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NOTE

All dates are given in Old Style unless stated otherwise. The year is taken to have started on 1 January.

In accordance with the convention which has been developed by historians of the early-modern court, the text distinguishes between the 'household' (or the 'royal household'), meaning all the departments employing domestic servants of the king, and the 'Household', meaning the department of the Lord Steward. The 'court' should be taken to mean the entire community resident within the royal palaces. For this reason, capitals have been used for the names of all departments and all government offices, except military positions. The practice in the use of capitalization has been adjusted throughout.
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INTRODUCTION

On 26 August 1663 Charles II wrote to the Lord Steward of his Household, the duke of Ormond, who, because he was also Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, was then living in Dublin. In this letter the king informed him of the details of a major reform which was to take place within the court departments over which he presided. Ormond had already known something of what was being planned but, not having been consulted, he had waited until receiving this official notification before presuming to send his thoughts to the king.¹ When he wrote his reply, he did not object to what was being proposed but he did advise caution.

I conceive the Established forme of your housekeeping to be of great Antiquity in the fundamentall parts of it, & to have acquired so much veneration amongst the people, that it is become a considerable part in the Governem[en]t & greatnesse of the State: The legall Jurisdiction & the allowed priviledges of your household Servants are constant instances and remembrances to the people of the power & Maj[es]tie of the King and of the duty & Obedience they owe him, and certainly such Advantages are not to be parted with, or lessened, but for some other that are visably or certainly greater, or when they can bee held no longer. If it be thought the household can bee dissolved or retrenched and the jurisdiction & priviledges belonging to it not fall in the whole or in proportion, I doubt it will not prove so, for Jurisdiction not frequently exercised & priviledge rarely made use of do always impaire & sometimes extinguish, nor are there any Jurisdictions or Im[m]unities in or belonging to the Crowne that I can think of but such as have also some advantage to the people, or to some order of them, and if that be taken away or lessened the Jurisdiction or Im[m]unity becomes a burden without Supporters, or with so many the fewer...²

Such examples of royal servants writing down how they thought of the institution which employed them are very rare from the late seventeenth century and these comments are all the more important because, as Lord Steward to Charles II and then to James II, Ormond was better placed than almost anyone else to uphold the moral purpose which he took to be the true calling of the royal household. It may seem that any association of the idea of moral purpose with the Restoration court can only be incongruous. As Ormond’s comments indicate, this would be a mistake. To him, to the bulk of the royal servants and to most of the rest of the king’s subjects, it was because there was nothing in the least incongruous with this idea that they found the debaucheries of a privileged few so deplorable. In a society where it was the most banal of commonplaces to think of the kingdom as a household, the king’s actual household could hardly be seen as anything other than a microcosm of the whole. If his authority over his subjects was as a master over his family, then it followed that the king’s

¹ He had already received letters from Anglesey and Henry Bennet warning him what to expect. (HMC Ormonde, ns III, p. 64, 67, 69, 71, 74, 78, 81-2; Bodl. MS Carte 221, fols. 77-8, Bennet to Ormond, 22 Aug 1663).
² Bodl. MS Clarendon 80, fol. 189, [Ormond] to Charles II, 9 Sept 1663. Although this is only a copy and does not indicate who the sender was, there is no doubt that the letter is by Ormond.
authority over his own 'family' was the truest expression of regal power. A well-ordered, virtuous, contented and affluent kingdom seemed possible only if the court was such and for it not to be was something to be feared.³

There is now no longer any dispute about the centrality of the royal household in early-modern English government. Yet the late seventeenth century still stands out as the major gap amidst the considerable quantity of research which has, over the past quarter-century, been produced on the subject.⁴ This omission has been all the more striking given that administrative history and high-political biography are two of the undoubted strengths within the field of Restoration history.⁵ It is hoped that this represents a satisfactory beginning to the process by which the salient lesson derived from the existing works on the early-modern court, that it is too fruitful an area of study to be ignored, is applied to this period.

For such a start, concentration on the brief reign of James II has certain advantages. One of these is not that it provides what could be thought of as a typical snapshot. Rather, as will be shown, it is because it was, in many respects, untypical that it makes a useful standpoint from which to set about an initial survey of what had gone before and what would come after. James's household cannot be viewed in isolation and much will be said about developments under Charles II. The treatment of some of the themes, moreover, can only be completed by examining aspects of the court of William III and these are dealt with in the final chapter.

Throughout James is a perpetual presence. This is only to be expected in a work which sets out to give some answers to questions which include who it was who served him, in what manner did he manage his household, what effect did his religion have on the life of the court, to what extent did his servants support him and what happened when his power was taken from him. The king was the single reason for the existence of the household and that he must dominate any study of it is a true reflection of how far he did dominate it. Nevertheless, although some of it may illuminate aspects of his character in new ways, what is said of James here is not supposed to be a rounded portrait of him. The real figures of attention should be those who surrounded him and it would be unfair to assume that they are important only to the extent that they

---

³ Laslett has observed the link between the royal household and patriarchal theories of government. (P. Laslett (ed.), Patriarchia and other Political Works of Sir Robert Filmer, (Oxford, 1949), p. 25.
⁴ The volume edited by David Starkey on The English Court from the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War, (1987), testifies to the extent of the work which has been done on the courts of the Tudor and early Stuart monarchs and is the best introduction to the subject. The early eighteenth century is covered by J.M. Beattie, The English Court in the reign of George I, (Cambridge, 1967), and R.O. Bucholz, 'The court in the reign of Queen Anne', unpublished D.Phil thesis, Oxford, 1987.
⁵ As long ago as 1925 the administrative reforms within the royal household under Charles II were identified as a subject worth investigation. (F.M.G. Higham and C.S.S. Higham, 'The reign of Charles II as a field for research', BIHR, II, (1925), pp. 10-11. More recently Professor Jones has noted the need for 'serious studies' on the Restoration court. (J.R. Jones, The Revolution of 1688 in England, (1972, reprinted 1988), p. 338).
acted as means by which their master’s commands could be implemented. That many of
them would themselves have assumed no more than that and would not have expected
that they would be of interest to historians is no reason why they do not deserved to be
remembered.
CHAPTER ONE: JAMES II AND HIS COURTiers

