle when he praised the new ministry which had “taken all imaginable Care to put a stop to the Atheistical Hypocrisy of Occasional Conformity for Secular, and even Seditious purposes.”¹³⁵

The preachers were turning their attention to civil society, whether by the encouragement of public virtue or the flourishing of arts and trade. Simon Harrison mentioned particularly the education of children: “the Instilling and rooting in them the Principles of Religion, must be a Matter of Great Concernment to the Civil Happiness of a Nation, if Religion itself be so.”¹³⁶ Benjamin Loveling took time to praise: “This work and Labour of Love, [which] has of late been to Admiration strenuously Exerted in the Erection of many Charity-Schools, notwithstanding all the heavy pressures ... of a long impoverishing War.”¹³⁷ This entirely worthy interest would be turned, in a sectarian and partisan political atmosphere, into the Schism Act, which would attempt to extirpate Dissent by eliminating Dissenting academies.

¹³⁴ Hill, 1713, pp. 19, 24.

¹³⁵ Loveling, 1713, p. 19.

¹³⁶ Harrison, 1713, p. 16.

¹³⁷ Loveling, 1713, p. 17.

Conclusion

This thesis has argued that the sermons published for the thanksgiving services during the reign of Queen Anne allow an insight into the range and progression of opinion on political, religious and military topics. The culture of, and market for, reading and distributing sermons, together with the social status of the preachers and their accountability for the opinions expressed all combined to make these publications influential with a broad range of the early modern British public.

While the Queen and the ministry mandated the services, the publication of the sermons was at the discretion of the cleric concerned. Though self-promotion, desire for advancement and, for the more notable preachers, a desire to contribute to debate were motivations to publish, these motives mingled with an awareness of what was acceptable within public discourse. So a significant number of sermons in the early years of the reign are pro-ministry, anti-Dissenter, anti-William; in mid-reign a greater number of latitudinarian, internationalist preachers published, and – following the long silence from 1710-1713 during which no thanksgiving services were held – the published sermons of thanksgiving for the Peace of Utrecht were almost exclusively Tory-leaning, with the vociferous preachers like Luke Milbourne and Benjamin Loveling of the early reign returning to publication.

Analysis of the preachers and their published thanksgiving sermons elicits stands of opinion, while the sequence of almost annual services allows the progression and change of opinion to be gauged against the changing political and military events of the reign.

Mandating of the holding of thanksgivings was a fundamental power which the Queen and the ministry possessed. It created a national focus on events which the ministry found worthy of celebration and was an acknowledgement of the widespread belief in providence. The pageantry associated with the event in London highlighted the Queen's role as head of church and state and her earthly pre-eminence over Lords, Commons, ecclesiastics, and city fathers. The participants in the Queen's procession to St Paul's gave an indication of the waxing and waning of careers and influence within the royal household, and the enthusiasm of the crowds – the ordinary people of Westminster and London – was a welcome re-assurance of the stability of the polity. Throughout the country, thanksgivings required both civic and clerical authorities to acknowledge their debt to God's will. Thanksgivings were not held on a Sunday, as religious practice reserved Sunday as a Resurrection-feast.¹

¹ Caudle, 'Measure of Allegiance', p. 239. The Thanksgivings were largely held on working days. This was not always without complaint. On Thursday 19 Aug. 1708 Thomas Colton admonished his congregation in York:

However, the state did not possess the power to create uniformity of expressed opinion. Indeed, the published thanksgiving sermons served to mirror the polarity of opinion within which English society managed to oscillate. A significant and vocal minority of Anne's subjects attended thanksgivings in Dissenting congregations and, to underline the point, sermons given there were often published. Disagreements which were exaggerated by partisanship were exhibited within the proclamations of the thanksgivings. At the outset of the war, the aims of the conflict were described as: "restoring the Balance of Europe and Disappointing the Boundless Ambition of France,"² aims which would prove divisive as the war progressed. After the Pretender's attempt in 1708, the proclamation changed its view from a 'just' to a 'just and necessary'³ war, as if to underline the reawakening realisation of the threat to the homeland. In 1710, as war weariness accelerated, 'tedious and bloody' was added to 'just and necessary.'⁴

Even the selection of preachers at the main events in St Paul's was a matter of controversy. In 1705, the *Whipping Post*, a High Church-oriented newsletter,⁵ criticised the selection of Dr Willis, a Whig, as preacher for the thanksgiving, contrasting him unfavourably with the previous two preachers, the Tory bishop Trelawny in 1702 and the High Church dean William Sherlock, in 1704.⁶ The official sermons varied with the character and viewpoint of the preacher selected, for example, George Stanhope's June 1706 thanksgiving was discretion itself, whereas Bishop Burnet's December 1706 sermon railed against the excessive power of monarchs and implicitly called for the restoration of the Edict of Nantes. If the purpose was to craft a uniform message, the Queen and ministry's thanksgiving efforts were in vain. The power of the Queen over the message was demonstrated most effectively by her absence. Her bereavement in 1708 led to the suspension of the formal, unified ceremony, thereafter separate services were held for the monarch, the Lords and Commons. In a St Paul's bereft of royalty and parliamentarians, John Adams lamented to the congregation, whose most auspicious member was merely the Lord Mayor: "Never has so much Retirement so vast an Influence."⁷ The effect of the Queen's withdrawal from public ceremony, ostensibly during the two-year mourning period following the death of her consort, was to dissociate herself from an increasingly unpopular ministry. The absence of an official

'Whatever service we offer to God, it should be a willing Mind. You that live in the Country, should not grudge God a Thanksgiving Day in a time of Harvest.' Thomas Colton, 1708, p. 22.

² *Proclamation, for a Publick Thanksgiving* (London, 1702).

³ *Proclamation, for a General Thanksgiving* (London, 1708). The phrase 'Just and Necessary' appears in all subsequent proclamations.

⁴ *Proclamation, for a General Thanksgiving* (London, 1710).

⁵ Written by William Pittis; Theodore F. M. Newton, 'William Pittis and Queen Anne Journalism', *Modern Philology*, xxxiii (1936) pp. 279-302.

⁶ See Appendix 1.

⁷ John Adams, Nov. 1709, p. 9.

focus for the thanksgiving, had the effect of fanning partisan polarity but allowing the Queen to deftly reverse her support of the ministry in line with the public mood.

Anglican and Dissenter alike warned that God's continuing favour was dependent on the virtue and faith of His people, and to neglect the duty of thanksgiving would endanger the safety and prosperity of the realm. Bishop Trelawny warned in the reign's first thanksgiving: "It is only the steady performance of our Duty to God, in keeping his Laws and cleaving to his Commandments ... that will engage him to protect, and fight for us, to bless our Counsels and prosper our Wars."⁸ And Bishop Hooper's sermon somewhat dubiously justified the peace at the last thanksgiving as: "the Great Blessing of Peace, Just and Honourable ... In which by the Events of His over-ruling Providence we are placed."⁹

There was unanimity of understanding on the classification of providence into common, miraculous and special. In the 1704 Thanksgiving sermons three preachers (two bishops and one Dissenter)¹⁰ presented almost identical definitions and classifications of providence: the common being the annual marvel of the harvest; the miraculous being direct Divine intervention such as parting the waves for Moses, and special providence being God's will expressed through the medium of selected individuals, known as instruments or second causes. Joseph Harrison, in the 1713 Thanksgiving, attested to the guiding hand of miraculous providence, in God's winnowing of the Habsburg and Bourbon dynasties through cholera, until those remaining became more amenable to making peace.¹¹

Special providence was viewed as a more contemporary, though more problematic, manifestation of God's care, relying as it did on an individual, whose role only became clear in retrospect. Through the reign, the preachers felt that events made these signs manifest: the confusion¹² of an erstwhile shrewd and experienced enemy; the protection of key individuals in battle,¹³ the union of previously hostile kingdoms. The sermons, at least until 1708, built detail upon detail to show that Marlborough was such a

⁸ Trelawny, 1702, p. 4.

⁹ Hooper, 1713, p. 11.

¹⁰ Archbishop King of Dublin, Bishop Fowler of Gloucester and the Baptist John Piggott. Archbishop King's 1704 (Blenheim) Thanksgiving sermon is a masterclass on Providence (see above p. 52).

¹¹ Harrison, 1713, p. 11. The Holy Roman Emperor, Joseph II, had died without issue, of smallpox in Apr. 1711, leaving his brother Charles, hitherto contender for the Spanish throne, as heir to the Austrian Habsburg Empire. The same European smallpox epidemic took Louis XIV's son and grandson. The heir to the French throne was now Louis's sickly two-year-old great-grandson.

¹² 'Infatuation' is a key word to describe this divinely administered confusion. In the Jun. 1706 Thanksgiving for Ramillies, Samuel Terrick in York spoke of the enemy 'strangely infatuated', while Richard West, Burnet's chaplain, asked "Whence come the Infatuation? it was of the Lord no doubt." The Presbyterian John Evans concurred: "Enemies that had a formidable Strength, are strangely infatuated." In Feb. 1709 the Seventh Day Baptist Joseph Stennett noted, "God can infatuate their [the enemies] Counsels, or break their well concerted Measures and make their armies flee, even when none pursues."

¹³ Such as the decapitation of the unfortunate Colonel Bringfield at Ramillies, rather than Marlborough, who was inches away at the time.

second cause. This however created apprehensions at the human level. By 1709, Marlborough's reputation was in decline, leading to the caution from the Richard Chambre: "[w]e are to take Care, that we do not so admire and dote upon the Instrument, as to neglect the Hand that manages it; and so lose our selves in the Praises of our Generals, as to forget that it is God who raises them up."¹⁴

The monarch could also be such an instrument, whether a despot like Louis: "since God, does for the sins of his People, make use of cruel and outrageous Instruments to punish and afflict them for awhile, in order for their Reformation,"¹⁵ or a pious and devout magistrate whose annual fasts and thanksgivings signified her acknowledgement of the debt owed to the deity. However, even in the case of the Queen, differences emerged as to whether the Queen's pious example was something the people needed to emulate for society's salvation or whether she was an intermediary for her nation "contending with Heaven for a special Blessing," which subjects should "resolve to follow, tho' at a great distance."¹⁶ Nicholas Beare assured his listeners that "God acts mediately, and therefore we may not detract what is of right due to his Viceregents."¹⁷ As with the sovereign's piety, so too with the war itself. In 1708, Richard Coleire noted that war had to be: "accounted the last Reasons of Kings, and the Field of Battle is the only open Court in which they can plead their Momentous Controversies,"¹⁸ whereas in 1704, the Dissenter Joseph Stennett had asserted the rights of the nation, rather than the Prince: "But when nations contend and have no Judge on Earth to whom they can agree to refer their cause ... [they must] make an appeal to God the Sovereign judge of the universe and refer their Quarrel to the Decision of his providence."¹⁹

The thanksgiving sermons expressed a widely held anxiety that belief in providence was being undermined, and this would lead to the withdrawal of God's favour and a presumed chastisement at the hands of Louis and the Papists. In 1704, William Fleetwood, a zealous Whig,²⁰ acknowledged that God's ways could appear mysterious, but that there was a Divine plan: "we Christians know of no such things as

¹⁴ Chambre, 1710, p. 7.

¹⁵ Arwaker, 1707, p. 11.

¹⁶ Rivers, Feb. 1709, pp. 13. Though praise of the Queen was common to all, it is clear from their sermons that a division existed between those who viewed each person's piety as necessary to their personal salvation, for which the sovereign could be an example, and those who felt that the monarch had a special, intercessional role with God for the nation's temporal wellbeing.

¹⁷ Beare, Dec. 1706, p. 9.

¹⁸ Coleire, 1708, p. 15.

¹⁹ Stennett, 1704, pp. 15, 16. The tory view of the Prince's authority to make war would be echoed by Richard Coleire in his 1708 sermon (p. 12). It must be pointed out that Stennett rather obscures the clarity of the distinction in political philosophies in his Feb 1708/09 sermon: "as war is an Appeal to God to give, by his Providence, a Decision of such Controversys [sic] between Princes and States, as cannot be otherwise determined for want of sufficient Arbiters on Earth" p. 17.

²⁰ Stuart Handley, 'Fleetwood, William (1656–1723)', *Oxford DNB* [accessed 16 Mar. 2106].

Chance and Fortune, but know that God above governs the world, and disposes well of all events: but Providence *i.e.* his way of ordering and disposing them, seems to us, so varying and uncertain.”²¹

All preachers distinguished between providence, the perhaps unknowable unfolding of God’s will and chance or fortune. In 1705, Lewis Atterbury, Francis’s older, calmer brother, asserted that: “the affairs of this world are not govern’d by Chance and Fortune, but by an infinitely Wise and Good and powerful being; who continually watches over, protects and defends us.”²² The High Churchman Richard Fiddes²³ warned of a falling away from religious practice induced by a belief in fortune: “indeed if all Effects come to pass by a fatal and fix’d chain of Natural Causes, ‘twill be hard to evince the necessity of Prayer to Christians, as a means of averting any Evil.”²⁴ Perhaps the most incongruous disparagement of chance is the Presbyterian Josiah Woodcock’s criticism of Epicurean philosophy.²⁵ He held: “the World to be made of Atoms ... without any Design and uniting together by meer blind Chance into such exquisite and nice Order ... tis no wonder that ... he should go on to blunder farther, and make Chance and Confusion to be the Governours of the World.”

Underlying the unanimity about providence was an anxiety about unity. Discussion of the need for unity, paradoxically, brought forth the most severe condemnation of the enemy within. A key dividing line between Anglicans was their attitude to Dissent. A spectrum of opinion incorporating High Church and Tory views held that any deviation from Anglican practice opened up the possibility of schism and an undermining of faith, whereas Whig-leaning, Low Church views had a more pragmatic view that Protestant solidarity, national and international, was necessary to defeat popery and absolutism. For Anglican Whigs and Dissenting ministers the enemy within lurked in a putative Jacobite/High Church nexus. They saw a ‘French faction’ behind High Church manoeuvres to extirpate Dissent, which they saw as a method to reduce Britain’s ability to resist French hegemony.

Dissenting opinion saw Protestant unity as a spectrum of allowable beliefs, whereas Whig clergy saw religious unity being achieved by non-coercive influence. This dichotomy led to severe public embarrassments for Richard Willis following his 1705 Thanksgiving sermon, which patronised Dissenters, and for Bishop Talbot in the differing views he gave on the validity of the Kirk when speaking in the Lords and his 1707 Thanksgiving sermon. Tories saw disunity as undermining the nation’s relationship with God, and a threat to providential care. Many preachers compared Dissenters to the

²¹ Fleetwood, 1708, p. 13.

²² Atterbury, 1705, p. 22.

²³ Richard Sharp, ‘Fiddes, Richard (1671–1725)’, *Oxford DNB* [accessed 16 Mar. 2106].

²⁴ Fiddes, 1702, pp. 4, 7.

²⁵ Woodcock set up as a strawman for deism and atheism in his 1708 Thanksgiving sermon. Josiah Woodcock, 1708, p. 8.

Israelites, in their worship of the false Gods while Moses was on Mount Sinai. Tories were convinced that Dissent needed to be extirpated and, upon returning to power in 1710-1714, attempted to put this conviction into practice. Only the advent of a latitudinarian German Monarch and the Tories' overriding belief in obedience would put paid to this after 1714.

In his 1708 Thanksgiving sermon at St Paul's, six months after the rude awakening of the Pretender's invasion attempt, Bishop Fleetwood starkly pointed out that: "There were many, from within, that must invite, encourage, and abet these Enemies of God, our Queen, and Government, our Laws and Religion."²⁶ Two years later, in the midst of the Sacheverellite agitation and the Tory resumption of power, Richard Chambre in St Paul's²⁷ lamented the: "unwarrantable Heats and Animositie... [which] give the enemy an advantage against us, and even invite and tempt him to break in upon us, and destroy us. We should lay aside all odious Names and Distinctions of Parties."²⁸ In his thanksgiving sermon of 1710, the prominent Presbyterian Samuel Wright saw: "a Popish or a French party gaining ground in this land ... persecuting those whom they call Schismatics ... Tis further also urged against us that we preach up Schism from the Church, as well as Sedition in the State."²⁹

In light of the continuing threat from France, the fate of the Huguenots, and unease about the succession, the Whiggish/Dissenter view of the threat of disunity is clear. Less obvious is the Tory/High Church perspective on disunity. In 1702, Richard Needham had disparaged Dissenters as political radicals and potential traitors: "the greatest admirers of what they call a Publick Spirit, are ambitiously indifferent as to unanimity in the Religion of their Country, and prone to prefer the Manners and Constitutions of every Nation to those of their own."³⁰

In 1704, Benjamin Loveling was even clearer about the problem: "For when subjects either obey or disobey Authority according to their own Pleasure, they make a plain discovery of their Pride and Ungovernable temper."³¹ By 1713, with the controversial Peace of Utrecht achieved, and High Church Toryism in the ascendant, Loveling lumped Whigs and Dissenters together as "[a]dversaries to Piety and Order, and Peace at Home, are likewise Adversaries to Peace Abroad."³² In the same year in Burnet's own cathedral, but in a sermon very much at odds with the views of his bishop, Richard Eyre shuddered at the depredations of the now-overthrown Whig ministry: "at such a Time, it was made a Crime to say

²⁶ Fleetwood, 1708, p. 31.

²⁷ Chambre preached in 1710 to a St Paul's bereft of the Queen, Lords and Commons.

²⁸ Chambre, 1710, p. 16.

²⁹ Wright, 1709, [5th Nov] p. 9, 18; [7th] p. 28.

³⁰ Needham, 1702, p. 19: Sermon to Lower House of Convocation in King Henry VII's Chapel.

³¹ Loveling, 1704, p. 4.

³² Loveling, 1713, p. 19.

the Church was in Danger,”³³ while Luke Milbourne took a scattergun view of his opponents: “we have a Discontented, Hypocritical, Atheistical Crew among us ... Libertines, Enemies to Loyalty, common Justice, Morality, and whatsoever might tend to the Happiness and Security of a Nation.”³⁴

The sharpest test for Tory-leaning clerics came at the thanksgiving for the union with Scotland. The union of the two kingdoms brought with it the recognition of an Established Presbyterian Church within a unified Kingdom of Great Britain. For a significant section of Anglican opinion, this was the establishment of schism, a practical implementation of a defiance of God’s providence. The secular security from Scottish invasion, the obvious endorsement by the Queen, and the buttressing of the Protestant Succession were matters which Anglican clerics had to set against the threat to the Established Church of England. Francis Hutchinson endorsed those bishops who voted for the union in very pragmatic terms, saying they had not been afraid: “to trust their cause to the providence of God, and the conscience of their fellow subjects, rather than obstruct the nation’s good, for fear of a distant uncertain danger.”³⁵ Whereas the more rueful view was expressed by Nathaniel Marshall: “were a Church so Excellent as ours ... to suffer by this incorporation, then indeed we would buy it at a much dearer rate than any advancement of our Civil interests could make us amend.”³⁶

Dissenters of all descriptions, throughout the reign, were assiduous in asserting their loyalty to the Queen and the nation, while maintaining a separate, though equal, Protestantism. In his response to the union, Josiah Woodcock waxed lyrical about the differences between “Unity and Uniformity” before berating those who used the recognition of the Scottish Kirk as a ground for opposing the union: “Some have seem’d to be afraid, that two different Religions would hinder that good Effect and Success of the Union ... but God forbid that our two Religions, if they are really two different ones, should subject us to the dreadful Calamities in the Civil State.”³⁷

All strands of opinion reviled Louis, but as the war progressed the differing reasons for revulsion revealed differences in outlook among the clerics. Louis, and to a lesser extent France itself, provided a concept of ‘The Other’ against which to define English and British values.³⁸ Louis was tyrannical, blasphemous, and absolute. He traduced all tenets of acceptable kingship so that even High Tories felt able to denounce him as usurping divine power. In contrast, Anne was moderate, pious and modest. The

³³ Richard Eyre, 1713, p. 10. White Kennett, in a comment on Eyre’s sermon noted that the preacher was “running down the Bishop of the Church wherein he preached.” See above p. 212.

³⁴ Milbourne, 1713, p. 3.

³⁵ Hutchinson, 1707, p. 13.

³⁶ Marshall, 1707, p. 15.

³⁷ Woodcock, 1708, pp. 18, 19.

³⁸ The concept was deployed in Linda Colley, *Britons* (New Haven, 1992), pp. 5,6.

providential consequences of the contrast could be seen on the battlefields of Blenheim, Ramillies and Oudenarde. Preachers differed in their attitude to France itself; some poured scorn on a nation that could support such a monarch; others were inspired by concern for the plight of French Protestants.

At the outset, all shades of opinion agreed that Louis was “the Grand Incendiary of Europe,”³⁹ who would seek “to reduce us to the Model of his own Tyranny.”⁴⁰ Differences of tone emerged, however, with the Whiggish William Fleetwood seeing Louis as a product of the failure of limited monarchy: “if he were not absolute at home, he could do no great mischief abroad.”⁴¹ A different perspective on Louis’s duplicity viewed him as unworthy to be God’s vice-regent: Nicholas Brady upbraided him as a “Haughty Pretender”⁴² to God’s power; William Goldwin declared him unworthy as “a monarch’s crimes draw down an heavy load of God’s displeasure on the whole body of a State”;⁴³ and John Grant was outraged that Louis had: “found out a way to baffle the public faith of Oaths and Treaties, and thereby render the best securities of Kingdoms precarious and uncertain.”⁴⁴ From 1706 onwards a difference emerged between those preachers who felt that Louis was no longer a threat to his neighbours and those who felt he could not be trusted to keep any treaty for longer than it was to his tactical advantage.

Dissenting ministers expressed abhorrence in language more visceral than their Anglican counterparts, speaking of the: “Gallick Tyrant, the insatiable Cormorant and common Disturber of the peace of Europe.”⁴⁵ They identified more with the oppressed Huguenots:

[with] unparalleled barbarity he has persecuted the Protestants in France, as well as those of Piedmont, and the principality of Orange... how many have been condemned to the slavery of the Gallies, or that of the American Plantations ... Flight and the Poverty and Hardship attending the state of Exile in foreign countries.⁴⁶

The French propensity to make false thanksgivings irritated all shades of opinion: “every Thanksgiving to God, every Procession of Publick Triumph, is a Mockery and Insolence to Heaven, A Glorifying in the Shame of being the Curse of Nations.”⁴⁷ ... “Upon every trifling occasion have prostituted

³⁹ Loveling, 1704, p. 17.

⁴⁰ Lambert, 1702, p. 10.

⁴¹ Fleetwood, 1704, p. 6.

⁴² Brady, 1704, p. 23.

⁴³ Goldwin, Dec. 1706, p. 6.

⁴⁴ Grant, 1704, p. 17.

⁴⁵ G. Mills, Dec. 1706, p. 29.

⁴⁶ Stennett, 1704, p. 23.

⁴⁷ Coleire, 1708, p. 13.

their Te Deum's as if they dared to hope they could deceive God as well as Man"⁴⁸ and "The French pretended (as is Customary for them to do when they off with the greatest loss) that they had by much the better of us in the Action, Te Deum was appointed to be Sung for their pretended Victory."⁴⁹

Similarly, all sides wished to: "avoid that impious Flattery which is so notorious in France, where they say nothing of their Monarch and their Marshals unless their Panegyrics swell into Blasphemy."⁵⁰ The statue to Louis in the Place des Victoires, celebrating the 1679 Treaty of Nijmegen was the most commonly referenced example of outrageous flattery.⁵¹ The statue shows Louis trampling the Triple Alliance, with various inscriptions on the plinth, the most blasphemous of which, to English eyes, was 'Viro Immortal.' Throughout the reign, Louis was castigated for his claims of immortality and invincibility.

None of the sermons acknowledged that France, despite being under a despotic yoke, had held fast; none found that, despite the ravages of famine, it had fielded armies to defend its borders. Tories could condemn Louis as unworthy to be God's vice-regent by dint of his duplicity; Whigs could condemn his absolutism and Dissenters his savagery. As ever, within the superficial uniformity of condemnation was a diversity of opinion which led to division. By the battle of Ramillies in 1706, Tory opinion was crystallising that the purpose of the war – the restoration of balance in Europe – had been achieved. Whigs would continue to argue, for at least another six years, that Louis's duplicity made a peace treaty a risky venture and Dissenters argued for a restoration of the Edit of Nantes, with some calling for Louis's overthrow.

The Queen embodied the potentially unstable balance of revolution politics, her position being by appointment of Parliament and by a somewhat contorted hereditary right. She deftly maintained that balance throughout the reign, endeavouring not to fall within the influence of either party, cajoling the Lords by her attendance *incognita* on occasion, dispensing patronage when required. None of the sermons mention her combination of agility and stubbornness,⁵² demonstrated both by her reluctant acceptance of Junto lords into the ministry, and, eventually, the dismissal of Godolphin, Marlborough and most of the

⁴⁸ Kennett, 1704, p. 24.

⁴⁹ Conway, Nov. 1709, p. 10.

⁵⁰ Manningham, 1708, p. 7.

⁵¹ A partial list includes Trelawny 1702; Daniel Hill, Jun. 1706; John Spademan, Jun. 1706; Gilbert Burnet, Dec. 1706; Jean Armand Dubourdieu, Dec. 1706; John Hoadly, 1708; Josiah Woodward, Feb. 1709; Francis Hare, Feb. 1709; Phillip Stubbs 1713.

⁵² Nor have historians, the traditional view having been that she was dull, weak and easily led. Edward Gregg's biography goes some way to restoring her reputation, however it too is over-reliant on the correspondence between the Queen and the embittered Duchess of Marlborough. Kevin Sharpe's view in *Rebranding Rule* finds that, in contrast to her predecessors, she exercised and bequeathed a diminished monarchical authority.

ministry.⁵³ The sermons demonstrate that all significant shades of opinion, at least until 1710, rested their hopes in the Sovereign. The Queen's ascension to the throne was greeted as a return to English verities; clerics were keen to have a vice-regent who was so obviously devoted to the Established Church. "Let us always pay that Homage of true Affection, Reverence and Obedience to Her Sacred Majesty, which Her Exemplary and Unparalleled Virtues justly challenge from dutiful and Loyal Subjects."⁵⁴ For Tories, despite their growing unease at the length of the war, Anne was: "a Prime Instrument of Attaining those Victories."⁵⁵ Her piety allowed her to play an active role with the deity in ensuring His blessing on Britain's endeavours: "The Queen, whose shining, but unaffected Piety, hath engaged Heaven to Fight her Battels";⁵⁶ "A Queen, who, by Her exemplary Goodness, Her Steddy and Sincere piety, her Unpresidented Charity and other shining Virtues, hath engaged Heaven on our side";⁵⁷ "herself contending with Heaven for a special Blessing, by an ardent Devotion, and exemplary Piety";⁵⁸ "Her fervent Prayers that have fought for us."⁵⁹ Her remission of the 'first fruits' for the benefit of impoverished clergy only enhanced her reputation: "None of her Royal predecessors, not the Glorious Elizabeth herself, submitted to the Churches rules more obediently as a daughter, none nourished and comforted it more tenderly as a Mother."⁶⁰ Though some were over-optimistic: "No sooner did she ascend the Throne, but that Spirit of Enmity, and Discord, which was gone out unto the Nation, seem'd all of a sudden to vanish."⁶¹

While Tory-leaning clerics praised the change, for Whigs, Anne's accession encapsulated continuity with her immediate predecessor, she "who has to Admiration supplied our want of Him." For Whigs too, she embodied aspirations:

How passionately does She press us to Moderation ... But alas, how doth the spirit of bitterness, wrath and revenge bear rule in a great number of them [her subjects] As if they were intent upon nothing so much as making the Church and State as miserable as they can; and exposing us all to the common enemy.⁶²

⁵³ By way of (an inexact) comparison, had George V dismissed both Asquith and Haig following the Somme, it is doubtful that that George would have been branded by history as dull or easily led. Of course, Sharpe's overall point is that such was the evolution of British constitutional power that by the early twentieth century it would have been impossible even to contemplate that the Monarch would dismiss the Prime Minister.

⁵⁴ Clarke, 1702, p. 28.

⁵⁵ Lacy, Dec. 1706, p. 21.

⁵⁶ Stanhope, 1708, p. 11.

⁵⁷ Marston, Feb. 1709, p. 16.

⁵⁸ Rivers, Feb. 1709, p. 13.

⁵⁹ Adams, Nov. 1709, p. 23.

⁶⁰ Milbourne, 1704, p. 26.

⁶¹ Fiddes, 1702, p. 25.

⁶² Fowler, 1704, pp. 11, 13.

For Dissenters, there was a positive, though guarded welcome. Dissenters took her adoption of the theme of a nursing mother to the nation as an inclusive welcome to Protestants of all denominations: “Our Queen so evidently manifested herself a Mother in Our Israel”,⁶³ “We may long enjoy the advantages we possess under the Influence of her happy government. Let us contribute what we can to the support of it.”⁶⁴ Only the extremist Joseph Jacob, “not only a Dissenter from the Church of England, but from all religious societies,”⁶⁵ noted the single-mindedness with which the Queen pursued her faith. Behind the protestations of loyalty, Dissenting ministers clung to parliament and law: “we have liberty of conscience given us in a Parliamentary way, and established by Law; mercies which under some of the former reigns we did not enjoy.”⁶⁶

By mid-reign, her reconciliation with Whig policies and personalities was perplexing to the Tories, who fell back on obedience: “if we cannot always penetrate into the Motives of Her Conduct, let us acquiesce in the submission that is due to those who represent the Sovereign Power.”⁶⁷ In the 1705 Thanksgiving in St Paul’s, the Whiggish Richard Willis was able to proclaim her moderation before the Queen, Lords and Commons: a “Gracious Queen who ... loves Judah [Church of England], is against vexing Ephraim [Dissenters], and is Zealous and Hearty against the Philistines [French].”⁶⁸ She could be seen as: “A queen that demonstrates a tender regard and Concern for all her Subjects,”⁶⁹ and “who does not make herself the Head of a Party, but is truly a Nursing Mother to the church and not only just, but kind to all her Subjects.”⁷⁰

The Queen’s encouragement of the union with Scotland and her concern for the Palatine refugees encouraged Dissenting ministers to unrealisable heights of internationalism: “may Persecuted Protestants be succoured and relieved”,⁷¹ and “make her the Glorious Instrument of re-establishing the Reform’d Religion Abroad!”⁷² However, the tensions surrounding the Sacheverell sermon brought a more realistic, almost plaintive, assessment from Samuel Wright:

⁶³ Evans, 1704, p. 6.

⁶⁴ Stennett, 1704, p. 32.

⁶⁵ *Observer* (1702), 6-9 Jan. 1703. Jacob’s comment on Anne’s single-mindedness was a rueful compliment upon the sincerity of her belief, from a dissenting minister who criticised dissenters for their part in Occasional Conformity.

⁶⁶ Freke, Nov. 1709, p. 13.

⁶⁷ Fiddes, 1705, p. 13.

⁶⁸ Willis, 1705, p. 15.

⁶⁹ Mills, Dec. 1706, p. 27.

⁷⁰ Standen, 1707, p. 14.

⁷¹ Mayo, Feb. 1709, p. 23.

⁷² Stennett, 1707, p. 15.

It is also the will of our Earthly Sovereign, and what she has frequently express'd a very great Concern for, in most of her publick Speeches ... that there might remain no other contention, but who shall exceed in contributing to advance our present Happiness, and secure the Protestant Succession.⁷³

Marlborough's rise to greatness had been accompanied by his rise to riches, which engendered consistent suspicion, murmurings and envy from the start of the reign. Though this is not made explicit in the sermons – until the 1713 Thanksgiving – condemnations of murmurings are common through almost all the thanksgivings. The continuous condemnation of 'envy and slander'⁷⁴ of Marlborough indicates that his rise "to the greatest Height that any subject has ever grown up to"⁷⁵ was not uncontroversial. His downfall in 1711 was accompanied by investigations of corruption, which fell on ground prepared by years of rumours of avarice and suspicions of treason which had followed Marlborough through from the previous reign. Benjamin Loveling condemned "malicious and unjust ... Defamations" that Marlborough had "thirst[ed] after French money."⁷⁶

The Thanksgiving for Utrecht saw Marlborough condemned by Tory-leaning preachers, who castigated him and his wider family for having, as one put it: "found means of enriching themselves with Spoil and Plunder in that Dreadful Calamity." That same preacher condemned him as a warmonger: "Instead of hearkening to any terms of Peace, an Inclination was then shewn to have a General for Life; had that been, 'tis natural to think the War would have been so too when we can't see any reason, there could be for One, without the Other."⁷⁷ Luke Milbourne castigated: "a very trusty Servant, and faithful Minister, [who] when his Mask is pull'd off, appears an Errant Cheat, one who set his own, or it may be, his Parties Interests, far before that of his prince or Country." He continued with more than a touch of envy to reflect that: "[a]ny Man who considers the prodigious Estates rais'd of Late Years by those who have had the handling of the Publick Revenue and were worth little or nothing before must believe that something more than the Lawful Perquisites of the Places went to the raising of such mighty Banks."⁷⁸

The preachers' opinions on the war yield perhaps the most paradoxical insights. Tory-leaning preachers, while acknowledging the sovereigns right to engage in war, were nonetheless the first major strand of opinion which called for a halt to the conflict, having deemed its objectives to have been met. On the other side, the Whig-leaning preachers, supporters of limited monarchy, became increasingly vehement in support of the restoration of the Roman Catholic Imperial Habsburgs. In this context, the

⁷³ Wright, Nov. 1709, p. 29.

⁷⁴ In only three of the Thanksgivings – 1705 (a languid year), 1707 (Union with Scotland) and 1708 (Oudenarde) – is there no condemnation of 'envy and slander' being put about in relation to Marlborough.

⁷⁵ Burnet, Jun. 1706, p. 10.

⁷⁶ Loveling, 1702, p. 18.

⁷⁷ Eyre, 1713, p. 6.

⁷⁸ Milbourne, 1713, p. 13.

Dissenting ministers' advocacy of the restoration of persecuted French Protestants is the most comprehensible, though least attainable, of the various strands of opinion.

Though it did not touch British shores, the War of Spanish Succession did involve an existential threat to British liberties, governance and worship. It provided a backdrop to all controversies and divisions and became an increasing financial burden. After 1706, with the exception of the 1708 invasion scare, the threat of French hegemony retreated, indeed Louis's almost annual entreaties to negotiate were met with intransigent allied terms. Whig-leaning Anglican preachers echoed the ministry in its fear of French duplicity. For Dissenting ministers even the allied peace demands were insufficient to restore displaced Huguenots. The arrogance of the allies, combined with the lack of tangible progress towards a French collapse, slowly kindled a demand for peace. In the absence of effective political representation, this demand was manifested slowly, timidly in the thanksgiving sermons of Tory-inclined preachers until it burst forth in the Sacheverellite fury.

In the early part of the reign, preachers were concerned to justify the lawfulness of the war. If for Richard Chapman –“When Monarchs or Princes quarrel, the Sword only is their law”⁷⁹– the Whig-leaning White Kennett noted that the war was “for the Civil Liberties of Europe.”⁸⁰ A leading Dissenter, Daniel Williams, was explicit as to the desired outcome: “‘till France be so reduced, as the Balance of Europe may be secure; and if possible, the Protestant Religion restored there.”⁸¹ The difficulty in defining victory was illustrated in the proclamations of thanksgivings in the early part of the reigns, describing the war's purpose as “for the Common Safety of our Realms, and for Disappointing the Boundless Ambition of France.”⁸² As French setbacks mounted, a division emerged between those who felt that Britain was safe from Louis, those who felt that his boundless ambition could never be quenched, and Dissenters who pursued the civil liberties of Huguenots and other foreign Protestants.

John Evans, vicar of Ewell, first mooted, in the aftermath of Blenheim, that the balance had been restored: “[Louis's] neighbours may live quietly by him, without the danger of being invaded by France.”⁸³ By February 1709, after the fall of the Spanish Netherlands, William Marston, vicar of Redbourn, near St Albans, claimed that: “[the] Haughty and Ambitious Monarch has been compell'd to

⁷⁹ Chapman, 1704, p. 8.

⁸⁰ Kennett, 1704, p. 22.

⁸¹ Williams, 1702, p. 29.

⁸² The phrase appears in the Proclamations from 1702 to 1706. In 1708, the phrase ‘just and necessary’ was added to ‘just war’ and the phrase ‘liberties of Europe’ was interposed between common safety and boundless ambition of France.

⁸³ Evans, 1704, p. 24.

quit his Usurp'd Possessions, and retire to defend his own Frontiers ... Never had we so fair a prospect of bringing this war to an Honourable and Speedy conclusion, as at this time."⁸⁴

In the same year Thomas Manningham, soon to become a Tory bishop, preaching before the Queen, rather daringly suggested:

our Christianity obliges us to make War no longer than the Necessity lies upon us, and to Judge of that Necessity too by the best Rules of Wisdom and Equity, and to bring that War we are justly engaged in to as speedy an End and as happy a Conclusion as may be.⁸⁵

The Pretender's invasion attempt ten months after the union, hoping to capitalise on Scottish discontent, had the paradoxical effect of inducing clerics critical of the war's length to re-endorse the legality for the war, temporarily reduce their criticism, and eliminate published comments that could be seen as inimical to Protestant unity. Nonetheless, frustration resurfaced the following year as Marlborough's advances slowed in northern France, Spain absorbed increasing amounts of treasure for little overall gain and Britain's allies seemed to get the best of such spoils of war as existed. This frustration boiled over in the Sacheverellite outbursts. Two weeks after Sacheverell's sermon,⁸⁶ the far less intemperate Thomas Rivers expressed the prevailing war-weariness: "the present [war] has been so long, and so severe a Contest, as event to weary the very conquerors, and make them wish for Breath and Respite and Peace ... to secure a quiet injoyment of what we already have."⁸⁷

Whig-leaning preachers were more inclined to see international alliances as necessary for the maintenance of the balance of Europe. In 1706, Bishop Burnet claimed that: "the Defence of neighbouring princes is really the Defence of ourselves," which led him to proclaim as a war aim: "to rescue Spain from a Perfidious Invader and restore it to the Rightful Owner."⁸⁸ Josiah Hort, chaplain to the Earl of Wharton, warned against those who: "are very warm for a Peace, for other reason than that they are weary of taxes ... We made a dear Experiment of this in the last Peace ... and what was the Consequence? – it soon broke out again into a new War."

Hort went on to give the aspirational but vague war aim: "We can have no manner of Security 'til the French King is brought so low, that it shall be wholly out of his power to disturb us," and labelled opponents of the war as Jacobites: "There are those amongst us, who are loth that the King of France

⁸⁴ Marston, Feb. 1709, p. 16.

⁸⁵ Manningham, Feb. 1709, pp. 5, 8.

⁸⁶ But before its publication and the impeachment.

⁸⁷ Rivers, Feb. 1709, p. 10.

⁸⁸ Burnet, Jun. 1706, pp. 12, 11.

should be brought too low, because it would defeat such hopes and Prospects as they are pleased to entertain, but durst not own.⁸⁹

Dissenting ministers, encouraged by the unprecedented defeats which Louis was suffering continued to proclaim the goal of the war as: “the revival of Liberties in other countries ... by re-establishing the Protestant Religion in those countries from whence it has been extirpated by the most barbarous ... methods.”⁹⁰

At the Oudenarde Thanksgiving, Thomas Knaggs continued the internationalist theme, though, unlike Dissenting ministers, he made common cause with foreign princes rather than foreign Protestants: “we fight only to secure our Country, and help other States and Princes from being destroy’d by a furious Foe.”⁹¹ In February 1709, the Presbyterian Daniel Mayo continued to hope for an outcome which would result in: “persecuted Protestants and oppressed Nations ... succoured and relieved.”⁹²

By the Thanksgiving for the Peace of Utrecht, for which Whig-leaning preachers did not publish, those who did publish took a more vociferous and self-righteous tone. Preachers deprecated the perfidiousness of the allies: “while the Kingdom has labour’d under this heavy Yoak, how has it been robb’d and plunder’d of its Wealth and Riches by its hungry Allies abroad, and its pretended Friends at Home!.”⁹³ They impugned the motives of the former ministry: “The making of Peace was once in the Hands of Other men, but they resolv’d to give only such Terms as they knew would be rejected.”⁹⁴

Two subcategories of sermon may be worthy of particular attention: those of Dissenting ministers whose sermons display a uniformity of outlook which belies their factious reputation and divided ecclesiastical allegiances, and those of Irish Anglican clerics whose sermons mix veneration of William with a firm view of the dangers of Dissent.