I

Charles II died in the hour before noon on 6 February 1685. His brother then withdrew to his closet to compose himself while the Privy Councillors waited in the Council Chamber nearby. When he was ready, James joined them and opened the proceedings of the Accession Council with the speech which all have agreed was exactly right for the occasion. Its message of continuity matched that of the traditional rituals of a royal accession which began to unfold as soon as he had finished speaking.

The Privy Councillors were reappointed and resworn. Guilford, Halifax, Sunderland and Middleton handed over the Great Seal, the Privy Seal and the Signet which were then returned to them. It was ordered that a proclamation was to be issued declaring that all royal officials were to be allowed to remain in office. The Board of Green cloth was informed that the existing Household establishment was to remain in force for the time being. Only after it had dealt with these matters did the Council order that the new king be proclaimed and that the late king be buried.1

Once the accession ceremonies were over James began to demonstrate that his promises of continuity and the symbolism of the rituals were to be continued in the practical matter of who got which positions. Apart from the appointment of Rochester to the Treasury and the few changes which followed from it, all the major appointments outside his own household were given to those who already had them. Sunderland and Middleton remained as the Secretaries of State, Guilford as Lord Chancellor, Feversham as Lord Chamberlain to Queen Catherine and Dartmouth as Master of the Ordnance. Likewise, in Scotland Queensberry remained as Lord Treasurer, Perth as Lord Chancellor, and Moray and Lundin as the Secretaries of State while in Wales Beaufort continued as Lord President of the Council of the Marches. Regarding Ireland, with Rochester no longer available to be the Lord Lieutenant designate to replace Ormond, James appointed Clarendon, the closest alternative. It was also Clarendon who became Lord Privy Seal after Halifax was moved to fill Rochester's other old position, that of Lord President of the Council. Conveniently, as Mary Beatrice needed a Lord Chamberlain now that she had become the queen consort, this was given to Godolphin, who, as the First Commissioner of the Treasury, was the one other senior courtier who needed to be moved as a result of Rochester's transfer. This and the following chapter will describe how there were greater upheavals among some of the senior members of the royal household but, even in these cases, there was still a stress on continuity.

1 PC 2/71, fols. 6-9, 6 Feb 1685.
It could be argued that reappointing Sunderland was James's biggest mistake and so is a warning against complacently assuming magnanimity to have been unquestionably to James's advantage. Yet there is also evidence which suggests that that magnanimity could have been little more than cynicism. In the course of several conversations with him, James explained to the French ambassador, Barillon, his thinking behind these appointments. He assured Barillon that his main aim had been to create a good impression but, aside from the public relations purposes, he claimed that this was a way of retaining control over the anglican courtiers. The threat of dismissal and the promise of office could be used to ensure that both those who were in and those who were out would be more inclined to support him. How serious these comments are to be taken is debatable. Keen to convince Louis XIV of his commitment to catholicism, James probably made them largely to reassure Barillon, who was concerned that none of the great offices had been given to a catholic, although his comments do show that James was fully aware that court appointments could be exploited in this way. There is another reason to doubt that these were mere exercises in cynicism for the most striking feature of the changes is that those who benefitted most from them, namely Rochester, Clarendon, Peterborough and Dartmouth, were simply his best friends. It would have been astonishing had Rochester and Clarendon, his brothers-in-law, not received high office.

That Peterborough and Dartmouth became Groom of the Stole and Master of the Horse was no less predictable. In these same offices in James's household they had been the most important of his servants and by appointing them to the equivalent offices in his new household he was clearly signalling that he wanted his relations with them to remain unaltered. Both however had to face objections from their predecessors before they were allowed to take up their new positions. Following Charles II's death it rapidly became evident that Bath would not be reappointed as Groom of the Stole and, although there were rumours that he would be compensated by becoming the Lord Chamberlain, by 17 February he had submitted a petition arguing that his patent had been for life. In making this bid to retain his place, he would have been aware that he did not possess Peterborough's advantage of having been closely associated with James during the 'exclusion crisis' but, having instead been associated with Danby, he had, at least, demonstrated greater reliability than many courtiers. He had, alone among


the Gentlemen of the Bedchamber, voted against Stafford’s conviction for treason and had been especially active in the remodelling of the electorally vital Cornish corporations, returning to London in November 1684 ‘well loaden with western charters’. He was correct if he thought that James held such dependability in high regard. What gave his arguments some weight was uncertainty over the legal status of life patents following a change of monarch. Given the exceptional circumstances of the previous accession, it was sixty years since there had been a comparable situation so the issue was bound to give rise to a certain amount of confusion. The ruling of the lawyers that all patents should lapse was a serious blow to Bath. It cost him not only the Groomship of the Stole but also most of his pension and, subsequently, the dukedom of Albemarle.

A further blow was that his claim for the mourning hangings used in the Bedchamber was disallowed. With Bath’s objections disallowed, Peterborough was appointed in his place two days before the coronation. Burnet, who had no liking for Bath, observed ‘all people were glad, not so much out of their love to the one, as out of hatred to the other’.

Peterborough himself, in his lavish (and, to a certain degree, fraudulent) celebration of his lineage published to mark his appointment, describes how great endeavours were used to prevent the Earl of Peterborow from succeeding to the place under the new King, wherein he had served his Majesty while he was Duke, the space of twenty years together; but his Master was too just and generous not to stick to his old servant, that had run so many fortunes and hazards with him.

As a judgement about himself, this was not undeserved. The same sense of loyalty which had caused him to defy his father in order to fight for Charles I and which had made him one of the hard-line supporters of the court in the Lords following the

---


6 LC 5/201, fol. 456, memorandum on Bath’s claim. This claim was made on the basis of the Groom of the Stole’s entitlement to the furnishings of the Bedchamber and that claim had been granted. (SP 44/71, p. 102, reference to Attorney-General, 17 Feb 1685; SP 44/336, p. 36, James II to Rogers, 16 Mar 1685; p. 37, James II to Chiffinch, 16 Mar 1685).


8 R. Halstead [pseud.], *Succinct Genealogies*, (1685), p. 441. It is assumed that chapter XVII, although written in the third person, was largely autobiographical, supplemented with eulogistic commentary by his collaborator, Rev. Richard Rands. For the evidence that some of the earlier documents printed in this volume are forgeries, see G.H. Fowler, ‘Early records of Turvey and its neighbourhood’, *Publications of the Bedfordshire Historical Record Society*, XI, (1927), pp. 47-104; G.E. C[okayne] and V. Gibbs (eds.), *Complete Peerage*, X, p. 499n. As some of the forgeries can be dated later than 1675, Peterborough and Rands must be the prime suspects.
Restoration had commended him to James during his service as Groom of the Stole, transforming what had initially been a purely formal relationship into one of real friendship. On being appointed in 1665 he had had the difficult task of succeeding Muskerry, whose death at the battle of Lowestoft had been a traumatic experience for James, for he had been killed by the same cannonball which had just missed James and which also killed another of his closest friends, Falmouth. That Muskerry had been the son of Clancarty, the leading Irish catholic courtier, as well as the son-in-law of St.Albans and the nephew of Ormond, had given his position within James’s circle some political significance and one of the reasons why Peterborough may have been chosen to succeed him was that he had links with the Irish catholics through his wife, the daughter of the earl of Thomond and Clancarty’s cousin. Possibly because there had been no other suitable courtier available who could claim the vacancy on the basis of friendship alone, James had been persuaded by one of his servants, who was hoping for a reciprocal favour, that Peterborough should be appointed. Peterborough would claim that he had been reluctant to accept and that he admitted one of his reasons for accepting was because he needed the money indicates that this was probably not just a display of modesty. James had not found this reluctance impressive. This start of his career in James’s service may have seemed unpropitious but eight years later he had negotiated James’s second marriage, acting as his proxy at the ceremony at Modena. The mission had been far from easy and his reward came when his wife was appointed Groom of the Stole to the new duchess. This had underlined that he was the most prominent member of the Yorkist reversionary interest just when its obvious attractions, which had steadily been becoming more so with the increasing improbability that the queen would produce any children, began to be overshadowed by James’s unpopularity. This public identification of him with the marriage meant that he had responded to the criticisms of it from parliament by making it clear that he thought it was none of parliament’s business.

His role as James’s spokesman in the Lords had become all the more important during the struggle against exclusion. In March 1679, when James left to go into exile, Peterborough had stayed behind for this purpose. Admittedly most of the real work to mobilize what support there was for James had been done by Hyde but that Hyde still sat in the Commons had had both advantages and disadvantages and it was Peterborough who had decided that, whatever their past relations had been, James’s best interests would be served if his servants supported Danby. After his removal from

---


the Privy Council and the prorogation of May 1679 he joined James in Brussels.11 That autumn, when they returned, Peterborough had embarked on an intrigue which was as naive as it was daring. In an attempt to gain inside information on the activities of the whigs, he made contact first with Peyton and then with Dangerfield, arranging meetings for them with James. The possibility of uncovering the plots claimed by Dangerfield opened up tantalising prospects but, with the collapse of all their credibility, little appeared to have been gained from these meetings except to give apparent substance to Dangerfield's subsequent story that Peterborough had tried to solicit him into a plot by James to kill the king.12 It was no accident that when parliament next met, in October 1680, the whigs made much use of Dangerfield for Peterborough again represented James in the debates in the Lords. By the time the Lords came to consider the exclusion bill he had repulsed his personal critics and

in all the force of Speech, in Reason, in Arguments, of what could concern the publick, or the private interests of Men, in Honor, in Conscience, in Estate, did out-do himself, and every other Man; and in fine, his conduct and his parts were both victorious, and by him all the wit and malice of that party was overthrown.13 These comments by his own ghost-writer were not echoed by other contemporaries, who agreed that the credit was due to Halifax, but Peterborough had done all James had expected him to. The next month James gave an indication of his approval when he asked Hyde to obtain Peterborough's reappointment to the Privy Council in order to strengthen his support on it. As yet this was still too provocative a proposal for the whigs still believed that there was some mileage in Dangerfield and his claims. A year later Essex was said to be preparing the impeachment of those implicated including James as well as Peterborough. However, the absence of a parliament spoilt Essex's plans and when Peterborough was reappointed as a Privy Councillor in February 1683 it was unambiguous evidence that James and his supporters were no longer an embarrassment to the king.14 Peterborough probably felt that membership of the Privy Council was no more than his due and the real rewards did not come until after his master became king. Although a grant to Norfolk, Clarendon and him to license pedlars would quickly end in failure, he would carry the sceptre at the coronation, become Lord High Steward to Mary Beatrice on Arlington's death and, in an honour which rivalled