In a letter to John Evans, the staunchly Whig Bishop of Bangor, William King wrote of Irish Anglicans:

we have one happiness, that generally speaking the most hearty persons for the Church are likewise most cordial for the Revolution, which I believe is partly due to the great suffering they underwent in King

⁸⁹ Hort, Dec. 1706, pp. 11, 12, 14.

⁹⁰ Stennett, Jun. 1706, p. 29.

⁹¹ Knaggs, 1708, p. 11.

⁹² Mayo, Feb. 1709, p. 23.

⁹³ Hilliard, 1713, p. 20.

⁹⁴ Milbourne, 1713, p. 16.

James's reign, and I am apt to think that if in England they had tasted a little more of our treatment, there would have non-jurors been as few with you as with us.⁹⁵

The violent, sectarian past and the continuing religious and political threats narrowed the spectrum of opinion for Irish churchmen. Their English counterparts were conscious of threats, and could, on occasion, enumerate them enthusiastically, but there was a general perception that providence had rendered England a land where: "shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree; and none shall make them afraid."⁹⁶ Robert Eccleshall points out that: "themes which tended to surface in England during moments of crisis – the twinning of Catholicism and Presbyterianism as being equally subversive of church and state ... assumed in Ireland a monotonous quality."⁹⁷ In Isleworth, Middlesex, Charles Williams's thanksgiving for the union with Scotland noted England's advantages: "our clime is fertile, our constitution excellent, our liberties large, our rights inviolable, and our laws wholesome."⁹⁸ Ralph Lambert, preaching in London, opined: "is not England, that only Place, which in a very few Years has escaped the Miseries of Bloodshed and Plunder."⁹⁹ The émigré Alexander Jephson noted the contrast between the islands: "[God] did ... only show England the Rod, but he suffered poor Ireland to feel the smart."¹⁰⁰ Jephson had fled Ireland, having celebrated William's 1688 landing with a sermon which struck the Irish Jacobite authorities as seditious. Preaching in Surrey, at sixteen years' remove, Jephson reflected: "poor Ireland seemed to be marked out by Heaven for Ruin and Destruction ... The Protestants were all disarmed and imprisoned, and given up to the Mercy of Ravenous Wolves."¹⁰¹

The bloodlessness of the Glorious Revolution in England allowed a significant number of preachers to ignore William's contribution, even going so far as to ignore the revolution itself in the litany of providential deliverances. In St Paul's in 1702, Bishop Trelawny evoked both the "murther [sic] of the best of Kings, and the happy Restoration of his Son."¹⁰² William Lloyd, in December 1706, saw the Restoration as the wellspring of England's greatness: "yet from this low ebb [the Commonwealth], both

⁹⁵ S.J. Connolly, *Religion, Law and Power: The Making of Protestant Ireland 1660-1760* (Oxford, 1992) p. 80. The letter is dated Feb. 1709. John Evans was translated to Church of Ireland bishopric of Meath in 1716.

⁹⁶ Micah: 4:4.

⁹⁷ Robert Eccleshall, 'Anglican Political Thought in the century after the Revolution of 1688' in D. George Boyce, Robert Eccleshall and Vincent Geoghegan, eds., *Political Thought in Ireland since the Seventeenth Century* (London, 1993) p. 37.

⁹⁸ Charles Williams, 1707, p. 8.

⁹⁹ Lambert, 1702, p. 8.

¹⁰⁰ Jephson, 1704, p. 8, 9.

¹⁰¹ Alexander Jephson, 1704, p. 7. In his 1715 sermon giving thanks for the safe arrival of George I, Jephson was a little more colourful, noting "poor Ireland already had the *Skean* brandished at every Protestant's throat" Alexander Jephson, 1715, p6.

¹⁰² Jonathan Trelawny, 1702, p. 4.

[church and monarchy] were restored, and all things peaceably, without Blood, by a most wonderful Providence, return'd to their Proper Channels."¹⁰³ Edward Clarke pointed to the Restoration as the prime example of a peaceful transition from “dismal Night of Confusion ... the glorious Dawn of the Restoration appear'd, at what time our Religion, Government and Laws return'd from exile, together with their, then great, Patron and Defender.”¹⁰⁴ From another perspective, preachers lauded the “late Blessed and Glorious Revolution,”¹⁰⁵ noting the wonders of providence in bringing it about “without Effusion of Blood and no damage to the Land,”¹⁰⁶ and railed that William was “ungratefully forgotten by some, and basely aspers'd by others.”¹⁰⁷

By dint of adversity, no such spectrum existed in Ireland, Alexander Jephson attested to the contrast. England had seen: “[a] conquest without a Battel, a Kingdom peaceably delivered up by a Popish King into the hands of a Protestant Prince,” whereas in Ireland “the Silver Streams of stately Boyne and the adjacent Vallies [sic], in soft murmurings and eternal Ecchoes [sic] sound forth the praises his Valour and Conduct deserved, especially the Irish Protestants.”¹⁰⁸ In Ireland itself this narrowing of the spectrum was evidenced by sermons which would have seemed to their English counterparts anomalous, even contradictory. In Dublin, the high-flying Bishop Edward Smyth, unlike Trelawny, was simultaneously able to lament: “the publick [sic] sacrifice of ... Charles the First, a true father and Ornament of this Church,” while praising William: “Our late Glorious Deliverer was the first instrument of Providence in doing this... who wrought our deliverance.”¹⁰⁹ Francis Higgins, unlike English High Church preachers, acknowledged that the “Monarchy tho' Hereditary, [is] not Arbitrary, but circumscribed by laws,” and in the same sermon describe James II as: “that unhappy, Deluded and Biggotted Prince,” while acknowledging William as: “our late Glorious King and Deliverer,” who had been vilified because of the “false steps of his Ministers.”¹¹⁰ Archbishop William King, whose political adeptness allowed him to navigate both Whig and Tory political waters, invoked his audience's own memories of “not only Death, but ... Pain, Labour, Famine, Sickness and Oppression ... on such as survive.” King was clear on “a battle being a sort of appeal to God,” and acknowledged that:

[the] Vanquished [are]... obliged to submit to his enemy, which he must lawfully do, an absolute and complete conquest giving so far a right, that he who is overcome, may look on his Conqueror as one set

¹⁰³ William Lloyd, Dec. 1706, p. 13.

¹⁰⁴ Clarke, 1702, p. 2.

¹⁰⁵ Pyle, 1707, p. 10.

¹⁰⁶ Chandler, Nov. 1709, p. 18.

¹⁰⁷ Wright, 1710, [5th], p. 13.

¹⁰⁸ Jephson, 1704, p. 9.

¹⁰⁹ Smyth, 1702, p. 9.

¹¹⁰ Higgins, 1705, p9.

over him by God, and swear Allegiance to him, notwithstanding any obligation to a former Prince. This being one of the ways, by which Providence makes Kings.¹¹¹

The commonalities with English sermons are also clear: the deep belief in providence and society's need to maintain God's favour. Edmund Arwaker, preaching in Dungannon, echoed the Huguenot Dubourdieu: "God, does for the sins of his People, make use of cruel and outrageous Instruments to punish and afflict them for awhile, in order for their Reformation; yet he will at last, in his own time, deliver them from their Oppressors ... When God has sufficiently chastised his People, he will cast the Rod into the Fire; he will destroy the Instruments of executing his Wrath and Indignation."¹¹² Sermons delivered on both islands venerated the Queen: "The hand that holds the Reins of Government, be it never so gentle, and is yet Strong."¹¹³ Edward Smyth held the view that her direct interaction with the Deity was the source of victory: "Our Great and Pious Queen, to whose conduct, under God, we must acknowledge these Victories, who has immediately Governed and Directed these Successes."¹¹⁴

There was a common acknowledgment of the official war aims to: "curb the exorbitant Power of France and procure a Balance of Power in Europe,"¹¹⁵ and that: "the Security which the happy Establishment of Our Holy Religion, indeed the whole Protestant Interest, will gain by it."¹¹⁶ By dint of recent experience, Irish sermons were earlier to acknowledge that war: "is always accompanied by Fraud and Injustice, with oppression and breach of Faith, on one side or other, and too often on both,"¹¹⁷ and that vice and immorality were almost the unavoidable consequences of war,¹¹⁸ a view which did not find expression in English thanksgiving sermons until the 1713 peace. Irish sermons shared the same mordant view of Louis as: "Invader of the Rights and Common Disturber of the Peace of Europe,"¹¹⁹ and of the perfidiousness of the French, as: "strong, powerful, subtle [sic], fierce, cruel and voracious Oppressors"... "our very enemies who have lost Truth in their arts of Colouring and Disguising."¹²⁰

While having a clear difference on the necessity of force to buttress their position on the island, Irish Anglican ministers fully identified with the English church and nation. Edward Smyth spoke of the

¹¹¹ King, 1704, p. 13.

¹¹² Arwaker, Dec.1706, p. 11.

¹¹³ Delany, 1713, p. 17.

¹¹⁴ Smyth, 1702, p. 18.

¹¹⁵ Arwaker, Dec. 1706, p. 22.

¹¹⁶ Smyth, 1702, p. 4.

¹¹⁷ King, 1704, p. 5.

¹¹⁸ Delaney, 1713, p. 9.

¹¹⁹ Higgins, 1705, p. 15.

¹²⁰ Smyth, 1702, p. 2.

“Establishment of the Church of England,” not the Church of Ireland, as the bulwark against “the Thunder and Arts of ... Rome. This they observed to be the Glory and Strength of the Protestant side.”¹²¹ In a 1708 sermon delivered to Irish Protestants living in London, commemorating the 1641 massacres, Ralph Lambert mingled confessional and national distinctions. He lamented that British Protestants who lived: “in utmost Intimacy, and Friendship and Confidence with their Popish Neighbours” were set upon by the “Original Irish.” On being presented with an opportunity, “the Popish Lords of the Pale ... descendants of the Old English ... [joined] a Rebellion of the Irish, in order to root out all of the English Nation ... [showing] that Religion alone was the Quarrel.” Indeed, the Old English proved “more bloody Enemies than the Original Irish,” persuading a further segment of the population, “the Scottish Protestants, that they had no Design against them; but only to root out their old Enemies the English,”¹²² only to betray them later.

There is no explicit evidence in the thanksgiving sermons of the emergence of an Irish Protestant identity separate from English Protestantism.¹²³ In fact, the sermons make common cause with their English counterparts on the necessity of improving public morality and on the threat posed by Dissent and the newer free-thinking enemies of the Church. D.W. Hayton sees in the Irish High Churchmen’s espousal of secular politics a willingness to take part in “a broader crusade, across all Queen Anne’s dominions, against the forces of irreligion, Whiggism and Presbytery.”¹²⁴ As the Hanoverian regime settled in and the Jacobite threat receded, a separate Irish Protestant identity emerged, symbolised by the politically adroit, though intensely litigious, Archbishop King who opposed English clergymen taking Irish sees. Hayton sees the proceedings of the Irish Convocation from 1703-13 as shedding light on High Church/Low Church differences within the Church of Ireland. Though inspired by, and mirroring, their English counterparts, he finds evidence of the narrower spectrum of Irish opinion in that: “the two parties within the Church were not seriously divided on questions of doctrine, liturgical practice, the relationship of Church and State, evangelical strategies or ecclesiastical reform,” and points to a Low Church faction that favoured internal Church reform, whereas the Irish High Church faction distinguished themselves by their “intense involvement in secular politics,”¹²⁵ which waxed and waned with the fortunes of the Tory regimes in England. Unlike its Canterbury counterpart, it did not divide sharply between a Low Church upper house and a High Church lower house. In fact, Hayton has pointed out that at least half of the Irish

¹²¹ Edmund Smyth, 1702, p. 6.

¹²² Lambert, 1708, pp. 10, 13.

¹²³ See D.W. Hayton, *The Anglo-Irish Experience, 1680-1730: Religion, Identity and Patriotism* (London, 2012), p. 39 which cites Edmund Arwaker’s 1694’s poem *An Elegy on his Excellency Lieutenant-General Tollemach* as an early expression of Irish Protestant nationalism, which was to become popular during the first half of the eighteenth century.

¹²⁴ Hayton, ‘The High Church party’, p. 138.

¹²⁵ Hayton, ‘The High Church Party’.

episcopate could be defined as High Church.¹²⁶ Convocation's effectiveness was limited by disagreement as to its role. Effectively those bishops who wished to use it as a tool of Church reform were stymied by high-flyers whose proposals to improve the material well-being of the clergy encroached on the powers of the Irish House of Commons.

The relative poverty of the Church of Ireland caused it to have many supplicant interactions with both parliaments and the sovereign. The bishops played their part in an Irish Parliament whose interaction with its English counterpart and the English Privy Council would be controversial. The Irish Parliament had not passed a Toleration Act, but in 1704 passed a Test Act, attempting to ensure that holders of political office were practicing Anglicans. Archbishop King commissioned Jonathan Swift to pursue, through his political contacts in England, the remission of first fruits and twentieths to the Irish Church, which had been returned to the Church of England in 1703. The remission request became a source of political horse-trading through 1705 and 1706, as the increasingly Whig English ministry wished to obtain a repeal of the Irish Test clauses in exchange for supporting remission, while King lobbied successfully against linking the two.¹²⁷ The search for patronage took Francis Higgins, Ralph Lambert and many others to England. Higgins, who held a prebend in Christ Church, Dublin, was dispatched to England in 1705 to pursue a jurisdictional dispute with Archbishop King. Higgins caused major controversy by an intemperate Whig-baiting sermon delivered in Chapel Royal on Ash Wednesday 1707, which resulted in his arrest for sedition. Lambert, based in England from 1702, returned to Ireland as Wharton's chaplain, and became the focus of High Church attack in the Irish Convocation, eventually leading Wharton to prorogue the assembly in 1709.

If attitudes to the Revolution and idea of non-resistance divided opinion between clerics in Ireland and England, a more contemporary issue was the minority position of Protestantism in Ireland. S.J. Connolly estimates that Catholics made up approximately eighty percent of the population, with Anglicans and Dissenters – primarily Presbyterians – equally dividing the remainder.¹²⁸ Robert Eccleshall describes Irish Anglicans as having insecurities “more characteristic of a sect.”¹²⁹ Joseph Richardson asserts that Irish Anglicans – Archbishop King being their foremost exponent – saw three viable churches competing to win the support in Ireland, each theologically unable to coexist.¹³⁰ While Catholicism was

¹²⁶ Hayton, 'The High Church Party', pp. 117-40.

¹²⁷ The issue rumbled on until remission of the first fruits was granted in Nov. 1710, fully seven years after the remission to the Church of England.

¹²⁸ Connolly, *Religion, Law and Power*, pp. 144-164.

¹²⁹ Eccleshall 'Anglican Political Thought' estimates about one tenth of the population.

¹³⁰ Joseph Richardson, 'Archbishop William King, Church Tory and State Whig?', *Eighteenth-Century Ireland*, xv, (2000), p. 76.

quiescent after 1692, Presbyterianism was seen as a rising threat, particularly in Ulster.¹³¹ The numbers of Scottish immigrants in the 1690s resulted in Presbyterians outnumbering Anglicans in the province, and the establishment of the General Synod of Ulster in 1691 portended a rival, organised establishment, which for certain Church of Ireland prelates evoked the demise of the Episcopalian establishment in Scotland. As well as efforts at persuasion, the Church used its established status to attempt to suppress, with varying degrees of success, the formation of new Presbyterian congregations, to lobby against legislation for toleration of Irish Dissent and more generally by challenging the validity of Dissenter marriages through Church courts.¹³²

Edward Smyth, High Church bishop of Down and Connor, in 1702 displayed an aversion to Protestant Dissent as a tool of rampant Popery, reminiscent of Tory high-flyers,¹³³ asserting that the Dissenters role was: “to bring in Popery, by Crying out against it; and to Destroy the Reformation by Pretences of making it a Thorow one.” The triumph of either Dissenters or Catholics would ultimately “bring in Superstition ... [and] overwhelm Our Temporal Rights and Liberties,”¹³⁴ by methods of “Inhumanity, Cruelty and Wantonness in Blood”¹³⁵ regularly remembered by reference to the 1641 massacres. Later, Francis Higgins, dubbed ‘the Irish Sacheverell,’ in his 1705 Thanksgiving sermon used almost the same language as Smyth in describing Rome’s use of Dissent as a pathway to: “Shake, Undermine or Loosen our present Establishment in Church and State, under the pretences of greater Liberty of Conscience, and a more perfect and thorough Reformation.”¹³⁶ Higgins displayed a more pugnacious style which was to get him into trouble with the political and ecclesiastical establishment on both sides of the Irish Sea, when he blasted “deposing and King-killing” as practices supported by “Soto’s, Bellarmin’s and Suarez’s” principles as well as those of “Calvin and Zuinglius, Buchannan and Knox.”¹³⁷ William King, no latitudinarian, made no mention of Dissent during his Blenheim Thanksgiving sermon. Even the rather mild Edmund Arwaker, in his December 1706 Thanksgiving sermon, in an almost throwaway remark, used the Judah and Ephraim analogy which so infuriated English Dissenters when deployed at St Pauls the previous year by the Whiggish Richard Willis.¹³⁸

In general, the thanksgiving sermons of Irish-born and Irish-based clergy showed an awareness of their embattled, minority position and a clear understanding of the role of violence in political transitions

¹³¹ Connolly, *Religion, Law and Power*, pp. 166-171.

¹³² See Philip O’Regan, *Archbishop William King of Dublin* (Dublin, 2000), pp. 138-141.

¹³³ See Milbourne 1713, p. 18 (see above p.217).

¹³⁴ Smyth, 1702, pp. 5, 7.

¹³⁵ Lambert, 1708, p. 9.

¹³⁶ *Ibid*, p. 14.

¹³⁷ *Ibid*, p. 9.

¹³⁸ Arwaker, Dec. 1706, p. 14.

in their kingdom. Irish émigré clergymen celebrated the relative tranquillity of England in contrast with the travails of their home country. Attempts to alleviate the material poverty of Irish Anglican clergymen resulted in efforts by Swift and King to discretely influence the English ministry and Privy Council, to increasing vociferously partisan agitation on both islands by individuals as different as Higgins and Lambert.¹³⁹ The shared attachment to the doctrines and practices of the Church of England and the need for providential as well as material aid, held in check the resentments inherent in Irish Protestantism's independent though supplicant position within the English civil and religious structure.

All but one of the thirty-five Dissenting ministers who published sermons¹⁴⁰ are quick to venerate King William alongside his successor, asserting their loyalty both to Queen and Parliament: "Let us bless God for the Great Favour he has shown us in placing Her Majesty on the Throne of these Kingdoms, under whose happy Government we enjoy so much peculiar Blessings."¹⁴¹ They were keen to underline that their freedoms were based on law, and guaranteed by Parliament. In general, they were far more viscerally affected by the sufferings of foreign Protestants and were more inclined to disparage in colourful terms, the person of Louis, "a Pharaoh in Spirit and Temper,"¹⁴² than their Anglican counterparts. The Dissenting ministers did find some common ground with latitudinarian Anglicans and with Whig political views on the rule of Parliament. However, differences emerged over the course of the reign both in terms of patronising latitudinarian attempts at inclusion and in the clash between the differing levels of vigour in support for international Protestantism.¹⁴³

At the beginning of Anne's reign, possibly to counteract the perception of increased High-Church influence, a committee of three denominations of Dissenting ministers was formed, consisting of four Presbyterians, three Independent and three Baptist ministers, and determined to present a united address to the Queen.¹⁴⁴ The *London Gazette* noted that: "Mr Daniel Williams, with the rest of the Protestant Dissenting ministers, in and about the city of London, viz. Presbyterians, Independents and Anabaptists, waited on her majesty with an humble address."¹⁴⁵ The address noted the: "unspeakable loss ... [of] our late Glorious Monarch," acknowledged Anne's "undoubted title" to the crown and her "constant zeal for

¹⁴⁰ Joseph Jacob who published in 1702, 1704 and 1705 "not only a dissenter from the Church of England, but from all religious societies," who lambasted his fellow dissenters with arguments which are identical to High Church Tories (see p.32).

¹⁴¹ Stennett, Jun. 1706. p. 31.

¹⁴² John Billingsley, *Holiness and Righteousness the Best Return for National Deliverances. A Sermon on Luke I. 74, 75. Preach'd at Crutched-Friars, Nov. 5. And Silverstreet, Nov. 7, 1710* (London, 1710), p. 9.

¹⁴³ See Appendix 1.

¹⁴⁴ Ivimey, *A History of the English Baptists*, iii, p. 42.

¹⁴⁵ *London Gazette*, 16-19 Mar. 16, 1702.

the Protestant religion.” The ministers assured her of their “inviolable fidelity” and “dutiful affection ... not doubting of our share in the many blessings of your Majesty’s wise and happy reign.”¹⁴⁶

Throughout the thanksgiving sermons, the Dissenting ministers managed to keep to the themes enunciated in their address. As a body, they were determined to confound the “malicious Asperation on our Persons and Principles that we are enemies to the Monarchy.”¹⁴⁷ In common with a large number of Anglican clergymen they showed glimpses of regret at the passing of William and anger towards those who had been “unjust to the name of a Prince to whom (under God) they owe the Restoration of their Civil and Preservation of their Religious Liberties as to refuse that Honour to His Memory.”¹⁴⁸ The Presbyterian John Evans was keen to contrast Anne with her dissolute father and uncle: “The Bold Licentiousness of former Courts is remarkably discountenanc’d by the Royal Precepts and Example: Noble and Generous Attempts have been made for Reformation of Manners.”¹⁴⁹ Dissenters were urged to shoulder the burden of: “the Taxes for the support of her benign Government and convince the World, that it is an unjust and malicious Aspersion cast upon us [Dissenters] and our principles, to represent us at any time as Malcontents and disaffected to the Monarchy.”¹⁵⁰

By mid-reign it was possible for Dissenters to identify the Queen as: “free from the madness of Bigotry, and the Rage of a persecuting spirit”¹⁵¹ and associate her with maximalist war goals: “The Cause in which Her Majesty is engaged is Just and Glorious ... to succour Men in distress, to relieve the Oppressed, to restore Liberty to Captives, and to help them to Right who are wrong’d.”¹⁵² Even as the reign drew to a close, and the Sacheverellite clouds gathered, rather than criticise the Queen herself Dissenters criticised those around her “of a Popish or a French party gaining ground in this land ... who are Schismatics from Love and Charity.”¹⁵³

For all the ‘Inviolable Fidelity’¹⁵⁴ these preachers professed, the Presbyterian Thomas Freke made it clear that their rights were based on the rule of law: “The Queen, whose Glory consists of Ruling a Free people according to Law.”¹⁵⁵ At the Blenheim Thanksgiving, Joseph Stennett, a Seventh-Day Baptist,

¹⁴⁶ *The humble address of the dissenting ministers in and about the City of London; viz. Presbyterians, Independents, and Baptists: presented to Her Majesty by the Reverend Mr. Daniel Williams* (Dublin, 1702).

¹⁴⁷ Norris, 1704, p. 21.

¹⁴⁸ Stennett, 1704, p. 21.

¹⁴⁹ Evans, Jun. 1706, p. 25.

¹⁵⁰ Mills, Dec. 1706, p. 28.

¹⁵¹ Standen, 1707, p. 14.

¹⁵² Stennett, Feb. 1709, p. 19.

¹⁵³ Wright, Nov. 1709, Dedication, p. 1. and Sermons p. 9.

¹⁵⁴ The phrase, used in the 1702 humble address, recurs in the Jun. 1706 address *the humble address of the dissenting ministers in and about the City of London, presented to the Queen by Mr. Spademan, on the 17th of Jun. 1706* (Edinburgh, 1706).

¹⁵⁵ Freke, Nov. 1709, p. 21.

asserted the right of his congregation to attend their own service in Pinner's Hall: "There's no Law to restrain any of us from rendering service to her Majesty and to our Native Country after this pious matter."¹⁵⁶ Through the mid-reign, with Whig parliamentarians increasingly powerful, Dissenting opinion was pleased: "The beginning of the year open'd with the most Auspicious Harmony between the Queen and Her Houses of Parliament";¹⁵⁷ "Among our benefits we may well count ... the mutual confidence between Her Majesty and Parliament."¹⁵⁸ The union with Scotland afforded Stennett an opportunity to express an inclusive, political view: "that the different sentiments of Protestants in Matters of Religion, are very consistent with their living peaceably together under the same Government and being mutually serviceable to the Public."¹⁵⁹ The increasing pressure felt by Dissenters towards the end of the reign found expression in Thomas Freke's plaintive assertion that: "we have liberty of conscience given us in a Parliamentary way, and established by Law,"¹⁶⁰ and the Presbyterian John Billingsley's comparison with France, where "nothing more increaseth Wickedness in a Land, than successful Attempts upon National Rights."¹⁶¹

Perhaps the greatest distinguishing feature of Dissenting thanksgiving sermons was the visceral disdain for Louis, and the empathy with the suffering of "our persecuted Brethren, who are either driven out to seek their Bread, or there detain'd in worse than AEgyptian Bondage."¹⁶² Daniel Williams's repeated phrase 'God forgets not the Blood of the Protestants,'¹⁶³ used first with reference to the Protestants of Bohemia and then more generally in December 1706, marks a baseline from which the expectations of Dissenters was set. Joseph Stennett felt that the Queen had been given: "the chief honour of breaking the Chains of Europe,"¹⁶⁴ and Daniel Mayo, a Presbyterian minister, hoped that "persecuted Protestants and oppressed Nations be succoured and relieved."¹⁶⁵

Matthew Henry summed up the Dissenting position in the year of the victories of Ramillies and Turin:

our communion with the Religious Assemblies of our own land, both those by the legal Establishment, and those by the Legal Toleration is, in a particular manner, comfortable to us... We have a great reason to be thankful also, both to God and the Government, for the continuance of our own Liberties and Opportunities

¹⁵⁶ Stennett, 1704, p. 32.

¹⁵⁷ Colton, Dec. 1706, p. 23.

¹⁵⁸ D. Williams, Dec. 1706, p. 18.

¹⁵⁹ Stennett, 1707, p. 14.

¹⁶⁰ Freke, Nov. 1709, p. 13.

¹⁶¹ Billingsley, Nov. 1709, p. 8.

¹⁶² Oldfield, Dec. 1706, p. 8.

¹⁶³ D. Williams, 1702, p. 23 and Dec. 1706, p. 23.

¹⁶⁴ Stennett, 1707, p. 15.

¹⁶⁵ Mayo, Feb 1709, p. 23.

which we desire always to be found Quiet and Peaceable, Humble and Charitable in the use of, and Diligent and Faithful in the Improvement of, for the glorifying of God.¹⁶⁶

In his thanksgiving sermon for the union, Giles Dent's remarks would not have been disowned by any latitudinarian Anglican:

and since we worship the same God, tho we differ in some Modes of worship, as far as we have attain'd let us walk by the same Rule, let us mind the same thing; and in other things let us make use of the Apostle's advice, and bear with and forbear one another ... for let a man worship God either after one or another manner, provided he worships him at all.¹⁶⁷

By the latter part of the reign, the pressure of renewed High-Church influence was becoming more obvious:

Tis further also urged against us that we preach up Schism from the Church, as well as Sedition in the State... so that upon the whole, the Cry of the church of England's being in Endanger'd by the Dissenters, we may conclude to be certainly one of the wildest Suggestions that every gained ground in the midst of us.¹⁶⁸

The Dissenting community, far from dividing into furious sects, maintained in their published thanksgiving sermons, a consistency in terms of view which bespeaks some level of co-ordination of outlook.¹⁶⁹ The impact of the committee of denominations, the interaction between influential figures such as Dr Williams and Harley, combined with the waxing and waning of the threat of High Church influence over a sovereign who was not as inclined as her predecessor to favour Dissent, all served to enforce a disciplined message which is obvious across the geographical and factional divides of the Dissenting community.

One hundred and ninety-two thanksgiving sermons were published from the thanksgivings held during the reign of Queen Anne. With the exception of the political achievement of the union with Scotland, all were thanksgivings for military victories. The outcome of the War of the Spanish Succession bore within it a struggle for international recognition of the British succession.

¹⁶⁶ Henry, Dec. 1706, p. 25.

¹⁶⁷ Dent, 1707, p. 15.

¹⁶⁸ Wright, Nov. 1709, pp. 18-19.

¹⁶⁹Of the thirty-five ministers who published, a tentative classification would find sixteen Presbyterians, six Baptists and four independents, with insufficient information to classify the remaining nine. However, Baptists covers Seventh-Day and Particular as well as Jacob, who defied all classifications. Some preachers (*e.g.* Samuel Harris) moved from Congregational ministry to Presbyterianism.

Something approaching half of the sermons, all delivered by clergymen of the Established Church, can be said to be characterised by one but usually more of a cluster of features: an emphasis on the Queen's as God's vice-regent (including in matters spiritual); a tendency towards a protective, if not fearful, attitude towards the Church's position; and, from 1706, an increasing disenchantment with the war. Roughly a quarter are from Anglicans respectful of the Queen and Parliament, inclusive of other strands of domestic Protestantism, and unconvinced that victory over Louis XIV had been achieved. Roughly one in every four published sermons are from Dissenting ministers,¹⁷⁰ and for a community known for religious individualism, their sermons show a remarkable consistency in an anxiety to demonstrate loyalty to Queen and Parliament, vigorous support for the war, and a deep concern for the fate of persecuted Protestants. The volume of published Dissenting sermons belied their congregational numbers and may have made them appear more of a domestic threat to those Anglicans who wished to view them as such. Joseph Williamson, Rector of Leathley, Yorkshire, estimated that the Church of England "makes three parts in four"¹⁷¹ of the nation, a significant underestimation of the greater than ninety percent estimated by modern scholarship.¹⁷² The number of sermons varied from a maximum of thirty for Blenheim (1704) to a minimum of five the following year, as a certain complacency set in. Evidence of self-censorship exists in the preponderance of Tory-leaning sermons which were published in years of Tory ascendancy, 1702 and 1713, and the significant waxing and waning of Whig sermons as the reign progressed.

Sermon culture allowed for a certain level of dialogue – even at the level of exchanges of charges of treason and damnation – within literate early modern British society. Most obviously, critics were able to preach and publish against Sacheverell – Richard Chapman vociferously, White Kennett in a more veiled way with a sermon before the Queen. This enabled public recitation of opinion and evidence, however dubious, on the part of identifiable, educated, respected individuals. Samuel Bromesgrove's sermon to his Huguenot congregation instructed on how they might become 'entirely English,'¹⁷³ in a maladroit, if not threatening way. It allowed for public response and refutation. Jean Armand Dubourdieu was able to use Bishop Burnet's utterances as cover for his own denigration of Louis XIV, both during the war and later when brought before the Bishop of London at the instigation of the French. By its accountability it set limits of acceptability on what could be published – the Queen could not be criticised,

¹⁷⁰ A number of sermons are from 'foreign' preachers – German and French congregations, and a relatively small proportion of sermons could not readily be classified into any of these types.

¹⁷¹ Joseph Williamson, *A Vindication of the Thanksgiving-Sermon of the Reverend Dr. Willis, Dean of Lincoln; from the Reflections of a Late Pamphlet; Entitled a Review of the Case of Ephraim and Judah; and Its Application to the Church of England and the Dissenters*. By Joseph Williamson, A. B. Presbyterian of the Church of England (London, 1705), p11.

¹⁷² Barry Coward, *The Stuart Age* (London, 1980), p. 465.

¹⁷³ Bromesgrove, 1704, p. 12.

and though in 1708, Thomas Manningham pointedly raised the issue of the war, claiming that: “our Christianity obliges us to make War no longer than the Necessity lies upon us,”¹⁷⁴ rarely were the Queen’s ministers individually criticised, though other groups could be condemned as fanatics, Schismatics, or Jacobites. Considerations of self-censorship extend to the decision not to publish as is evident both from the quantity and titles of Tory-leaning published sermons in the years 1702 and 1713, and the silence of the Whigs in 1713.

The demand for sermons and the infrastructure for their publication and dissemination ensured that they formed a part of the lively political debate that was a feature of early modern England. It is the contention of this thesis that it is possible through these sermons to reconstruct the twists and turns of the independent, though interconnected, strands of partisan opinion through the decade. Particularly striking is the consistency of Dissenting opinion and the significantly early point in the war at which Tory disenchantment began to manifest itself. Philip Stubbs, preaching at St James, Garlickhythe in 1713, retrospectively credited his friend Sacheverell with becoming:

the fortunate Instrument of furnishing out a lucky Incident in the wonderful Progress of a good Cause; We cannot sufficiently adore the mysterious Providence of God, in choosing the foolishness of Preaching, as some were pleased to call it in a literal Sense, to confound the Wise.¹⁷⁵

The Sacheverellite uproar was promulgated through a large-scale infrastructure for the publication and dissemination of sermons, which fed a demand for opinion as well as instruction. His sermon, though an intemperate outlier in style, was part of a system of accountable opinion, which could be seen as more authoritative, and more potentially politically threatening, than political pamphlets in terms of their influence upon public opinion.

¹⁷⁴ Manningham, 1708, p. 7.

¹⁷⁵ Philip Stubbs, 1713, p. 19.

Appendix 1: A Specific Latitudinarian-Dissenter Controversy..

Though the 1705 thanksgiving was “inconsiderable” in relation to the previous one, and Boyer alluded to rumours that there was doubt at court as to whether to hold it, the controversy attendant on Willis’s sermon at St Paul’s illustrates the divide between Dissenters and the latitudinarian wing of the Church of England, two groups of similar view and, in High Church diatribes, linked together.

Willis’s sermon was criticised in the *Whipping Post*, a High Church-oriented newsletter.¹ “It had been Her Majesties Misfortune out of three Sermons Preached before Her at St Paul’s, to have two of them, and those the last, not worthy of a Country Vicarage.”² The Whiggish *Observer*, as was its didactic wont, published dialogue between a sophisticated Observer and less worldly Countryman in which it promulgated its view that the *Whipping Post*’s criticism of Willis would inculcate “an abhorrence of the Practices of the High Church Party.”³

Criticism of Willis’s tolerant view arrived from a less expected source with the publication in October of *A Review of the Case of Ephraim and Judah*, published anonymously⁴ as an open letter to Dr Willis. Starting with a respectful “I do not doubt you design in it was very pious and generous,” the author returns the patronizing tone saying that the Dissenting community “can forgive you all the smooth flourishes which were calculated for a Court-Audience” but goes on to refute the analogy between Dissenters and Ephraim, the Old Testament idolaters, and ridicules Willis by stretching the analogy to imply “St Paul’s, like the Temple at Jerusalem, were the only place to worship.”

The author divides his refutation of Willis into theological and political arguments, summarizing the theological by “The less important Circumstantials of Modes and Discipline not being fixed by our saviour, were left to be agreed by the Prudence of his followers” and invokes the Principle of Toleration as both a political and theological good: “Let no man argue against the liberty which the Genius of our excellent Religion allows.”

¹ Written by William Pittis; ref Theodore F. M. Newton, ‘William Pittis and Queen Anne Journalism’, *Modern Philology*, xxxiii (1936), pp. 279-302.

² *Whipping Post*, no 13. The worthy one was Trelawny’s in 1702. Though Sherlock’s in 1704 was High Church in tone, Sherlock himself was viewed with suspicion for his prevarication around non-juring in 1688/9.

³ *Observer*, 8 -12 Sept. 1705.

⁴ All quotes in the following paragraphs from *A review of the case of Judah and Ephraim, and its application to the Church of England and the Dissenters. With an essay on the original of religious animosities, and the proper Means to compose 'em. In a letter to the Reverend Dr. Willis Dean of Lincoln, occasion'd by his thanksgiving-sermon on the 23d o Aug., 1705. before Her Majesty at St Paul's* (London, 1705).

Turning to the political controversies, the author evinces a commonly held view of the insincerity of the High Church politicians – especially those listed as patriots in the *Memorial to the Church of England*.⁵ “It is agreed by most sensible persons, that our greatest Divisions are a mere State-Quarrel, in which Religion and the Church are not immediately concerned, but that they are artfully brought into it for a specious Pretence ... Nothing can expound the Riddle of some gentlemen’s having a world of Zeal, and not one Grain of Morality.” Acknowledging by implication that Church-Dissenter divisions do cause political tension, the author points out that

Heats and Animosities reign as much between Churchmen themselves, witness the new Party-Names, ... nor is it only their Friendship or Hatred to Dissenters, and their judgement of the reasonableness or unreasonableness of a Toleration, or of the Occasional Bill, that makes the difference, but their disagreeing opinions of Government, of the Power of the Prince, the Liberties of the People, and of the present Administration both in Council and Parliament ... There would be the same contention for superiority at Court, in the Houses of Lords and Commons, in the Magistracy, tho there were not a Dissenter in England.

As an aid to Dr Willis and the tolerant part of the Church of England, the author points to two exemplars of tolerant “Bodies of Men ... United in common interest ... without animosities” – the Royal Society, “a Union of the most various Characters that can be thought of among Mankind ... [who] are not distracted in this Pursuit [the Improvement of Natural Knowledge] , or divided into parties by their Religious Principles”;⁶ and the city of Amsterdam, where by Sir William Temple’s account “ they differ without enmity or scorn.”

The case of the moderate Church of England clergy was reasserted by Joseph Williamson⁷ in a discourse which, according to the author, was written with Dr Willis’s knowledge, “and Publish’d without his Approbation.” After some irritable comment about how far to take the Ephraim-Dissenter analogy, Williamson outlines the mainstream Church of England view that Dissenters “reject at once the Common Prayer-Book and all the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church; though the use of them is enjoy’d by the Ecclesiastical and Civil laws,” that “terms of the National church [are] lawful” and that “power of making

⁵ Rochester, Nottingham, Jersey and Sir Edward Seymour.

⁶ This was true, both Sir Isaac Newton and James Drake, co-author of the *Memorial*, were members of the Royal Society at the time. However Newton’s difficulties with Sir Robert Hooke, the Society’s president until the latter’s death in 1703, illustrate that heats, animosities and contention for superiority are a regrettable part of the human condition, secular as well as confessional.

⁷ The Database of the Clergy of the Church of England has one entry for Joseph Williamson, rector of Leathley, in Yorkshire, 1711-1743.

Church Orders is lodged in the Queen, Parliament and Convocation.”⁸ Williamson expressed the minimalist view of the Toleration Act that it “does not import the Establishment of their assemblies, but only the Non-Prosecution of them.” He condemned their effrontery in taking “to themselves Teachers to the exclusion of their authoriz’d Pastors, and ... continually sounding the Trumpet of Schism.”

Williamson dismissed the idolisation of the Royal Society as irrelevant, its work “in no way relating to Church or State” and quoted Bishop Burnet’s published comments about the lively disputes between Lutherans and Calvinists in Amsterdam to negate the utopian view of the author of the letter, and pointing to the depredations of England’s Protectorate administration as a warning to latitudinarians. In a view that might indicate Dissenters visibility more than their numbers, he imagined only three in four of the population of England to be Church of England members, rather than the greater than ninety percent that modern scholars estimate.⁹

Williamson comes to the political nub, by refuting utterly the *Letter’s* suggestion that contentions and animosities would remain even in the absence of Dissenters. On the contrary, he asserted that the existence of division among the people supported parliamentary and civil excess:

There would be no struggles for or against a Bill to prevent Occasional Conformity, nor any jealousy of taking away a Toleration Act. Though there might still remain designing men to keep up animosities in the Government, there would be no great hazard to the State from such, because they would not be supported by such strong factions as now they are.

⁸ Mention of Convocation rather than the episcopacy may indicate the extent of Francis Atterbury’s proselytising among the lower orders for the clergy. Leathley was in the Yorkshire archdiocese whose archbishop, Sharp, was somewhat sympathetic, or at least less antagonistic to Convocation, than Canterbury’s Tenison.

⁹ Barry Coward, *The Stuart Age* (London, 1980), quotes Dr Watts survey for the Committee of Three Denominations, made between 1715 and 1718, as arriving at a figure of 6.21 per cent of the population of England and 5.74 per cent of the Welsh population.

Appendix 2: Preachers by Year and Denomination

1702

Name	Surname	Location	Anglican	Dissent	Other	Comment
JJ	Caesar	Savoy			1	German cong. London
Richard	Chapman	Cheshunt herts	1			
Edward	Clarke	Nottingham	1			
John	Cockburn	Amsterdam			1	Anglican Amsterdam
Richard	Fiddes	Holderness	1			
William	Foster	Stamford	1			
Richard	Holland	Warwick	1			
Joseph	Jacob	Turners Hall		1		
Ralph	Lambert	St Giles in Field				Whig controversialist
Benjamin	Loveling	Banbury	1			Anti-Quaker
William	Needham	Convocation	1			Sancroft's chaplain
Humphrey	Prideaux	Norwich	1			
Edward	Smyth	Dublin	1			Bishop
TC	Tc	York	1			
Jonathan	Trelawny	St Pauls	1			Bishop
Charles	Whiting	Hereford	1			
Daniel	Williams	hand alley		1		Leading Presbyterian
Benjamin	Woodroffe	oxford	1			

1704

Error! Not a valid link.

1705

Name	Surname	Location	Anglican	Dissenter	Comment
Lewis	Atterbury	Whitehall	1		Brother of Francis
Richard	Fiddes	York	1		
Francis	Higgins	Dublin	1		High Church controversialist
Joseph	Jacob	London		1	
Richard	Willis	St Pauls	1		Whig controversialist

June 1706

Name	Surname	Location	Anglican	Dissenter	Other	Comment
Thomas	Bradbury	Stepney		1		Independent
William	Bramston	Essex	1			
Gilbert	Burnet	Salisbury	1			Whig Bishop
John	Catlyn	Montgomery	1			
John	Dubourdieu	Savoy London			1	Huguenot
John	Evans	Chester		1		Presbyterian
Robert	Fleming	London		1		Presbyterian
JAM	Gardiner	Crooked Lane	1			
Thomas	Gatchell	Devon	1			
Daniel	Hill	Rochester Cathedral	1			
Thomas	Knaggs	St Giles in the fields	1			
Andrew	Low	Wycombe		1		
William	Perse	Yorkshire	1			
John	Spademan	London		1		Presbyterian
George	Stanhope	St Pauls	1			Prominent preacher
Joseph	Stennett	Pinnors Hall London		1		7 th day Baptist
Philip	Stubbs	Greenwich	1			Pro-Sacheverrell later
Samuel	Terrick	York	1			
Richard	West	Golden Square	1			Burnet's chaplain
John	Whittle	Kent	1			
J.	Wilder	Oxford	1			
Benjamin	Woodroffe	Oxford	1			
JN		at Sea			1	

December 1706:

Name	Surname	Location	Anglican	Dissenter	Other	Comment
Edmund	Arwaker	Dungannon1				Irish origin
Nicholas	Beare	St Botolph's, Aldersgate 1				
Gilbert	Burnet	St Pauls	1			Whig Bishop
T.	Colton	York		1		Presbyterian
Jean Armand	Dubourdieu	Savoy			1	Huguenot
William	Goldwin	Newham.1				
Matthew	Henry	Cheshire		1		Presbyterian
Nathaniel	Hodges	Spital fields London		1		Baptist
Josiah	Hort	Wendover1				
Benjamin	Lacy	Exon	1			
Charles	Lamb	Enfield1				
William	Lloyd	Diss, Norfolk1				
George	Mills	Norfolk		1		
Joshua	Oldfield	Globe Alley		1		Presbyterian
Deuel	Pead	St Ethelburga	1			
John	Short	Miles Lane London		1		Independent
William	Stainforth	Barnbrough, York1				
William	Stephens	Sutton surrey1				Whig controversialist
William	Ward	Portsmouth1				
Daniel	Williams	Hand Alley		1		Presbyterian
Thomas	Wise	Richmond1				

1707:

Name	Surname	Location	Anglican	Dissenter	Other	Comment
Richard	Allen	Barbican		1		Baptist
Isaac	Bates	Hackney		1		Presbyterian
Charles	Bean	Oxford	1			
Nicholas	Brady	Richmond	1			Irish Origin
George	Burnet	Andover		1		
Edward	Chandler	Worcester		1		Whig bishop 1717
Richard	Collins	Kent	1			
Robert	Davidson	Kent	1			
Giles	Dent	London		1		Presbyterian
PD - Patrick	Dujon	Doncaster	1			
John	Edwards	Cambridge	1			Church of England sympathy to Calvinists
Richard	Enock	Suffolk	1			
Thomas	Freke	Bartholomew's Close	1			Presbyterian
John	Grant	St Dunstan's in the West	1			
Francis	Hutchinson	Bury St Edmunds	1			
Thos	Manningham	Holbourn	1			Tory Bishop 1709
Nathaniel	Marshall	Ormonde St	1			
Joshua	Oldfield	Oxford		1		Presbyterian
John	Ollyffe	Uxbridge	1			
Deuel	Pead	Clerkenwell	1			
Thomas	Pyle	Lyme Regis	1			Whig controversialist
Joseph	Standen	Somersetshire		1		Baptist, later conformed to Church of England
Joseph	Stennett	Pinners Hall		1		7 th day Baptist
William	Talbot	St Pauls	1			Whig Bishop
Christopher	Taylor	Leather Lane		1		Presbyterian
Hugh	Todd	Penrith	1			High Church controversialist
Charles	Williams	Middlesex	1			
Daniel	Williams	Hand Alley		1		Presbyterian

1708:

Name	Surname	Location	Anglican	Dissenter	Other	Comment
Richard	Coleire	Kent	1			Inspiration for Gulliver's travels?
Thomas	Colton	York		1		Presbyterian
J. Armand	Dubourdieu	Savoy, London			1	Huguenot
Wm	Fleetwood	St Pauls	1			Whig bishop 1708
John	Hoadly	Salisbury	1			Brother of Benjamin
Thomas	Knaggs	St Mrgts, Westminster1				
Thomas	Manningham	Windsor	1			Tory bishop 1709
MI	Stanhope	Chapel Royal	1			
Henry	Stephens	Oxford	1			
Josiah	Woodcock	Oxford		1		Presbyterian

Feb 1709

Name	Surname	Location	Anglican	Dissenter	Comment
Simon	Browne	Portsmouth		1	
George	Conway	Wokingham		1	
Francis	Hare	House of Commons	1		Whig controversialist
Thomas	Manningham	B4 Queen at St James	1		Tory Bishop 1709
William	Marston	Hertfordshire	1		
Daniel	Mayo	Kingston upon Thames		1	Presbyterian
Deuel	Pead	Clerkenwell	1		
Joseph	Stennett	Pinners Hall		1	7 th day Baptist
Charles	Trimnell	House of Lords	1		Whig bishop 1707
Josiah	Woodward	Whitechapel	1		

Nov 1709

Name	Surname	Location	Tory	Whig	Comment
John	Adams	St Pauls	1		Boyle lecturer
Samuel	Baker	Winchester	1		
Edward	Chandler	Worcester	1		Whig bishop 1717
Richard	Chapman	Cheshunt,	1		
Samuel	Clarke	House of Commons	1		philosopher
George	Conway	Wokingham		1	
Thomas	Freke	Bartholomew close		1	Presbyterian
Gideon	Hardinge	Kingston	1		
Samuel	Harris	Goodman's Fields		1	
John	Hough	House of Lords	1		Whig Bishop
White	Kennett	Chapel Royal , Queen	1		Whig Controversialist
Thomas	Knaggs	Knightsbridge	1		
Thomas	Masters	Rotherhithe		1	Independent
Thomas	Rivers	Winchester	1		
Samuel	Wright	Blackfriars		1	Presbyterian

1710

Name	Surname	Location	Anglican	Dissenter	Comment
John	Billingsley	Silver Street		1	Presbyterian
Thomas	Bradbury	Fetter Lane		1	Independent
Simon	Browne	Portsmouth		1	
Gilbert	Burnet	Salisbury	1		Whig Bishop
Richard	Chambre	St Pauls	1		
Samuel	Clarke	St James's Westminster	1		Philosopher
Thomas	Goddard	Windsor	1		
George	Stanhope	St James's	1		Boyle lecturer
Thomas	Swift	Puttenham	1		Brother of Jonathan
Samuel	Wright	Blackfriars		1	Presbyterian

Name	Surname	Location	Anglican	Dissenter	Comment
William	Bear	Devon	1		
John	Bradley 1659-1742	York	1		
Nicholas	Brady	Richmond ,	1		Irish origin
George	Cummings	St Mgt	1		
James	Davies	Radnor	1		
Patrick	Delany	Dublin	1		Irish origin
Richard	Eyre	Salisbury	1		Opposes Burnet, his Bishop
James	Gardiner	Lincoln	1		
Thomas	Good	Worcester		1	
Joseph	Harrison	Cirencester	1		
William	Hartwell	Durham	1		
Andrew	Hill	Unknown		1	
Samuel	Hilliard	Lothbury	1		
Matthew	Hole	Stokegursey, 1 Somersetshire			
George	Hooper bp	St Pauls	1		Tory Bishop
William	Law	Cambridge	1		Refused oath to George 1
Benjamin	Loveling	Banbury	1		
Luke	Milbourne	St Ethelburga	1		High Church controversialist
Jacob	Prosser	Portsmouth		1	
Philip	Stubbs	Greenwich	1		High Church controversialist

Appendix 3: Preacher Biographies

Preachers whose names are underlined have entries in the Oxford Dictionary National Biography, (accessed in March 2016). Background details in such cases are a summary of the DNB article. For other Church of England preachers, unless otherwise stated, background information comes from the Clergy of the Church of England database. For preachers who gave sermons in thanksgiving for the 1707 union W.R. and V.B. McLeod's bibliography *Anglo-Scottish Tracts, 1701-1714: A Descriptive Checklist* (Lawrence, KA, 1979) is a useful source.

Titles noted are the biographical information listed on the frontispiece of the sermon for Church of England preachers. For Dissenting preachers I have just noted this fact in the title, as the information on the printed sermon was usually quite sparse.

Name: John Adams (1662-1720)

Title: D.D. Rector of St Alban Wood Street and Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty

Thanksgiving Sermon: Nov. 1709

Background

Educated: Eton, Kinds Cambridge ; DD (1705). 1694 rector of St Alban, Wood Street presented to the rectory of St Bartholomew, London, by Lord Chancellor Harcourt¹. Prebendary of Canterbury (1703) ; canon of Windsor (1708); Elected provost of King's College (1712). Boyle lecturer in 1703, fifteen of his sermons were printed.

Name: **Anthony Addison** (1670-1719)

Title: Rector of Abington and chaplain to the Duke of Marlborough

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1704

Background: (CCed)

MA Oxford Queens, 1682 ; Vicar Abingdon St Helen with St Nicholas 1698-1719.

Name: **Richard Allen**

Title: Dissenting Minister

Thanksgiving Sermons: 1707

¹ Tory grandee, defended Sacheverell, later Lord Keeper and Lord Chancellor: Stuart Handley, 'Harcourt, Simon, first Viscount Harcourt (1661?-1727)', *Oxford DNB*, [accessed 8 Mar. 2016].

Background:

1. Mr Richard Allen, a famous minister, much noted in his day for usefulness, piety and charity; tho' he had not the advantages of a learned education, yet he was a man of good natural endowments, and by his own industry, after he was called to the work of the ministry, he attained to such an acquaintance with the oriental languages, and other parts of useful learning, as to exceed many who enjoyed the benefits of a learned education in the schools. The church, of which he was elder, is one of the most ancient congregations of the Baptists, about London, being first constituted in the time of the civil wars, and had for the pastor the famous Mr John Gosnold, who about the year 1670, was succeeded by Mr Thomas Plant; and about the year 1693 Mr Allen succeeded Mr Plant, bringing with him a small congregation, to which he had been pastor before, which met at Turner's Hall in Philpot-lane. He was their pastor many years, and always preserved the character of a pious man, and of an ingenious and useful preacher; and continued in his work till within a few months before his death, which was on the 20th of Feb 1717.³
2. Church at Turner's Hall: This place was situated in Philpot-Lane, which reaches from Fenchurch-street, north to Little Eastcheap, south, part lying in Langbourn-ward, and the greater part in Billingsgate-ward. It was occupied in 1688 by Mr Richard Allen, a respectable Baptist Minister, who was originally a member of the Baptist church in White's-alley, Moorfield's. In 1695. he removed, with his people, to the Church in Barbican, where he succeeded Mr Thomas Plant.⁴

Name: **Andrew Archer** (1674-1728)

Title: Preacher at the Chappel of King Charles the Martyr⁵, at Tunbridge-Wells, in Kent

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1704

Background: (CCEd)

BA Oxford/Merton 1697, MA 1702 ; Preacher and Chaplain Tunbridge Wells 1702-

Name **Edmund Arwaker** (c.1660-1730)

Title: Rector of Donaghmore in the Diocese of Armagh, and Chaplain to his Grace the Lord Lieutenant (Ormonde)

Thanksgiving Sermon: Dec. 1706

Background:

³ T.Crosby, *The History of the English Baptists: From the Reformation to the Beginning of the Reign of King George I* (4 vols, London 1738) iv, 346.

⁴ Ivimey, *A History of the English Baptists*, ii, 348.

⁵ The church, a site of High Tory veneration, had no resident minister until 1709 so relied on visiting clergymen to conduct services: Lacey, *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr*, p. 167.

1. A graduate of Kilkenny College, Ireland⁶.
2. In postulating the existence of an Irish Kingdom which embodied Protestant interests, Arwaker ... can be seen to give early expression to a concept that was to become popular during the first half of the eighteenth century, and eventually become dominant: that of the Protestant Irish Nation.

An example of the co-existence in the Protestant Mind of the two concepts of Nationality comes from a poem written in 1694 by a Church of Ireland rector, Edmund Arwaker. Recalling the recently concluded Jacobite war, Arwaker at first told his readers how 'Hibernia, that unhappy land, / Her Empress Albion dust withstand/ And strove to wrest the sceptre from her hand'. However, when the war is over we find that Hibernia has been subjected, not to 'Albion' but to 'her sovereign' and 'please with the blessings of his gentle reign', she could sing 'her liberty regained/ which, if unconquered, she had ne'er obtained. [Edmund Arwaker, an Elegy on his Excellency Lieutenant-General Tollemache (London 1694) pp 5-6]. In other words, we begin with the notion of Gaelic Ireland struggling to throw off the imperial domination of England, and end with a quiet different scenario, William, king of Ireland, saving the Protestant Kingdom from James.⁷

Name: **Lewis Atterbury** (1656–1731)

Title: LLD and one of Six Preaching Chaplains at Whitehall

Thanksgiving Sermons: 1705

Background:

Brother of Francis Atterbury. Chaplain to the mayor of London, Sir William Pritchard (1684) ; rector of Sewell in Northamptonshire (1685). Appointed lecturer at St Mary-at-Hill, London (1691). He was a chaplain to the Princess Anne, he was less contentious than his brother Francis, and continued as a royal chaplain under George I.

Name: **Samuel Baker** (? – 1731)

Title: None (on sermon)

Thanksgiving Sermon: Nov. 1709

Background (CCEd):

MA 1701

Rector Sherborne St John 1701-1702

⁶ D.J. O'Donoghue, *The poets of Ireland: a biographical and bibliographical dictionary of Irish writers of English verse* (Dublin, 1912), pp. 11-12.

⁷ Hayton, *The Anglo-Irish Experience, 1680-1730: Religion, Identity and Patriotism*, p. 39.

Preacher throughout the diocese of Winchester (1715)

Rector Laverstoke 1715-1726 ; Lasham (1730-31)

Name: **Isaac Bates**

Title: Dissenting Minister

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1707

Background:

‘BATES, Isaac, d. before 4 October 1758. Born in Halifax and probably educated at Edinburgh University, he was chaplain for some time to the Westby family at Revenfield Hall, Rotherham, Yorkshire. By 1697 he was looking for another position, but he was still in the north in January of 1699/1700. Around 1700, Bates made his way to London and to Hoxton (1700-1730) where he had an afternoon congregation of Presbyterians and where he met Dr Daniel Williams who became a long-time friend. While apparently a learned man, he was not popular in the pulpit and was never able to secure a full-time charge. In ideology he was considered a Calvinist and in polity a Presbyterian. His sermon on 1 May 1707 stressed the mutual advantages to be gained by the union. He argued that England would lose nothing but her name and would gain a good friend in the north as well as a good people and a numerous population. Upon his death in or around 1758, Bates was the last surviving trustee of the Dr Williams's Trust.’⁹

Name: **Charles Bean** (1675-1731)

Title: AM Fellow of Merton College in Oxford, and Chaplain to the Right Honourable Charles, Earl of Peterborough

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1707

Background:

‘An Anglican clergyman, Bean was born the son of Robert Bean of Norton, Worcestershire. He matriculated at Magdalen Hall, Oxford, 4 May 1693, and received his B.A. there 4 February 1696/7. A fellow of Merton College and chaplain to the Earl of Peterborough, he preached a sermon at St Mary's on 1 May 1707, and immediately was accused by both political extremes of having shown either too slight a zeal for the established church by praising the union, or too slight a respect for William and Anne by showing inadequate zeal for the union. This intolerable situation forced him in early June to publish his sermon to disprove the rumours circulating through Oxford. It was his first publication and by no means one which he enjoyed.

⁹ W.R. and V.B. McLeod, *Anglo-Scottish Tracts, 1701-1714: A Descriptive Checklist* (Lawrence, KA, 1979),p159

His published sermon reflected a fervent desire to avoid antagonizing either his high-church brethren at Oxford or the Queen at Westminster. His subsequent career was successful in a limited fashion. He was vicar at Beakesbourne, Kent, in 1710; of Lydd in 1711; rector of Bishopsbourne in 1720, and of Ickham in the same year. He was chaplain to the Prince of Wales in 1719 and continued as chaplain to Charles, Earl of Peterborough. In 1716, he published a sermon condemning rebellion, but there was little in his later published works to compare with the controversy surrounding his first publication.¹⁰

Name: **William Bear**

Title: Vicar of Abbotsham, Devon

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1713

Background {CCed}:

Beare, Willimus is noted as perpetual Vicar of Abbotsham, Exeter Dioceses from 1686.

Name **Nicholas Beare**

Title: Curate at St Botolph's, Aldersgate

Thanksgiving Sermon: Dec. 1706

Background [CCed]:

MA 1693, ordained 1693, by Thomas Sprat, Bp. Rochester.

Name: **John Billingsley** (1657–1722)

Title: Dissenting Minister (Crutched Friars)

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1710

Background:

Presbyterian minister. Educated at Nottingham by John Reyner... attended Trinity College, Cambridge, but did not matriculate... moved to Sheffield as assistant to Presbyterian Edward Prime. He ministered in Selston, Nottinghamshire (1687-1694)... succeeded Samuel Charles as pastor to a joint congregation of Presbyterians and Independents at Kingston upon Hull (1694-1706). Elected to replace Samuel Rosewell as assistant to William Harris at the Presbyterian congregation of Crutched Friars, London. Billingsley sided with the non-subscribers in 1719

¹⁰ W.R. and V.B. McLeod, *Anglo-Scottish Tracts, 1701-1714: A Descriptive Checklist* (Lawrence, KA, 1979).p. 159.

Salter's Hall controversy i.e. he thought the imposition of religious tests of any sort violated the fundamental principle of Dissent.

Name: **Thomas Bradbury** (1676/7–1759)

Title: Dissenting Minister

Thanksgiving Sermons: June 1706, 1710

Background:

Independent minister and religious controversialist. Assistant to John Galpin, at Stepney (1704), ordained minister in Fetter Lane, London, 1707. Published *Confession of Faith*, demonstrating Calvinist beliefs. A defender of religious liberty and supporter of the Hanoverian succession. His highly political sermons every 5 November, were notorious and popular. One such was 'The *lawfulness of resisting tyrants*', (1713). His raucous post-sermon behaviour each 5 November was criticised by Isaac Watts, among others. Queen Anne was said to have called him Bold Bradbury. His meeting house was destroyed in the Sacheverell riot in 1710.

Name: **John Bradley** (1659-1742)

Title: Prebendary of York Minster

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1713

Background [CCed]:

Adm. sizar at JESUS, June 30, 1676. Of Yorkshire. ' Matric. 1676; B.A. 1679-80; M.A. 1683. Incorp. at Oxford, 1683. R. of St Mary Castlegate York, 1688. R. of St Mary, Bishophill, 1705. Preb. of York, 1707. Died Jan. 1742, aged 82.

Name: **Nicholas Brady** 1659–1726

Title: Minister of Richmond in Surrey and Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty

Thanksgiving Sermons: 1704, 1707, 1713

Background

Poet and Church of England clergyman, was born at Bandon, co. Cork. Graduated from Trinity College, Dublin BA (1685) and MA (1686). Brady remained in Ireland during 1690 and earned

favour among Jacobites by preaching the divine right of kings and non-resistance. Leaving Ireland, Brady was commissioned on 23 April 1694 as chaplain to Colonel Sir Richard Atkins's foot regiment and soon afterwards he became chaplain to William III and Queen Mary. He is remembered a metrical translation of the psalms in collaboration with another protestant Irish clergyman, Nahum Tate, poet laureate, and, like Brady, a protégé of the earl of Dorset. Brady was a fashionable preacher not only in his own churches but at court and before city livery companies

Name: **William Bramston**

Title: DD Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty

Thanksgiving Sermon: June 1706

Background [CCEd]:

1. [CCEd] BA Cambridge/Queens'1679; MA 1686, DD 1708

Ord. deacon and priest (London) Dec. 21, 1679. Preb. of Wells, 1704-35. Preb. of Worcester, 1713. R. of Woodham Walter, Essex, 1686-1720. R. of Willingale Spain, 1686-1708. R. of St Christopher, London, 1708-35. P.C. of Mortlake, 1720-35. Died Aug. 25, 1735. 'Administration of Effects at a Probate Court.'Admon. ('Prerogative Court of Canterbury.'P.C.C.) 1735.

2. Of Tory Stock, Father Sir John was Tory MP Maldon 1679-1685; Brother Thomas was Tory MP Maldon 1712-1727.¹¹ Yet sermon Whiggish

Name: **Samuel Bromesgrove**

Title: Preacher at the Tabernacle in Spittle-Fields [sic]

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1704

Background:

1. CCEd: MA Oxford/Corpus Christi 1694
Preacher/Lecturer Spitalfields, 1697-1770.

2. [14 December 1711] Petition by Samuel Bromesgrove, licensed minister for 16 years to a chapel in Spitalfields serving Artillery Ground and Norton Folgate, that he be made incumbent of any new parish formed by the union of the two districts:¹² 'your petitioner has for 16 years Officiated (with the licence and approbation of the most Revd. The Lord Bp of London) as Minister in a Chapel or Tabernacle erected for the worship of God according to the Liturgy of the Church of England as by Law Established in Spittle Fields, and by the Piety of the Revd Sir Geo. Wheler, Knt.'

¹¹ H.O.P. 1690-1715, ii, pp. 197-202.

¹² Lambeth Palace Library, MS 2712 (f.159r-v): The Queen Anne churches: a catalogue of the papers of the Commission for Building Fifty New Churches in London and Westminster, 1711-1759 / compiled by E.G.W. Bill.

Name: **John Broughton**

Title: Chaplain to His Grace, Duke of Marlborough

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1704

Background:

1. [CCEd]: BA Cambridge/Christ College 1694, MA 1706
Reader St Andrew Holborn, 1706-1713
2. John Broughton of Christ College, Cambridge, BA 1693, MA 1697; DD 1716; vicar of Kingston upon Thames 1712, and buried there July 5, 1720. Dr Broughton published some other single sermons ; one in 1704; one '*before the Queen*' (1707); '*On the Execution of Mr Noble*' (1713) and an '*Assize Sermon*' (1722).¹³

Name: **Simon Browne** (c.1680–1732)

Title: [Dissenting] Minister in Portsmouth

Thanksgiving Sermons: Feb. 1709, 1710

Background:

Dissenting minister and religious controversialist. He was minister in Portsmouth and in 1716 in Old Jewry London. He abandoned ministry in 1716 due to depression, possibly due to death of his wife and son. In a funeral sermon Anthony Atkey cited 'a complicated domestic affliction', His records have been used to illustrate early modern insight into mental illness¹⁴.

Name: **George Burnet**

Title: [Dissenting] Minister of the Gospel at Andover

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1707

Background:

'The Rev. George Burnet was not one of the better known ministers of the early eighteenth century. His publication was limited to this one work, a sermon preached 1 May 1707. While he was said to have been 'of Andover,' there apparently is little record of his work in that town. He remains one of the more anonymous figures of the period. Burnet, like most preachers on 1 May, tended toward a glorification of God and monarch as the essential theme for that day. The union would halt internal warfare, unite all

¹³ A.C. Grayling, Naomi Goulder and Andrew Pyle eds., *The Continuum Encyclopaedia of British Philosophy* (Oxford 2006).

¹⁴D. Berman, David, 'Simon Browne: the Soul-Murdered Theologian', *History of Psychiatry*, vii (1996), pp 257-263.

Protestants against Catholicism and France, secure the Hanoverian succession, strengthen Anne, and honor God who wrought peace and harmony among men.’¹⁶

Name: **Gilbert Burnet** (1643–1715)

Title: Lord Bishop of Salisbury

Thanksgiving Sermons: June 1706, Dec 1706, 1707, 1710

Background:

Bishop of Salisbury and historian. Chaplain to the prince of Orange before 1688 landing, thereafter he tried to reconcile Church of England to the new regime. He eventually recommended the revocation of all King James's ecclesiastical appointments and the reappointment of those willing to swear allegiance to William and Mary. Burnet was close to Queen Mary, and recommended fasts and thanksgivings for the war as a method of unifying the nation. Burnet became bishop of Salisbury in May 1689. Politically Burnet was a Whig, he was less in favour during Queen Anne's reign. Burnet's house was attacked during the Sacheverell riots in 1710. Burnet voted along Whig lines in the Lords to condemn Sacheverell.

Name: **John James Caesar**

Title: Chaplain to the King of Prussia. Sermon delivered at Prussian Congregation at Savoy Palace

Thanksgiving Sermons: 1702, 1704

Background:

The High German Congregation of the Evangelical Reformed Religion in the Chapel Royal in the Palace of the Savoy. This was the third German congregation in London, and was formed of immigrants from the Palatinate who were of the Reformed (Calvinist) tradition. King William had granted use of the chapel to refugees from the Palatinate. In early 1700's there were only 20 paying members, and 60 others; the pastor's stipend was provided by their patron, King Friedrich I of Prussia.¹⁷

Name: **John Catlyn**

Title: MA. Vicar of Kerry and Chaplain to his Grace the Duke of Bolton

Thanksgiving Sermon: June 1706

¹⁶ W.R. and V.B. McLeod, *Anglo-Scottish Tracts, 1701-1714: A Descriptive Checklist* (Lawrence, KA, 1979), p.162

¹⁷ Panikos Panayi *Germans in Britain since 1500* (London 2003), p. 41.

Background:

No information has been found on John Catlyn

Name: **Richard Chambre**

Title: MA

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1710

Background: [CCEd]:

MA Cambridge/Trinity 1699

Lecturer/Curate St Botolph's Aldersgate 1713

Name: **Henry Chandler**

Title: Dissenting Minister, Bath

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1704

Background:

He first settled at Malmsbury, and afterwards at Hungerford, in Wilts; but the greatest part of his ministry was exercised at Bath, where he died in 1719.¹⁸

Name: **Edward Chandler** (1668?–1750),

Title: DD Canon of Worcester Cathedral

Thanksgiving Sermons: 1707, Nov. 1709

Background

Bishop of Durham (1730). Born in Dublin. MA (1693) Trinity College, Dublin; (1701) DD Emmanuel College, Cambridge. Chaplain to Bishop Lloyd at Lichfield in 1690s, where he received a stall on 30 April 1696. Became bishop of Lichfield 1717. Translated to Durham in 1730, by recommendation of Bishop Wake of Canterbury and Gibson of London. He was reckoned to be very wealthy and was accused of having paid £9,000 for the promotion to Durham.

Name: **Richard Chapman:** (c.1669- 1734)

¹⁸ J.Tolumn, *An historical view of the state of the Protestant dissenters in England, and of the progress of free enquiry and religious liberty, from the Revolution to the accession of Queen Anne* (London, 1814), p. 217.

Title: Vicar at Cheshunt, Hertfordshire

Thanksgiving Sermons: 1702, 1704, Nov. 1709

Background [CCEd]:

MA Oxford/Christ Church 1689

Vicar Cheshunt 1689-1734

Name: **Samuel Clarke** (1675–1729)

Title: D.D. Rector at St James's Westminster and Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty

Thanksgiving Sermons: Nov. 1709, 1710

Background:

Chaplain to Bishop Moore of Norwich (1698), whose patronage and library aided Clarke's studies. Moved to London in 1706 as Rector of St. Benet Paul's Wharf, and in 1709 was granted the comfortable living of St James's, Westminster.

Delivered 1704 and 1705 Boyle lectures which established him as a leading national and European theologian. He attracted criticism from Leibniz who felt his work undermined religion. He was defended by Newton and others.

Name: **Edward Clarke:**

Title: Vicar of St Mary's Parish Church, Nottingham; York Arch Dioceses

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1702

Background: [CCEd]:

Vicar of St Mary's Nottingham 1698 to 1708

Name: **John Cockburn** (1652-1729)

Title: Chaplain at English Church in Amsterdam

Thanksgiving Sermons: 1702

Background

Church of Scotland minister and Church of England clergyman; deprived as a nonjuror. Attended briefly at James court in St Germain, moved to English Church in Amsterdam in 1696. In 1709, having abandoned nonjurancy, he obtained a living in Curry Malet, Somerset.

Name: **Richard Coleire**

Title: MA Rector Of Harrietsham, and late Fellow of All-Souls-College, Oxford

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1709

Background

1. [CCed] Foster: s. Walter, of London, gent. BRASENOSE COLL. matric. 11 Sep. 1685, aged 15; fellow of ALL SOULS' COLL. 1688, B.A. 1689, M.A. 1693, proctor 1701, chaplain to Col. Wyndham's regiment 1696, chaplain to Viscount Falkland and to Marchioness Dowager of Wharton, rector of Harrietsham, Kent 1702-16, vicar of Tong, Kent 1712, and of Isleworth, Middlesex 1716 and of Kingston-upon-Thames 1720-6, minister of Richmond, Surrey 1726. See Foster's Ind. Eccles.; Rawlinson, i. 107, iv. 116, xvi. 394; & Hearne, i. 230.
2. Coleire may have been the inspiration for *Gulliver's Travels*. He had taken plurality to a new level, having been rector in Harrietsham since 1702, between 1706 and 1713 he was listed as chaplain of at least five different ships. In 1706 his Ship, the Medway, left Portugal without him and he was forced to make his way back to England by various means. Swift spent six weeks with Coleire in Autumn 1708¹⁹.

Name: **Richard Collins** 1679-1714

Title: Vicar of Burnham in Kent, and Chaplain to the Right Honourable Mary, Countess Dowager of Fauconberg²⁰

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1707

Background:

‘An occasional writer with some three published sermons to his credit during the reign of Anne, Collins was a young Anglican clergyman from Hereford and a graduate of Brasenose College, Oxford (1699). He was chaplain to Mary, Countess Dowager of Fauconberg; vicar of Burnham, Kent in 1701; of Meopham, Kent in 1707; and rector of Crayford, Kent in 1711. He was Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty's Royal Navy at Chatham. His sermon preached 1 May 1707 was dedicated to Sir Owen Buckingham, M.P., and Lord Mayor of London in 1704-1705. Buckingham was a powerful London merchant and Whig politician and a patron of some importance.

¹⁹ Michael Treadwell, ‘Swift, Richard Coleire, and the Origins of Gulliver's Travels’, *The Review of English Studies*, xxxiv (1983), pp. 304-11.

²⁰ Thomas Belasyse, later Count Fauconberg, married Mary Cromwell during the Protectorate. He was sufficiently flexible to bribe Charles II, while ambassador-extraordinary in France, and to join General Monck's March south prior to the restoration. Opposed to James I, he found renewed favour in minor roles under William. In 1707 Mary Cromwell was a wealthy widow, seventy, though still ‘fresh and gay’. Her numerous properties in Yorkshire, Lancashire, Middlesex, and Soho Square, London featured in many contemporary rumours concerning the removal and secret burial of her father's remains: Peter Gaunt, ‘Belasyse, Mary, Countess Fauconberg (bap. 1637, d. 1713)’, *Oxford DNB* [accessed 7 Mar. 2016].

Collins in his sermon reflected a typical Anglican attitude, for while praising Anne and the union, he sought to avoid extremes in handling the Presbyterians.²¹

Name: **Thomas Colton**

Title: Dissenting Minister (York)

Thanksgiving Sermons: Dec. 1706, 1708

Background

1. Dr Thomas Colton of York.... [was] executor, friend and pastor to Lady Hewley.....He was then (1692) about thirty years of age, and had been chaplain to Sir William Ayscough several years; but having an inclination to study physic, he had gone to Holland and studied there, taking a degree in medicine.²²
2. ST SAVIOURGATE CHAPEL, sometimes known as Lady Hawley's Chapel; it was registered in Quarter Sessions on 28 April 1693. The building is in the form of a cross, the area of each limb being equal to that of the central intersection; the land round it was used as a burial ground. The chapel is brick-built with a tiled roof and the entrance is by folding doors. Lady Hewley, who was one of the original benefactors of the chapel, made an allowance to the minister during her lifetime and by an article in the charity she founded in 1707, made provision for the continuation of this allowance after her death. A Presbyterian congregation continued to attend the chapel under the successive ministries of Thomas Colton (to 1731) and John Hotham.²³

Name: **George Conway**

Title: Dissenting Minister (Wockingham)

Thanksgiving Sermons: Feb. 1709, Nov 1709

Background No information has been found on George Conway

Name: **George Cummings**

Title: No title (Sermon preached at St Margaret-Patten's Church in Rude-Lane, London)

Thanksgiving Sermons: 1713

Background

²¹ W.R. and V.B. McLeod, *Anglo-Scottish Tracts, 1701-1714: A Descriptive Checklist* (Lawrence, KA, 1979). P.165.

²²J. Hunter, *The rise of the old dissent, exemplified in the life of Oliver Heywood, one of the founders of the Presbyterian congregations in the county of York. 1630-1702* (London 1842), p. 377

²³ <http://www.british-history..uk/ac/vch/yorks/city-of-york/pp404-418> (accessed 7 Mar. 2016)

No information has been found on George Cummings.

Name: **Robert Davidson**

Title: Rector of Hayes in Kent

Thanksgiving Sermons: 1707

Background:

‘The Rev. Robert Davidson, rector of Hayes, Kent contributed one sermon to those published on 1 May 1707. It was, as he admitted in his preface, his first effort at publication, and it likely was his last. His sermon was that of an Anglican clergyman eager to stress the loyalty due to Anne as Queen, and to emphasize the positive results of the union. He had been curate of Downe, a daughter church of Hayes, from 1693 to 1696, when he became rector of Hayes. Here he remained until his death in 1714.’²⁴

Name: **James Davies**

Title: Curate of Llandilo in the County of Radnor

Thanksgiving Sermons: 1713

Background

No information has been found on James Davies

Name: **Patrick Delany** (1685?–1768).

Title: M.A. Fellow of Trinity in Dublin, and Chaplain to the Right Honourable Sir Constantine Phipps, High Chancellor, and one of the Lords Justices of the Kingdom of Ireland.

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1713

Background:

Patrick Delany educated at Trinity College, Dublin. Friend of Swift. Swift called Delany the ‘most eminent preacher we have’.²⁵

²⁴ W.R. and V.B. McLeod, *Anglo-Scottish Tracts, 1701-1714: A Descriptive Checklist* (Lawrence, KA, 1979).p.168.

²⁵ Leslie Stephen, *Dictionary of National Biography*, 1885-1900 (London, 1909) Volume 14, and Andrew Carpenter. "Delany, Patrick". *Dictionary of Irish Biography*. (ed.) James McGuire, James Quinn. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Name: **Giles Dent**

Title: Dissenting Minister

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1707

Background:

‘A Presbyterian minister in London, Giles Dent is an elusive figure who either died young or left the ministry soon after 1712. Possibly he was a ministerial assistant to Edmund Calamy at Westminster, where his sermons generally were preached. A staunch defender of the revolution, Dent preached regularly on the November anniversary of the landing of William at Torbay in 1688. His sermon preached on 1 May 1707 reflects a general approach to the union, a safe, Whiggish sermon unlikely to offend Anglicans.’²⁷

Name: **John Dubourdieu** (c.1643–1720?)

Title: Minister of the Savoy

Thanksgiving Sermons: 1704, June 1706

Background:

Church of England clergyman, born at Bergerac in south-western France. Fled in 1683, became minister at French chapel at the Savoy for thirty five years from 1685.

Name **Jean Armand Dubourdieu** (1677–1727)

Title: Chapelain de Mylord Duc de Devonshire et Ministre de la Savoye

Thanksgiving Sermons: Dec. 1706, 1708

Background:

Son of John Dubourdieu. Naturalized in 1685, he matriculated from Gloucester Hall, Oxford (1694); chaplain to the duke of Devonshire, whose patronage gained him the rectory of Sawtry Moines in 1701. He also became chaplain of the Smyrna factory. His preaching denounced Louis XIV and Catholicism. In May 1713 Dubourdieu was brought before the bishop of London to answer charges brought by the French ambassador that he had insulted Louis XIV; he successfully defended himself.

Name: **Patrick Dujon (PD)** (c. 1682-1728)

Title: Vicar at St George’s Church in Doncaster

Thanksgiving Sermons: 1707

²⁷ W.R. and V.B. McLeod, *Anglo-Scottish Tracts, 1701-1714: A Descriptive Checklist* (Lawrence, KA, 1979),p.168.

Background

1. [CCEd] MA Edinburgh 1698 ; Vicar Doncaster, 1706-17298; Prebend York Minster, 1711-1728.
2. ‘This minister was a High Tory Anglican who regarded the union, the Scots, the Presbyterians, and just about everything else about this affair with extreme repugnance. He accepted the authority of the Queen, and therefore accepted the union as her command. But the best he hoped for was the conversion of the Presbyterians to Anglicanism.’²⁸

Name: **John Edwards** (1637-1716)

Title: DD

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1707

Background:

BA (1657) and MA (1661) from St. John’s Cambridge. He entered Trinity, Cambridge as a fellow. Became vicar of St. Peter’s Colchester in 1683, but left after three years. He returned to Cambridge and became DD (1699), wrote and preached extensively. Thereafter he remained in Cambridge, writing numerous works on theological themes. Edwards was noted for Calvinistic views, though he stayed within the Established Church. His sermon preached 1 May 1707 has been considered more notable for its attack upon immorality within contemporary society and it has been suggested that he viewed Scotland favourably mainly for the strictness of moral enforcement.²⁹

Name: **William Elstob** (1674?-1715)

Title: Rector of the Two United Parishes of St Swithun and St Mary Bothaw, London. Chaplain to the Right Reverend Father in God, William, Lord Bishop of Carlisle.