12 Succinct Genealogies, pp. 434-8.
13 ibid, p. 438.
14 Clarendon Correspondence, I, p. 48, York to Hyde, 14 Dec 1680; HMC Ormond, n.s. VI, pp. 262-4, ---- to Ormond, 14 Dec 1681; PC 2/69, fol. 320, 23 Feb 1683.
the confirmation of him in the Groomship of the Stole, was one of the first three Knights of the Garter invested by James.\textsuperscript{15}

Whereas Peterborough had benefitted from being a second-generation earl and Rochester from being James's brother-in-law, it was to Dartmouth's advantage that he was the son of William Legge, one of the Grooms of the Bedchamber to Charles I during the difficult years of the mid-1640s. It also helped that he had used his connections with James to develop a military career for himself away from the court because there were few more effective ways of gaining James's respect. At the age of about twenty, as George Legge, he had followed his father by becoming one of James's Grooms of the Bedchamber and within five years had risen to higher things. In 1670 his father had died, creating a vacancy for the place of Lieutenant-General of the Ordnance and in 1672 James had obtained it for him. The following year, finding himself in the position of being a staunch anglican who was also a trusted servant of James, he had been one of the major beneficiaries of the Test Act, succeeding James as the governor of Portsmouth (he had hitherto been the lieutenant-governor) and being promoted from his Bedchamber to replace Henry Jermyn as his Master of the Horse. For these same reasons, James had later viewed it to be important during his exiles to Brussels and Edinburgh that, as with Hyde and Peterborough, Legge should be placed in positions of power to ensure that his interests as heir were protected. This was most obviously the case with the Ordnance, a department more politically sensitive than most at a time of unrest. In 1679 the whigs had tried to gain control over it by creating a commission to replace the position of Master-General so in December 1680, hoping to have this reversed, James wrote from Edinburgh to advise Hyde to get the king to promote Legge to become Master-General and just over a year later the king agreed. He was, however, appointed only on condition that he step down as governor of Portsmouth which disappointed James, who felt that this was even more important than his new place at the Ordnance.\textsuperscript{16} In March 1682 he was appointed to the Privy Council, although only after a report that he would not be had caused James to tell him that 'I look on it to be a greater injury to me, then it is to you, since tis because you are my servant that you are not admitted of it, and not for any other reason'.\textsuperscript{17} In fact, it was

\textsuperscript{15} Clarendon Correspondence, I, p. 284, Clarendon to Sunderland, 2 Mar 1686; PC 2/71, fol. 136, 7 May 1686; fol. 170, 12 Nov 1686; Bodl. MS Clarendon 88, fol. 111, articles of agreement between John Irving and Norfolk, Peterborough and Clarendon, Nov 1685; C 66/3284, no. iv, letter patent to Norfolk, Peterborough and Clarendon, 29 April 1686; C 212/7, m. 4, cancellation of letter patent to Norfolk, Peterborough and Clarendon, 1686; Succinct Genealogies, p. 693, 696-7. The previous year a bill against hawkers, pedlars and petty chapmen had been passed by the Commons but had been halted in the Lords. (Journals of the House of Commons, IX, p. 719, 731, 733, 736, 744; Journals of the House of Lords, XIV, p. 52, 57, 70, 77).


\textsuperscript{17} HMC Dartmouth, I, pp. 73-4, York to Legge, 25 Feb 1682.
largely because he was James's servant that later that year he had been raised to the peerage as Baron Dartmouth.

In a way which had also been true for Hyde, James's use of him to represent him at court during his absences had had the effect of conferring on him a degree of political gravitas independent of James's patronage. Indeed, to have been effective in this role would have required him not simply to report James's stance regarding policy (James could do that for himself in his letters to Charles) but also to lobby the king and the inner circle of advisers and, although among them there would have been a natural interest in what he had to say, it would have been up to him to impress. Charles II does appear to have been impressed. By the summer of 1681 Henry Sidney was telling William that while 'Feversham hath more of the King's personal kindness than any body, Mr. Legge hath a great deal' and by 1683 he felt able, presumably without directions from James, to advise the king that Lord Russell be pardoned.18 His position was strengthened even further when he successfully conducted the evacuation of Tangier. Yet on his return from North Africa in the spring of 1684 he had been faced with ill-disguised resentment from many who were envious of his growing favour so that Sir Henry Shere had written to him of everyone being 'grievously and scandalously misled by the false and industrious representations of your adversaries' and Preston had hoped that 'something were done for our poor Lord Dartmouth, I am sure he deserveth well, but he hath enemies as well as other people'.19 Almost certainly prominent among these enemies would have been his arch-rival, Arthur Herbert, whose enmity towards him probably explains the comment made by Weymouth to Halifax the previous September that 'there are Engines at worke to lessen L[or]d Dartmouth, w[hi]ch may succeed in the Dukes family'.20 Where an indication of Herbert's involvement in these moves against him does emerge is in the dismissal by Dartmouth, as soon as he got back, of Randolph MacDonnel as one of James's Equerries for criticising him in a letter of which Herbert was the recipient. With his absence having meant that he was now probably not as in touch with the nuances of court intrigue as he would have wished, Dartmouth had responded to this rancour against him by imperiously declaring that he was above such things. The claim to impartiality looks, however, as if it may have owed more to indecision than to high-mindedness and there is a suspicion that his failure to exploit his favour damaged him in the eyes of Charles

---

19 *HMC Dartmouth*, I, p. 114, Shere to Dartmouth, 5 April 1684; *HMC 7th Report*, appendix, p. 310, Preston to [?Gwyn], 2/12 Aug 1684.
20 B.L. Althorp papers C5, Weymouth to Halifax, 7 Sept 1683.
II. It was not necessarily welcome news to him that shortly after his return there were rumours that he was about to become Lord Lieutenant of Ireland.  

In so far as he would have been prepared to admit to being a member of any particular group at court, Dartmouth would have said that he served the duke of York. In practice, this meant he had backed Rochester. It is indicative of the nature of the relationship between them that it was with Dartmouth that Rochester spent Christmas 1684. Together they headed the anglican contingent which perforce had been dominant in James's counsels in the years before 1685. They were important both as the most visible members of the reversion interest and as the best guarantors the tories had that James could be trusted. If Rochester was the more impressive politician, Dartmouth was, perhaps, the closer companion. His mutual interests with James seem to have been not just naval, for his position as his Master of the Horse suggests that he also had something of his master's passion for field sports. It is, moreover, not implausible to detect in James's letters to him hints of affection.

It was not that their friendship was an easy one. In 1679 Legge had succinctly outlined to the Commons the quandary facing all royal servants, telling them that 'I am the Duke of York's servant, and I will serve him affectionately, but I have been bred amongst them that speak no language but my own, and I will live and die a Protestant, and am as loyal as my family has always been.' Two years later in the Oxford parliament, when he was the only one of James's servants sitting in the Commons, he had been even blunter. In one of the most moving professions of toryism produced by the 'exclusion crisis', he had, with great courage, considering his close friendship with James, revealed feelings which must have been secretly shared by most other tories.

I speak now for England and for my Posterity, (I have seven children). How will this look? The King's Father was murdered, and you take his Brother from him. Sure this can take no effect with the King, and the Lords, to make it a Law. I wish the Duke many happy days, but, from my heart, I wish the King more than the Duke. The King is a healthy man, and the Duke is not - What I have said is not as I am the Duke's servant, barely out of pique of Honour, but that I would not do any thing to destroy my Posterity.

---

21 Bodl. MS Carte 216, fol. 482, Reading to Arran, 24 April 1684; A. Browning (ed.), Memoirs of Sir John Reresby, (Glasgow, 1936), p. 335; HMC Ormonde, n.s. VII, p. 237, Arran to Ormond, 27 May 1684. There may be an example of his unwillingness to become involved in factionalism in his reluctance to adopt a clear stance on the Pennsylvanian boundary dispute over which the circle around James was split. (M.M. Dunn and R.S. Dunn (eds.), The Papers of William Penn, (University of Pennsylvania, 1681-7), II, p. 534, Markham to Penn, 27 Mar 1684).

22 Bodl. MS Carte 217, fol. 101, Arran to Ormond, 1 Jan 1685.

23 HMC Dartmouth, I, passim.

24 A. Grey, Debates of the House of Commons, from the Year 1667 to the Year 1694, (1763), VII, p. 263.

25 ibid, VIII, p. 329.
The Commons heard him out in silence: a silence of sympathy and respect, perhaps, as much as of hostility.

Religion was the one thing which stood between them. In July 1679 James had written to him from Brussels, telling him bluntly to pray, once for all, never say any thing to me again of turning Protestant; do not expect it or flatter yourself that I shall ever be it; I never shall; and if occasion were, I hope God would give me grace to suffer death for the true catholick Religion, as well as banishment; what I have done was not hastily but upon mature consideration and foreseeing all and more than has yet happened to me, and did others enquire into the Religion as I have done, without prejudice, prepossession, or partial affection, they would be of the same mind in point of Religion as I am.

In the initial abruptness of this reply is heard what was probably James's usual response to anglicans who made this suggestion and, in those cases, he would have expected that response to suffice. That here he felt the need to elaborate was because, coming from Legge, the suggestion was something more than just a piece of policy advice. It is known that Legge had raised the subject again on at least one subsequent occasion in 1680 but then he had received much the same reply. Then, after Bishop Morley of Winchester, on his deathbed in October 1684, warned him that James should not rely on the idea that anglicans would not oppose him because they believed in non-resistance, he, according to his son, 'frequently put king James in mind of Morley's last message to him, though to very little purpose; for all the answer was, that the bishop was a very good man, but grown old and timorous'.

It was not, now the consoling thought that Charles might outlive James had proved to be of little comfort and when he could no longer sublimate his service to James in terms of service to Charles, that Dartmouth was any less willing to serve James. Suspicion of Rome was not that simple. Elsewhere in his speech to the Oxford parliament, which, despite his modesty on the matter, shows that he had acquainted himself with the historical and legal issues which had been at stake, he had observed, 'I know my own weakness is not having been bred to the Law; but by enquiry I find, that the Doctrine of deposing Kings, and of their Kingdoms, is the damnable Doctrine of the Church of Rome'.

This had been a reminder to the enthusiasts for exclusion that there were other, greater, misfortunes which could befall the kingdom than James’s catholicism. Even so, it had also indicated that Dartmouth’s respect for James would be tempered by his incomprehension at his religious beliefs. One senses that gradually they were coming to