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1704

Background:

Anglo-Saxon scholar. Scholar at Queen's College, Oxford, the centre of Anglo-Saxon studies in the University. He was among a group eager to prove the continuity both of national institutions and of church teaching from Anglo-Saxon times.

Name: **Richard Enoch** (1658-1748)

Title: MA. Rector of Sutton in Suffolk

²⁸ W.R. and V.B. McLeod, *Anglo-Scottish Tracts, 1701-1714: A Descriptive Checklist* (Lawrence, KA, 1979), p. 170.

²⁹ Additional notes from McLeod, *Anglo-Scottish Tracts*, p. 170

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1707

Background

1. [CCEd]: MA Trinity College Oxford, 1682; Rector Erwarnton 1682-1685; Sutton 1684-1748.
2. 'The Rev. Mr Enock was an Anglican clergyman born the son of George Enock of Sibford Ferris, Oxfordshire. He matriculated at Trinity College, Oxford, on 5 May 1673, and graduated B.A., 1677. From 1682 until 1684 he was rector of Erwarnton, Suffolk, and from 1684 rector of Sutton in Suffolk, where he remained through 1707 when he published the sermon which he had preached 1 May 1707. At that time he described himself as rector of Sutton, and dedicated his work to Lady Parker, widow of Sir Philip Parker of Arwarnton Hall in Suffolk. Enock, who seems to have published little before or after his sermon, might best be described as a minister of the old school and one who rarely departed from his text, which he examined in great detail and with much high-flown language.'³⁰

Name: **John Evans** (1679/80–1730)

Title: Dissenting Minister, Chester and Wrexham.

Thanksgiving Sermons: 1704, June 1706

Background:

In 1702 he became minister to an Independent congregation at Wrexham. He became Daniel William's assistant in 1704 in Hand Alley, Westminster, and succeeded him upon Williams's death, in 1716. Under Williams's influence he joined the Presbyterians in London.

Name: **John Evans**

Title: Minister of Ewell, Surrey

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1704

Background:

[CCEd]: Vicar Ewell (1697-1748)

Name: **Richard Eyre** (1665-1746)

Title: AM, Canon Residentiary of the Church of Sarum

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1713

³⁰ W.R. and V.B. McLeod, *Anglo-Scottish Tracts, 1701-1714: A Descriptive Checklist* (Lawrence, KA, 1979), p. 171

Background:

[CCEd]: FOSTER: s. Rich. of New Sarum, Wilts. gent. ST JOHN'S COLL. matric. 6 April 1682, aged 17; fellow of ALL SOULS' COLL. 1685, B.A. 1685, M.A. 1689, admitted Merchant Taylors' school 1677; licenced (VG) 28 April 1690, to marry Margaret Hawes of St Anne Westminster, spinster; rector of Burghclere, Hants. 1690, canon of Sarum 1692, and of Wells 1711, master of St John's Hospital, Wilton, Wilts. 1713; died before 4 Feb. 1745-6. See Rawl. ii. 285, xvii. 114, xx. 192; Foster's Ind. Eccles. & Robinson, i. 293.

Name: **Richard Fiddes**: (1671–1725)

Title: Rector of Halsham, Holderness

Thanksgiving Sermons: 1702, 1705

Background

Educated at Wykeham, near Scarborough, BA (1691) University College, Oxford. Rector Halsham in Holderness (1696). He moved to London, befriended Swift and other members of Queen Anne's last tory Ministry. He became chaplain to Robert Harley, earl of Oxford, and received patronage from the Duke of Ormond.

He was a vociferous opponent of Dissent, he revered the memory of Charles I. A friend of William Law (prominent non juror, Thanksgiving Sermon 1713). Fiddes supported the Occasional Conformity Bill (1711) and the Schism Bill (1714).

Name: **William Fleetwood** (1656–1723)

Title: Rector of St Austin's London, and Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty

Thanksgiving Sermons: 1704, 1708

Background:

Whig Clergyman. Born in 1656 in the Tower of London, the son of Captain Geoffrey Fleetwood (d. 1665), an ordnance official. Fleetwood was educated at Eton College, then BA (1679), MA (1683) King's College, Cambridge

Rector of St Augustine's, London (1689), lecturer at St Dunstan-in-the-West. In the 1690s Fleetwood became a regular preacher before the king, and at other major occasions. He was named a chaplain to William III and Mary II, he also impressed. Queen Anne and in 1708 she backed him to become Bishop of St. Asaph. He voted against Sacheverell in 1710. William Nicolson, bishop of Carlisle, noted on 26 February 1711 that Fleetwood was 'much delighted with the Medley of this day by Mr [Arthur] Maynwaring [a Whig propagandist]'.³¹ Fleetwood

³¹ Jones and Holmes eds., *The London Diaries of William Nicolson* (Oxford, 1985), p. 551.

opposed the Tory peace policy and voted against the French commercial treaty in 1713 and the Schism Bill in 1714.

Name: **Robert Fleming** (c.1660–1716)

Title: None

Thanksgiving Sermon: June 1706

Background:

Minister to the English Presbyterian congregation at Leiden (1692-5). In 1698 with William III's support, he became minister at the Scots Church, Founders' Hall, Lothbury, in the City of London, a post he held until death.

According to Joshua Oldfield he was always tolerant of differing viewpoints. He represented London ministers of the 'three denominations' in presenting an address of congratulation to Queen Anne on the Union in May 1707. He has been reckoned a supporter of the protestant and Hanoverian successions, and a visceral opponent of the papacy, the king of France, and Jacobitism.

Name: **William Forster**

Title: Rector of St Michael's in Stamford, and Chaplain to the Right Hon. John, Earl of Exeter

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1702

Background:

1. CCEd: MA 1697 ; Curate Stamford All Saints, 1697; Rector Stamford 1700-1709; Warden Stamford, Browne's Hospital 1703-1731.
2. Adm. Sizar at Emmanuel, July 5 1682, MA 1690, v. of Stamford 1700-09, R. of Clement Danes, London 1708/09.³³
3. John Cecil, 6th Earl of Exeter 'wielded the family interest at Stamford for the Tories and also enjoyed electoral influence in Northamptonshire'.³⁴

Name: **Edward Fowler** (1631/2–1714)

Title: Lord Bishop of Gloucester

³³ Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses: a biographical list of all known students, graduates and holders of office at the University of Cambridge, from the earliest times to 1900* (Cambridge, 1924), ii, p. 164.

³⁴ H.O.P. 1690-1715, iii, pp. 500-1.

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1704

Background

Bishop of Gloucester (1691) replacing a non-juror. He had clashed with High Church and Tory factions in the 1680s... In 1690 he noted the gain from Anglicans and Dissenters needing 'to be united in affection, and to have more charity for each other' under James II, 1688 'was the most comfortable year, that ever fell within my memory' Fowler bemoaned the tendency to categorize as high or low-church, voted against the 'church in danger' measures, and opposed the Occasional Conformity Bill.

Name: **Thomas Freke** (? – 1716)

Title: Dissenting Minister (Bartholomew's Close)

Thanksgiving Sermons: 1707, Nov 1709

Background:

'An obscure Presbyterian minister, the Rev. Thomas Freke was for some years assistant to both the Rev. John Quick at Bartholomew Close and to the Rev. Richard Stratton at Haberdashers' Hall, London. In 1706 he succeeded Quick and his sermons thereafter are published as having been preached there. Such was the case with his sermon preached 1 May 1707, which was distinguished more by moderation and the desire to avoid offending the Anglicans than by original thought. While reasonably prolific with some eight published sermons between 1704 and 1716, Freke was not a noted minister in London, and his sermons do not seem to have aroused much interest. Indeed his last days—and his marriage to one of two women in his congregation who fought to have him—seem to have aroused more interest than his published works.'³⁵

Name: **J.A.M. Gardiner**

Title: MA, Rector at St Michael's, Crooked-Lane

Thanksgiving Sermon: June 1706

Background: No information has been found on this preacher

Name: **James Gardiner** (? – 1732)

Title: Mael's, Subdean and Canon Residentiary of Lincoln Cathedral

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1713

³⁵ W.R. and V.B. McLeod, *Anglo-Scottish Tracts, 1701-1714: A Descriptive Checklist* (Lawrence, KA, 1979), p. 173.

Background:

Younger son of James Gardiner (1636/7–1705) bishop of Lincoln. Educated at Westminster School, and BA (1695), MA (1702) Emmanuel College, Cambridge. He was ordained deacon by his father in 1702. Held prebend of Asgarby, as subdean of Lincoln cathedral, master of St John's Hospital, Northampton, and Bedford Hospital, Nottingham, all of which posts he held until his death.

Published a *Practical Exposition of the Beatitudes* (1712) and a 1713 sermon titled *The Duty of Peace amongst the Members of the Same State*.

Name: **Thomas Gatchell**

Title: Vicar of Ottery St Mary, in the county of Devon

Thanksgiving Sermons: June 1706

Background:

1. Vicar of Parish of St Mary of Ottery, Devon 1696-1712³⁶
2. Cambridge: admitted to Caius (age 18) 1657. Son on Thomas, husbandman. B. at Anger sleigh Somerset. School Pittminster (m. Glenvill). Matric 1657; Scholar 1657-61. Subscribed for deacons orders (Bristol Dec. 21 1662. V. of Burstock, Dorset 1662-90. Amon of one of those names (Exeter) 1713; of Ottery St Mary, clerk. Perhaps father of next (Venn, I, 401; F.S. Hockaday) - [next is another Thomas Gatchell, matric 1714, BA 1717-8. School Ottery St Mary (Mr Marker)³⁷
3. Thomas Gatchell, Anglican-Tory, vicar of Ottery St Mary, Devon, Gatchell's kinsman Edward was a Presbyterian minister in the same part of Somerset where both were reared. Edward later recanted. The Gatchell family story as well as the long-lasting communal tensions remaining from James's reign are encapsulated.³⁸

Name: **Thomas Goddard**

Title: AM Canon of Westminster

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1710

Background:

³⁶ <http://archiver.rootsweb.ancestry.com/th/read/DEVON/2000-01/0946910584> (accessed 29 Mar. 2016)

³⁷ <http://www.mocavo.co.uk/University-of-Cambridge-Alumni-Cantabrigienses-a-Biographical-List-of-All-Known-Students-Graduates-and-Holders-of-Office-Volume-2-3/664850/212> (accessed 29 March 2016)

³⁸ G.V.M. Heap, 'Dissenting Influence in a Seventeenth-Century Grammar School', *Journal of educational administration and history*, xiv (1982), pp. 1-9.

1. [CCEd] : Described as scholar of Magdalen, Oxford, in 1697. Presumably Foster: Goddard, Thomas, S. Edw., of Tidworth, Wilts, gent. St Mary Hall, matric 1 Mar 1688-9, aged 15; demy Magdalen Coll. 1689-98, BA 1692, MA 1695, rector of North Wraxall, Wilts, 1697-1708, of North Tidworth, Wilts, 1708-31, canon of Windsor 1707, rector of St Bennet Fink, London, 1725; died at Bath 10 May 1731. See Rawl., ii, 231; Bloxam, vi, 75; Foster's Index Eccl. St Benedict Fink entries say curate, but Foster says rector.
2. [Defoe]: 'to those who are ... carried away by the foolish notion ... of Dr S_{acheverell}'s late Seditious Discourse ... is Humbly referr'd to an excellent sermon, Preach'd by the Reverend Mr Goddard, Canon of Windsor³⁹.

Name : **William Goldwin** (c. 1682-1747)

Title: BA, fellow of King's College, Cambridge

Thanksgiving Sermon: Dec. 1706

Background:

1. [CCEd]: Venn: Adm. at King's, a scholar from Eton. B. at Windsor. Matric Michs. 1700. BA 1704-5; MA 1708. Fellow 1703. Ord deacon (London) May 19 1706; priest May 30 1708. Master of the Grammar School at Bristol 1710-17. V. of St Nicholas Bristol 1717-47. Fellow of Eton College 1733-47. Author, sermons. Died June 1 1747
2. William Goldwin (born c.1682; died at Bristol 1747) was an English schoolteacher and vicar who left his mark on cricket by creating the sport's earliest known work of literature. Goldwin, wrote a poem of 95 competent and sometimes graceful lines of Latin hexameters on a rural cricket match. It was called *In Certamen Pilae* (On a Ball Game) and it was published in his *Musae Juveniles* in March 1706. He attended Eton and then graduated to King's College, Cambridge in 1700. He subsequently became a Master of Bristol Grammar School and was Vicar of St Nicholas' Church in Bristol until his death in 1747.⁴⁰

Name: **Thomas Good**

Title: AM, Rector of Astley in the County of Worcester

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1713

Background:

No information has been found on Thomas Good.

Name: **John Grant** (c. 1658 – 1736)

³⁹ J. McVeigh, ed., *Daniel Defoe, A review of the state of the English nation. Vol.7, 1710-11* (London, 2009), pp. 234-5. Defoe's support of Goddard provoked a reply from Sacheverellite minor poet, Dr William King in pamphlets entitled *Two Friendly Letters from honest Tom Boggy to the rev. Mr. Goddard, Canon of Windsor* (London, 1710).

⁴⁰ H.S. Altham, (1962). *A History of Cricket, Volume 1 (to 1914)*. George Allen & Unwin (London, 1962), pp.2-10.

Title: Prebendary of the Cathedral Church of Gloucester, Vicar of St Dunstan's in the West, London

Thanksgiving Sermons: 1704, 1707

Background:

1. [CCed]: MA, 1678, Vicar St Dunstan in the West, 1678-1736.
2. Vicars of St Dunstan's in the West: John Grant MA prebendary of Rochester, published two sermons in 1704 and 1707, and died in 1736, having lived to the advanced age of 80, and enjoying his vicarage 59 years.⁴¹

Name: **Gideon Hardinge** (? – 1712)

Title: AM., Vicar of Kingston, Surrey

Thanksgiving Sermon: Nov. 1709

Background

Gideon Hardinge (died 1712) vicar of Kingston, Surrey is mentioned as the father of Nicholas Hardinge (1699–1758), Latin poet and politician, in the latter's Oxford DNB entry.

Name: **Francis Hare** (1671–1740)

Title: D.D., Residentiary of the Cathedral Church of St Paul and Chaplain-General of Her Majesty's forces under his Grace the Duke of Marlborough

Thanksgiving Sermons: Feb. 1709, 1711 (special circumstance)

Background

Bishop of Chichester (1727). B.A. (1692) MA (1696) DD (1708) from King's College, Cambridge. At Cambridge he was tutor of (Sir) Robert Walpole and of Marlborough's son, the Marquis of Blandford. Chaplain-general to the army in Flanders (1704). A royal chaplain under Queen Anne, fellow of Eton, 1712, rector of Barnes, Surrey, 1713 to 1723, and held a prebend in St Paul's from 1707 till his death. In 1727 he was consecrated bishop of St Asaph. He opposed Bishop Hoadly in the Bangorian controversy. Allusion to him in Pope's *Dunciad* testifies to his celebrity as a preacher.

He published defences of Marlborough and the war including *The Allies and the Late Ministry defended against France*, 4 parts, 1711 (A rejoinder to Swift's *Conduct of the Allies*); *Management of the War*, 1711; *Conduct of the Duke of Marlborough during the present War*, 1712;. A thanksgiving sermon on the taking of Bouchain (preached by Hare 9 Sept. 1711) was bitterly ridiculed a retort entitled in '*A Learned Comment*,'

⁴¹ J.P. Malcolm, *Londinium redivivum; or An antient history and modern description of London* (London, 1805), p. 453.

Name: **Samuel Harris**

Title: Dissenting Minister In Mill-yard, Goodman's Fields

Thanksgiving Sermon: Nov. 1709

Background:

1. Harris was Minister of a congregational Church at Canterbury about 1691. He Became minister about 1697 of the Presbyterian congregation in Broad Street Wapping; owing to some dispute he left (before 1705) to form a Presbyterian congregation in Mill-yard Goodman's Fields. He was assisted 1707-1709 by John Lewis, who left for the Congregational Church, Red Cross Street; and from 1711 by John Shuttleworth⁴²
2. A breakaway congregation: Mill Yard c1705-38 A group of Presbyterians seceded and rented the Seventh Day Baptists' premises at Mill Yard. They were led by Samuel Harris (died 1738), who had been a Congregationalist minister in Canterbury from 1691-96 before coming as a pastor to Broad Street. The reason for the split was presumably the 'Arian question' [Arians denied the full divinity of Christ] mentioned above, since Harris became a 'Salter's Hall Subscriber'. A Calvinist, and initially regarded as an acceptable preacher, he became increasingly disabled and reclusive, losing friends and congregation, and unable to work with assistants, none of whom stayed long.⁴³

Name: **Joseph Harrison**

Title: Minister of Cirencester

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1713

Background [CCed]:

Foster: son of Richard of Brindle, co. Lancs., cler., BRASENOSE College matric. 20 Nov. 1685 aged 15; BA 1689; MA EMMANUEL college Cambridge 1702; PC of Cirencester, Gloucs., 1690; Chancellor of the diocese and commissary of dean and chapter of Canterbury; R of Daglingworth, Glos 1729; father of John; see Rawl. iv, 346, xvii, 209 and Foster Ind. Eccl.

Name: **William Hartwell**

Title: Subdean of Durham Cathedral

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1713

⁴² A. Gordon, *Freedom after Ejection*, p. 279.

⁴³ (accessed 7 Mar. 2016) <http://www.stgite.org.uk/media/dissenters2.html>

Background [CCEd]:

MA 1681. Rector Whickham (1681-1685), Rector Stanhope (1685-1725), Prebendary Durham Cathedral (1710-1725).

Name **Matthew Henry** (1662–1714)

Title: Dissenting Minister [Cheshire]

Thanksgiving Sermon: Dec. 1706

Background

Presbyterian minister: Minister at Crook Lane, Chester. Henry's reputation as a leading minister of his generation was founded on extraordinarily active evangelical ministry both in the pulpit and in the study. Henry's most celebrated and enduring work was his Exposition of the Old and New Testament. In 1712 he moved to Mare Street, Hackney, one of the most important congregations near London. He was also named by Dr Daniel Williams as one of the original twenty-three trustees of his charity, though because of his premature death he never acted.

Name: **Francis Higgins** (1669/70–1728)

Title: Prebendary of Christ's Church, Dublin

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1705

Background:

Ordained in 1689, while an undergraduate, Trinity College Dublin occupied by Jacobite troops, he was made curate of St Andrew's, Dublin, and claimed to have been imprisoned by the Jacobite authorities. He emerged as a prominent high-churchman in the Irish convocation (1704). Archbishop King of Dublin, noted [he] 'got the management of the clergy ... into their hands'. His partisanship was recognized in England when he preached in the Chapel Royal on Ash Wednesday (26 February) 1707, with a sermon which denounced Whigs as enemies of the monarchy and the Established Church. This resulted in his arrest for preaching sedition.⁴⁴

Name: **Daniel Hill**

Title: Prebendary of Rochester Cathedral

Thanksgiving Sermon: June 1706

Background [CCEd]:

M.A. 1702. S. of Daniel, of Salisbury. School, Westminster. ' Matric. from Christ Church, Oxford, July 13, 1666, age 19; B.A. (Oxford) 1670; M.A. 1673; D.D. (Lambeth) 1720. R. of

⁴⁴ Additional notes from John Bergin. "Higgins, Francis". *Dictionary of Irish Biography*. (ed.) James McGuire, James Quinn. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2009

Southfleet, Kent, 1679-1729. Preb. of Rochester, 1684-1729. R. of St Margaret's, Rochester, 1691-1729. Head Master of Faversham School. Married, at Rochester Cathedral, May 28, 1713, Hester Wilbraham, widow. Died June 25, 1729. Buried in Rochester Cathedral. Father of Thomas (1701). (Al. Oxon.; H. G. Harrison.)

Name: **Andrew Hill**

Title : Dissenting Minister

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1713

Background:

No information has been found on Andrew Hill

Name: **Samuel Hilliard**

Title: Prebendary of Lincoln, and lecturer at St Margaret's Lothbury, London

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1713

Background

1. [CCed]: VENN :M.A. from PEMBROKE, 1700. S. of Samuel, of St Saviour's, Southwark, scrivener. B. June 3, 1676. Matric. from University College, Oxford, Aug. 25, 1693, age 16; B.A. (Trinity, Oxford) 1697. Lecturer at St Mary, Lothbury, 1698. Preb. of Lincoln, 1704. R. of Stifford, Essex, 1709-42. R. of Rainham, 1718-42. Buried at Stifford, Mar. 26, 1742. Will (Consist. C. London) 1742. (Al. Oxon.; J. Ch. Smith.)
2. In 1708/9 Samuel Hilliard made strenuous efforts to have Matthew Tindall's book '*The Rights of the Christian Church asserted, against the Romish and all other Priests who claim an independent Power over it*'⁴⁶ suppressed. The book argued that the right to worship God according to conscience was not consistent with the claim by the clergy to exercise a spiritual authority. The attempt was unsuccessful. Hilliard documented his quest '*A narrative of the prosecution of Mr Sare and his servant, for Selling the Rights of the Christian Church. In answer to what Relates to that Prosecution. In the Second Part of the defence of the said book. By Samuel Hilliard, M. A. Prebendary of Lincoln. London, 1709.*'⁴⁷

Name: **John Hoadly** (1678–1746)

Title: MA prebendary of Salisbury Cathedral

⁴⁶ The book was published anonymously, Hilliard pursued the bookseller Richard Sari in order to identify the author and publisher.

⁴⁷ S.Lalor, *Matthew Tindal, Freethinker: An Eighteenth-Century Assault on Religion*, (London 2006), p. 12

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1708

Background:

Church of Ireland archbishop of Armagh. BA (1697) St Catharine's College, Cambridge. His eldest brother was Benjamin Hoadly (1676–1761), the leading latitudinarian. Appointed deputy headmaster of Norwich grammar school (1700) John Hoadly was chaplain to Bishop Gilbert Burnet, Rector of St Edmund's, Salisbury, and successively prebendary (21 February 1706), archdeacon (6 November 1710), and chancellor (16 April 1713) of that diocese. In 1717 he became rector of Ockham in Surrey and one of George I's chaplains in 1717.

Bishop of Ferns and Leighlin (1727). Hoadly became Archbishop of Dublin in 1730 and of Armagh in 1742 and acted as one of the Lords justices (1742 and 1744) and vice-chancellor of TCD (1743–6). He has been considered a leading member of the 'English interest' among the bishops of the Church of Ireland His publications included several sermons, a pastoral letter on the Jacobite rising of 1745, a defence of Gilbert Burnet, and a commentary on the work of Bishop William Beveridge of St Asaph.⁴⁸

Name **Nathaniel Hodges**

Title: Dissenting Minister

Thanksgiving Sermon: Dec. 1706

Background:

1. Hodges settled in 1698 as pastor of the Baptist Church at Plymouth, but this was a misfit. The church did not seem sorry when in January 1701/2 he 'succeeded to earthly honors', and accepted a call to Artillery Lane in Spitalfields where he settled on 7 June. When Sir William Hodges, a wealthy merchant and moderate Whig MP, died in 1714, Nathaniel became wealthy by inheritance on his uncle's death in 1714. He was evidently, at the age of thirty-nine, a Baptist Leader. Hodges, with twelve other ministers, went to the King (1714) to present an address against the Schism Act. Hodges was one of the non-subscribers at the synod at Salters' Hall in 1719, and disillusioned he laid down his ministry. He was knighted in 1721.⁵⁰

Name: **Matthew Hole** (1639/40–1730)

Title: Sometime Fellow of Exeter College in Oxford, now Vicar of Stokegursy in Somersetshire and Prebendary of the Church of Wells.

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1713

⁴⁸ Additional notes from John Bergin. "Hoadly, John". *Dictionary of Irish Biography*.

(ed.) James McGuire, James Quinn. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

⁵⁰William Thomas Whitley [1861-1947], 'A Baptist Governor of Madras in 1716', *Baptist Quarterly* vii (1934), pp. 123-137.

Background

BA (1661) MA (1664), BD (1674), DD (1716) from Exeter College, Oxford. In 1688 Vicar of Stokegurse, Somerset via the patronage of his friend Henry Godolphin, and prebendary of Wells Cathedral. From 1708 to 1711 he also held the living of Fiddington, Somerset. He provoked controversy and a pamphlet exchange with John Moore (1642–1717), Presbyterian minister in Bridgwater, in 1698 and 1699, over his views on a fixed liturgy. He published a two-part rejoinder, *An Antidote Against Infidelity* (1702, 1717), to William Coward's *Second Thoughts Concerning Human Soul* (1702).

Name: Richard Holland:

Title: Curate at St Magnus, lecturer of Allhallows the Great; Chaplain to Duke of Richmond

Thanksgiving Sermons: 1702

Background [CCed]: Curate St Magnus the Martyr 1700-1703; Rector East Mersea 1703-1706.

Name: George Hooper (1640–1727)

Title: Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1713

Background:

Bishop of Bath and Wells. BA (1660), MA (1663), BD (1673), DD (1677) Christ Church, Oxford. He was close to Princess Mary, wife of William of Orange in Holland and in 1681 became chaplain to King James II. He was one of three clerics who were with the duke of Monmouth prior to his execution. Tensions with William stalled Hooper's progress until Anne's reign. A leading High-Church spokesman in the convocation of 1701 where he defied Archbishop Tenison. On good terms with Queen Anne and Robert Harley, Hooper was made Bishop of St. Asaph, and rapidly translated to the more lucrative Bath and Wells in 1703.

Over time in the Lords he moved to oppose Godolphin and Harley, voting with the high tory position on 'the Church in Danger' questions and the union, and supported the Tory peace strategy. Nonetheless he was emphatically Hanoverian in terms of the succession.

Name: Josiah Hort (c.1674–1751)

Title: Vicar of Wendover and Chaplain to the Right Honourable Earl of Wharton

Thanksgiving Sermon: Dec. 1706

Background:

Church of Ireland archbishop of Tuam. Born in England and, initially educated in a nonconformist academy, he was a fellow student of Isaac Watt, who remained a lifelong friend. Eventually he conformed and attended Clare College, Cambridge, leaving without a degree in 1705. Ordained a priest by Bishop Simon Patrick of Ely. Chaplain to John Hampden, MP for Buckinghamshire.

In 1709 accompanied the earl of Wharton to Ireland as chaplain to the lord lieutenant, becoming dean of Ardagh (1720) and bishop of Ferns and Leighlin (1721). It was claimed that the archbishops of Armagh, Dublin, and Tuam petitioned the king against Hort's nomination, because of his early nonconformist background.

Name: **Nathaniel Hough**

Title: Lecturer of Kensington, Fellow of Jesus College Cambridge, Chaplain to Countess Fauconberg⁵¹

Thanksgiving Sermons: 1704

Background

1. [CCEd] : MA Cambridge/Jesus 1699
Fellow Jesus College Cambridge 1703-1710
Preacher throughout the diocese of Winchester, 1715
2. Rector of St George's Southwark in June 1716⁵²

Name: **John Hough** (1651-1743)

Title: Lord Bishop of Litchfield and Coventry

Thanksgiving Sermons: Nov. 1709

Background

Bishop of Worcester (1717). BA (1673) MA (1676) Magdalen College, Oxford. Hough was elected President of Magdalen in 1687, when the fellows attempted to reject James II's declared Catholic candidate. Bishop of Oxford (1690), translated to Lichfield and Coventry (1699) and Worcester (1717). Voted along Whig lines in Lords against the occasional conformity and schism bills.

Name: **Francis Hutchinson** (1660-1739)

⁵¹ Mary Cromwell third daughter of Cromwell, widow of 1st Earl of Fauconberg.

⁵² Caudle 'Measures of Allegiance' (Yale PhD, 1996) p 477,n40.

Title: DD , Minister of St James's Parish in St Edmund's Bury.

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1707

Background:

Born in Derbyshire, BA (1680), MA (1684) DD (1698) St Catharine's College, Cambridge. Curate of James's at Bury St Edmunds (1692). Tolerant of Dissenters, took a low-church line in Convocation of Canterbury. Appointed royal chaplain 1714. Consecrated bishop of Down and Connor (1721), by recommendation of William Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury.

Name: **Joseph Jacob:**

Title: Dissenting Minister, Turner's Hall, London

Thanksgiving Sermons: 1702, 1704, 1705

Background

Independent Dissenting Minister, controversial among Dissenters. Formed his own Congregation in 1698. Forbade congregation to wear wigs, forbade them to attend other church meetings, encouraged singing. His congregation eventually deserted him, as he engaged in political and religious controversies continuously.⁵⁴

Name: **Alexander Jephson**

Title: Master of the Free-School in Camberwell, Surrey

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1704

Background:

1. [CCEd]: Schoolmaster Stepney 1693; Rector Ramsden Bellhouse 1700-1733.
2. The Jephson family have long been associated with the parish of Camberwell, more particularly as connected with the Free Grammar School. The first of the family to settle in Camberwell was Alexander Jephson, Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, who was compelled to escape from Ireland in the days of Tyrconnel, after having preached a sermon on Deborah and Barak on the landing of William and Mary. The sermon was interpreted as seditious, and he would have been imprisoned by the lord lieutenant if he had not escaped to England. He became master of the Grammar School at Ratcliffe, [Stepney] and from thence, with seventy boys, removed to Camberwell School in the year 1700. He was rector of Bell-house, in Essex, and was succeeded in his school by his son William, who was a Fellow of St John's College, Cambridge, and rector of Little Hornead, Herts.⁵⁵

⁵⁴ Walter Wilson *The history and antiquities of Dissenting churches* ,i, pp. 139-143.

⁵⁵ W.H. Blanch, *The parish of Camberwell: a brief account of the parish of Camberwell: its history and antiquities* (London, 1875), p. 48.

Name: **White Kennett** (1660–1728)

Title: DD Arch Deacon of Huntingdon and Minister of St Botolph's without Aldgate

Thanksgiving Sermons: 1704, November 1709

Background:

Bishop of Peterborough (1718). Refused to read James II's declaration of indulgence in his church (1687). Appointed curate of St Botolph's, Aldgate in 1700. Popular preacher- appeared before Corporation, Commons and Queen during the 1700's. Opponent of Atterbury and High-church faction in Convocation. Defended Marlborough, Godolphin Ministry. Was traduced in Sacheverell sermon and replied vigourously.

Name: **William King** (1650–1729)

Title: Lord Archbishop of Dublin

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1704

Background

Born 1650 in Antrim town, into a Scots Presbyterian family, education in Presbyterian schools in Antrim and Tyrone. Converted to Anglicanism while attending Trinity College Dublin (BA 1671, MA 1673). Ordained a priest of Church of Ireland in 1674. In 1690 he was detained by Jacobite forces and imprisoned, released by Williamite forces following victory at the Boyne. He discussed the implications of the period for passive obedience in *The State of the Protestants of Ireland under the Late King James's Government* (1691), which established him as the Church of Ireland's most prominent supporter of the revolution.

As Archbishop of Dublin from 1703, he was involved in attempts to persuade Queen Anne to remit First Fruits and Twentieths to Church of Ireland. This led to controversy with Lord Lieutenant Wharton in 1707-08, who attempted to removal sacramental test in Ireland as a quid-pro-quo. He criticised political factionalism in England and rejected it as a political model for Ireland, stating instead that Church of Ireland needed to be equally vigilant of Catholic resurgence and Protestant Dissent.⁵⁶

Name: **Thomas Knaggs**

Title: Lecturer at St Giles in the Fields, Chaplain to Falk, Lord Brooke⁵⁸

Thanksgiving Sermons: June 1706, 1708, Nov 1709,

⁵⁶ Additional notes from Philip O'Regan. "King, William". *Dictionary of Irish Biography*.

(ed.) James McGuire, James Quinn. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

⁵⁸ I believe this to be Faulke Greville, 3rd Baron Brooke of Beauchamps, son of Robert Greville, Robert, second baron, a parliamentarian army officer and religious writer.

Background:

1. Vicar at Croft, Lincolnshire 1720-1724
2. Knaggs was of Emanuel College, Cambridge. He occurs with the degree of A. B. when presented to Errington vicarage in April, 1682. He was afternoon lecturer at All Saints, Newcastle from 1687 to 1697. In the MS. life of Barnes it is said, 'At All Hallows was Mr Knaggs, who, quarrelling with Dr Atherton, a strong passive obedience man, got himself many potent enemies—removed to the rectory of St Giles', London.' In the title of a sermon, preached before the lord mayor and court of aldermen, at Bow church, November 5, 1693, he is called lecturer of St Nicholas' and chaplain to Ford Lord Grey. Another sermon, preached at Trinity chapel, in the parish of St Martin's in the Fields, February 4, 1700, is dedicated to Lady Sarah Brooke, 'by Thomas Knaggs, M. A. lecturer in Newcastle, and chaplain to the Right Honourable Ford, Earl of Tankerville.' He died May 12, 1724. His salary as lecturer was £70.⁵⁹
3. Knaggs had been chaplain to Monmouth's confidant Ford, Lord Grey. In 1697 he had left All-Hallows [Newcastle], following an argument with Dr Atherton, a strong passive obedience man, got himself many potent enemies and removed to the rectory of St Giles, in London.⁶⁰

Name **Benjamin Lacy**

Title: MA and Master of the Grammar-school at Crediton in Devon

Thanksgiving Sermon: Dec. 1706

Background:

Not mentioned in CCED, the sermon was delivered at St John's chapel before the Mayor and of the city of Exeter. No further information has been found on Benjamin Lacy.

Name **Charles Lamb**

Title: Curate at Enfield

Thanksgiving Sermon: Dec. 1706

Background: [CCED] :

(as Charles Lambe) VENN: M.A. from KING'S, 1709. S. of John (1664), of Wheathampstead, Herts., Dean of Ely. Matric. from Christ Church, Oxford, July 12, 1697; B.A. (Oxford) 1701; D.D. (Lambeth) 1722. V. of Impington, Cambs., 1704. R. of Trottscliffe, Kent, 1709. Chaplain to

⁵⁹ 'All Saints' church: The new church; clergy and lecturers', *Historical Account of Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Including the Borough of Gateshead* (1827), pp. 302-322 source: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=43356> (accessed 29 Mar. 2016)

⁶⁰ William Hylton Dyer Longstaffe eds., *Memoirs of the Life of Mr. Ambrose Barnes, Late Merchant and Sometime Alderman of Newcastle upon Tyne* (London 1867), p. 447,

the Duke of Portland, governor of Jamaica. R. of St John's, Kingston, Jamaica, 1729.
'Administration of Effects at a Probate Court.'Admon. ('Prerogative Court of Canterbury.'P.C.C.)
1733. Brother of Henry (1692). (Al. Oxon.)

Name: **Ralph Lambert:**

Title: Rector Grindon on 1690-1702 (CCEd),

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1702 (delivered in Parish Church St Giles in the Fields)

Background:

1. Pen. (Mr Haslam) Aug. 13, 1681, age 15; S. of George; b. Co. Louth, Sch. 1683. B.A. Vern. (1686), MA AEst. 1696. BD and DD AEst. 1701.⁶¹
2. Appointed by Wharton as his chaplain in 1708, Lambert accompanied Wharton to Ireland, when the latter was made Lord Lieutenant. Lambert was later Church of Ireland Dean of Down (1709-1717), Bishop of Down (1717-1727) and Bishop of Meath (1727-1731). Opponent of Swift.⁶²

Name: **William Law** (1686–1761)

Title: Fellow of Emmanuel College in Cambridge

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1713

Background;

Devotional writer and second generation nonjuror, who couldn't swear allegiance to George I. BA (1708), MA (1712) Emmanuel College, Cambridge. Displayed Jacobite sympathies while at Cambridge, which brought him to the notice of authorities. Appointed Curate at Haslingfield, near Cambridge (1711), published a sermon for Thanksgiving of Utrecht which was seen as High-Church emphasizing themes of the duty of submission and the wickedness of resistance to lawful rulers. In 1716 he refused to abjure the Pretender on accession of George I.

He opposed Hoadley in Bangorian controversy in 1717. Law was sustained by wealthy benefactors after 1716, as he could hold no official position in the Church of England. In 1730's he became a correspondent of John Wesley, later turning against him.

Name **William Lloyd**

Title: Curate at Diss, Norfolk

⁶¹ G.D. Burtchaell, T.U. Sadleir (eds.), *Alumni Dublinenses: a register of the students, graduates, professors and provosts of Trinity College in the University of Dublin* (Dublin, 1935).

⁶² I. Ehrenpreis, *Swift: the Man, His Works, and the Age* (London, 1983) ii, 265,322-3,363-4

Thanksgiving Sermon: Dec. 1706

Background: [CCEd]:

William Lloyd (1704-1754) Curate and School Master Diss 1704; Rector Thrandeston (Suffolk) 1709-1754 (death)

Benjamin Loveling: (1690-1727)

Title: Vicar of Banbury

Thanksgiving Sermons 1702, 1704, 1713

Background

1. [CCEd]: Curate and Vicar Banbury, 1700-1717.
2. Noted locally for controversy with local Quakers.⁶³
3. Loveling's son, also Benjamin (1711-?) was a dissolute minor poet, who has an Oxford DNB entry.

Name: **Andrew Low**

Title: Dissenting Minister (as no location on frontispiece of sermons)

Thanksgiving Sermon: June 1706

Background:

1695 : Andrew Low of Chepping Wycombe, a teacher of a Dissenting congregation, subscribed the latter declaration [against Transubstination] and that contained in 1 William and Mary, c. 18.⁶⁴

Name: **Thomas Manningham** (d. 1722)

Title: DD Chaplain in the Ordinary to Her Majesty

Thanksgiving Sermons: 1707, 1708, Feb. 1709

Background

Bishop of Chichester (1709). BA (1673) MA (1677) New College Oxford. He became a lecturer at the Temple and DD (Lambeth, 1691), Rector of St Andrew's, Holborn (1691) a parish with significant High-Church membership. In 1713 he yielded the living of St. Andrews in favour of

⁶³ Claridge, Richard. *Melius inquirendum: or, an answer to a book of Edward Cockson... being a review of the controversie, between Benjamin Loveling Minister of Banbury in the said County, and the Quakers there;.* By Richard Claridge. London, 1706. And Bugg, Francis. *Quakerism drooping, and its cause sinking: Also, a reply to the Quakers apology... By Ben. Loveling, ... London, 1703.*

⁶⁴ Guy R. Crouch , County of Buckingham calendar to the sessions records volume ii. 1694 to 1705 (Buckinghamshire ,1936) ,p. 180.

Henry Sacheverell. Manningham supported the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. Though High-Church, he was a supporter of the Hanoverian Succession.

Name: **Nathaniel Marshall** (bap. 1680, d. 1730)

Title: LLB, Vicar of St Pancras, and Lecturer of Aldermanbury

Thanksgiving Sermons: 1707

Background:

LLB (1702) DD (1717) Emmanuel College, Cambridge. Appointed vicar of St. Pancras (1706), and rector of the united parishes of St Vedast, Foster Lane, and St Michael-le-Querne (1716). Marshall had a reputation as an authority on the ancient Christian Church. His sermon *A defence of our constitution in church and state, or, An answer to the charge of the non-jurors accusing us of heresy and schism, perjury and treason* (1717) aroused opposition from leading Latitudinarians and nonjurors.