---

26 According to Derig, this speech ‘was well enough received from him, as one whose obligacion to the Duke were very great’. (M.F. Bond (ed.), The Diaries and Papers of Sir Edward Derig, (HMSO, 1976), p. 124).
28 HMC Dartmouth, I, p. 55, York to Legge, 14 Dec 1680.
29 Burnet, History, II, p. 440, footnote by Dartmouth.
30 Grey, Debates, VIII, p. 328.
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In the initial abruptness of this reply is heard what was probably James's usual response to anglicans who made this suggestion and, in those cases, he would have expected that response to suffice. That here he felt the need to elaborate was because, coming from Legge, the suggestion was something more than just a piece of policy advice. It is known that Legge had raised the subject again on at least one subsequent occasion in 1680 but then he had received much the same reply.28 Then, after Bishop Morley of Winchester, on his deathbed in October 1684, warned him that James should not rely on the idea that anglicans would not oppose him because they believed in non-resistance, he, according to his son, 'frequently put king James in mind of Morley's last message to him, though to very little purpose; for all the answer was, that the bishop was a very good man, but grown old and timorous'.29 It was not, now the consoling thought that Charles might outlive James had proved to be of little comfort and when he could no longer sublimate his service to James in terms of service to Charles, that Dartmouth was any less willing to serve James. Suspicion of Rome was not that simple. Elsewhere in his speech to the Oxford parliament, which, despite his modesty on the matter, shows that he had acquainted himself with the historical and legal issues which had been at stake, he had observed, 'I know my own weakness is not having been bred to the Law; but by enquiry I find, that the Doctrine of deposing Kings, and of their Kingdoms, is the damnable Doctrine of the Church of Rome'.30 This had been a reminder to the enthusiasts for exclusion that there were other, greater, misfortunes which could befall the kingdom than James’s catholicism. Even so, it had also indicated that Dartmouth’s respect for James would be tempered by his incomprehension at his religious beliefs. One senses that gradually they were coming to

26 According to Dering, this speech 'was well enough received from him, as one whose obligacion to the Duke were very great'. (M.F. Bond (ed.), The Diaries and Papers of Sir Edward Dering, (HMSO, 1976), p. 124).
28 HMC Dartmouth, I, p. 55, York to Legge, 14 Dec 1680.
29 Burnet, History, II, p. 440, footnote by Dartmouth.
30 Grey, Debates, VIII, p. 328.
recognise that neither could change the other's views and that they had agreed to differ. By evading the differences between them they preserved their friendship but, by doing so, Dartmouth would, now that James was king, lose much of his political influence with him.\textsuperscript{31} Even so, he retained sufficient importance to be included on the 'cabinet council'.\textsuperscript{32}

Dartmouth had fewer problems than Peterborough obtaining confirmation of his appointment because the opposition came from the duchess of Portsmouth who, with the death of Charles II, was a spent force at court. In December 1679 Charles had dismissed Monmouth from all his offices except the Mastership of the Horse but had appointed Sir Stephen Fox, Sir Richard Mason, Sir Nicholas Armorer, Thomas Wyndham and Roger Pope to exercise his functions.\textsuperscript{33} These Commissioners had remained in place until December 1681 when, to crush speculation that Monmouth might regain his father's favour, it had been announced that Richmond, the king's bastard by the duchess of Portsmouth, was to become Master of the Horse. The fact that Richmond was then only nine years old had been overcome by creating a new Commission which was to deputize for him until he reached the age of fourteen. It was headed by Henry Guy, the Secretary of the Treasury, to ensure strict financial control during what was a time of retrenchment while one of the Equerries of the Hunting Stables, Charles Adderley, was probably included for his inside knowledge of the department's operations. It was to its third member, Theophilus Oglethorpe, that the real responsibility had been entrusted.\textsuperscript{34} Oglethorpe had an existing link with the Stables through his brother, Sutton, who was the Master of the Stud, but the main significance of his inclusion lay in his wife's connections with the duchess of Portsmouth. Eleanor Wall, whom he had married earlier in 1681 and who was Sempstress and Laundress of the Body to the king, was one of the duchess's servants and was frequently used by her as her intermediary in court intrigues. When Lord


\textsuperscript{34} Campana de Cavelli, \textit{Les Derniers Stuarts}, I, pp. 367-8, York to Legge, 6/16 Dec 1681; E.M. Thompson (ed.), \textit{Correspondence of the Family of Hatton}, (Camden Society, n.s. XXII, 1878), II, p. 11, Lyttelton to Hatton, 6 Dec 1681; \textit{HMC Frankland-Russell-Astley}, p. 48, Fauconberg to [Frankland], 6 Dec [1681]; N. Luttrell, \textit{A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs from September 1678 to April 1714}, (Oxford, 1857), I, p. 149; LS 13/172, fols. 86-9, Privy Seal warrant, 22 Jan 1682; C 66/3225, dorso no. 3, letter patent to Richmond, 22 Jan 1682. There had been an understanding at court that the previous Commission represented a temporary arrangement until Richmond reached the age of fourteen. \textit{(HMC Ormonde}, n.s. V, p. 247, Cooke to Ormond, 2 Dec 1679). The memorandum by Henry Guy of his yearly fees in B.L. Add MS 15896, fols. 58-9 concerns his income as Secretary of the Treasury and not as a Stables Commissioner. (S.B. Baxter, \textit{The Development of the Treasury}, 1660-1702, (1957), p. 193, 272-4).
Courcy had wanted a military commission he had applied to her hoping that the duchess of Portsmouth could be persuaded to support his request and in June 1682 Arran advised his father, Ormond, to make contact with her and Mrs Roche, another of the duchess's servants who was probably her cousin, because of their family connections in Ireland. Especially revealing is that at the trial of Fitzharris she had been able to confirm that the accused had received payments from the Secret Service fund. The duchess of Portsmouth had not however got Oglethorpe appointed just as a favour to his wife. Control over the Stables gave her the sort of opportunities for departmental patronage which were usually denied to a female courtier and it is clear that she intended to make full use of them. In 1684 when Sir John Reresby had unsuccessfully tried to get his son appointed a Page of Honour he had made sure it was she who presented him to the king. In obtaining her support he probably benefitted from his friendship with Oglethorpe who also came from Yorkshire. When Richmond had become High Steward of York in 1683 it had been through Oglethorpe that Reresby had sent his congratulations and this friendship may explain why in December 1681 Halifax, who was then trying to cultivate the duchess of Portsmouth, had felt that he would have been able to get Reresby onto the Stables Commission 'had ther been any considerable sallary with it'. An early indication that the duchess wanted to use Oglethorpe to administer the Stables in an aggressive manner had been that she had immediately asserted that the Stables Commission had authority over the Queen's Stables. This prompted Lumley's resignation as the Master of the Horse to Queen Catherine.

With the rest of her power gone the duchess of Portsmouth did not respond kindly to James's announcement that he was going to replace Richmond with Dartmouth. She received a further shock when she tried to see James only to be turned away by Peterborough as a way of pressing home the changed realities of court politics. The wife of the former Stables Commissioner, Sir Richard Mason, heard it


36 Reresby, Memoirs, p. 240, 301-2, 331-3, 335.

37 Reresby, Memoirs, pp. 247-8. Exactly when Lumley resigned is confused. One source from February 1682 tells how he had done so in protest at this infringement on his authority. (HMC Rutland, II, pp. 64-5, Viscountess Campden to countess of Rutland, 10 Feb 1682). Sonya Wynne has, however, pointed out to me that a dispatch from Barrilion to De Croissy dated 24 February 1684 mentions that Charles II had forced his wife to dismiss Lumley and substitute him with Ferrers. Barrillon explains that Lumley had resisted the efforts of the Stables Commissioners to control him and implies that Ferrers had accepted their pretensions. (Archives des Affaires Etrangères, Paris, Correspondence Politique, Angleterre, 152, fols. 129-30). That the Household cheque roll does not record Ferrers's appointment nor delete the entry for Lumley may be significant but probably is not. (LS 13/9, unfol.).
said that, when she eventually got her audience, James told her 'that he would have a Master of the Horse who was able to execute the office' while others reported that it had been made clear to her that she should settle her financial affairs with the Stables and leave.\(^{38}\) Oglethorpe was more fortunate because he and his wife had, during the previous five years, taken the precaution of securing the favour of James and Mary Beatrice.\(^{39}\) For this reason, Dartmouth had him appointed as an Equerry in 1685 so that he could be of continuing use to the Stables. He would be knighted the following July when he brought James the news of Monmouth's defeat at Sedgemoor.

II

The appointments of Rochester, Peterborough and Dartmouth did not exhaust those of his existing servants for whom places had to be found. Arthur Herbert and John Churchill could not go unrewarded and again James appointed them to the posts in which they had served him as duke of York. Herbert therefore replaced Henry Sidney as Master of the Robes. This would have been a straightforward decision given that James would have had little wish to continue Sidney in office. As the envoy to the Hague between 1679 and 1681 Sidney had been a vital link in the attempts by his nephew, Sunderland, to persuade William to set himself up as the real exclusionist alternative to James in the belief that only through him could a solution be found to the constitutional crisis. William had had enough sense to realise that his intervention would have been no solution at all but in the charming Sidney he found an English politician whom he was able to trust and in 1682 William had insisted that he be appointed to the command of the Anglo-Dutch Brigade. James's dislike of him was such that in June 1685 he turned it into a major diplomatic incident and forced Sidney's dismissal from this position as well. It cannot have helped Sidney that, almost twenty years before, James had had him removed as Master of the Horse to his first wife on the suspicion that he had been having an affair with her.\(^{40}\) For Churchill, who had served under Peterborough as James's other Gentleman of the Bedchamber, there was created an equivalent position, that of First Gentleman of the Bedchamber, ranking


immediately below the Groom of the Stole, and he was further distinguished from the rest of the Gentlemen of the Bedchamber by being appointed three weeks before they were.

One thing both Herbert and Churchill shared was their dislike of Dartmouth.\(^{41}\) The reasons for this antipathy are obscure but that they could not yet match the combined authority of Rochester and him and that they, his almost exact contemporaries, had not reached places quite as senior as his made them all the more jealous. Dartmouth had, after all, been James’s Master of the Horse since 1673. Churchill had not been promoted from a Groom of his Bedchamber until 1677 when he had become his Master of the Robes. He had probably only been raised to be Gentleman of his Bedchamber in December 1684 on the death of Lord Hawley. Churchill had at least been a member of James’s household since about 1667 when he had got a position as one of his Pages of Honour. Herbert had entered it far more recently, becoming a Groom of his Bedchamber only sometime between 1677 and 1682. He had then succeeded Churchill at the Robes in 1684.\(^{42}\) It is true that, outside James’s household, he had been a Lord of the Admiralty and that Churchill was already a regimental colonel, however, in his military career, Dartmouth had achievements to match. What underlines their differences in status more than anything else was that at the same time Dartmouth had been given an English peerage, Churchill had had to make do with only a Scottish one while Herbert by 1685 was still only a commoner without any parliamentary experience.

While Charles II was still alive, Churchill and Herbert were hampered by being entirely dependant on James’s patronage in a way Rochester and, to a lesser extent, Dartmouth were not. In 1680 James had tried to get Churchill appointed as Sidney’s successor as envoy to the Hague and in 1683 had promoted him as a possible Secretary of State.\(^{43}\) On neither occasion had he succeeded. Only after James became king did


\(^{42}\) B.L. Add MS 18958, establishment of York’s household, 1677; HMC Rutland, II, p. 42, Lady Grace Chaworth to Roos, 22 [Nov 1677]; B.L. Althorp papers D1, establishment of York’s household, 1682; B.L. Althorp papers D2, establishment of York’s household, [c.1685]. The information on the careers of Herbert and Churchill in James’s household before 1685 given in the standard biographical reference works is inaccurate. (Dictionary of National Biography), X, pp. 315-16; XXVI, p. 169; Complete Peerage, VIII, p. 492; XII, part I, p. 785; B.D. Henning (ed.), The History of Parliament - The House of Commons, 1660-1690, (1983), II, p. 69, 526-8). Particular confusion has been caused by the traditional claim that Churchill became James’s Gentleman of the Bedchamber in 1673. This is wrong. He became a Groom of his Bedchamber. (W.D. Cooper (ed.), Savile Correspondence, (Camden Society, LXX, 1858), p. 30, Savile to Halifax, 26 Oct 1672). It is, admittedly, doubtful whether Hawley acted as Gentleman of the Bedchamber towards the end of his life. Feversham probably deputized for him before his own appointment as Master of the Horse to Queen Catherine in 1679. Thereafter Churchill may have acted as Hawley’s deputy as he, unlike either Hawley or Feversham, accompanied James to Brussels.