Name: **William Marston**

Title: MA, Chaplain to His Grace the Duke of Marlborough, Vicar of Redbourn

Thanksgiving Sermon: Feb. 1709

Background [CCEd]:

MA Cambridge/Trinity 1698

Vicar Redbourn (Hertfordshire) (1704-1727)

Name: **Thomas Masters**

Title: Dissenting Minister

Thanksgiving Sermon: Nov. 1709

Background

[In 1703] Mr Chapman was succeeded at Rotherhithe by Mr Thomas Masters, of whom our information is slender. He is described as an honest, serious preacher, but having in a great measure lost his hearing, became unfit for conversation. It is no wonder, therefore that he should not have been popular, or acceptable in his ministry; on which account he left his people in 1730.⁶⁵

Name: **Daniel Mayo** (1672–1733)

⁶⁵ Walter Wilson, *The history and antiquities of Dissenting churches*, iv , p. 369.

Title: MA

Thanksgiving Sermon: Feb. 1709

Background

Presbyterian minister. His father was a Presbyterian Minister in Surrey, who had been ejected from Church of England. Daniel obtained an MA degree, in Scotland and studied in Leiden. He was appointed assistant minister in Tothill St. Westminster in 1696, became pastor in his father's former congregation in Kingston, Surrey in 1698. A popular preacher, Mayo has noted as one of the leader Presbyterians of the reign.

Name: **Luke Milbourne** (1649–1720)

Title: Presbyter at St Ethelburga,

Thanksgiving Sermons: 1704, 1713

Background:

Poet and clergyman. Rector of St Ethelburga, Bishopsgate, London (1704). High Churchman, supporter of Henry Sacheverell. His sermons praised Charles I and criticized William of Orange. He wrote an unfavourable commentary *Notes on Dryden's Virgil* (1698), Dryden retorted scornfully. Milbourne was lampooned as priest of Dullness by Dryden's friend Alexander Pope in the *Dunciad* (2.311–14).

Name: **George Mills**

Title: Dissenting Minister Guestwick, Norfolk

Thanksgiving Sermon: Dec. 1706

Background:

He came and was unanimously chosen to the pastorate, and ordained at Guestwick, November 6th 1695. Here he continued till his death, December 6th, 1723, in the 73rd year of his age. Mr Harmer notices that 'he had not a regular education for the ministry,' a rare thing in those days; but he says 'he has always been spoken of as a very worthy man, who had a very pleasant delivery, and was highly esteemed by this congregation.'⁶⁶

Name: **JN**

Title: MA

Thanksgiving Sermon: June 1706

Background: Unknown

⁶⁶ John Browne , *History of Congregationalism and Memorials of the Churches in Norfolk and Suffolk*, (London 1877), p325

Name: **William Needham:**

Title: Rector of Alresford, Proctor for Dioceses of Winchester

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1702

Background

1. [CCEd]: Vicar King's Osborne 1690-1708
Rector Old Alresford 1691-1726.
2. Chaplain to Archbishop Sancroft 1685-1691.⁶⁷

Name: **R. Norris**

Title: unknown, location unknown

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1704

Background:

No information has been found on R. Norris

Name **Joshua Oldfield** (1656–1729)

Title: Dissenting Minister

Thanksgiving Sermon: Dec. 1706, 1707

Background:

Presbyterian minister. In the 1670s he attended Magdalene College, Cambridge, Lincoln College, Oxford, and Christ's College, Cambridge however without taking a degree as he refused to subscribe to the articles. Oldfield became chaplain to Sir John Gell at Hopton Hall, Derbyshire, and tutor to the family of Paul Foley, later speaker of the House of Commons.

Oldfield became minister at Oxford in 1691, and in 1699 minister at Globe Alley meeting Maid Lane, Southwark. In conjunction with his ministry he ran a Presbyterian academy, which was highly esteemed within the Dissenting community.

A correspondent of Locke and Newton, Oldfield was a religious moderate. The University of Edinburgh awarded him a DD in 1709.

Name: **John Ollyffe** (1676- c. 1743)

⁶⁷ H.Slatius, H Wharton, *The Life of William Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury* (London 1821),p. 69 and G. D'Oyly, *The Life of William Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury* (2 vols., London,1821), i, pp. 464,469. Though Needham remained close to Sancroft, he was not a non-juror.

Title M.A. rector of Hedgerly Bucks

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1707

Background:

‘The Rev. John Ollyffe was the third generation to bear that name; and since all three were clergymen, this John Ollyffe III often is confused with his more successful father. The first John Ollyffe apparently was an ejected clergyman of Wivelsfield in Sussex who by 1647 had settled at Arundel, where his son John Ollyffe was born. This second John Ollyffe was minister first at West Aimer (1673-1693) and then at Dunton (1693-1717). He was a moderately successful Anglican clergyman with several publications to his credit, most of them either sermons or religious tracts. The third John Ollyffe was more obscure. He was at the rectory of Hedgerley in Buckinghamshire from 1699 through 1743, and it was this John Ollyffe who published a sermon preached on 1 May 1707. It was a typical Anglican sermon seeking reconciliation among Protestants and hoping to make the best of a union which was not agreeable to them but which was desired by the Queen. Ollyffe stressed the positive aspects whenever possible and held out the hope of a further union or a conversion to Anglicanism by the Presbyterians in Scotland.’⁶⁸

Name: **Deuel Pead**

Title: Chaplain to his Grace the Duke of Newcastle

Thanksgiving Sermons: Dec. 1706, 1707, Feb 1708/09

Background:

Little is known of Pead’s early life. He was admitted to Cambridge as a pensioner in 1664, served as a chaplain in the British navy in 1671, and settled in Anne Arundel County, Maryland, in about 1682. By November of 1683 he had become the minister of Christ Church, Middlesex County, Virginia, and remained in this post until returning to England some seven years later. Pead probably returned to England at the suggestion of John Holles, Earl of Clare and by 1694 Duke of Newcastle, who became his lifelong patron. In 1691 Pead was appointed ‘Minister’ of St James’s, Clerkenwell, London, a position he held until his death. In the same year he became chaplain to Holles and in 1707 was further rewarded with a rectorship in Essex. From 1694 through 1709 Pead preached and published -sometimes with dedications to Holles, once to King William-an interesting series of sermons on historical and state subjects and occasions, interspersed with others on strictly moral and spiritual themes. Then, as he had been earlier in Virginia, he was a staunch supporter of the status quo, now William instead of James II. There was nothing strange or inconsistent in his turning his support to William and Mary and Anne rather than continuing to acknowledge the Catholic Stuarts, for like most Anglicans his loyalty was to established authority.⁶⁹

Name: **William Pearson**

⁶⁸ W.R. and V.B. McLeod, *Anglo-Scottish Tracts, 1701-1714: A Descriptive Checklist* (Lawrence, KA, 1979), p. 191.

⁶⁹ R.B. Davis, *Intellectual Life in the Colonial South, 1585-1763* (3 vols., Knoxville, 1978), i. pp. 716-17.

Title: Archdeacon of Nottingham and Canon Residentiary of the Church of York

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1704

Background

1. [CCEd]: Rector Bolton Percy, Subdean York Minster, Archdeacon of Nottingham,
2. William Pearson was collated to the stall of Ampleford at York, 17 June, 1689. On 26 July, 1690 he was made archdeacon of Nottingham, and on the same day admitted to the rectory of Barton, co. Notts, which he resigned for that of Wheldrake, co. York, in January, 1691-2. On 26 May, 1692 he was collated to the prebend of Segeston at Southwell. On 1 May, 1695 he was installed Sub-dean of York. On 18 May, 1697, he ceded the rectory of Wheldrake on being collated to the rich living of Bolton Percy, which he held until his death.⁷⁰

Name: **William Perse**

Title: A.M. Minister of Malton and Rector of Heslerton, and formerly fellow of King's College Cambridge

Thanksgiving Sermon: June 1706

Background [CCEd]:

sizar (age 15) at CHRIST'S, Oct. 6, 1688. S. of William (1658). B. at Faversham, Kent. School, Eton. ' Matric. 1692; B.A. 1692-3; M.A. 1707. Ord. deacon (York) Mar. 1692-3; priest, Sept. 1694. Chaplain to the Earl of Berkshire. V. of Weaverthorpe, Yorks. Succeeded his father as R. of West Heslerton, 1707 -1723)

Name: **John Piggott**

Title: Dissenting Minister (Particular Baptist⁷¹)

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1704

Background

The first mention we have of this judicious and useful minister is in 1692. He was at this time a preaching member of the Church in Goodmans-fields. He is spoken of as a schoolmaster who preached occasionally. Mr Joseph Stennett, pastor of the Sabbatarian church at Pinner's-Hall was his particular friend.... Mr Piggott was warmly attached [to King William]. This is proved in one of these sermons preached April 16, 1696, on a day of Public thanksgiving 'for the discovery and defeat of the late detestable conspiracy against His Majesty's person, and of a designed invasion from France'. It is dedicated to the Earl of Monmouth, and is an evidence of the high estimation

⁷⁰ *The register of burials in York minster, accompanied by monumental inscriptions, and illustrated with biographical notices.* by Robert H. Skaife, The Mount (York., 1881).

<http://www.genuki.org.uk/big/eng/YKS/Misc/MIs/ARY/YorkMinsterBurials1c.html> (accessed 29 Mar. 2106)

⁷¹ So designated because they held to a restricted or particular atonement which was only for the elect. They began as a secession from the (Congregational) Separatists: K.S. Latourette, *A History of Christianity; Volume II: ad 1500-ad 1975* (2 vols., New York 1975), p. 818.

in which Mr Piggott held that inestimable sovereign ... It appears that Mr Piggott was very eminent as a preacher in the denomination to which he belonged from the many public occasions on which he was selected to preach. Mr Piggott was called to his reward in March 1713, and his funeral sermon was preached by his friend Mr Joseph Stennett.⁷²

Name: **Humphrey Prideaux**: 1648-1724

Title: Dean of Norwich

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1702

Background

Dean of Norwich and author. BA, MA, BD and DD from Christ Church, Oxford. He was tutor to Lord Chancellor Finch's son in the 1670's and with Finch's patronage secured the rectories of Llandewi Felffre, Pembrokeshire (1677), of St Clement's, Oxford (1679), and the prebend of Norwich (1681). In 1688 he supported William of Orange's landing and takeover of power. He was a noted Arabic scholar, mainly his *Life of Mahomet* (1697).

He left significant correspondence which details local and church politics. He was concerned about the threat of Jacobitism and Catholicism.

Name: **Jacob Prosser**

Title: Chaplain to Her Majesty's Chapel Royal and Garrison in Portsmouth

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1713

Background:

No information has been found on Jacob Prosser

Name: **Thomas Pyle** (1674–1756)

Title: M.A. Lecturer in St Margaret's Church in Lyn-Regis

Thanksgiving Sermons 1707

Background:

Educated at Gresham's grammar school at Holt, Norfolk, then BA (1696) MA (1699) Caius College, Cambridge. He was ordained by Bishop Moore of Norwich in 1698. He held Whig political views and hoped for preferment with the rise of local MP, Robert Walpole. He gained a

⁷² Joseph Ivimey, *A History of the English Baptists*, ii, pp. 451-2.

reputation as an eloquent preacher, his *Paraphrase of the Acts and Epistles, in the Manner of Dr Clarke* (1725) found favour among low-churchmen and Dissenters. Pyle did not advance in the Church, perhaps due to concerns about his impetuosity.

Name: **Thomas Rivers**

Title: LLD, Prebendary of Winchester and Fellow of All-Souls College Oxford

Thanksgiving Sermon: Nov. 1709

Background:

1. [CCed]: Foster: Rivers, Thomas, s. Jo. of Chafford, Kent, bart. Corpus Christi Coll., matric. 15 Oct 1685, aged 17, BA 7 Mar 1688-9; fellow All Souls' Coll., BCL 1694, DCL 1699; admitted to Merchant Taylors' school 1673; born 4 Feb 1667-8, prebendary of Winchester 1702, rector of Chilcombe 1718, and of Easton, Hants, 1723, until he died 8 Sept 1732, buried in Winchester cathedral; brother of John 1683. See Robinson, i. 280; Rawl. ii. 126; Foster's Index Eccl.
2. Thomas Rivers was, in 1715, labelled 'a violent Whig' by Hearne.⁷³ Hearne's views on Rev. Rivers are typically intemperate, and I believe in relation to his November 1709 sermon, false. River's Thanksgiving sermon of 1709 is the only one of the fifteen published sermons to mention Charles I 'butchered Majesty, extinguish'd Monarchy' following which 'our forefathers fell under the Suppression of their Liberties, the Subversion of their Constitution, by the madness of the People [p5/6], though Rivers does acknowledge that 1688 as necessary due to 'the Misguided Zeal of a Deluded Prince' [p6].

Name: **William Sherlock** (1639/40–1707)

Title: Dean of St Paul's, Master of the Temple and Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty

Thanksgiving Sermons: 1704

Background:

DD (1680) Prebend of St Pancras at St Paul's Cathedral (1681), lecturer at St Dunstan's and in 1685 master of the Temple. Sherlock was a prolific, anti-Catholic author in James's reign. His house became a centre of clerical opposition to James. Seen as leaning towards non-juring, he temporized though eventually took the Oaths to William and Mary at the last possible deadline, thereafter being distrusted by both jurors and non-jurors.

Name **John Short**

Title: Dissenter, Miles Lane

⁷³ C.E. Doble ed., *Remarks and Collections of Thomas Hearne* (8 vols, London 1885), v, p 134.

Thanksgiving Sermon: Dec. 1706

Background:

Mr Short was educated for the Ministry among Non-Conformists, but at what seminary we are not able to say. It is highly probable that he passed some time in one of the universities of Holland. Having finished his studies, he set up an academy at Lyme, where he was very successful in training young men to the ministry; and occasionally preached for his father, who had a private meeting in that town. He afterwards removed to Colton, in Devonshire, where he followed the same profession. Upon the death of the Rev. Matthew Barker, in 1698, he was invited to London to succeed him in this congregation at Miles 'Lane. In this connection, he continued till his death, which happened about the year 1718. Mr Short was a man of considerable learning, of great piety, and of sound judgement. He had the misfortune to have an impediment in his utterance, which was a great denial to him, and occasioned his not being heard with pleasure in the pulpit; so that his congregation sunk under his administration.⁷⁴

Name: **Edward Smyth** (c.1662–1720)

Title: Bishop of Down and Connor, Church of Ireland

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1702

Background

BA (1681), MA (1684) DD (1696) Trinity College Dublin. Fled Ireland during 1689 Jacobite War; appointed Chaplain to King William III 1693. Appointed Bishop of Down and Connor, under the patronage of Duke of Ormonde, 1699. He was particularly concerned about the threat from Dissenters. A leaned man, member of the Dublin Philosophical Society, he contributed mainly on topics to do with natural history.⁷⁵

Name: **John Spademan** (1648? -1708)

Title: Dissenting Minister

Thanksgiving Sermon: June 1706

Background:

Tutor and assistant to Joshua Oldfield, at a Dissenting academy in Hoxton-square, London. He had been pastor of the English Presbyterian Church at Rotterdam during the 1680s. Indeed Spademan was among three Dissenting ministers – one each representing Presbyterian,

⁷⁴Wilson W., *The history and antiquities of Dissenting churches*, i, pp. 463-465.

⁷⁵ Additional notes from Linde Lunney. "Smyth (Smith), Edward". *Dictionary of Irish Biography*. (ed.) James McGuire, James Quinn. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Congregationalist and Independent preachers, who presented a loyal address to Her Majesty in 1706.⁷⁷

Name: **William Stainforth**

Title: DD Rector of Barnbrough and Canon Residentiary of York.

Thanksgiving Sermon: Dec. 1706

Background:

1. [CCed]: Venn: Adm. sizar at EMMANUEL, June 8, 1663. Of York. S. of John, of York (and Mary, dau. of Marmaduke Blakeston, Esq.). ' Matric. 1663, Stanford; B.A. 1666-7; M.A. 1670; D.D. 1694. Ord. deacon (York) June 2, 1667; priest, June 21, 1668. R. of St Mary, Bishophill Senior, York, 1668-1705. V. of St Martin, Coney Street, York, 1675. Preb. of Southwell, 1679-1713. Preb. of York, 1680-1713. R. of Barnborough, Yorks., 1704-13. Chaplain to Elizabeth, Viscountess Purbeck. Buried Aug. 16, 1713, in York Minster.
2. William Stainforth, of Emanuel College, Cambridge. was ordained deacon at Bishopthorpe 2 June, 1667, and priest 21 June, 1668. On 9 July, 1668, he was instituted to the rectory of St Mary Bishophill Senior, York, which he ceded in May, 1705. On 2 Oct. 1704, he was instituted to the rectory of Barnbrough, which he held until he died (1713).⁷⁸

Name: **Joseph Standen**

Title: (Dissenting) Minister of Coleford, Near Froome, in Somersetshire

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1707

Background:

1. 'STANDEN, Joseph, d. after 1726. Among the preachers of the early eighteenth century, Joseph Standen is not well known. When he preached his 1 May 1707 sermon he described himself as a minister of Coleford near Frome in Somersetshire. It is likely that he was a student in Alton parish, Hampshire, under Samuel Tonlyns, and that he received a grant from the Congregational Fund Board of some, £10 a year between 1691 and 1693. From 1713 to 1726 he was at Newbury in Berkshire, but in 1726 conformed to the Established Church and was made vicar of Speen in Berkshire. His 1 May sermon was a moderate one which sought toleration in matters religious as well as a reformation of manners and the rooting out of vice and profaneness. During the reign of Anne he also published two other sermons.'⁷⁹

⁷⁷ D. Bogue, J.Bennett, *History of dissenters, from the Revolution in 1688, to the year 1808* (3 vols., London 1809), ii, p. 31.

⁷⁸ <http://genealogy.links.org/links-cgi/readged?/home/ben/camilla-genealogy/current+c-stainforth3463+2-2-0-1-0> (accessed 7 Mar. 2016).

⁷⁹ W.R. and V.B. McLeod, *Anglo-Scottish Tracts, 1701-1714: A Descriptive Checklist* (Lawrence, KA, 1979), p. 199.

2. On [James] Peirce's leaving this town [Newbury in 1713], he was succeeded by the rev. Joseph Standen, who remained the pastor of that congregation till Christmas 1726, when having conformed to the Established Church, he was shortly afterwards inducted to the vicarage of Speen, of which parish he continued the incumbent until his death, in 1749, at the age of 76. He was buried in the chancel of Speen Church. Mr Standen was considered a man of talent, but of some eccentricity of manner; he possessed no small share of wit and humour, the latter sometimes bordering almost on the ludicrous, in which he would occasionally indulge, even in the pulpit.

His farewell sermon to his Dissenting congregation, was from Acts xiii, verse 46. 'Lo! I turn to the Gentiles'. He was highly respected by both Churchmen and Dissenters, and continued a friendly intercourse with the latter to the time of his death.⁸⁰

Name: **George Stanhope** (1660–1728)

Title: DD, Dean of Canterbury, Chaplain in the Ordinary to Her Majesty

Thanksgiving Sermons: June 1706, 1710

Background:

Dean of Canterbury. Obtained the vicarage of Lewisham in Kent (1689) through the patronage of the earl of Dartmouth⁸¹; Stanhope became chaplain to William and Mary (1694) and continued in that post under Queen Anne and George I. DD (1697). Awarded the Boyle lectureship in 1701 and 1702, which recognized his status as an excellent preacher, he delivered numerous sermons as high-profile events.

Stanhope had strong links with the high church movement.⁸² Together with Dr Robert Moss he refused to preach a thanksgiving sermon before the lord mayor and aldermen on 5 December 1709, as a protest against the treatment of Sacheverell. Associated with such High Church figures as Sacheverell, Joseph Trapp and Francis Atterbury, he was reckoned as less extreme than such high-flyers, and was known to maintain friendly relations with some Low-Churchmen.

Name: **Michael Stanhope**

Title: M.A.

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1708

Background [CCed]:

⁸⁰ E.W. Gray, *The History and Antiquities of Newbury and Its Environs, Including Twenty-eight Parishes, Situate in the County of Berks.*: (Speenhamland, 1839), p. 123.

⁸¹ William Legge (1672-1750), on most political matters Legge was a tory – he was chosen on 15 Jun. 1710 to replace Sunderland as secretary of state for the southern department. He acted as one of the lords justices until the arrival of George I in England, when he was relieved of his office. Perhaps his most enduring monument was the annotated copy of Burnet he left in his library, which provided a tory refutation of the period's most Whiggish historian: Stuart Handley, 'Legge, William, first earl of Dartmouth (1672–1750)', *Oxford DNB*, accessed 7 Mar. 2016].

⁸² The evidence of his sermons (Jun. 1706, and 1710) suggests moderation rather than the consistent high churchmanship attributed to him by the Oxford DNB. G.V. Bennett classifies him as Hanoverian Tory, *Crisis*, p. 174.

VENN: Adm. pens. at CORPUS CHRISTI, 1698. S. of Charles, of Mansfield Woodhouse, Notts. Bapt. there, Dec. 20, 1681. Matric. 1698; B.A. 1701-2; M.A. 1705; D.D. 1717. Incorp. at Oxford, 1702. Preb. of St Paul's, 1711-37. R. of East Leake, Notts., 1717. Preb. of Windsor, 1730-7. Married Penelope, dau. of Sir Salathiel Lovell, Knt., Baron of the Exchequer. Buried at Shelford, July 20, 1737. Will, Prerogative Court of Canterbury. (Al. Oxon.; Burke, Peerage; G. Mag.; Godfrey, Churches of Notts., 421.)

Name: **Joseph Stennett** (1663–1713)

Title: Dissenting Minister

Thanksgiving Sermons: 1704, June 1706, 1707, Feb 1708/9

Background:

Pastor at the Seventh Day Baptist congregation at Pinners' Hall, Old Broad Street from 1690. Brother-in-law of Daniel Williams, Presbyterian minister. His sermon celebrating the victory at Blenheim was read and rewarded by Queen Anne. His friends included Nahum Tate, the poet laureate, and Mordecai Abbot (receiver-general of HM customs).

Name **William Stephens** (1649/50–1718)

Title: B.D.

Thanksgiving Sermons: Dec. 1706

Background:

BA (1668), MA (1671) BD (1678) St Edmund Hall, Oxford. Became rector of Sutton in Surrey (1690) under the patronage of Lady Ann Mason, whose family had Whig connections.

Stephens was a regular guest of Shaftesbury in 1700-01, and his *A Letter to King William III* held forth on a Whig view of monarchy. He preached before the Commons in January 1700 and ignored the martyred of Charles I – a slight in the circumstances - and disparaged the use of the anniversary ‘to flatter princes with notions of arbitrary power’. The Commons refused to vote their thanks to Stephens, or to request that he have his sermon printed. The occasion prompted a vote to restrict such invitations to deans or doctors of divinity.

In 1705 Stephens criticized Marlborough and Harley in his *The Letter to the Author of the ‘Memorial of the State of England’*, he was made to apologize for its publication and sentenced to stand in the pillory, a sentence commuted by the intervention of the duchess of Marlborough with the Queen.

Name: **Henry Stephens**

Title: MA and Fellow of Merton College Oxford

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1708

Background [CCEd]:

Foster: Stephens, Henry, s. H(enry), of Overton, Wilts, cler. Corpus Christi Coll., Oxford, matric. 10 Dec 1686, aged 15, bible clerk, BA 1690, fellow Merton Coll., 1693, MA 1697, proctor 1707; born at Overton 16 Dec 1672-3, chaplain to the English factory at Oporto 1709-14, vicar of Malden and Chessington, Surrey, 1714, and canon of Winchester 1733, until his death at Malden 11 Apr 1739; brother of George and John 1695. See Rawl. i. 129, xviii. 236, xix. 65; OHS iv. 299; Hearne, i. 225, ii. 211.

Name: **Philip Stubbs** (1665–1738)

Title: Chaplain to Her Majesty's Navy in Ordinary, and of Her Royal Hospital at Greenwich

Thanksgiving Sermons: June 1706. 1713

Background:

BA (1686), MA (1689), BD (1722) Wadham College Oxford. Rector of Woolwich (1694), a fishing village along the Thames and the site of a royal dockyard, he became the first chaplain of Greenwich Hospital for disabled seamen. Rector of St Alphage, London Wall (1699), of St James Garlickhythe in London (1705)

Stubbs was renowned as a preacher. He published many individual sermons and addresses, and in 1704 a collected volume.

Name: **Thomas Swift**

Title: M.A. formerly chaplain to Sir. William Temple, now Rector of Puttenham in Surrey

Thanksgiving Sermons: 1710

Background:

1. [CCEd]: MA 1695

Rector Puttenham (1695-1752)

2. Thomas Swift A.M. who became rector of Puttenham in 1694 was the first cousin of the celebrated Dean of St Patrick's. This living is in the gift of the crown; and it has been supposed that Lord Somers, then lord chancellor, presented Mr Swift to his benefice through the influence of Sir Wm Temple, to whom he was chaplain. Mr Deane Swift, the biographer of Dr Jonathan Swift says that 'Thomas Swift was a man of learning and abilities, but unfortunately bred up, like his father and grandfather, with an abhorrence and contempt for all the puritanical Sectaries'; whence he seems to infer that he neither had, nor could well have, the least hope of rising in the church.⁸⁵

⁸⁵ E.W. Brayley, *A topographical history of Surrey* (London, 1841), p. 242.

Name: **William Talbot** (1659–1730)

Title: The Right Reverend Father in God, William, Lord Bishop of Oxford

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1707

Background

1. Bishop of Durham (1721). Dean of Worcester (1691) through the patronage of his kinsman, Charles Talbot, twelfth earl and subsequently duke of Shrewsbury, Lambeth DD (1691) He preached before Mary II in 1692 and 1694 at Whitehall. Ordained Bishop of Oxford (1699), he took a Whig line in the Lords –opposed Occasional Conformity (1703), favoured Union with Scotland (1707), voted to impeach Sacheverell (1710).
2. ‘A most grand Whig divine, William Talbot was fortunate to enjoy patronage throughout his long career sufficient to advance him to one of the richest bishoprics in England. Educated at Oriel College, Oxford, from which he received an M.A. in 1680, he was never known for his learning but rather for his grand style of preaching and for his equally grand style of life. He began his career as rector of Burghfield, a living which he soon abandoned for the position of Dean of Worcester, vacated by George Hicke, a nonjuror. In 1699, with the patronage of William III, he was appointed to the see of Oxford. There he remained until 1715 when George I allowed him to transfer to Salisbury and then in 1721 to Durham, worth £8,700 a year. A Whig, Talbot refused to abandon his principles in 1710 and voted to impeach Henry Sacheverell, a clergyman much esteemed by the tory party. A beautiful speaker with a marvellous command of the language, Talbot preached the 1 May 1707 sermon at St Paul's and thus gave the official sermon for that day of celebration. It was an eloquent, short sermon preached by a master at pleasing die royal ear.’⁸⁶

Name: **Christopher Taylor** (? – 1723)

Title: Dissenting Minister

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1707

Background:

‘Born at Taunton and educated at an academy there, Christopher Taylor was ordained a Presbyterian minister in 1687 at Lyme Regis in Dorset. He was a minister at Bath, and after 1699 in London, where he succeeded Richard Bures at Leather Lane. Already known as a moderate, prudent man, he was chosen by the government to accompany Mr Shute, later Lord Barrington, into Scotland in 1706. While Shute encouraged the nobility and gentry to support the union, Taylor was expected to work with the Presbyterian ministers who feared for the Established Church in Scotland. That Taylor would preach a sermon on 1 May 1707, therefore, is not surprising, nor is his style unusual among the Dissenting ministers in England. It was a safe,

⁸⁶ W.R. and V.B. McLeod, *Anglo-Scottish Tracts, 1701-1714: A Descriptive Checklist* (Lawrence, KA, 1979), p. 202.

moderate sermon which stressed obedience to the Queen and deplored disunity among Protestants in England and in Scotland. Taylor was not a prolific publisher, and his sermon of 1 May is one of two which he presented to the press during the reign of Anne.⁸⁷

TC:

Title: Sermon Delivered in the City of York, by T.C. (Unknown)

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1702

Background

Unknown

Name: **Samuel Terrick**

Title: Canon Residentiary of the Church of York and Rector of Wheldrake

Thanksgiving Sermon: June 1706

Background:

1. [CCEd]: MA 1711; York Minister, Prebend of Wistow (1711-1719), Rector Wheldrake (1719 upon his death).
2. Ralph Thoresby's diary mentions the author examining the library of the late Samuel Terrick and in a footnote mentions Terrick as having been Chaplain to Alexander Stanhope (James's father) who had been ambassador extraordinary to Spain under William (1689).and afterwards Chaplain to Archbishop Sharp.⁸⁸

Name: **Hugh Todd** (c.1657–1728)

Title: Vicar of Penrith, and canon of the Collegiate and Cathedral Church of Carlisle

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1707

Background

1. BA (1672) MA (1679) Queen's College, Oxford, BD and DD in 1692. Vicar of Kirkland, Cumberland (1694). With a wide range of intellectual interests, not least in the church history of his home county, he published translations from Greek and Latin, and several poems, presented papers to the Royal Society.

⁸⁷ W.R. and V.B. McLeod, *Anglo-Scottish Tracts, 1701-1714: A Descriptive Checklist* (Lawrence, KA, 1979), p. 203.

⁸⁸ J. Hunter ed., *The Diary of Ralph Thoresby FRS... (1677-1724). Now First Published from the Original Manuscript*, (2 vols., London 1830) ii, p. 266.

A High-Church tory, he frequently clashed with his bishop (from 1702) William Nicolson. He and Dean Francis Atterbury, questioned the bishop's right of visitation, arguing against insisting that the cathedral statutes used for the visitation were invalid.

2. ‘ Rev. Hugh Todd was an Anglican minister best remembered for his long and bitter dispute with Bishop Nicolson over the rights and privileges of the bishop within the see. Born in Cumberland, Todd was educated at Queen's College, Oxford, and at University College, from which he received his D.D. degree on 12 December 1692. In 1684

Todd and Atterbury, however, so strongly asserted their own independence of the bishop they alienated and frightened the church hierarchy, which in 1708 secured passage of a bill through Parliament establishing the right of the bishop to visitations within the see. Since Nicolson was closely allied by 1708 with the Whigs, and since Todd and Atterbury most certainly were identified with the party, the struggle between Todd and Nicolson took on all the character of a party fight, which indeed it was. The spectacle of a high churchman, who sought to defend the Established Church, excommunicated for disobedience to his bishop, illustrates the confusion associated with politics in the reign of Anne. Todd's sermon preached 1 May 1707, however, was remarkably moderate for a man of his reputation. He stressed the advantages to those who lived on the borders between the two countries, recapitulated their past history, and while recognizing the advantages of conformity to the Anglican Church, did not take an extreme position in this commemorative sermon.⁸⁹

Name: **Jonathan Trelawny** (1650–1721)

Title: Bishop of Exeter

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1702

Background:

One of the ‘Seven’ bishops who resisted James II in 1688. With a Royalist military background, Trelawny has mustered troops in the Monmouth rebellion. In 1689 he opposed the notion that James had abdicated and was against the offer of the crown to William and Mary. A friend of Atterbury, and having high church views in convocation, he nonetheless was a key supporter of the Marlborough –Godolphin regime through the early and middle years of Anne’s reign.

Name: **Charles Trimmell** (Bap. 1663, d. 1723)

Title : DD Arch-Deacon of Norfolk, Prebendary of Norwich, Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty

Thanksgiving Sermons: 1704, June 1706

Background:

Bishop of Winchester. Son-in-law of William Talbot, Bishop of Oxford, Salisbury and Durham. Trimmell became prominent in the disputes in the lower house of convocation in 1701, opposing the claims of Francis Atterbury and the ‘high flying’ Tories.

⁸⁹ W.R. and V.B. McLeod, *Anglo-Scottish Tracts, 1701-1714: A Descriptive Checklist* (Lawrence, KA, 1979), p. 205.

Archdeacon of Norfolk, and a prebendary of Norwich Cathedral. Friend of Humphrey Prideaux, and Charles, Lord Townshend, Trimnell was on close terms with the dominant Norfolk Whigs. In 1707 he was consecrated Bishop of Norwich amid much partisan pressure on the Queen. On Trimnell's arrival in Norwich as bishop, Prideaux noted: 'No bishop has been received with better respect since the memory of any alive'.

Trimnell was part of a group of Whig senior churchmen, headed by Archbishop Tenison, bishops William Nicolson and William Wake, deans Francis Blackburne and White Kennett, and Archdeacon Edmund Gibson, closely associated with the earl of Halifax, the earl of Wharton, Lord Somers, and the third earl of Sunderland.

Name: **John Walker**

Title: Dissenting Minister, Brentford

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1704

Background:

Mr John Walker [died 1724] was many years a Dissenting minister at Brentford in Middlesex, and was succeeded by Mr John Baker.⁹⁰ (Mr Walker was a nephew of a more famous John Walker, who had been ejected in Lancashire, and had given a famous sermon at Bolton).

Name: **William Ward**

Title: A.M. Vicar of Portsmouth, and chaplain to the Right Honourable George Earl of Warrington.⁹¹

Thanksgiving Sermon: Dec. 1706

Background:

1. [CCEd]: BA Oxford/Brasenose, 1693. Curate Selsey, 1693; Vicar Portsmouth 1697-1717.
2. Portsmouth was a parish where by the well-known Dissenter Simon Browne had acquired a considerable reputation amongst the Dissenters. In addition to a renowned competitor, the Rev. Ward was plagued by unco-operative church wardens. Their disputes about rights to perquisites began in 1703 and led, via six different actions in six different courts, to Rev. Ward achieving a pyrrhic victory at Winchester Assizes in 1713.⁹²

⁹⁰ E. Calamy, S. Palme, *The Nonconformist's Memorial: Being an Account of the Ministers, who Were Ejected Or Silenced After the Restoration* (3 vols., London 1775) ii, p. 101.

⁹¹ Booth, George, second earl of Warrington (1675–1758), Whig. E. Lord, 'Booth, George, second earl of Warrington (1675–1758)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/2878, accessed 7 Mar. 2016].

⁹² <http://history.inportsmouth.co.uk/people/vicars-of-portsmouth.htm> (accessed 7 Mar. 2016).

Name: **Richard West**

Title: Morning Preacher at New Chapel in St James's near Golden Square, and Chaplain to the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Sarum (Burnet)

Thanksgiving Sermon: June 1706

Background:

1. [CCEd] FOSTER: s. R. of Creaton, Northants. cler. MERTON COLL. matric. 22 March 1688-9, aged 17, demy MAGDALEN COLL. 1689-97, B.A. 1691, M.A. 14 Feb. 1693-4, D.D. Lambeth 13 April 1708; chaplain to Bishop Burnet, vicar of Inglesham 1702, and rector of East Hendred, Berks. 1713; canon of Winchester 1706, archdeacon of Berks. 1710 until his death 2 Dec 1716; brother of Edward 1679, and Thomas 1684. See Ath. iv. 602; Bloxam, vi. 68; Hearne, i. 233; & Rawl. i. 114.
2. The Occasional Conformity affair also elicited *The True Character of a Churchman* from an intemperate Whig called Richard West. It vindicated toleration, comprehension and Burnet's reputation. West was Burnet's chaplain, and later marked himself out by an outrageous sermon before the House of Commons defending the execution of Charles I 1710]. When Jonas Proast died in 1710 West succeeded him as archdeacon of Berkshire. Hearne, bemoaning the passing of Proast, called West a man 'famous for his preaching up anti-monarchical, rebellious doctrines', and, outraged at his new preferment, remarked that Burnet evidently thought it good to reward him 'by advancing him to spiritual preferment instead of the gallows.'⁹³
3. The exchanges between Richard West and Henry Sacheverell at the end of William III's reign are fairly symptomatic [of High-Church vs. Low Church controversy]... Replying to Sacheverell's accusation that Latitudinarians or Low-Churchmen interpreted each one of the Thirty-nine Articles in thirty-nine different ways, West wrote that 'if I think that scriptures most favour the Arminian tenets, as they are called, I am sure I can't honestly assent to them [the Articles] in a Calvinistical Sense'. Just as Burnet had been accused of Socinianism or worse, so West here implied that the Oxonian Sacheverell and his backers were Calvinists.⁹⁴

Name: **Charles Whiting**

Title: Rector of Ross and Canon-Residentiary of Hereford

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1702

Background:

1. [CCEd]: There is one Charles Whiting in CCEd, but his dates are ordination 1738, death 1755.

⁹³John Walsh, Colin Haydon, Stephen Taylor, eds., *The Church of England c.1689–c.1833 From Toleration to Tractarianism*, (Cambridge,1993), p. 171.

⁹⁴Nicholas Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism C. 1530-1700* (Manchester,2001), p. 335.

2. There is mention of Dr Charles Whiting, rector of Ross, Herefordshire, as the founder of a Blue Coat (i.e. Charity) School in Ross 1709.⁹⁵

Name: **John Whittell**

Title: Rector at Footh-Cray in Kent.

Thanksgiving Sermon: June 1706

Background: [CCEd]: Rector Footh Cray (1700-1726)

Name: **John Wilder**

Title: M.A. Fellow of Pembroke College, Oxon.

Thanksgiving Sermon: June 1706

Background: [CCEd]: possibly John Wilder Rector Oxford, St Aldgate, died 1743

Name: **Charles Williams** (1679/1680-1718)

Title: Lecturer, at Isleworth Middlesex

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1707

Background:

‘Charles Williams was a native of Llanurgan, Brecon, who was educated at St Mary's Hall, Oxford, receiving his degree in 1704. He was a lecturer at Petersham, Surrey, and at Isleworth, Middlesex. He died at Little Hallingbury in Essex in 1718.’⁹⁶

Name: **Daniel Williams** (c.1643–1716)

Title: Presbyterian Minister, Hand Alley

Thanksgiving Sermons: 1702, December 1706, 1707

Background

Presbyterian minister and benefactor. In 1688 Williams influenced London Dissenting Ministers to oppose James II's declaration of Indulgence. He represented English Dissent in Queen Anne's Reign. He led the joint address in March 1702 of the 'Three Denominations' on the accession of

⁹⁵ Pigot's Directory of Herefordshire, 1822 (accessed 29 Mar. 2016).

<http://freepages.genealogy.rootsweb.ancestry.com/~cbennett/pigotsross1822.htm>

⁹⁶ W.R. and V.B. McLeod, *Anglo-Scottish Tracts, 1701-1714: A Descriptive Checklist* (Lawrence, KA, 1979), p. 207.

Anne; the first occasion that the Presbyterians, Independents, and Baptists had acted together. He kept an active correspondence with Robert Harley, first earl of Oxford, from at least 1701.

Name: **Richard Willis** (Bap. 1664, d. 1734)

Title: DD, Dean of Lincoln, Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1705

Background:

Bishop of Winchester. Willis accompanied William III to Holland as chaplain in 1694, Lambeth DD (1695) and became a prebendary of Westminster. Willis was a strong Whig, and was denied ecclesiastical advancement during Anne's reign. In a 1708 sermon before the Queen he was criticised for appearing to establish a parallel between the Church and Dissenters. Willis clashed with Francis Atterbury in Convocation and was defeated for election as prolocutor in 1710. Willis was made bishop of Gloucester in December 1714.

Name: **Thomas Wise**

Title: B.D. Fellow of Exeter College Oxford, chaplain to Duke of Ormonde

Thanksgiving Sermon: Dec. 1706

Background:

1. He was born at Drayton, Vale of White Horse, the son of John Wise from Dorchester, Oxfordshire.⁹⁷ He was educated at Exeter College, Oxford, where he was fellow 1694-1726. He became rector of St Alphage Church, Canterbury (1709), vicar of Bekesbourne (1711), Six Preacher of Canterbury Cathedral (1711), prebendary of Lincoln Cathedral (1720), and was chaplain to the Princess of Wales (1721) and the Duke of Ormonde.⁹⁸
2. In 1706 he published an abridgement of Ralph Cudworth's *Intellectual System*. In 1711 he published *The Christian Eucharist Rightly Stated*.⁹⁹

Name: **Josiah Woodcock**

Title: Dissenting Minister (Oxford)

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1708

Background:

⁹⁷ Charles William Boase, *Register of the rectors, fellows, and other members of the foundation of Exeter College* (Oxford 1894), p. 126. <http://www.archive.org/stream/alumnioxoniense00fostgoog#page/n392/mode/2up> (accessed 7 Mar. 2016).

⁹⁸ Ingram Hill, *The Six Preachers of Canterbury Cathedral* (London 1982), p. 73-4.

⁹⁹ David A. Pailin, 'Cudworth, Ralph (1617-1688)', *Oxford DNB*, [accessed 8 Mar. 2016].

Josiah Woodcock was a Presbyterian Minister of Oxford. He was so well respected that even the curmudgeonly nonjuror Thomas Hearne noted that two Anglican clergymen risked reproach by attending his funeral in all Saints Church in July 1709.¹⁰⁰

Name: **Benjamin Woodroffe** (1638–1711)

Title: Canon of Christ-Church, Oxford

Thanksgiving Sermons: 1702, June 1706

Background:

Educated at Westminster School and BA (1659), MA (1662) Christ Church, Oxford, he was a tutor at Christ Church, and from 1674 subdean. Vicar of Shrivenham, Berkshire (1675), via the patronage of Sir Heneage Finch (later first earl of Nottingham), whose sons he had tutored at Christ Church. He favoured a reunion with the Orthodox Church and to this end made advances in building a Greek College in Oxford (latterly known as ‘Woodroffe’s folly’).

Name: **Josiah Woodward** (1657–1712)

Title: D.D. Minister of Poplar

Thanksgiving Sermon: Feb. 1709

Background

Church of England clergyman and moral reformer. BA (1676), MA (1679), DD (1699) St Edmund Hall, Oxford. Minister at Poplar, Middlesex (1689). A prolific author on the need for moral reformation. Boyle lecturer 1710, the lectures were published as *The Divine Original and Incomparable Excellency of the Christian Religion* (1711), and caused controversy. He was attacked as a friend of Dissent, and clashed with Henry Sacheverell.

Name: **John Worth**

Title: Dissenting Minister in Marlborough

Thanksgiving Sermon: 1704

Background

The scanty records we have begun with 1694, which is regarded as the official date of the founding of the Church [in Chipping Norton], though the above makes it clear that there was Protestant Dissent in the town many years previously. In 1694 a Mr John Worth began a short

¹⁰⁰C.E. Doble ed., *Remarks and Collections of Thomas Hearne*, ii, p. 217.

ministry, removing to Marlborough in or about 1699. He was a man of ability, and a sermon of his on the victory of Blenheim was widely known. · This was preached at Marlborough.¹⁰¹

Name: **Samuel Wright** (1683–1746)

Title: Dissenting Minister [Blackfriars]

Thanksgiving Sermons: Nov. 1709, 1710

Background

Presbyterian minister. 1708 became minister at Meeting House Court, Knightrider Street, Blackfriars. He had a fervent preaching style making his ministry very successful, according to his memorialist, ‘people flocked in crowds to hear him, as doves to the windows’. The meeting-house was twice enlarged and was attacked by the Sacheverell mob in 1710. Although an orthodox Calvinist, Wright took the side of the non-subscribers at the Salters' Hall conference of 1719.

¹⁰¹ Chipping Norton Baptist Church 1694-1944, http://www.biblicalstudies.org.uk/pdf/bq/11-10-11_282.pdf (accessed 29 Mar. 2016).

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Sermons:

All sermons have been sourced in Eighteenth Century Collections Online (ECCO), Trinity College Dublin, during or prior to February 2013, unless otherwise stated. As each preacher produced only one sermon for the requested Thanksgiving, their sermon becomes uniquely identifiable by date. In order to reduce clutter in footnotes, the preacher's name, year of delivery has been used as a short title.

- John Adams, *A sermon preach'd at the cathedral-church of St Paul, before the Right Honourable Sir Samuel Garrard, Bar. Lord-Mayor of the City of London, and the Court of Aldermen. on Tuesday, Novemb. 22. 1709. Being the Day Appointed by Her Majesty's Royal Proclamation, for a Publick Thanksgiving.* By J. Adams, D. D. Rector of St Alban Woodstreet, and Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty (London, MDCCIX [1709]).
- Anthony Addison, *A Sermon Preach'd at St Helen's in Abington, Berks, Sept. 7th 1704: ...* By Anthony Addison (Oxford, 1704).
- Richard Allen, *A Sermon Preach'd on Thursday the First of May, 1707. Being the Day Appointed for a General Thanksgiving for the Union of England and Scotland.* By Richard Allen (London, 1707).
- Andrew Archer, *A Sermon Preached in the Chappel at Tunbridge-Wells, September 7. 1704. Being the Day of Publick Thanksgiving for the Glorious Victory Obtained by Her Majesty's Forces under the Duke of Marlborough, over the French and Bavarians, at Bleinheim near Hochstet in Germany. Published at the Desire of the Auditors.* By Andrew Archer, A. M. Preacher at the Chappel at Tunbridge-Wells in Kent (London, MDCCIV [1704]).
- Edmund Arwaker, *A Sermon Preached at St Ann's-Church in Dungannon, on the 31st of December, 1706. ...* By Edmund Arwaker (Dublin, 1707).
- Lewis Atterbury, *A Sermon Preached at Whitehall, August the 23d, 1705. Being the Day Appointed for a Publick Thanksgiving for the Late Glorious Success of Her Majesty's Arms, and Those of Her Allies, under the Command of John Duke of Marlborough.* By Lewis Atterbury, L. L. D. And One of the Six Preaching Chaplains at Whitehall (London, 1705).
- Samuel Baker, *A thanksgiving sermon on Deuter XXVIII. part of verse 7th. Occasion'd by the late signal victory over the French near Mons, on Septemb. 11th. N.S. and the other remarkable successes of this present year 1709.* By Samuel Baker. Preach'd at Winchester, and Publish'd at the request of many of the Hearers (London, 1710).
- John Bates, *Two (United) Are Better Than One Alone. A Thanksgiving Sermon Upon the Union of the Two Kingdoms, of England and Scotland, Preached at Hackney, May 1. 1707.* By J. Bates, M.A (London, 1707).
- Charles Bean, *A Sermon Preach'd before the University of Oxford, on the First of May, 1707. Being the Day Appointed for a General Thanksgiving for the Happy Union of the Two Kingdoms of England and Scotland.* By Charles Bean, A. M. Fellow of Merton-College in Oxford, and Chaplain to the Right Honourable Charles Earl of Peterborough (London, MDCCVII [1707])
- William Bear, *The Blessing of Peace. Set Forth in a Sermon, Preached on Tuesday July the 7th, 1713. Being the Day Appointed for a Publick Thanksgiving, for the Conclusion of a Just and*

- Honourable Peace, between Her Most Excellent Majesty the Queen of Great-Britain, and the French King.* By W. Bear, Vicar of Abbotsham, Devon (Exon, 1713).
- Nicholas Beare, *A sermon preached, in the Parish-Church of St Botolph's Aldersgate, on the last day of December. Being the day appointed for a publick thanksgiving.* By Nicholas Beare, M.A. and for sometime curate there (London, 1707).
- John Billingsley, *Holiness and Righteousness the Best Return for National Deliverances. A Sermon on Luke I. 74, 75. Preach'd at Crutched-Friars, Nov. 5. And Silverstreet, Nov. 7, 1710.* By John Billingsley, Minister of the Gospel (London, 1710).
- Philip Bisse, *A Sermon Preached before the Honourable House of Commons, at St Margaret's Westminster, on Wednesday, March, 15, 1709/10. Being the Day Appointed by Her Majesty for a General Fast and Humiliation to Be Observed in a Most Solemn and Devout Manner, for Obtaining the Pardon of Our Sins, and Imploring Gods Blessing and Assistance on the Arms of Her Majesty and Her Allies, Engag'd in the Present War: And for Restoring and Perpetuating Peace, &c.* By Philip Bisse, D. D (London, 1710).
- Thomas Bradbury, *A Sermon Preach'd on Tuesday, Novemb. 7. 1710. Being the Day of Thanksgiving Appointed by Her Majesty for the Successes of the Last Campaign in Flanders and Spain.* By Thomas Bradbury (London, 1710).
- Thomas Bradbury, *The Welfare of Israel, Consider'd in Two Sermons on the Fifth of November, 1705, and 1706. With a Thanksgiving-Sermon, Preach'd at Stepney, on June the 27th, 1706.* By Tho. Bradbury (London, 1707).
- John Bradley, *Sermon preach'd at the cathedral of St Peter in York. On July the 7th, 1713. Being a day appointed for a general thanksgiving ...* By John Bradley [ESTC Citation No. N22904].
- Nicholas Brady, *A Sermon Preach'd at Richmond in Surrey, Upon July the 7th, 1713. Being the Day of Thanksgiving Appointed by Her Majesty for a General Peace.* By Nicholas Brady, D.D. Minister of Richmond in Surrey, and Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty (London, MDCCXIII [1713]).
- Nicholas Brady, *God the Defender of Our Cause. A Sermon Preached at the Parish-Church of Richmond in Surry, on Thursday Sept. 7th, 1704. Being the Thanksgiving-Day for the Late Glorious Victory Obtain'd over the French and Bavarians at Bleinheim near Hochstet, on Wednesday the 2d of August, by the Forces of Her Majesty and Her Allies, under the Command of the Duke of Marlborough.* By Nicholas Brady, D.D. Minister of Richmond in Surry, and Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty. Publish'd at the Request of the Auditors (London, 1705).
- Nicholas Brady, *A Sermon Preached at Richmond in Surry, on Thursday the First of May, 1707. Being the Day Appointed by Her Majesty for a General Thanksgiving, for the Happy Union of the Two Kingdoms of England and Scotland.* By N. Brady, D.D. Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty. Published at the Request of the Auditors (London, 1707).
- William Bramston, *A Sermon Preach'd at Malden in Essex, Upon the 27th Day of June, 1706. Being the Day Appointed by Her Majesty, for a Publick Thangsgiving to Almighty God, for Having Given to the Arms of Her Majesty, in Conjunction with Those of Her Allies, under the Command of John Duke of Marlborough, a Signal and Glorious Victory in Brabant, over the French Army, &c.* By William Bramston, Dd. Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty. Publish'd at the Earnest Request of the Corporation (London, 1706).
- Samuel Bromesgrove, *A Sermon Preached at the Tabernacle in Spittle-Fields, on September the 7th, 1704. Being the Day of Thanksgiving, for the Glorious Victory Obtained over the French and Bavarians at Bleinheim, near Hochstet, by the Forces of Her Majesty and Her Allies, under the Command of the Duke of Marlborough.* By Sam. Bromesgrove, M.A. And Preacher at the Said Tabernacle (London, 1704).
- John Broughton, *A Sermon Preach'd Upon the Thanksgiving-Day, September 7. 1704. For the Glorious Victory Obtain'd by Her Majesty's Forces and Thos of Her Allies, under the Conduct of His Grace the Duke of Marlborough.* By John Broughton M.A. Chaplain to His Grace (London, MDCCV [1705]).
- Simon Browne, *Uncommon blessings of Providence* (1709) [ESTC Citation No. N51008].

- George Burnet, *A sermon preached on the publick thanksgiving for the incorporating union of England and Scotland*. By George Burnet (1707) [ESTC Citation No. N37457].
- Gilbert Burnet, *A Sermon Preached at the Cathedral Church of Salisbury, on the Xxviith Day of June, Mdcclvi. Being the Day of Thanksgiving for the Great Successes God Has Given to the Arms of Her Majesty and Her Allies in Flanders and Spain, &c. By the Right Reverend Father in God, Gilbert Lord Bishop of Salisbury* (London, MDCCVI [1706]).
- Gilbert Burnet, *A Sermon Preach'd before the Queen and the Two Houses of Parliament at St Paul's on the 31st of December, 1706. The Day of Thanksgiving for the Wonderful Successes of This Year. Psalm Lxxii. Verse 4. He Shall Judge the Poor of the People, He Shall Defend the Children of the Needy, and Shall Break in Pieces the Oppressor. By the Right Reverend Father in God, Gilbert, Lord Bishop of Sarum. Published by Her Majesties Special Command* (Edinburgh, 1707).
- Gilbert Burnet, *A Second Sermon, from Psal. Cxliv. Ver. 15. Preach'd in the Cathedral-Church of Salisbury, on the Seventh of November, 1710. Thanksgiving-Day; By ... Gilbert Lord Bishop of Salisbury* ([Edinburgh?] 1710).
- John James Caesar, *God's Inevitable Judgments on Perjured Princes: A Sermon Preached to the Prussian Congregation in the Savoy, the 7th Day of September, 1704. Being the Solemn Thanksgiving for the Seasonable and Fatal Overthrow of Perfidious Bavaria, with a French Army, near Hochstet in Germany. By J.J. Caesar, Chaplain to the King of Prussia* (London, MDCCIV [1704]).
- John James Caesar, *the Victorious Deborah. A Thanksgiving-Sermon, for the Most Glorious Success of the Arms of Her Majesty of Great Britain, &c. And Her Allies, Both by Sea and Land. Preached the 12th of November, 1702. To the Prussian Congregation in the Savoy. By J.J. Caesar, Chaplain to the King of Prussia* (London, MDCCII [1702]).
- John Catlyn, *A sermon preached at Kerry in the county of Montgomery, on the 27th of June, 1706. Being the thanksgiving-day for the victory in Brabant, &c. By John Catlyn* (1706) [ESTC: T219057].
- Richard Chambre, *A Sermon Preach'd at the Cathedral-Church of Paul, before the Right Honourable Sir Gilbert Heathcote, Knt. Lord Mayor, and T He Aldermen and Citizens of London. On Tuesday, Novemb. 7. 1710. Being the Day Appointed by Her Majesty's Royal Proclamation, for a Publick Thanksgiving. By Richard Chambre, M.A.* (London, 1710).
- Edward Chandler, *A Sermon Preached at the Cathedral Church of Worcester, on the First Day of May, Being the Day Appointed for a General Thanksgiving for the Union of the Two Kingdoms. By E. Chaundler D.D. Canon of the Said Church. Publish'd at the Request of the Mayor and Aldermen of the City* (London, 1707).
- Edward Chandler, *A Sermon Preach'd at the Cathedral Church of Worcester, on the Twenty-Second Day of November Being the Day Appointed for a General Thanksgiving, By E. Chaundler* (Worcester, 1710).
- Henry Chandler, *The blessed God, and his happy instruments gratefully acknowledged, for the late glorious victory, obtained over the forces of France and Bavaria, under the conduct of His Grace the Duke of Marlborough. In a thanksgiving sermon, preach'd on that occasion at the Bath. By Henry Chandler* (1704) [ESTC Citation No. N32509].
- Richard Chapman, *The Providence of God Asserted and Maintained in a Sermon Preached on Decemb. The 3d. 1702. Being the Thanksgiving-Day for the Good Success and Victory Obtained by the Great Triumviri of This Nation. By Richard Chapman. M. A. Late Student of Christ Church in Oxford, and Now Vicar of Cheshunt in Hertfordshire. Published at the Request of Some Friends* (London, 1703).
- Richard Chapman, *The Lawfulness of War in General, and Justness of the Present Asserted. In a Sermon Preach'd at Cheshunt in Hertfordshire, on September 7, 1704. Being the Thanks-Giving Day for the Late Glorious Victory Obtained over the French and Bavarians at Bleinbeim near Hochstet, on Wednesday the 2nd of August, by the Forces of Her Majesty and Her Allies, under the Command of the Duke of Marlborough, by Richard Chapman, M.A. Late Student of Christ Church in Oxford, and Now Vicar of Cheshunt in Hertfordshire. Publish'd at the Request of Some Friends* (London, 1704).

- Richard Chapman, *Publick Peace Ascertain'd; with Some Cursory Reflections Upon Dr Sacheverel's Two Late Sermons. In a Sermon Preach'd on Tuesday, Nov. 22. 1709. Being the Day of Thanksgiving for the Signal and Glorious Victory Obtained near Mons, By Richard Chapman* (London, 1709).
- Samuel Clarke, *A Sermon Preach'd at the Parish-Church of St James's Westminster. On Tuesday November 7. 1710. Being the Day of Thanksgiving for the Successes of the Fore-Going Campaign. Printed at the Request of the Gentlemen of the Vestry of the Said Parish. By Samuel Clark, D. D. Rector of St James's Westminster, and Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty* (London, 1710).
- Samuel Clarke, *A sermon preach'd before the Honourable House of Commons, at the Church of St Margaret Westminster, on Tuesday, Nov. 22. 1709. Being the day of thanksgiving for the signal and glorious victory obtained near Mons, and for the other great successes of Her Majesties arms, this last year, under the command of the Duke of Marlborough. By Samuel Clarke, D.D. rector of St James's Westminster, and chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty* (London, 1709).
- Edward Clarke, *A sermon preach'd before the Right Worshipful the Mayor and Corporation of the town and county of Nottingham, in the parish church of St Mary ... December 3. 1702 ... By Edward Clarke, The second edition* (London, 1702).
- John Cockburn, *Two Sermons Preach'd in the English Church at Amsterdam the One Decem. 5th 1703. Appointed by the States a Day of Publick Prayer and Thanksgiving. The Other on Decem. 9th. Occasioned by the Late Storm. By John Cockburn D.D.* (Amsterdam, 1704).
- Richard Coleire, *A Sermon Preached at Harrietsham in Kent, August the 19th 1708. Being the Day of Publick Thanksgiving. By Richard Coleire, M.A. Rector of Harrietsham, and Late Fellow of All-Souls-College in Oxford* (London, MDCCVIII [1708]).
- Richard Collins, *The Original, Nature and Advantages of [Union]: Or, the Imitation of Christ's Kingdom, the Duty and Security of All Other Kingdoms. A Sermon Preached May 1. 1707. Upon the Wonderful and Happy Union of the Two Ancient Kingdoms, That Day Completed. By the Reverend Mr Collins, Vicar of Burham in Kent; and Chaplain to the Right Honourable Mary, Countess Dowager of Faucenberg. Publish'd at the Earnest Request of His Friends* (London, 1707).
- Thomas Colton, *A Sermon Preached in the City of York December, 31st. 1706. Being the Day of Thanksgiving Appointed by Her Majesty, for Rendering Our Most Hearty Thanks So Almighty God, for the Great and Wonderful Successes Vouchsaf'd This Year, to the Arms of Her Majesty and Her Allies, &c. By T. Colton, Minister of the Gospel* (York [1707?]).
- Thomas Colton, *A sermon, preach'd at York on the day of publick thanksgiving, June 27th, 1706. Appointed by Her Majesty for the glorious victory in Brabant, and great successes in Spain. By T. Colton* (London, 1708) [ESTC Citation No. N46674].
- Thomas Coulton, *Nahash's defeat, and Jabesh-Gilead's rescue: a sermon preach'd August 19. 1708. on occasion of the defeat of the intended invasion of North-Britain, and of the French forces near Audenarde* (London, 1708) [ESTC Citation No. N6023].
- George Conway, *A Sermon Preach'd at Ockingham, November the 22d, 1709: Being the Day Appointed by Authority for a Public Thanksgiving, for the Great and Glorious Advantages Obtained over the French Army, by Her Majesty's Forces and Her Allies, under the Command of the Duke of Marlborough. By George Conway. Publish'd at the Request of the Auditory* (London, 1709).
- George Conway, *A Sermon Preach'd at Ockingham, February the 17th 1708/9. Being the Day Appointed by Authority for a Publick Thanksgiving for the Great and Glorious Successes of the Last Year. By G. C.* (London, 1709).
- George Cummings, *The Good of Government. A Sermon, Preached in St Margaret-Patton's Church in Rude-Lane, London, on Tuesday, July 7, 1713. Being the Day Appointed by Her Majesty for a General Thanksgiving for the Peace. By G.C. A.M.* (London, 1713).
- Robert Davidson, *Brit. Ann. 1a. A Sermon Preach'd on the Thanksgiving-Day, for the Happy Union of Great Britain. Under Her Sacred Majesty Queen Anne, May the 1st, 1707. By Robert Davidson, Rector of Hayes in Kent* (London, MDCCVII [1707]).

- James Davies, *A Sermon Preached at the Parish-Church of Randilo [Sic], in the County of Radnor, on Tuesday the 16th Day of June, Being the Day of Publick Thanksgiving for the Conclusion of a Just ... Peace, ...* By James Davies (London, 1713).
- Patrick Delany, *A Sermon Preach'd at Christ-Church, Dublin, before Their Excellences the Lords Justices of Ireland; on Tuesday June the 16th, 1713. Being the Day of Thanksgiving for the Peace.* By Pat. Delany, M.A. Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin; and Chaplain to the Right Honourable Sir Constantine Phipps, Lord High-Chancellor, and One of the Lords Justices of the Kingdom of Ireland. Publish'd by Their Excellencies Special Command (Dublin, MDCCXIII [1713]).
- Giles Dent, *A Thanksgiving Sermon Preach'd on the First Day of May, 1707. On Occasion of the Happy Union between England and Scotland.* By Giles Dent (London, 1707).
- Jean Dubourdieu, *A Sermon Preached on the 7th Day of September, Being the Day of Thanksgiving for the Glorious Victory Obtained by the Forces of Her Majesty and Her Allies, under the Conduct of His Grace the Duke of Marlborough.* By John Dubourdieu Minister of the Savoy. Done out of French (London, 1704).
- Jean Dubourdieu, *The Triumphs of Providence in the Downfal of Pharaoh, Renew'd in the Late Battle of Ramellies [Sic]: Being a Sermon on Exodus Ix. Ver. 16. Preach'd at the Savoy-Church.* By John Dubourdieu, Minister of the French Congregation There (London, 1707).
- Jean-Armand Dubourdieu, *L'orgueil De Nebucadnetzar Abbatu De La Main De Dieu: Avec Quelques Applications Particulieres Aux Affaires Du Temps. Ou Sermon Sur Daniel, Ch. Iv. Vers. 29, 30, 31, 32. Prononce Dans L'eglise Francoise De La Savoye, Le Jour Solemnel De L'action De Graces, Le 31 Decembre, 1706. Avec Une Ample Preface Pour Faire ... De Ce Sermon. Par Jean Armand Dubourdieu, Chapelain De Mylord Duc De Devonshire, & Ministre De La Savoye* (Londres, 1707).
- Jean-Armand Dubourdieu, *L'epe'e De Gedeon Soûtenuë Par L'épée De L'eternel, Ou, Sermon D'action De Graces, a L'occasion De La Glorieuse Victoire Rempportée Sur Les François Prés D'oudenarde, Par Mylord Duc De Marlborough. Prononcé Dans Les Chapelles De La Savoye. Par J. Armand Dubourdieu, Minister De L'eglise De La Savoye* (Londres, 1708).
- Patrick Dujon, *A Sermon Preached in St George's Church in Doncaster, May 1. Being the Day of Thanksgiving, for the Wonderful and Happy Conclusion of the Treaty for the Union of Her Majesty Queen Ann's Two Kingdoms of England and Scotland.* By P. D. Vicar of the Said Church. Published at the Request of the Worshipful Mr Mayor, the Aldermen, and Other Gentlemen, the Hearers (London, 1707).
- Edwards, John. *One nation, and one king. A discourse on Ezek. chap. XXXVII. vers. 22. Occasion'd by the happy union of England and Scotland, which commenc'd on May the 1st, 1707.* By John Edwards, D.D. (Dublin, 1707).
- William Elstob, *A Sermon Upon the Thanksgiving for the Victory Obtain'd by Her Majesty's Forces, and Those of Her Allies, over the French and Bavarians near Hochstet, under the Conduct of His Grace the Duke of Marlborough.* By William Elstob, A.M. Rector of the Two United Parishes of St Swithun and St Mary Bothaw, London; and Chaplain to the Right Reverend Father in God, William, Lord Bishop of Carlisle (London, 1704).
- Richard Enock, *The Blessed Union: Or, a Sermon, Preached on Psalm 133.1. On the First Day of May, 1707. Being the Thanksgiving-Day,* By Richard Enock (London, 1707).
- John Evans, *A Sermon Preached at Chester and Wrexam [Sic]. Septemb. 7th. 1704. Being the Day of Publick Thanksgiving for the Glorious Victory at Bleinheim.* By John Evans (London, 1704).
- Evans, John, *A sermon preach'd May the 19th, 1706. On occasion of the surprising victory obtain'd at Ramelly in Brabant, May 12. By the forces under the command of His Grace the Duke of Marlborough.* By John Evans. Publish'd at the request of several of the auditory. (London, 1706).
- John Evans, *The being and benefits of divine providence, vindicated and asserted, in a sermon preached on September. 7. being the day of publick thanksgiving: for the glorious victory over the French and Bavarians, obtained at Bleinheim in Germany; on Wednesday, Aug. 2. by the Forces of Her Majesty, and Her Allies; under the Command of the Duke of Marlborough.* By John Evans,

- Minister of Ewell, Surrey* (London, 1704).
- Richard Eyre, *The Blessing of Peace. A Sermon Preach'd at the Cathedral Church of Sarum, July 7. 1713. The Day of Thanksgiving for the Peace. By Rich. Eyre, A.M. Canon Residentiary of the Church of Sarum. Publish'd at the Request of the Mayor and Corporation of the City of New Sarum; and of the Gentlemen, That Heard It* (Oxford, 1713).
- Richard Fiddes, *A Sermon Preached on the Thanksgiving Day: December, 3d. 1702. For the Signal Successes Vouchsafed to Her Majesties Forces to Sea and Land: Under the Command of the Earl of Marlborough in the Low-Countries; and James Duke of Ormond General, and Sr. George Rook Admiral, at Vigo. As Also to Those of Her Allies, Engaged in the Present War against France and Spain. And Like Wise, for the Recovery of His Royal Highness the Prince of Denmark. By Richard Fiddes, Rector of Halsham in Holderness* (York, 1703).
- Richard Fiddes, *A Thanks-Giving Sermon on the 23 of August, 1705. Or a Discourse Showing That God in the Government of the World Acts by Particular Wills* (York, 1705).
- William Fleetwood, *A Sermon Preach'd before the Queen at St Paul's, August the 19th. 1708. The Day of Thanksgiving for Our Deliverance from the Late Invasion, and for the Victory Obtain'd near Audenard. By William, Lord Bishop of St Asaph. Publish'd by Her Majesty's Special Command* (London, 1708).
- William Fleetwood, *A Sermon Preached on September the 7th. Being the Day Appointed for the Thanksgiving. By W. Fleetwood, Rector of St Austin's, London; and Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty* (London, 1704).
- Robert Fleming, *Seculum Davidicum Redivivum; or, the Divine Right of the Revolution Evinc'd and Apply'd: In a Discourse, Occasion'd by the Late Glorious Victory at Ramilly, and the Other Successes of the Arms of Her Majesty and Her Allies, in the Spanish Netherlands, under the Command of His Grace the Duke of Marlborough; and by the Other Successes in Spain, under the Conduct of the Earls of Peterborough and Galloway. The Sum Whereof Was Delivered in a Sermon on the General Thanks-Giving-Day, June 27, 1706. By Robert Fleming* (London, MDCCVI [1706]).
- William Forster, *A Sermon, Preach'd before the Worshipful the Mayor and Aldermen, of Stamford. In the Parish Church of St Michael's on Thursday the 3d of December, 1702. Being a Day of Publick Thansgiving [Sic] for the Great Success Wherewith God Hath Been Pleased So Signally to Bless the Arms of Her Majesty Both by Sea and Land, and Also Those of Her Allies This Year against France and Spain. By William Fostser, A.M. Rector of St Michael's in Stamford, and Chaplain to the Right Honourable, John Earl of Exeter. Printed at the Request of the Mayor and Aldermen* (London, [1702?]).
- Edward Fowler, *A Sermon Preached in the Chappel at Guild-Hall, Upon Thursday the 7th of September, 1704. Being the Day of Publick Thanksgiving to Almighty God, for the Late Glorious Victory, Obtained over the French and Bavarians, at Bleinheim, near Hochstet; on Wednesday the Second of August, by the Forces of Her Majesty and Her Allies, under the Command of the Duke of Marlborough. By Edward, Lord Bishop of Gloucester* (London, 1704).
- Thomas Freke, *Union, the Strength of a People. Considered in a Sermon, Preached in Bartholomew-Close, on May the First, 1707. Being the Day Appointed by Her Majesty, for a General Thanksgiving for the Happy Union of the Two Kingdoms of England and Scotland, in Great Britain. By Thomas Freke* (London, 1707).
- Thomas Freke, *Prayers and thanksgivings to be offered up to God in Christian assemblies, for magistrates, supreme and subordinate. Set forth in a sermon preach'd in Bartholomew-Close, on the occasion of the publick thanksgiving November 22d, 1709. By Thomas Freke.* (London, 1710).
- James Gardiner, *A Thanksgiving Sermon Preach'd on June 27th 1706. At St Michael's-Church Juxtàcrooked-Lane, for a Glorious Victory in Brabant, over the French Army, by Her Majesty's and the Confederate-Forces under the Command of John Duke of Marlborough: And, for the Relief of Barcelona. By Jam. Gardiner, M.A. And Rector of the Said Parish* (London, MDCCVI [1706]).

- JAM Gardiner, *The duty of peace amongst the members of the same state, civil or ecclesiastical, impartially laid down and recommended: ... A sermon ...* By James Gardiner (London, 1713).
- Thomas Gatchell, *A sermon preached on June the twenty seventh, being the day appointed for the Thanksgiving.* By Tho. Gatchell, vicar of Ottery St Mary (London, 1706) [ESTC Citation No. N47078].
- Thomas Goddard, *The Guilt, Mischief and Aggravations of Censure: Set Forth in a Sermon Preach'd in St George's Chapel, within Her Majesty's Castle of Windsor, on Sunday the 25th of June, 1710.* By Tho Goddard, A. M. Canon of Windsor (London, 1710).
- William Goldwin, *A Thanksgiving Sermon, Preached on the 31st of December. 1706. At Newnham in Hertfordshire.* By William Goldwin, Batchelor of Arts, and Fellow of King's Colledge in Cambridge (London, 1710).
- Thomas Good, *The Blessedness of Peacemakers. A Sermon Preach'd at the Parish-Church of Astley in the County of Worcester, on Tuesday, July 7th, 1713. Being the Day of Publick Thanksgiving for the Conclusion of a Just and Honourable Peace between Her Most Excellent Majesty the Queen of Great-Britain, and His Most Christian Majesty the French King.* By Thomas Good, A. M. Rector of the Said Church (Worcester, 1713).
- John Grant, *A Sermon Preach'd at the Parish Church of St Dunstan's in the West, London, on the First of May, 1707. Being the Thanksgiving-Day for the Glorious and Happy Union of the Two Kingdoms of England and Scotland.* By John Grant, M. A. Prebendary of the Cathedral Church of Rochester, and Vicar of St Dunstan's in the West, London (London, MDCCVII [1707]).
- John Grant, *Deborah and Barak the glorious instruments of Israel's deliverance. A sermon preach'd at the cathedral church of Rochester, on the seventh of September, 1704. Being the Thanksgiving - Day for The Glorious Victory obtained by the Duke of Marlborough, over the French and Bavarian Armies, at Bleinbeim near Hochstet, on the Banks of the Danube. Published at the Request of Some Gentlemen.* By John Grant, M. A. Prebendary of the Cathedral Church of Rochester, and Vicar of St Dunstan's in the West, London. (London, MDCCIV [1704]).
- Gideon Hardinge, *Victory and Success from God Alone. A Sermon Preach'd at Kingston Upon Thames, on Tuesday, November the 22d. 1709. Being the Day Appointed for a Publick Thanksgiving, &c.* By G. Hardinge, A.M. Vicar of Kingston. Publish'd at the Request of the Auditors (London, 1710).
- Francis Hare, *A Sermon Preach'd before the Honourable House of Commons, at the Church of St Margaret Westminster, on Thursday, Feb. 17. 1708/9. Being the Day of Thanksgiving for the Preservation of Her Majesty from the Treacherous Designs and Attempts of Her Enemies This Last Year; and for the Many Great Successes of Her Arms, &c. Under the Command of the Duke of Marlborough.* By Francis Hare, D. D. Residentiary of the Cathedral-Church of St Paul, and Chaplain-General of Her Majesty's Forces under His Grace the Duke of Marlborough (London, MDCCIX [1709]).
- Joseph Harrison, *A Sermon Preach'd in the Parish-Church of Cirencester, on Tuesday July the 7th 1713, Being the Thanksgiving-Day for the Peace.* By Joseph Harrison, M.A. Minister of That Parish (London, 1713).
- Samuel Harris, *A blow to France. Or, a sermon preach'd at the meeting in Mill-Yard, in Good-Man's-Fields; Nov.22. 1709. Being the day appointed by Her Majesty, for a general thanksgiving, for the late Glorious Victory obtain'd over the French, at Blaregnies, near Mons; by the Forces of Her Majesty, and Her Allies, under the Command of His Grace, John, Duke of Marlborough, and Prince Eugene: And other Successes of the Campaign of the Year, 1709.* By Samuel Harris, S.T.P. (London, 1709) [ESTC Citation No. T85477].
- William Hartwel, *A sermon preached in the cathedral church of Durham, on the 7th of July, 1713. being the thanksgiving day for the conclusion of a just and honourable peace.* By W. Hartwel, D.D. (Newcastle upon Tyne, 1713) [ESTC Citation No. T180458]
- Matthew Henry, *Great Britain's present joys and hopes; open'd in two sermons preach'd in Chester: the former on the national Thanksgiving-Day, Decemb. 31. 1706. The latter, the day following, being*

- New-Year's Day. By Matthew Henry, ...* [ESTC Citation No. N30747]
- Francis Higgins, *A Sermon Preach'd before Their Excellencies the Lord Justices, at Christ-Church, Dublin; on Tuesday the 28th of August, Being the Day Appointed for a Solemn Thanksgiving to Almighty God, for the Late Glorious Success in Forcing the Enemies Lines in the Spanish Netherlands, by the Arms of Her Majesty, and Her Allies, under the Command of the Duke of Marlborough. By Francis Higgins, M.A. Prebendary of St Michael's (Dublin, 1705).*
- Andrew Hill *A sermon preached July the 7th. 1713. being the day of thanksgiving for the peace. By A. Hill* [ESTC Citation No. T180535].
- Daniel Hill, *A Sermon Preach'd in the Cathedral Church of Rochester on the 27th of June, 1706. Being the Thanksgiving-Day for a Glorious Victory Obtain'd over the French Army in Brabant, under the Command of the Duke of Marlborough, Captain-General of Her Majesty's Land-Forces, and Commander in Chief of the Army of the Allies. By Daniel Hill, A.M. Prebendary of the Said Cathedral-Church (London, MDCCVI [1706]).*
- Samuel Hilliard, *A narrative of the prosecution of Mr Sare and his servant, for selling the rights of the Christian Church. In answer to what relates to that ... of the said book. (1713).* (note this paper came attached to Matthew Henry December 1706 sermon: *Great Britain's present joys and hopes; open'd in two sermons preach'd in Chester: the former on the national Thanksgiving-Day, Decemb. 31. 1706. The latter, the day following, being New-Year's Day. By Matthew Henry (London, 1707)* [ESTC Citation No. N30747].
- John Hoadly, *The Abasement of Pride: A Sermon Preach'd in the Cathedral of Salisbury, at the Assizes Held for the County of Wilts, July the 18th. 1708. Upon Occasion of the Late Victory. By John Hoadly, A.M. Prebendary of the Said Church. Published at the Request of the Stand Jury (London, MDCCVIII [1708]).*
- Nathaniel Hodges, *A Sermon Preach'd December 31. 1706. Being the Day of Solemn Thanksgiving Appointed by Her Majesty for the Late Glorious Successes of Her Arms, and Those of Her Allies, During the Last Campaign. By Nathanael Hodges (London, 1707).*
- Matthew Hole, *Two Sermons: I. The Danger of Arraigning God's Ministers, in the Delivery of Their Message; and of Condemning Innocent Persons. In a Sermon Preach'd Upon the Expiring of the Sentence against Dr. Sacheverell. Ii. An Olive-Branch of Peace, after a Deluge of War; or, the Blessings of Peace Compar'd with the Miseries of War. In a Sermon Preach'd on the Publick Day of Thanksgiving for the Peace. By Matthew Hole, B.D. Sometime Fellow of Exeter College in Oxon, Now Vicar of Stokegursey in Somersetshire, and Prebendary of the Church of Wells (London, 1713).*
- Richard Holland, *A Sermon Preached at the Parish-Church of St Magnus the Martyr, by London-Bridge, on Thursday, November 12. 1702. Being the Day of Solemn Praise and Thanks-Giving, Appointed by Her Sacred Majesty, for the Glorious Successes of Her Arms by Sea and Land, with Those of the Allies. Printed at the Requet of Some Who Desired It to Be Repreached the Sunday Evening After. By Richard Holland, M.A. Chaplain to His Grace the D. Of Richmond, Curate of St Magnus, and Lecturer of Athallows the Great (London, 1702).*
- George Hooper, *A Sermon Preach'd before Both Houses of Parliament, in the Cathedral Church of St Paul, on Tuesday, July 7. 1713. Being the Day Appointed by Her Majesty for a General Thanksgiving for the Peace. By the Right Reverend Father in God George Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells. Publish'd by Her Majesty's Special Command (London, 1713).*
- Josiah Hort, *A Sermon Preach'd at the Parish Church of Wendover, in the County of Bucks, on the 31st of December 1706. The Day of Thanksgiving for the Wonderful Successes of This Year: By Josiah Hort, Vicar of Wendover, and Chaplain to the Right Honorable the Earl of Wharton (London, 1707).*
- John Hough, *A Sermon Preach'd before the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, in the Abbey Church at Westminster, on the 22d of November, 1709. Being the Thanksgiving-Day. By the Right Reverend Father in God, John Ld. Bp. Of Litchfield and Coventry (London, MDCCIX [1709]).*
- Nathaniel Hough, *Successes, When the Signs of Divine Favour: A Sermon Preached Upon the Occasion*

- of the General Thanksgiving Sept. 7. 1704. By Nath. Hough, M. A. Chaplain to the Right Honourable the Countess Fauconberg, Lecturer of Kensington, and Fellow of Jesus-College, Cambridge. Published at the Request of Several Gentlemen (London, MDCCIV [1704]).*
- Francis Hutchinson, *A Sermon Preach'd at the Assize at Bury St Edmunds in Suffolk, March the 25th, 1707. Publish'd at the Request of the Two Grand-Juries. By Fran. Hutchinson, D. D. And Minister of St James's Parish in That Town (London, MDCCVII [1707]).*
- Joseph Jacob, *To Nikos, or the Victory Display'd. In a Sermon Preach'd the 7th of the Month, 1704, Being the Day of Thanksgiving for the Late Victory at Bleinheim. With a Short Appendix against Slandering. Now Publish'd at the Request of the Hearers. By Joseph Jacob a Servant of Christ Crucify'd (London, MDCCIV [1704]).*
- Joseph Jacob, *The Works of God Declar'd, in a Sermon Preach'd at Turners-Hall, the 12th of the 9th Month, 1702. Being the Day of Thanksgiving for the Success of the Queens Forces. Now Publish'd at the Request of the Hearers. By Joseph Jacob a Servant of Christ Crucified (London, 1702).*
- Joseph Jacob, *Desolations Decypher'd and the Kingdom of Christ Discover'd. In a Second Discourse Upon Ezekiel Xxi. Ver. 27. ... By Joseph Jacob (London, 1705).*
- Alexander Jephson, *A Sermon Preach'd in the Parish-Church of Camberwell, on the 7th Day of September, 1704. Being Appointed by Her Majesty as a Day of Publick Thanksgiving and Rejoycing for the Glorious Victory Obtain'd over the French and Bavarians at Bleinheim, near Hochstet, on the 2d of August Last Past, by the Forces of Her Majesty and Her Allies, under the Command of the Duke of Marlborough. Publish'd at the Request of the Auditors. By Alexander Jephson, A. M. And Master of the Free-Schooll in Camberwell, in Surry (London, 1705).*
- White Kennett, *A Sermon Preached in the Church of St Botolph Aldgate, in London, on September Vii. 1704. The Day of Solemn Thanksgiving for the Late Glorious Victory Obtain'd over the French and Bavarians by the Forces of Her Majesty and Her Allies under the Command of the Duke of Marlborough. By White Kennett, D. D. Arch-Deacon of Huntingdon, and Minister of St Botolph without Aldgate (London, 1704).*
- White Kennett, *Glory to God, and Gratitude to Benefactors. A Sermon Preach'd before the Queen, in Her Royal Chapel of St James's on Tuesday the 22d. Of Nov. 1709. The Day of Publick Thanksgiving, for the Signal and Glorious Victory at Blaregnies, near Mons in Hainault. Publish'd by Her Majesty's Special Command. By White Kennett, D. D. Dean of Peterborough, and Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty (London, 1709).*
- William King, *A Sermon Preach'd before Their Excellencies, the Lords Justices of Ireland, at the Cathedral of the Holy Trinity, Dublin, Alias Christ-Church, on the 7th. Of September, 1704. Being the Thanksgiving-Day for the Late Glorious Victory Obtained over the French and Bavarians at Blenheim near Hochstet, on Wednesday the 2d. Of August, by the Forces of Her Majesty and Her Allies, under the Command of His Grace the Duke of Marlborough. By William, Lord A. Bp. Of Dublin (London, 1704).*
- Thomas Knaggs, *God with Us, a Sermon Preach'd at St Giles Church in the Fields, On ... May 19th, 1706. ... By Tho. Knaggs (London, 1706).*
- Thomas Knaggs, *A Sermon Preach'd at St Margarets Westminster, August the 19th. 1708. Being the Thanksgiving-Day for the Late Great Victory Obtain'd over the French Army near Audenarde, by Her Majesty's Forces, and Those of Her Allies, under the Command of the Duke of Marlborough. By Tho. Knaggs, M. A. Lecturer of St Giles's in the Fields, and Chaplain to the Right Honourable Fulk Lord Brook (London, 1708).*
- Thomas Knaggs, *A Thanksgiving Sermon for Our Many Deliverances, Particularly the Victory Obtain'd near Mons, by the Troops of Her Majesty, and Those of Her Allies, under the Command of the Duke of Marlborough. Preach'd in the Chapel at Knightsbridge, Nov. 22. 1709. By Tho. Knaggs, M. A. Lecturer of St Giles's in the Fields, and Chaplain to the Right Honourable Fulk, Lord Brooke (London, 1709).*
- Benjamin Lacy, *A sermon preach'd before the Right Worshipful the Mayor, and aldermen of the City of*

- Exon, At St John's Chapel, the 31th of December, being The Day appointed for Publick Thanksgiving, for the Glorious Successes vouchsafed to the Arms of Her Majesty and Her Allies. By B. Lacy, M. A. And Master of the Grammar-School at Credition in Devon. (Exon, 1707).*
- Charles Lamb, *England Happy at Home and Abroad. A Sermon Preached in the Parish Church of Enfield, in the County of Middlesex; on December the 31st, 1706. The Day of General Thanksgiving, for the Glorious Successes with Which God Has Been Pleas'd to Crown the Armies of Her Majesty, and the Confederates, Both by Sea and Land. By Charles Lamb, Curate of Enfield. Publish'd at the Request of the Audience (London, 1707).*
- Ralph Lambert, *A Sermon, Preach'd Nov. The 12th. 1702. Being the Day, Appointed for a Publick Thanksgiving to Almighty God: For the Glorious Successes of Her Majesties Arms, by Sea and Land, in the Parish-Church of St Giles's in the Fields. By Ralph Lambert, D. D. Publish'd at the Request of the Gentlemen of the Said Parish, in Vestry (London, 1703).*
- William Law, *A Sermon Preach'd at Hazelingfield, in the County of Cambridge, on Tuesday, July 7. 1713. Being the Day Appointed by Her Majesty's Royal Proclamation for a Publick Thanksgiving for Her Majesty's General Peace. By W. Law, M. A. Fellow of Emanuel College in Cambridge (London, 1713).*
- William Lloyd, *A Sermon Preach'd at the Parish Church of Diss in Norfolk. Upon the 31st of December, 1706. Being the Day of Thanksgiving for the Wonderful Successes of This Year. By William Lloyd, Curate There. Publish'd at the Request of the Chief Inhabitants (London, 1707).*
- Benjamin Loveling, *A Sermon Preach'd at Banbury, December 3. 1702. Being the Day of Publick Thanksgiving, by Benjamin Loveling, M. A. Vicar of Banbury (London, 1702).*
- Benjamin Loveling, *Safe Directions for a General Thanksgiving. A Sermon Preach'd at Banbury the Seventh of September, Being the Day of Publick Thanksgiving, for the Late Glorious Victory Obtain'd over the French and Bavarians, by the Forces of Her Majesty and Her Allies, under the Command of the Duke of Marlborough. By Benjamin Loveling, M.A. Vicar of Banbury in Oxfordshire (London, 1704).*
- Benjamin Loveling, *Peace the Gift of God: Rest, Safety, and Opportunities of Piety, the Fruits of Peace. A Sermon Preach'd at Banbury, in Oxford-Shire, on Tuesday the Seventh of July, 1713. It Being the Day of Thanksgiving, Appointed by Her Majesty, for a General Peace. By Benjamin Loveling, M.A. Vicar of Banbury. Published at the Earnest Request of a Great Many of the Parishioners (Oxford, 1713).*
- Andrew Low, *A Sermon Preach'd the 27th Day of June, 1706. Being the Day Appointed by Her Majesty, for a Solemn Thanksgiving, on the Occasion of the Glorious Victory in Flanders, and the Great Successes in Spain. By Andrew Low (London, 1706).*
- Thomas Manningham, *A Sermon Upon the Union of the Two Kingdoms, Preached in the Parish Church of St Andrew Holborn, May the 1st, 1707. By Tho. Manningham, D. D. Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty (London, 1707).*
- Thomas Manningham, *A Sermon Preach'd before the Queen at Windsor, July the 11th, 1708. Being the First Sunday after the Account of the Late Great Victory Obtain'd over the French Army near Audenarde, by Her Majesty's Forces, and Those of Her Allies, under the Command of the Duke of Marlborough. By Tho. Manningham, D. D. And Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty. Publish'd by the Queen's Special Command (London, 1708).*
- Thomas Manningham, *A Sermon Preach'd before the Queen at Saint James's: On Thursday the 17th of February, Being Appointed for a Day of Thanksgiving ... By Tho. Manningham (London, 1709).*
- Nathaniel Marshall, *A Sermon Preach'd at the New Chapel in Ormond-Street, Upon Thursday, May the First, 1707, Being the Day of Thanksgiving to Almighty God for the Union of the Two Kingdoms of England and Scotland. And at the Parish of St Mary Aldermanbury the Sunday Following. Publish'd at the Request of Several in Each Audience. By N. Marshall, L. L. B. Vicar of St Pancras, and Lecturer of Aldermanbury (London, 1707).*
- William Marston, *A Sermon Preach'd at Redbourn near St Alban's in Hartfordshire, on the Seventeenth Day of February, 1708/9. Being the Day of Thanksgiving, for Protecting Her Majesty from the*

- Attempts of Her Enemies, and for the Many and Great Successes Throughout This Last Campaign.* By William Marston, M. A. Chaplain to His Grace the Duke of Marlborough, and Vicar of Redbourn. Publish'd at the Request of the Auditors (London, 1709).
- Thomas Masters, *A Sermon Preach'd on November 22. 1709. Being the Day of Thanksgiving for the Successes of the Last Campaign.* By Thomas Masters (London).
- Daniel Mayo, *Joshua's Example Propounded for Our Imitation, in a Thanksgiving-Sermon Preach'd at Kingston Upon Thames, February the 17th, 1708/9.* By Daniel Mayo, M.A. In Which Is Summarily Contain'd a Relation of All the Most Memorable Victorys over, and Successes against the Common Enemy and Oppressor, since Her Majesty's Happy Accession to the Throne (London, MDCCIX [1709]).
- Luke Milbourne, *Great Brittain's Acclamation to Her Deborah. A Sermon Preached in the Parish Church of St Ethelburga, September Vii. 1704. Being the Day Appointed by Her Majesty for a Solemn Thanksgiving for the Great Victory Gain'd by the Confederate Forces of England, Holland and the Empire, against the French and Bavarians at Bleinheim in Germany, under the Conduct of John Duke of Marlborough and Prince Eugene of Savoy.* By Luke Milbourne, Presbyter (London, 1704).
- Luke Milbourne, *Peace the Gift of God, but the Terrour of the Wicked; in a Sermon Preach'd on the Thanksgiving for the Peace, July the 7th, 1713. At the Parish-Church of St Ethelburga.* By Luke Milbourne (London, 1713).
- George Mills, *A Sermon Preach'd to a Dissenting Congregation in Norfolk, on the 31st of December, 1706. Being a Day of Public Thanksgiving Appointed by Her Majesty, for the Glorious Successes of Her Majesties Arms and Those of Her Allies the Last Campaign in Flanders, Spain, and Italy. The Second Edition. Publish'd at the Request of the Hearers.* By G. M Pastor of a Church of Christ at Geslwick (Norwich, 1707).
- J.N., *A Sermon Preached at Sea, the 27th Day of June, 1706. Being the Day Appointed for a General Thanksgiving to Almighty God for the Signal Success Wherewith He Has Been Pleased to Bless Her Majesty's Arms in Flanders and Spain.* By J.N. M.A. (London, 1706).
- William Needham, *A Sermon Preach'd at Westminster, Nov. 12. 1702. In K. Henry the Vii's Chapel, before the Reverend Clergy of the Lower House of Convocation. Being the Day Appointed by Her Majesty for Thanksgiving to Almighty God for the Signal Successes Vouchsafed to Her Forces Both by Sea and Land.* By W. Needham, B. D. Rector of Alresford, and One of the Proctors for the Diocese of Winchester (London, 1702).
- Richard Norris, *A Sermon Preach'd on September 7. 1704. Being a Day of Publick Thanksgiving for the Glorious Victory Obtain'd over the Forces of France and Bavaria, by the Arms of Her Majesty, and Her Allies, under the Conduct of His Grace the Duke of Marlborough.* By R. Norris (London, MDCCIV [1704]).
- Joshua Oldfield, *Private grief allay'd by publick joy: a sermon preach'd December 31st 1706, being the day of solemn thanksgiving for the glorious successes of the last campaign.* By Josh. Oldfield [ESTC Citation No. T228260].
- Joshua Oldfield, *Israel and Judah Made One Kingdom: A Sermon Preach'd May the First, 1707. Being the Day Appointed for Publick Thanksgiving Upon the Union of England and Scotland, Commencing on That Day.* By Josh. Oldfield (London, 1707).
- John Ollyffe, *A sermon preach'd May the 4th. 1707, at Uxbridge, upon occasion of the late day of thanksgiving for the union of the two kingdoms of England and Scotland.* By John Ollyffe, M.A. Rector of Hedgerly Bucks (London, 1707).
- Deuel Pead, *Annus Victoriis Mirabilis: A Thanksgiving Sermon Preach'd on Tuesday, Dec. 31. 1706. At St James's Clerkenwell. Occasion'd by the Signal Victories Obtain'd over the French, by the Duke of Marlborough, and the Rest of the Confederate Forces.* By Dr. Pead, Chaplain to His Grace the Duke of Newcastle (London [1707?]).
- Deuel Pead, *The Honour, Happiness, and Safety of Union. Or, a Sermon Upon the Uniting England and Scotland, Preach'd at the Parish Church of St James Clerkenwel, May 1. 1707.* By D. Pead,

- Chaplain to His Grace John Duke of Newcastle* (London, 1707).
- Deuel Pead, *Parturiunt Montes, &c. Or, Lewis and Clement Taken in Their Own Snare. A Sermon Preach'd in the Parish Church of St James Clarkenwell, on Thursday February the 17th, 1708/9. Being the Day of Thanksgiving Appointed by Her Majesty for the Glorious Successes of the Last Campaign. By D. Pead, Chaplain to His Grace the Duke of Newcastle. Publish'd at the Earnest Desire of the Auditory* (London, 1709).
- William Pearson, *A Sermon Preached in the Cathedral and Metropolitan Church of St Peter in York. Septemb. Vii. 1704. Being the Day of Thanksgiving for the Late Glorious Victory Obtained over the French and Bavarians at Bleinheim near Hochstet the Second of August by the Forces of Her Majesty and Her Allies, under the Command of the Duke of Marlborough. By William Pearson, Arch-Deacon of Nottingham, and Canon Residentiary of the Church of York* (York, 1704?).
- William Perse, *A Sermon Preached at Malton in Yorkshire. June 27th. 1706. Being the Day of Publick Thanksgiving for the Signal and Glorious Victory, Obtain'd by Her Majesties Arms, in Conjunction with Those of Her Allies; under the Command of Her Captain Generall His Grace the Duke of Marlborough in Brabant over the French Army, and for Other Great Successes in Catalonia, and Other Parts of Spain. By William Perse A. M. Minister of Malton and Rector of Heslerton and Formerly Fellow of Kings College in Cambridge* (York, 1706?).
- John Piggott, *A Sermon Preach'd the 7th of September, 1704. Being the Solemn Thanksgiving-Day for the Late Glorious Victory Obtain'd over the French and Bavarians at Bleinheim near Hochstet, on Wednesday the Second of August, by the Forces of Her Majesty and Her Allies, under the Command of the Duke of Marlborough. By John Piggott* (London, MDCCIV [1704]).
- Humphrey Prideaux, *A Sermon Preach'd in the Cathedral-Church of Norwich, December the 3d, 1702. Being a Day Appointed for Publick Thanksgiving to Almighty God for the Signal Successes Vouchsafed to Her Majesty's Forces Both by Sea and Land; and Also to Those of Her Allies Engaged in the Present War against France and Spain. By Humphrey Prideaux, D.D. Dean of Norwich* (Norwich, 1703).
- Jacob Prosser, *The Danger of Turning Again to Folly: A Sermon Preach'd at the Royal Chappel in Portsmouth, on Tuesday, July 7. 1713. Being Thanksgiving-Day for the Peace, &c. By Jacob Prosser, Chaplain to Her Majesty's Chappel-Royal, and Garrison of Portsmouth. Late a Dissenting Teacher at Maidenhead in Berks* (London, 1713).
- Thomas Pyle, *National Union a National Belssing. A Sermon Preach'd at St Margaret's Church in Lyn-Regis, on the First of May, 1707. Being the Day of Publick Thanksgiving for the Happy Union of England and Scotland by Thomas Pyle, M.A. Lecturer in the Said Town* (London, MDCCVII [1707]).
- Thomas Rivers, *A Sermon Preach'd at the Cathedral-Church of Winchester, on Tuesday, Nov. 22. 1709. Being the Day of Thanksgiving for the Glorious Victory, and Signal Successes of Her Majesties Arms, This Last Year, under the Command of the Duke of Marlborough. By Thomas Rivers, L. L. D. Prebendary of Winchester, and Fellow of All Souls College, Oxon* (London, 1710).
- William Sherlock, *A Sermon Preach'd before the Queen, at the Cathedral Church of St Paul, London, on the Seventh of September, 1704. Being the Thanksgiving-Day for the Late Glorious Victory Obtain'd over the French and Bavarians at Bleinheim near Brochster, on Wednesday the Second of August, by the Forces of Her Majesty and Her Allies, under the Command of the Duke of Marlborough. By William Sherlock, D. D. Dean of Paul's, Master of the Temple, and Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty. Licensed and Printed According to Order* (London, 1704).
- John Short, *A Sermon Upon the Head-Ship of Christ Preach'd the 31st of December 1706. The Day of Thanksgiving for the Happy and Wonderful Successes of This Year. By John Short, Minister of the Gospel* (London, 1707).
- Edward Smyth, *A Sermon Preached before Their Excellencies the Lords Justices at Christ-Church, Dublin, on the 3d of December, 1702. Being the General Thanksgiving ... By ... Edward Lord Bishop of Down and Connor* (Dublin, 1703).
- Andrew Snape, *A Sermon Preach'd before the Honourable House of Commons, on Wednesday the 28th of*

- March, 1711. Being the Day Appointed by Her Majesty's Royal Proclamation for a General FaSt By Andrew Snape, D.D. And Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty* (London, 1711).
- John Spademan, *Deborah's Triumph over the Mighty. A Sermon Preach'd on the Day of Publick Thanksgiving, June 27. 1706. Appointed by Her Majesty, for the Glorious Victory in Brabant, and Great Successes in Spain. By John Spademan, M.A. Minister of the Gospel. With the Gratulatory Address of the Dissenting Ministers in and About London* (London, 1706).
- William Stainforth, *A Sermon Preached in the Cathedral and Metropolitcal Church of St Peters in York. December, 31St 1706. Being the Day of Thanksgiving Appointed by Her Majesty, for Rendering Our Most Hearty Thanks to Almighty God, for the Great and Wonderfull Successes Vouchsas'd This Year, to the Arms of Her Majesty and Her Allies, &c. And Publish'd at the Request of the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor, the Worshipful the Recorder, the Aldermen of the City of York. By William Stainforth, D.D. Rector of Barnbrough, and Canon Residentiary of York* (York, 1707?).
- Joseph Standen, *A Sermon Preach'd May 1. 1707. Being the Day of Thanksgiving for the Union of the Two Kingdoms of England and Scotland. By Joseph Standen, Minister of Coleford near Froome in Somersetsshire* (London, 1707).
- George Stanhope, *A Sermon Preach'd before the Queen at the Cathedral Church of S. Paul, London, the Xxviith Day of June Mdcovi. Being the Day Appointed for a General Thanksgiving to Almighty God for the Success of Her Majesty's Arms in Flanders and Spain, &c. By George Stanhope D.D. Dean of Canterbury, and Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty. Publish'd by Her Majesty's Special Command* (London, 1706).
- George Stanhope, *The Common Obstructions to Faith, and a Good Life Considered. A Sermon Preached in the Chapel-Royal at St James's, Novemb. The 6th, 1709. By George Stanhope* (London, 1710).
- George Stanhope, *A Sermon preached before the Queen in the Chapel-Royal at St James's November the 7th 1710. Printed by W. Bowyer, for Richard Sare at Grays-Inn-Gate in Holborn* (London, 1710).
- Michael Stanhope, *God the Author of Victory. A Sermon Preach'd in the Royal-Chappel at White-Hall, on Thursday the 19th of August, 1708. ... By Michael Stanhope* (London, 1708).
- Joseph Stennett, *A Sermon Preach'd on the First of May, 1707. Being the Day Appointed for a Publick Thanksgiving for the Happy Union of England and Scotland. By Joseph Stennett* (London, M.DCC.VII. [1707]).
- Joseph Stennett, *A Sermon Preach'd on Thursday, February 17. 1708/9. Being Appointed by Her Majesty for a Solemn Thanksgiving to Almighty God, for the Many and Great Successes of the Confederate Arms This Last Campaign. By Joseph Stennett* (London, MDCCIX [1709]).
- Joseph Stennett, *A Sermon Preach'd on Thursday the 7th of September 1704, Being the Day Appointed by Her Majesty for a Solemn Thanksgiving to Almighty God for the Late Glorious Victory Obtain'd over the French and Bavarians at Bleinheim near Hochstet, by the Confederate Forces under the Command of the Duke of Marlborough. By Joseph Stennett* (London, 1704).
- Joseph Stennett, *A Sermon Preach'd on Thursday the 27th of June 1706. Being the Day Appointed by Her Majesty for a Solemn Thanksgiving to Almighty God for the Late Glorious Progress of Her Majesty's Arms and Those of Her Allies in Flanders and Spain. By Joseph Stennett* (London, 1706).
- Henry Stephens, *A Sermon Preach'd before the University of Oxford, at St Mary's, on Thursday the 19th of August, 1708. Being the Day of Thanksgiving, for Our Deliverance from the Late Invasion, and for the Victory Obtain'd near Audenard. By Henry Stephens, M. A. And Fellow of Merton Coll. Oxon* (Oxford, MDCCVIII [1708]).
- William Stephens, *A Sermon Preach'd at Sutton in Surrey, on December 31. 1706. By William Stephens, B. D. Published at the Request of the Auditory* (London, 1707).
- Philip Stubbs, *Peace Upon Earth, the Gift of God; and Good-Will to One Another, the Duty of Men. A Sermon Preparatory to the General Thanksgiving, Preach'd on Sunday, May the 26th, 1706. In the Oratory of the Royal Hospital at Greenwich, &c. On Occasion of the Glorious Successes Then Commememorated by Authority with Which God Was Please to Crown the Forces of Her*

- Majesty, and Her Allies, by Land and Sea, in Brabant and Catalonia. Isaiah Chap Lvii. Part of 19 Verse. I Create the Fruit of the Lips, Peace; Peace to Him That Is Far Off and to Him That Is near by Ph. Stubbs, One of the Chaplains to Her Majesty's, Navy in Ordinary, and of Her Royal Hospital at Greenwich. Publish'd at the Request of Its Auditors (London, 1706).*
- Philip Stubbs, *Thankfulness for Peace, the Subjects Duty to God's Vicegerent. A Sermon Preach'd at St James Garlick-Hythe, London, and in the Oratory of the Royal Hosiptal, Greenwich, July 1713. On Occasion of the General Thanksgiving Appointed by Her Majesty for Peace. By Philip Stubbs, M.A. Rector of St James Garlick-Hythe, London; and First Chaplain of Her Majesty's Royal Hospital for Seamen, at Greenwich (London, 1713).*
- Thomas Swift, *Noah's Dove. An Earnest Exhortation to Peace: Set Forth in a Sermon Preach'd on the 7th of November, 1710. A Thanksgiving-Day. By Tho. Swift, M.A. Formerly Chaplain to Sir William Temple, Now Rector of Puttenham in Surrey (London, 1710?).*
- T.C., *The Day of the Lord Upon the Ships of Tarshish. A Sermon Preach'd Decem. 3. 1702. In the City of York; Being the Day of Thanksgiving Appointed by the Queen for the Signal Successes Vouchsaf'd to Her Majesties Forces by Sea and Land, under the Command of the Duke of Marlborough, in the Low-Countries; and the Duke of Ormond, General, and Sir George Rook, Admiral, at Vigo. As Also to Those of Her Allies in the Present War against France and Spain. By T. C. (London, MDCCIII [1703]).*
- William Talbot, *A Sermon Preach'd before the Queen at the Cathedral Church of St Paul, on May the First, 1707. Being the Day Appointed by Her Majesty for a General Thanksgiving for the Happy Union of the Two Kingdoms of England and Scotland. By the Right Reverend Father in God, William Lord Bisho of Oxford. Published by Her Majesty's Special Command (London, 1707).*
- Christopher Taylor, *A Thanksgiving-Sermon, Preach'd on the First Day of May, 1707. On Occasion of the Happy Union between England and Scotland. By Chr. Taylor (London, 1707).*
- Samuel Terrick, *A Sermon Preached in the Cathedral and Metropolitan Church of St Peter in York. June 27th. 1706. Being the Day of Thanksgiving for the Late Signal and Glorios Victory, Obtain'd by the Forces of Her Majesty, and Those of Her Allies; under the Command of His Grace, the Duke of Marlborough over the French Army in Brabant: And for Having Bless'd the Arms of Her Majesty and Those of Her Allies with Great Successes in Catalonia, and Other Parts of Spain. By Samuel Terrick Canon Residentiary of the Church of York, and Rector of Wheldrake (York, 1706).*
- Hugh Todd, *A Sermon Preach'd at Penrith, Not Far from the Confines of the Two United Kingdoms, on Thursday May 1. 1707. Being the Thanksgiving-Day for the Happy Union of England and Scotland. By Hugh Todd, D. D. Vicar of Penrith, and Canon of the Collegiate and Cathedral Church of Carlisle (London, 1707).*
- Jonathan Trelawny, *A Sermon Preach'd before the Queen, and Both Houses of Parliament: At the Cathedral Church of St Pauls Nov. 12. 1702. Being the Day of Thanksgiving; for the Signal Successes Vouchsafed to Her Majesties Forces by Sea and Land: Under the Command of the Earl of Marlborough in the Low-Countries; and James Duke of Ormond General, and Sir George Rook Admiral, at Vigo. As Also to Those of Her Allies, Engaged in the Present War against France and Spain. And Likewise, for the Recovery of His Royal Highness the Prince of Denmark. By the Right Reverend Father in God Jonathan Lord Bishop of Exeter. Published by Her Majesties Special Command (London, 1702).*
- Charles Trimmell, *A Sermon Preach'd before the House of Lords, at the Abbey-Church in Westminster, on Thursday, Feb. 17. 1708. Being the Day Appointed for a Publick Thanksgiving, &c. By the Right Reverend Father in God, Charles Lord Bishop of Norwich (London, MDCCIX [1709]).*
- Charles Trimmell, *A Sermon Preach'd in the Cathedral-Church of Norwich. September 7th, 1704. Being the Day of Thanksgiving to Almighty God, for the Late Glorious Victory Obtained over the French and Bavarians at Blenheim near Hochfset, on Wednesday the Second of August, by the Forces of Her Majesty and Her Allies under the Command of the Duke of Marlborough. By Charles Trimmell, D.D. Arch-Deacon of Norsolk, Prebendary of Norwich and Chaplain in*

- Ordinary to Her Majesty* (Norwich, 1704).
- John Walker, *God's Providence in Raising up and Abasing Cruel Oppressors explained....* [1704]
[Source: Thomlinson collection, Newcastle Libraries]
- William Ward, *A Sermon Preach'd at Portsmouth, December. 31. 1706. On Occasion of the General Thanksgiving for the Successes Where with It Has Pleased God to Bless the Arms of Her Majesty and Her Allies, This Year. By Wil. Ward, A.M. Vicar of Portsmouth, and Chaplain to the Right Honourable George Earl of Warrington* (London, 1707).
- Richard West, *A Sermon, Preach'd on the 27th. Day of June, 1706. Being the Day of Public Thanksgiving, at the New Chapel in St Jame's, near Golden-Square. By Richard West, M.A. Morning-Preacher There, and Chaplain to the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Sarum* (London, 1706).
- Charles Whiting, *A Sermon Preach'd at the Cathedral-Church in Hereford, Dec. 3. 1702. ... By Charles Whiting* (Oxford, 1703).
- John Whittle, *A Thanksgiving-Sermon Preach'd at Footh-Cray in Kent, June the 27th, 1706. For a Signal and Glorious Victory in Brabant, over the French Army. Obtain'd by Her Majesties Arms, in Conjunction with Those of the Allies, and for the Surprizing and Strange Progress of the Confederates Ever Since. As Also for the Continued Successes of the Forces of Her Majesty, and Her Allies, in Spain. By J. W. Rector of the Said Parish* (London, 1706).
- John Wilder, *A Sermon Preach'd on the 27th of June, 1706. Being the Thanksgiving-Day, for the Late Glorious Victory Obtain'd over the French in Brabant, by the Invincible Courage, and Admirable Conduct of That Great Captain, His Excellency and Grace, the Prince, and Duke of Marlborough. By J. Wilder, M.A. And Fellow of Pembroke College, Oxon* (Oxford, 1706).
- Charles Williams, *The Blessedness of Union. In a Sermon Preach'd Upon the First Day of May, 1707. At the Parish-Church of Thistleworth in Middlesex, Being a Day of Thanksgiving for the Happy Union between England and Scotland. By C. Williams, Lecturer* (London, 1707).
- Daniel Williams, *A Thanksgiving-Sermon, Occasioned by the Union of England and Scotland, Preach'd at Hand-Alley, May the 1st, 1707. By Daniel Williams, Minister of the Gospel* (London, 1707?).
- Daniel Williams, *A Thanksgiving Sermon, for the Success of Her Majesties Forces. Preach'd at Hand-Alley, November 12, 1702. By Daniel Williams, Minister of the Gospel* (London, 1702).
- Daniel Williams, *A Sermon Preached at Hand-Alley, the 31st of December, 1706. Being the Day of Thanksgiving Appointed by the Queen. By Daniel Williams, Minister of the Gospel* (London, 1707).
- Richard Willis, *A Sermon Preach'd before the Queen, at the Cathedral Church of St Paul, London, on the 23d Day of August 1705. Being the Thanksgiving-Day for the Late Glorious Success in Forcing the Enemies Lines in the Spanish Netherlands, by the Arms of Her Majesty and Her Allies, under the Command of the Duke of Marlborough. By Rchard [Sic] Willis, D. D. Dean of Lincoln, and Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty; Published by Her Majesty's Special Command* (London, [1705]).
- Thomas Wise, *A Sermon Preach'd at the Church of Richmond in Surry, on Tuesday the 31st Day of December, 1706. Being the Day Appointed by Her Majesty for a Solemn Thanksgiving to Almighty God, for the Great and Wonderful Successes of Her Majesty's Arms, and Those of Her Allies, the Last Year. By Thomas Wise, B.D. Fellow of Exeter-College in Oxford, and Chaplain to His Grace the Duke of Ormond* (London, 1707).
- Josiah Woodcock, *A Sermon Preach'd August 19, 1708. Being a Day of Thanksgiving, Appointed by Authority, for Defeating the Design'd Invasion; and the Victory near Audenard. By Josiah Woodcock* (London, 1708).
- Benjamin Woodroffe, *A Sermon Preached before the University of Oxford, at St Mary's Church, Decem. 3. 1702. Being the Day of Thanksgiving, 'for the Signal Successes, Vouchsafed to Her Majesty's Forces, Both by Sea and Land: As Also Those of Her Allies Engaged in the Present War against France and Spain. By Benj. Woodroffe, D. D. And Canon of Christ-Church in Oxford* (Oxford, 1703).

- Benjamin Woodroffe, *A Sermon Preached at Woodstock June 27. 1706. Being the Day of Thanksgiving for the Glorious Victory in Brabant Obtain'd over the French Army, by the Arms of Her Majesty and Her Allies under the Command of the Duke of Marlborough, and Restoring the Greatest Part of the Spanish Netherlands to the Possession of the House of Austria in the Person of King Charles the Third, by the Happy, and Wonderful Progress of the Confederate Forces.* By Benj. Woodroffe D.D. And Canon of Christ-Church in Oxford (Oxford, 1706).
- Josiah Woodward, *A Sermon Preached in the Parish-Church of St Mary White-Chappel, February 17th, 1708/9. Being the Day of Publick Thanksgiving to Almighty God for the Successes of the Last Campaign;* by Josiah Woodward, D. D. Minister of Popler (London, 1709).
- John Worth, *Dehovah Nisbeve [Sic] = the Lord Our Banner: Or, True Valour Protected and Prospered from Heaven. In a Sermon Preached at Marborough, on the Publick Thanksgiving-Day, Sept. 7. 1704. ...* By John Worth (London, 1705).
- Samuel Wright, *A Sermon Preach'd at Black-Fryars; on Occasion of the Publick Thanksgiving, November 22d, 1709.* By S. Wright (London, MDCCX [1710]).
- Samuel Wright, *The Love of One Another, the Great Duty of Christians. Considered in Two Sermons; the One Preached on the Fifth of November, the Other on the Day of Thanksgiving, the 7th of November, 1710. Wherein Due Regard Is Had to the Temper and Behaviour of the Papists; as Also to the True Interest of Protestants in Observing of This Duty.* By S. Wright (London, 1710).

Other Printed Primary Sources:

- John Arbuthnot, *A Sermon Preach'd to the People, at the Mercat-Cross of Edinburgh, on the Subject of the Union* (Dublin, 1707).
- Abel Boyer, *The History of the Life and Reign of Queen Anne* (London, 1722).
- Abel Boyer, *The History of the Reign of Queen Anne, Digested into Annals* (London, 1711).
- Gilbert Burnet, *A Discourse of the Pastoral Care* (London, 1692).
- Daniel Defoe, *Reasons Why This Nation Ought to Put a Speedy End to This Expensive War; with a Brief Essay, at the Probable Conditions on Which the Peace, Now Negotiating, May Be Founded* (Edinburgh, 1711).
- W. Derham, *The History of the Great Frost in the Last Winter 1703 and 1708/9 by the Reverend Mr W. Derham, Rector of Upminster, F. R. S.* *Philosophical Transactions*, xxvi (1708-9) pp.454-78.
- John Ellis, *Letters of Humphrey Prideaux, sometime dean of Norwich, to John Ellis, sometime under-secretary of state, 1674-1722* (London, 1875).
- Thomas Emlyn, *A Review of the Case of Judah and Ephraim, and Its Application to the Church of England and the Dissenters. With an Essay on the Original of Religious Animosities, ... In a Letter to the Reverend Dr. Willis Dean of Lincoln, Occasion'd by His Thanksgiving-Sermon on the 23d August, 1705* (London, 1705).
- J. Evans, *A funeral sermon occasion'd by the much lamented death of the late Reverend Daniel Williams, D.D. who deceas'd January the 26th 1715/6* (1716).
- Sir William Fraser, *The Earls of Melville and the Earls of Leven, Correspondence*, (3 vols, Edinburgh, 1890).

Gentleman in London, *A view of the Queen and Kingdom's Enemies in the case of the Poor Palatines*, p.6 (London, 1709 [1711?]).

Gentleman in South-Brittain. *An account of the late Scotch invasion; as it was open'd by My Lord Haversham in the House of Lords, on Fryday the 25th of February, 1708/9. With some observations that were made in the H-se of C-ns; and true copies of authentick papers. In a letter from a gentleman in South-Brittain to his friend in North-Brittain.* (London, 1709).

John M. Grey eds., *Memoirs of the Life of Sir John Clerk of Penicuik, Baronet, Baron of the Exchequer, Extracted by Himself from His Own Journals 1676-1755*, Scottish History Society, (Edinburgh, 1892).

Francis Higgins, *A Sermon Preached at the Royal Chapel at White-Hall; on Ash-Wednesday, Febr. 26, 1706/7. By Francis Higgins, A.M. Prebendary of Christ-Church, Dublin* (London, 1708).

The hasty Widdow or the Sooner the Better, London: printed for T. Smith, 1709. [ESTC Citation No. N52304 Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery].

The humble address of the Dissenting ministers in and about the City of London; viz. Presbyterians, Independents, and Baptists: presented to Her Majesty by the Reverend Mr Daniel Williams (Dublin, 1702).

The humble address of the Dissenting ministers in and about the City of London, presented to the Queen by Mr Spademan, on the 17th of June 1706 (Edinburgh, 1706).

C. Jones, G. Holmes, eds., *The London Diaries of William Nicolson, Bishop of Carlisle, 1702-1718* (Oxford, 1985).

Journals of the House of Commons (Burlington, 2011).

Journals of the House of Lords: 1709-1714 (London, 1767-1830).

White Kennett, *the Wisdom of Looking Backward, to Judge the Better of One Side and T'other by the Speeches, Writings, Actions, and Other Matters of Fact on Both Sides, for the Four Years Last Past* (London, 1714).

White Kennett, *A True Answer to Dr. Sacheverell's Sermon before the Lord-Mayor, Novemb. 5. 1709. In a Letter to One of the Aldermen* (London, 1710).

William King, *A friendly letter from honest Tom Boggy, To the Reverend Mr G-d, Canon of Windsor; Occasion'd by a Sermon against Censure, preach'd In St George's Chappel. Dedicated to her Grace the D-----ss of M-----h. Very proper to be tack'd to the Canon's Sermon* (London, 1710).

G. E. M. Kynynmound, Earl of Minto, ed., *Correspondence of George Baillie of Jerviswood*, (Edinburgh, 1842).

Letters from the Living to the Living, Relating to the Present Transactions Both Publick and Private. With Their Several Answers. ... Written by Several Hands (London, 1703).

N. Luttrell, *A brief Historical Relation of State Affairs* (6 vols, Oxford, 1857).

Delariviere Manley, *A Learned Comment Upon Dr. Hare's Excellent Sermon Preach'd before the D. Of Marlborough, on the Surrender of Bouchain. By an Enemy to Peace* (London, 1710).

J. Oldmixon, *The Life and Posthumous Works of Arthur Maynwaring, Esq Containing Several Original Pieces and Translations, in Prose and Verse, Never before Printed. To Which Are Added, Several Political Tracts* (London, 1715).

G. Parke, *Letters and Correspondence, Public and Private of the Right Honourable St John, Lord Viscount Bolingbroke* (4 vols., London, 1798).

George Ridpath, *Some Thoughts Concerning the Peace and the Thanks-Giving, Appointed by Authority to Be Observed for It. In a Letter from an Elder, to a Minister of the Church of Scotland* [Edinburgh?, 1713].

Philip Roberts, ed., *Hamilton Diary: The Diary of Sir David Hamilton, 1709-1714* (Oxford, 1975)

T. Sharp, *Life of John Sharp, Archbishop of York* (2 vols, London, 1825).

William Stephens, *A Letter to the Author of the Memorial of the State of England* (London, 1706)

The Cherubim with a Flaming Sword, That Appear'd on the Fifth of November Last, in the Cathedral of St Paul, to the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Sheriffs, and Many Hundreds of People, &C. Being a Letter to My Lord M --, with Remarks Upon Dr. Sa--ll's Sermon (London, 1710).

W.H. Summers, *History of the Congregational Churches in the Berks, South Oxen and South Bucks Association* (Newbury, 1905).

John Stow, *The Annales of England* (Imprinted at London, 1605).

William Talbot, *The Bishop of Oxford's speech in the House of peers in answer to several speeches made by the Lord Haversham, and others. Against the union* (Dublin, 1707).

John Thompson, *the Lord Haversham's Speech in the House of Peers, on Thursday, November 15. 1705* [London].

Jacob Tonson, *The Tryal of Dr. Henry Sacheverell, Before the House of Peers, for High Crimes and Misdemeanors, Etc.* (London, 1710).

Richard West, *The True Character of a Church-Man, Shewing the False Pretences to That Name. Together with the Character of a Low Church-Man Drawn in Answer to It. With Remarks* (London, 1702)

Joseph Williamson, *A Vindication of the Thanksgiving-Sermon of the Reverend Dr. Willis, Dean of Lincoln; from the Reflections of a Late Pamphlet; Entitled a Review of the Case of Ephraim and Judah; and Its Application to the Church of England and the Dissenters. By Joseph Williamson, A. B. Presbyterian of the Church of England* (London, 1705).

Form of Prayer:

Church of England. *A form of prayer and thanksgiving to almighty God: to be used on Thursday the seventh of September next, throughout the Kingdom of England, Dominion of Wales, and town of Berwick upon Tweed; for the late glorious victory obtained over the French and Bavarians at Bleinheim, near Hochstet, on Wednesday the second of August, by the Forces of Her Majesty and Her Allies, under the Command of the Duke of Marlborough. By Her Majesties Special Command* (London, 1704).

Proclamations:

By the Queen, a proclamation, for a publick thanksgiving (London, 1702).

By the Queen, a proclamation, for a publick thanksgiving, (London, 1706 [December]).

Proclamation appointing a solemn national thanksgiving (Edinburgh, 1706).

By the Queen, a proclamation, for a General Thanksgiving (London, 1708).

By the Queen, a proclamation, for a General Thanksgiving (London, 1708).

By the Queen, a proclamation for the Encouragement of Piety and Virtue, and for the Preventing and Punishing Vice, Profaneness, and Immorality (Edinburgh, 1708).

By the Queen, a proclamation, for a General Thanksgiving (London, 1710).

By the Queen, a proclamation, for a publick thanksgiving (London, 1713).

By the King and Queen, a proclamation for a publick thanksgiving (London, 1691).

By the King and Queen, a proclamation for a publick thanksgiving (London, 1693).

By the King and Queen a proclamation for a publick thanksgiving (London, 1694).

By the King a proclamation for a publick thanksgiving (London, 1696).

By the King a proclamation for a publick thanksgiving (London, 1697).

Newspapers:

British Apollo

British Mercury

Daily Courant

Evening Post
English Post with News Foreign and Domestick
Flying Post or The Post Master
London Gazette
Observator (1702)
Post Boy
Post Man and the Historical Account
Review of the State of the English Nation (Cumulation)
The Spectator
Whipping Post

Secondary Sources:

Books:

- Charles John Abbey, *The English Church and Its Bishops, 1700-1800* (London, 1887).
David C. Agnew, *Protestant Exiles from France in the Reign of Louis XIV* (London, 1886).
George A. Aitken, ed., Swift, *Journal to Stella*, (London, 1901).
P. Backscheider, *Daniel Defoe: His Life* (London, 1992).
S. J. Geoff Baker and Ann McGruer, eds., *Readers, Audiences and Coteries in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2006).
S.J. Barnett, *The Enlightenment and Religion: The Myths of Modernity* (Manchester, 2004).
Stephen B. Baxter, *William III* (London, 1966).
G. V. Bennett, *White Kennett, 1660-1728, Bishop of Peterborough: Study in the Political and Ecclesiastical History of the Early Eighteenth Century* (London, 1957).
G. V. Bennett, *The Tory Crisis in Church and State, 1688-1730: The Career of Francis Atterbury, Bishop of Rochester* (Oxford, 1975).
E. G. W. Bill, *The Queen Anne Churches: a catalogue of the papers in Lambeth Palace Library of the Commission for Building Fifty New Churches in London and Westminster, 1711-1759* (London, 1979).
Jeremy Black, *The English Press in the Eighteenth Century* (Aldershot, 1991).
W. H. Blanch, *The parish of Camberwell: a brief account of the parish of Camberwell: its history and antiquities* (London, 1875).
P.W.M. Blayney, *The Texts of King Lear and their Origins: Nicholas Oakes and the First Quarto* (Cambridge, 1982).

- Peter Borsay, *The English Urban Renaissance: Culture and Society in the Provincial Town 1660-1770* (Oxford, 1989).
- Karin Bowie, *Scottish Public Opinion and the Anglo-Scottish Union, 1699-1707* (Boydell, 2007).
- D. George Boyce, Robert Eccleshall and Vincent Geoghegan eds., *Political Thought in Ireland since the Seventeenth Century* (London, 1993).
- William Bray, ed., *The Diary of John Evelyn* (London, 1907).
- E.W. Brayley, *A topographical history of Surrey* (London, 1841).
- John Brewer, *The Sinews of Power, War, Money and the English State 1688-1783* (London, 1990).
- John Browne, *History of Congregationalism and Memorials of the Churches in Norfolk and Suffolk*, (London, 1877).
- Andrew Browning, *Thomas Osborne, Earl of Danby* (Glasgow, 1951).
- Oscar Browning, ed., *The Journal of Sir George Rooke, Admiral of the Fleet, 1700-1702*, (Naval Records Society, London, 1897).
- R.O. Bucholz, *The Augustan Court* (Stanford, 1993).
- Gilbert Burnet, *Bishop Burnet's History of His Own Time* (London, 1833).
- Donald Burrows, *Handel and the English Chapel Royal* (Oxford, 2005).
- David Cannadine and S. R. F. Price, eds., *Rituals of Royalty: Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies* (Cambridge, 1987).
- David Carnegie, Andrew Agnew, *Protestant Exiles from France, in the Reign of Louis XIV* (1866).
- Edward Carpenter, *Thomas Tenison, and Archbishop of Canterbury: His Life and Times* (London, 1948).
- J.J. Cartwright ed., *The Wentworth Papers, 1705-1739* (London, 1883).
- S.H. Cassan, *The lives of the bishops of Winchester* (2 vols, London, 1827).
- J. A. I. Champion, *The Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken: The Church of England and Its Enemies, 1660-1730* (Cambridge, 1992).
- John Childs, *The Army, James II and the Glorious Revolution* (Manchester, 1980).
- Winston Churchill, *Marlborough: His Life and Times* (3 vols. London, 1933).
- J.C.D. Clark, *English Society 1688-1832: Ideology, Social Structure and Political Practice During the Ancien Regime* (Cambridge, 1985).
- Tony Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution* (Cambridge, 1996).
- Tony Claydon, *William III* (London, 2002).
- Tony Claydon and Ian McBride, eds., *Protestantism and National Identity: Britain and Ireland, C.1650-C.1850* (London, 1998).
- George E. Cokayne, *Complete Peerage of England, Scotland, Ireland, Great Britain and the United Kingdom, Extant Extinct, or Dormant* (London, 1887).
- Patrick Collinson, *From Cranmer to Sancroft: Essays on English Religion in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (London, 2006).
- Linda Colley, *In Defiance of Oligarchy: The Tory Party 1714-60* (Cambridge, 1982).
- Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837* (New Haven, 1992).
- S.J. Connolly, *Religion, Law and Power: The Making of Protestant Ireland 1660-1760* (Oxford, 1992).
- Barry Coward, *The Stuart Age: England, 1603-1714* (Harlow, 2003).
- William Coxe, *Memoirs of Marlborough: With His Original Correspondence* (5 vols, London 1820).
- David Cressy, *Literacy and the Social Order: Reading and Writing in Tudor and Stuart England* (Cambridge, 1980).
- David Cressy, *Bonfires & Bells: National Memory and the Protestant Calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England* (London, 2004).
- Julia C. Crick and Alexandra Walsham, eds., *The Uses of Script and Print, 1300-1700* (Exeter, 2005).
- T. Crosby, *The History of the English Baptists: From the Reformation to the Beginning of the Reign of King George I* (3 vols, London 1738).
- Eveline Cruickshanks, S. Handley, and D. Hayton, eds., *The History of Parliament: The House of Commons, 1690-1715* (5 vols, Cambridge, 2002).
- Eveline Cruickshanks, *The Atterbury Plot* (Basingstoke, 2004).

- T.A. Davies, *The Quakers in English Society, 1655-1725* (Oxford, 2000).
- Charles Edward Doble, David Watson Rannie, and H. E. Salter, eds., *Remarks and Collections of Thomas Hearne* (London, 1885).
- R. Doebner, ed., *Memoirs of Mary, queen of England, (1689-1693): together with her letters and those of Kings James II. and William III. to the Electress, Sophia of Hanover*, (Leipzig, 1886).
- James Alan Downie, *Robert Harley and the Press: Propaganda and Public Opinion in the Age of Swift and Defoe* (Cambridge, 1979).
- Irvin Ehrenpreis, *Swift: the Man, his Works and the Age* (3 vols. London, 1962).
- Elizabeth L. Eisenstein, *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change: Communications and Cultural Transformations in Early-Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 1979).
- George Every, *The High Church Party, 1688-1718* (London, 1956).
- Jennifer Farooq, *Preaching in Eighteenth-Century London* (Woodbridge, 2013).
- Christopher J. Fauske, *Jonathan Swift and the Church of Ireland, 1710-24* (Dublin, 2002).
- Keith Grahame Feiling, *A History of the Tory Party, 1640-1714* (Oxford, 1924).
- Alan David Francis, *The First Peninsular War, 1702-1713* (London, 1975).
- Lori Ann Ferrell and Peter McCullough, eds., *The English Sermon Revised: Religion, Literature and History 1600-1750* (Manchester University Press, 2000).
- K.A. Francis and W. Gibson, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the British Sermon (1689-1901)* (Oxford, 2012).
- E.M. Gray, *The History and Antiquities of Newbury and Its Environs* (Speenhamland, 1839).
- Linda and Marsha Frey, *The Treaties of the War of the Spanish Succession* (Westport CT, 1995).
- Roderick Geike and Isabel A. Montgomery, *The Dutch Barrier 1705-1719* (Cambridge, 1930).
- John S. Gibson, *Playing the Scottish Card: The Franco-Jacobite Invasion of 1708* (Edinburgh, 1988).
- William Gibson, *The Church of England 1688-1832: Unity and Accord* (London, 2001).
- Sidney Godolphin and Henry Leonard Snyder, eds., *The Marlborough-Godolphin Correspondence* (3 vols, Oxford, 1975).
- Alexander Gordon, ed., *Freedom after Ejection: A Review (1690-1692) of Presbyterian and Congregational Nonconformity in England and Wales* (Manchester, 1917).
- Jeremy Gregory and Jeffrey S. Chamberlain, eds., *The National Church in Local Perspective: The Church of England and the Regions, 1660-1800* (London, 2003).
- Ole Peter Grell, Jonathan I. Israel, and Nicholas Tyacke, *From Persecution to Toleration: The Glorious Revolution and Religion in England* (Oxford, 1991).
- David Green, *Queen Anne* (London, 1970).
- Edward Gregg, *Queen Anne* (New Haven; London, 1980).
- Robin D. Gwynn, *The Huguenots of London* (Brighton, 1998).
- Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society* (Cambridge, 1989).
- Ralph Houlbrooke, *Death Religion and the Family in England 1480-1750* (Oxford, 1998).
- Tim Harris, Paul Seaward, and Mark Goldie, eds., *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England* (London, 1990).
- D.W. Hayton, *The Anglo-Irish Experience, 1680-1730: Religion, Identity and Patriotism* (London, 2012).
- Haydon, Taylor and Walsh, eds., *The Church of England, C. 1689-C. 1833: From Toleration to Tractarianism* (Cambridge, 1993).
- B.W. Hill, *Robert Harley: Speaker, Secretary of State and Premier Minister* (New Haven; London, 1988).
- Ingram Hill, *The Six Preachers of Canterbury Cathedral* (London, 1982).
- Geoffrey Holmes, *The Trial of Doctor Sacheverell* (London, 1973).
- Geoffrey Holmes, *British Politics in the Age of Anne* (London, 1987).
- G. Holmes, ed., *Britain after the Glorious Revolution, 1689-1714* (London, 1969).
- Henry Horwitz, *Revolution Politicks: The Career of Daniel Finch Second Earl of Nottingham, 1647-1730* (Cambridge, 1968).

- Henry Horwitz, *Parliament, Policy and Politics in the Reign of William III* (Manchester, 1977).
- Arnold Hunt, *The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and their Audiences 1590-1640* (Cambridge, 2010).
- Joseph Hunter, ed., *The Diary of Ralph Thoresby FRS. (1677-1724). Now First Published from the Original Manuscript* (2 vols, London 1830).
- Joseph Hunter, *The rise of the old Dissent, exemplified in the life of Oliver Heywood, one of the founders of the Presbyterian congregations in the county of York. 1630-1702* (London, 1842).
- Pasi Ihalainen, *Protestant Nations Redefined: Changing Perceptions of National Identity in the Rhetoric of the English, Dutch, and Swedish Public Churches, 1685-1772* (Boston, 2005).
- Charles W. Ingrao, *In Quest and Crisis: Emperor Joseph I and the Habsburg Monarchy* (Indiana, 1979).
- J. Ivimey, *A History of the English Baptists* (4 vols, London, 1814).
- Waltraud M. Jacob, *Lay People and Religion in the Early Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1996).
- Walter D. Jeremy, *The Presbyterian Fund and Dr. Daniel Williams's Trust: With Biographical Notes of the Trustees and Some Account of Their Academies, Scholarships and Schools* (London, 1885).
- Derek Keene, Arthur Burns, and Andrew Saint, eds., *St Paul's: The Cathedral Church of London, 604-2004* (New Haven, 2004).
- J. Klaits, *Printed Propaganda under Louis XIV* (Princeton, 1976).
- Mark Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain: Partisanship and Political Culture* (Oxford, 2005).
- Mark Knights, ed., *Faction Displayed: Reconsidering the Impeachment of Dr Henry Sacheverell* (London, 2012).
- Gary Stuart De Krey, *A Fractured Society: The Politics of London in the First Age of Party, 1688-1715* (Oxford, 1985).
- Barbara Kiefer Lewalski, *The Life of John Milton: A Critical Biography* (Oxford, 2000).
- John Andrew Lacey, *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr* (Woodbridge; Rochester, N.Y., 2003).
- Thomas Lediard, *John Duke of Marlborough*, (2 vols, London, 1743).
- William Hylton Dyer Longstaffe, ed., *Memoirs of the Life of Mr. Ambrose Barnes, Late Merchant and Sometime Alderman of Newcastle upon Tyne* (London, 1867).
- J.A. Lynn, *The Wars of Louis XIV, 1667-174* (London, 1999).
- Maynard Mack, *Alexander Pope: A Life* (New Haven; London, 1985).
- James Mackinnon, *The Union of England and Scotland: A Study of International History* (London, 1896).
- Falconer Madan, *A Critical Bibliography of Dr. Henry Sacheverell* (Lawrence, KA, 1978).
- Joseph McCormick, *State-Papers and Letters, Addressed to William Carstares* (Edinburgh, 1774).
- W.R. and V.B. McLeod, *Anglo-Scottish Tracts, 1701-1714: A Descriptive Checklist* (Lawrence, KA, 1979).
- Peter E. McCullough, *Sermons at Court: Politics and Religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean Preaching* (Cambridge, 1998).
- Peter E. McCullough and Lori Anne Ferrell, *The English Sermon Revised: Religion, Literature and History 1600-1750* (Manchester, 2000).
- Peter McCullough, Hugh Adlington, and Emma Rhatigan, eds, *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon* (Oxford, 2011).
- John Miller, *James II: A Study in Kingship* (Hove, 1978).
- Allan I. Macinnes, *Union and Empire: The Making of the United Kingdom in 1707* (Cambridge, 2007).
- Paul Kléber Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People, 1688-1788* (Cambridge, 1989).
- Mary Morrissey, *Politics and the Paul's Cross Sermons, 1558-1642* (Oxford, 2011).
- David Ogg, *England in the Reign of Charles II* (Oxford, 1955).
- David Ogg, *England in the Reigns of James II and William III* (Oxford, 1955).
- John Oldmixon, *The history of England, during the reigns of King William and Queen Mary, Queen Anne, King George I* (London, 1735).
- George D'Oyly, *The Life of William Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury* (London, 1821).
- David Onnekink, *The Anglo-Dutch Favourite: The Career of Hans Willem Bentinck, 1st Earl of Portland (1649-1709)* (Aldershot, 2007).

- David Onnekink, ed., *War and Religion after Westphalia, 1648-1713* (Aldershot, 2009).
- David Onnekink, ed., *Redefining William III, the Impact of the King-Stadholder in International Context* (Aldershot, 2007).
- John Henry Overton, *The Nonjurors: Their Lives, Principles, and Writings* (London, 1902).
- John Beresford Owen, *The Rise of the Pelhams* (London, 1971).
- Panikos Panayi, ed., *Germans in Britain since 1500* (London, 1996).
- Steven C. A. Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution* (New Haven, 2009).
- J.H. Plumb, *Sir Robert Walpole* (London, 1972).
- Philip O'Regan, *Archbishop William King of Dublin* (Dublin, 2000).
- P.W.J. Riley, *The English Ministers and Scotland 1707-1727* (London, 1964).
- N.A.M. Rodger, *The Wooden World: An Anatomy of the Georgian Navy* (London, 1986).
- Rachel Russell, *The Letters of Lady Rachel Russell: From the Originals at Woburn Abbey* (London, 1819).
- William L. Sachse, *Lord Somers: A Political Portrait* (Manchester, 1975).
- Lois G. Schworer, *The Declaration of Rights, 1689* (Baltimore; London, 1981).
- P.H. Scott and Saltire Society, *The Union of 1707: Why and How?* (Edinburgh, 2006).
- Romney Sedgwick, ed., *The History of Parliament: The House of Commons, 1715–1754* (2 vols, London, 1970).
- Kevin Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions: The Politics of Reading in Early Modern England* (New Haven, CT; London, 2000).
- Kevin Sharpe and Stephen N. Zwickler, eds., *Reading, Society and Politics in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2003).
- Kevin Sharpe, *Selling the Tudor Monarchy: Authority and Image in Sixteenth-Century England* (New Haven, Conn.; London, 2009).
- Kevin Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule: The Restoration and Revolution Monarchy, 1660-1714* (New Haven, Conn.; London, 2013).
- J.G. Simms, *The Williamite Confiscation in Ireland, 1690-1703* (London, 1956).
- J.G. Simms, *The Jacobite Parliament of 1689* (Dundalk, 1966).
- J.G. Simms, *Jacobite Ireland, 1685-91* (London, 1969).
- Samuel Smiles, *The Huguenots: Their Settlements, Churches, and Industries, in England and Ireland* (London, 1889).
- H. Smith, *Georgian Monarchy: Politics and Culture, 1715-1760* (Cambridge, 2006).
- Malcolm Smuts, *Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England* (Philadelphia, 1987).
- C. Johann Sommerville, *The Secularization of Early Modern England: From Religion Culture to Religious Faith* (New York, 1992).
- W.A. Speck, *Stability and Strife: England, 1714-1760* (London, 1977).
- W.A. Speck, *Reluctant Revolutionaries: Englishmen and the Revolution of 1688* (Oxford, 1988).
- John Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689* (New Haven, 1991).
- Gerald Milton Straka, *Anglican Reaction to the Revolution of 1688* (Madison, Wisconsin., 1962).
- Jeffrey Stephen, *Scottish Presbyterians and the Act of Union* (Edinburgh, 2007).
- Jeffrey Stephen, *Defending the Revolution: The Church of Scotland 1689–1716* (Routledge, 2013).
- Agnes Strickland and Elizabeth Strickland, *The lives of the seven bishops committed to the Tower in 1688* (London, 1866).
- Surtees Society, *Memoirs of the Life of Mr. Ambrose Barnes, Late Merchant and Sometime Alderman of Newcastle Upon Tyne. With an Index* (Durham, 1867).
- W.H. Summers, *History of the Congregational Churches in the Berks, South Oxen and South Bucks Association* (Newbury, 1905).
- Norman Sykes, *Church and State in England in the XVIIIth Century* (Cambridge, 1934).
- Norman Sykes, *Edmund Gibson* (Oxford, 1926).

- D. Szechi, *Jacobitism and Tory Politics 1710-14* (Edinburgh, 2003).
- Edward Maunde Thompson and Camden Society (Great Britain), eds., *Letters of Humphrey Prideaux, Sometime Dean of Norwich, to John Ellis, Sometime under-Secretary of State, 1674-1722* (London, 1875).
- G.M. Trevelyan, *England under Queen Anne* (3 vols, London, 1930-4).
- H.R. Trevor-Roper, *Archbishop Laud, 1573-1645* (London, 1962).
- W. Troost, *William III, the Stadholder-King: A Political Biography* (Aldershot, 2005).
- John Watkins, *Representing Elizabeth in Stuart England: Literature, History, Sovereignty* (Cambridge, 2002).
- Douglas Watt, *The Price of Scotland: Darien, Union and the Wealth of the Nations* (Edinburgh, 2006).
- E.A. Webb, 'The monastic buildings: The outer court', in *The Records of St Bartholomew's Priory and St Bartholomew the Great, West Smithfield*: (2 vols, Oxford, 1921).
- James Anderson Winn, *Queen Anne: Patroness of Arts* (Oxford; New York, 2014).
- Christopher A. Whatley, *The Scots and the Union* (Edinburgh, 2006).
- Walter Wilson, *The history and antiquities of Dissenting churches and meeting houses in London, Westminster, and Southwark: including the lives of their ministers, from the rise of nonconformity to the present time: with an appendix on the origin, progress, and present state of Christianity in Britain* (4 vols, London, 1808).
- Walter Wilson, *Memoirs of the Life and Time of Daniel De Foe: Containing a Review of His Writings and His Opinions Upon a Variety of Important Matters, Civil and Ecclesiastical* (London, 1830).
- Abigail Williams, ed., *Journal to Stella: Letters to Esther Johnson and Rebecca Dingley, 1710-1713. By Jonathan Swift* (Cambridge, 2013).

Articles:

- J.D. Alsop, 'The Detection of Matthew Prior's Peace Mission of 1711', *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vii (1984) pp.61-7.
- A. Aspinall, 'Statistical Accounts of the London Newspapers in the Eighteenth Century', *English Historical Review*, lxiii (1948), pp.201-32.
- Nigel Aston, 'Queen Anne and Oxford: The Royal Visit of 1702 and Its Aftermath', *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, xxxvii (2014), pp.171-84.
- Alex W. Barber, 'Censorship, Salvation and the Preaching of Francis Higgins: A Reconsideration of High Church Politics and Theology in the Early 18th Century', *Parliamentary History*, xxxiii (2014), pp.114-39.
- Peter Barber, 'Marlborough as Imperial Prince, 1704-1717', *British Library Journal*, viii (1982), pp.46-79.
- Daniel A. Baugh, 'Great Britain's 'Blue-Water' Policy, 1689-1815', *The International History Review*, x (1988), pp.33-58.
- J.C. Beckett, 'The Government and the Church of Ireland under William III and Anne', *Irish Historical Studies*, ii (1941), pp.280-302.
- Robert Beddard, 'The Guildhall Declaration of 11 December 1688 and the Counter-Revolution of the Loyalists', *The Historical Journal*, xi (1968), pp.403-420.
- G.V. Bennett, 'Robert Harley, the Godolphin Ministry, and the Bishops Crisis of 1707', *English Historical Review*, lxxxii (1967), pp.726-746.
- David Berman, 'Simon Browne: The Soul-Murdered Theologian', *History of Psychiatry*, vii (1996) pp 257-263.
- J.A.O.C. Brown, Anglo-Moroccan Relations and the Embassy of Ahmad Qardanash, 1706-1708. *The Historical Journal*, li (2008), pp.599-620.

- W. Bliss et al., 'The Duke of Marlborough's Letters at the Hague', *English Historical Review*, xi (1896), pp.117-20.
- Karin Bowie, 'Public Opinion, Popular Politics and the Union of 1707', *The Scottish Historical Review*, lxxxii (2003), pp.226-260.
- R.O. Bucholz, 'Nothing but Ceremony': Queen Anne and the Limitations of Royal Ritual', *Journal of British Studies*, xxx (1991), pp.288-323.
- Douglas S. Coombs, 'The Augmentation of 1709: A Study in the Workings of the Anglo-Dutch Alliance', *English Historical Review*, lxxii (1957), pp.642-661.
- Edward Corp, 'James II and David Nairne: The Exiled King and his First Biographer', *English Historical Review*, cxxxix (2014), pp.1383-1411.
- Brian Cowan, 'The Spin Doctor: Sacheverell's Trial Speech and Political Performance in the Divided Society', *Parliamentary History*, xxxi (2012), pp.28-46.
- Brian Cowan, 'The Rise of the Coffeehouse Reconsidered', *The Historical Journal*, xxxvii (2004), pp.21-46.
- Eveline Cruickshanks, David Hayton, and Clyve Jones, 'Divisions in the House of Lords on the Transfer of the Crown and Other Issues, 1689-94: Ten New Lists', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, liii (1980), pp.56-87.
- Gary S. De Krey, 'Political Radicalism in London after the Glorious Revolution', *The Journal of Modern History*, lv (1983), pp.585-617.
- H.T. Dickinson, 'The Poor Palatines and the Parties,' *English Historical Review*, lxxxii (1967), pp.464-485.
- H.T. Dickinson, 'The October Club', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, xxxiii (1970), pp.155-173.
- R. Doebner, 'Spanheim's Account of the English Court', *English Historical Review*, ii (1887), pp.757-73.
- David Eltis, 'The Volume and African Origins of the British Slave Trade before 1714', *Cahiers d'Etudes Africaines*, xxxv (1995), pp.617-27.
- E Cruickshanks, 'Charles Spencer, Third Earl of Sunderland, and Jacobitism', *English Historical Review*, cxiii (1998), pp.65-76.
- J. Farooq, 'Preaching for the Queen: Queen Anne and English Sermon Culture, 1702-1714', *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, xxxvii (2014), pp.159-69.
- H.N. Fieldhouse, 'St John and Savoy in the War of the Spanish Succession', *English Historical Review*, 1 (1935), pp. 278-91.
- H.N. Fieldhouse, 'Bolingbroke's Share in the Jacobite Intrigue of 1710-14', *English Historical Review*, lii (1937), pp.443-59.
- Paul S. Fritz, 'The Trade in Death: The Royal Funerals in England, 1685-1830', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, xv (1982), pp.291-316.
- Alex Garganigo, 'William without Mary: Mourning Sensibly in the Public Sphere', *The Seventeenth Century*, xxiii (2008), pp.105-41.
- Gerald Straka, 'The Final Phase of Divine Right Theory in England, 1688-1702', *English Historical Review*, lxxvii (1962), pp.638-58.
- William Gibson, 'William Talbot and Church Parties 1688-1730', *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, lviii, no. 1 (2007) pp.26-48.
- Mark Goldie and John Spurr, 'Politics and the Restoration Parish: Edward Fowler and the Struggle for St Giles Cripplegate', *English Historical Review*, cix (1994), pp.572-96.
- Eric J. Graham, 'In Defence of the Scottish Maritime Interest, 1681-1713', *The Scottish Historical Review*, lxxi (1992), pp.88-109.
- Edward Gregg, 'Was Queen Anne a Jacobite?' *History*, lvii (1972), pp.358-375
- Edward Gregg, 'Marlborough in Exile, 1712-1714', *The Historical Journal*, xv (1972), pp.593-618.
- Phyllis J. Guskin, 'Political Implications of Thomas Swift's Sermon 'Noah's Dove' (1710). *Eighteenth-Century Literature* i (1975), pp. 46-50.
- John Habakkuk, 'Presidential Address: The Rise and Fall of English Landed Families, 1600-1800', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, xxix (1979), pp.187-207.

- John Habakkuk, 'Presidential Address: The Rise and Fall of English Landed Families, 1600-1800: Ii', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, xxx (1980), pp.199-221.
- John Habakkuk, 'Presidential Address: The Rise and Fall of English Landed Families, 1600-1800: Iii. Did the Gentry Rise?', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, xxxi (1981), pp.195-217.
- Bob Harris, 'Scotland's herring fisheries and the prosperity of the nation', *Scottish Historical Review*, lxxix (2000), pp.39-60
- Frances Harris, 'The Honourable Sisterhood: Queen Anne's Maids of Honour', *British Library Journal*, xix (1993), pp.59-70
- Jonathan Harris, 'The Grecian Coffee House and Political Debate in London 1688-1714', *The London Journal*, xxv (2000), pp.1-13.
- Tim Harris, 'Was the Tory Reaction Popular?: Attitudes of Londoners Towards the Persecution of Dissent, 1681-6.' *The London Journal*, xiii (1987), pp.106-120.
- John B. Hattendorf, 'English Grand Strategy and the Blenheim Campaign of 1704', *The International History Review*, v (1983), pp.3-19.
- D.W. Hayton, 'The High Church Party in the Irish Convocation 1703-1712', in Hermann J. Real and Helgard Stover-Leidig, eds., *Reading Swift: Papers from The First Münster Symposium on Jonathan Swift* (Munich, 1998), pp.126-27.
- G.V.M. Heap, 'Dissenting Influence in a Seventeenth-Century Grammar School,' *Journal of Educational Administration and History* xiv (1982), pp.1-9.
- B.W. Hill, 'The Change of Government and The 'Loss of the City', 1710-1711', *The Economic History Review*, xxiv (1971), pp.395-413.
- B.W. Hill, 'Oxford, Bolingbroke, and the Peace of Utrecht', *The Historical Journal*, xvi (1973), pp.241-263.
- Eric Hinderaker, 'The "Four Indian Kings" And the Imaginative Construction of the First British Empire', *The William and Mary Quarterly*, liii (1996), pp.487-526.
- G.S. Holmes and W. A. Speck, 'The Fall of Harley in 1708 Reconsidered', *English Historical Review*, lxxx (1965), pp.673-98.
- Julian Hoppit, 'Financial Crises in Eighteenth-Century England', *The Economic History Review*, xxxix (1986), pp.39-58.
- Julian Hoppit, 'Attitudes to Credit in Britain, 1680-1790', *The Historical Journal*, xxxiii (1990), pp.305-322.
- Julian Hoppit, 'Political Arithmetic in Eighteenth-Century England', *The Economic History Review*, xxxix (1996), pp.516-540.
- Robert D. Horn, 'Marlborough's First Biographer: Dr. Francis Hare', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, xx (1957), pp.145-162.
- Lee Horsley, 'Vox Populi' In the Political Literature of 1710', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, xxxviii (1975), pp.335-353.
- S.H.F. Johnston, 'The Scots Army in the Reign of Anne', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, iii (1953), pp.1-21.
- Clyve Jones, 'Godolphin, the Whig Junto and the Scots: A New Lords' Division List from 1709', *The Scottish Historical Review*, lviii (1979), pp.158-174.
- Clyve Jones, 'The Politics and the Financial Costs of an Episcopal Appointment in the Early Eighteenth Century: The Promotion of William Wake to the Bishopric of Lincoln in 1705', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, liii (1990), pp.119-29.
- Peter Jones 'Antoine De Guiscard, 'Abbé de la Bourlie', 'Marquis de Guiscard' *British Library Journal* viii (London,1982)
- Benjamin Klein, 'Between the Bums and Bellies of the Multitudes': Civic Pageantry and the Problem of the Audience in Late Stuart London', *The London Journal*, xvii (1992), pp.18-26.
- Mark Knights, 'The Tory Interpretation of History in the Rage of Parties', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, lxviii (2005), pp.353-73.
- L.G. Wickham Legg, 'Torcy's Account of Matthew Prior's Negotiations at Fontainebleau in July 1711',

- English Historical Review*, xxix (1914), pp.525-32.
- R. Barry Levis, 'The Failure of the Anglican-Prussian Ecumenical Effort of 1710-1714', *Church History*, xlvii (1978), pp.381-99.
- Randall McGowen, "'He Beareth not the Sword in Vain"; Religion and the Criminal Law in Eighteenth Century England' in *Eighteenth-Century Studies* xxi (1987) pp. 192-211.
- Angus McInnes, 'The Appointment of Harley in 1704', *Historical Journal*, xi (1968), pp.255-71.
- Robert McJimsey, 'Shaping the Revolution in Foreign Policy: Parliament and the Press, 1689-1730', *Parliamentary History*, xxv (2006), pp 17-31.
- J. McTague, 'Anti-Catholicism, Incurability and Credulity in the Warming-Pan Scandal of 1688-9', *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, xxxvi (2013), pp. 433-448.
- W. Gregory Monahan, 'Lyon in the Crisis of 1709: Royal Absolutism, Administrative Innovation, and Regional Politics', *French Historical Studies*, xvi (1990), pp.833-48.
- Paul Monod, 'Jacobitism and Country Principles in the Reign of William III', *The Historical Journal*, xxx (1987), pp.289-310.
- Mary Morrissey, 'Scripture, style and persuasion in seventeenth century English theories of peaching' *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, liii, no. 4 (2002), pp686-706.
- William Thomas Morgan, 'The South Sea Company and the Canadian Expedition in the Reign of Queen Anne', *The Hispanic American Historical Review*, viii (1928), pp.143-66.
- T.F.M. Newton, 'William Pittis and Queen Anne Journalism. (Continued)', *Modern Philology*, xxxiii (1936), pp.279-302.
- Jamel Ostwald, 'The "Decisive" Battle of Ramillies, 1706: Prerequisites for Decisiveness in Early Modern Warfare', *The Journal of Military History*, lxiv (2000), pp.649-77.
- Derek J. Patrick, 'The Kirk, Parliament and the Union, 1706-1707', *The Scottish History Review*, lxxxvii: (2008(supplement)) pp.94-115.
- Derek J. Patrick, Christopher A. Whatley, 'Persistence, Principle and Patriotism in the Making of the Union of 1707: The Revolution, Scottish Parliament and the *squadron volante*.' *History*. April 2007, xcii, Issue 306, p.162-186.
- Ciro Paoletti, 'Prince Eugene of Savoy, the Toulon Expedition of 1707, and the English Historians: A Dissenting View', *The Journal of Military History*, lxx (2006), pp.939-62.
- J.H. Plumb, 'The Organization of the Cabinet in the Reign of Queen Anne', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, vii (1957), pp.137-57.
- A. Raffae, 'Presbyterians and Episcopalians: the Formation of Confessional Cultures in Scotland, 1660-1715' *English Historical Review* cxxv (2010), pp.570-598
- Joseph Richardson, 'Archbishop William King (1650-1729): 'Church Tory and State Whig'', *Eighteenth-Century Ireland*, xv (2000), pp.54-76.
- Clayton Roberts, 'The Fall of the Godolphin Ministry', *Journal of British Studies*, xxii (1982), pp.71-93.
- John C. Rule, 'A Career in the Making: The Education of Jean-Baptiste Colbert, Marquis De Torcy', *French Historical Studies*, xix (1996), pp.967-95.
- Kevin Sharpe, "Private Conscience and Public Duty in the Writings of Charles I," *The Historical Journal*, xl (1997), pp.643-65.
- Kevin Sharpe, "Representations and Negotiations: Texts, Images, and Authority in Early Modern England," *The Historical Journal*, xlii (1999), pp.853-8.
- G. Findlay Shirras and J. H. Craig, 'Sir Isaac Newton and the Currency', *The Economic Journal*, lv (1945), pp.217-41.
- Hannah Smith, 'Last of All the Heavenly Birth?: Queen Anne and Sacral Queenship' *Parliamentary History*, xxviii (2009), pp137-49.
- Andrew Sneddon, 'What the Witchcraft Bishop Did in Ireland: The Controversial Career of Francis Hutchinson. 1660-1739', *History Ireland*, xxviii (2010), pp.22-25.
- Henry L. Snyder, 'The Formulation of Foreign and Domestic Policy in the Reign of Queen Anne: Memoranda by Lord Chancellor Cowper of Conversations with Lord Treasurer Godolphin', *The Historical Journal*, xi (1968), pp.144-60.

- Henry L. Snyder, 'The Last Days of Queen Anne: The Account of Sir John Evelyn Examined', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, xxxiv (1971), pp.262-76.
- Henry L. Snyder, 'Queen Anne Versus the Junto: The Effort to Place Orford at the Head of the Admiralty in 1709', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, xxxv (1972), pp.323-42.
- H.L. Snyder, 'The Duke of Marlborough's Request of His Captain-Generalcy for Life: A Re-examination', *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research*, xlv (1967), pp.67-83.
- W.A. Speck, 'The choice of a Speaker in 1705', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, xxxvII (May 1964), pp.20-35.
- A.E. Stamp, 'The Meeting of the Duke of Marlborough and Charles Xii. At Altranstadt, April 1707', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, xii (1898), pp.103-16.
- Jeffrey Stephen, 'National Fasting and the Politics of Prayer: Anglo-Scottish Union, 1707', *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, ii (2009), pp.294-316.
- Jeffrey Stephen, 'Defending the Revolution: The Church of Scotland and the Scottish Parliament, 1689-95', *The Scottish Historical Review*, lxxxix (2010), pp.239-41.
- James R. Sutherland, 'The Circulation of Newspapers and Literary Periodicals, 1700-30', *Library*, xv (1934), pp.110-124
- Paul R. Sweet, 'Prince Eugene of Savoy and Central Europe', *The American Historical Review*, lvii (1951), pp.47-62.
- N. Sykes, 'The Cathedral Chapter of Exeter and the General Election of 1705', *English Historical Review*, xlv (1930), pp.260-72.
- N. Sykes, 'Queen Anne and the Episcopate', *English Historical Review*, l (1935), pp. 433-64
- Daniel Szechi, 'Constructing a Jacobite: The Social and Intellectual Origins of George Lockhart of Carnwath', *The Historical Journal*, xl (1997), pp.977-96.
- Daniel Szechi, 'Jacobite Politics in the Age of Anne' *Parliamentary History*, xxviii (2009), pp. 41-58.
- Grant Tapsell, 'Laurence Hyde and the Politics of Religion in Later Stuart England', *English Historical Review*, cxxv. (2010), pp.1414-1448.
- David Taylor, 'The Rising Sun Gains Advantage: The Iconography of George of Denmark as Royal Consort', *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, xxxvii (2014), pp. 245-257.
- Michael Treadwell, 'Swift, Richard Coleire, and the Origins of Gulliver's Travels', *The Review of English Studies*, xxxiv (1983), pp.304-11.
- G.M. Trevelyan, 'The "Jersey" Period of the Negotiations Leading to the Peace of Utrecht', *English Historical Review*, xlix (1934), pp.100-05.
- Evert Jan Van Leeuwen, 'Funeral Sermons and Graveyard Poetry: The Ecstasy of Death and Bodily Resurrection' *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, xxxii (3) (2009) pp.353-371.
- Brodie Waddell, 'The Politics of Economic Distress in the Aftermath of the Glorious Revolution, 1689-1702', *English Historical Review*, cxxx (2015), pp.318-351.
- R.B. Walker, 'The Newspaper Press in the Reign of William III', *The Historical Journal*, xvii (1974), pp.691-709.
- John Wells and Douglas Wills, 'Revolution, Restoration, and Debt Repudiation: The Jacobite Threat to England's Institutions and Economic Growth', *The Journal of Economic History*, lx (2000), pp.418-41.
- Christopher A. Whatley, 'Salt, coal and the union of 1707: a revision article', *Scottish Historical Review*, lxvi (1987), pp.26-45.
- Christopher A. Whatley and Derek J. Patrick, 'Contesting Interpretations of the Union of 1707: The Abuse and Use of George Lockhart of Carnwath's Memoirs', *Journal of Scottish Historical Studies*, xxvii (2007), pp.24-47.
- Jeffrey R. Wigelsworth, 'Bipartisan Politics and Practical Knowledge: Advertising of Public Science in Two London Newspapers, 1695-1720', *The British Journal for the History of Science*, xvi (2008), pp.517-40.
- William Thomas Whitley 'A Baptist Governor of Madras in 1716', *Baptist Quarterly* vii (1934), pp.123-137

- M.R.F. Williams, 'Between King, Faith and Reason: Father Peter Talbot (SJ) and Catholic Royalist Thought in Exile', *English Historical Review*, cxxvii. (2012), pp.1063-1097.
- Roger Wines, 'The Imperial Circles, Princely Diplomacy and Imperial Reform 1681-1714', *The Journal of Modern History*, xxxix (1967), pp.1-29.
- Rochelle Ziskin, 'The Place De Nos Conquêtes and the Unraveling of the Myth of Louis XIV', *The Art Bulletin*, lxxiv (1994), pp.147-62.

Doctoral Theses:

- James Caudle, 'Measures of Allegiance, Sermon Culture and the Creation of a Public Discourse of Obedience and Resistance in Georgian Britain' (Yale Ph.D. thesis, 1996).
- D.W. Hayton, 'Ireland and the English Ministers 1707-16' (University of Oxford, D.Phil. thesis, 1975).
- A.D.G. Steers, "'New Light Thinking" and Non-Subscription amongst Protestant Dissenters in England and Ireland in the early 18th Century and their relationship with Glasgow University and Scotland', (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Glasgow, 2006)