\(^{43}\) Clarendon Correspondence, I, p. 51, James to Hyde, 14 Dec 1680; HMC 7th Report, appendix, p. 363, Deanes to Preston, 29 Feb 1683.
Churchill’s career began to broaden out from the confines of James’s household and the army. In what was seen as a snub to Peterborough, he was immediately assigned the task of informing Louis XIV of Charles II’s death and on his return James went some way to remedying the discrepancy in rank between him and Dartmouth by granting him an English peerage in time for the new parliament. He lost out to Feversham in the appointment of the commander-in-chief but by July he was widely credited with the defeat of Monmouth, Sedgemoor being the first victory he had participated in as a senior commanding officer.

In contrast, James’s accession made almost no tangible difference to Herbert’s position for he gained nothing except the confirmation of his place at the Robes. Was James already aware of the differences between them which would cause Herbert to oppose his policies in the Commons later that year? The only reason to doubt this as a possible explanation is that when Herbert eventually forced James to dismiss him, James appears to have been genuinely surprised at the strength of Herbert’s convictions and it may have been that James had thought of him as loyal but light-weight. It is also possible that, as has been suggested was the case with Dartmouth, Herbert felt constant warnings to James would have little effect. Churchill certainly seems to have thought so. Bishop Burnet’s frequently-quoted judgement that Churchill

> never set the king on violent measures, but on the contrary, as oft as he spake to him of his affairs (which was indeed but seldom), he gave him always moderate counsels. He had kept himself wholly out of the counsels, and so set himself to manage his post in the army, in which he made great advantages, for money had as much power over him as he had over the king

neatly describes, without too much cynicism, this course of least resistance which most of these senior Anglican courtiers adopted. This, however, did prevent Churchill from being a close friend with Sunderland and it cannot be discounted that Tyrconnel benefitted from his links with him. On the other hand, one of the reasons why Herbert would prove less cooperative was that he had less to lose.

III

Churchill was not the only new appointment among the Gentlemen of the Bedchamber. Of the existing Gentlemen, only Mulgrave, Lichfield and Arran were reappointed, although Feversham was also promoted from being an extraordinary Gentleman. Beaufort, Somerset and Ossory became Gentlemen for the first time. Barillon believed that these changes were made to allow James to give jobs to his

44 Fox, History, appendix, p. xvii, Barillon to Louis XIV, 9/19 Feb 1685.
existing servants but this can only have been true for Churchill and (although he had not been one of his servants since 1680) Feversham. More significant is that the number of Gentlemen was reduced from the twelve laid down by the 1673 Bedchamber ordinances to only eight, the figure fixed in the 1661 ordinances but which had always been exceeded. The practice of appointing extraordinary Gentlemen was discontinued. Politics played only a secondary role in most of these changes. This may initially seem odd given that it is attested that the political sympathies of some of the Gentlemen had caused problems in the past. There had been the fact that, Bath excepted, all those then in office had voted against Stafford in December 1680 and in the weeks after the vote there had been rumours that a purge would take place. In truth, only Macclesfield, Manchester and Suffolk had been real causes for concern and it had been on these three that this speculation centred. They were, however, only suspended rather than dismissed. It was death which removed Manchester in 1683 and Macclesfield and Suffolk continued to be officially listed as Gentlemen, albeit under suspension, until the end of the reign.

The cases of these three should not overshadow the fact that most of the Gentlemen of the Bedchamber had been willing to support Charles II’s political agenda during the final years of the reign. Indeed, this had meant that those changes which had taken place among them over the past six years had been broadly neutral. In 1679 Sunderland had resigned on becoming Secretary of State, selling his place to Ranelagh, who was one of his clients and who had been promised such a place just a year before. Rochester and Ossory both died in 1680 and had been replaced by the two

47 Fox, *History*, appendix, p. xxxiv, Barillon to Louis XIV, 16/26 Feb 1685.
48 B.L. Althorp papers D4, Bedchamber ordinances, 1685, clause 15 –cp. Nottingham University Library, Portland MS Pw V 92, Bedchamber ordinances, 1661, clause 11; Portland MS Pw V 93, Bedchamber ordinances, 1673, clause 11.
49 *HMC Ormonde*, n.s. V, p. 521, 564, 566, 573. There is some confusion over the exact status of some of the Gentlemen in this period. A list attached to the Bedchamber regulations issued by Bath on 7 May 1684 contains the following information: Gentlemen of the Bedchamber: Bath, Dorset, Mulgrave, Albemarle, Oxford, Ranelagh, Latimer and Sussex. Supernumeraries: Lichfield, Rochester, Middleton, Feversham and Lansdowne. Excused from waiting: Newcastle and Lindsey. Abroad: Arran and Shrewsbury. Suspended: Macclesfield and Suffolk. (B.L. Egerton MS 3350, fol. 7-8). Slightly different information is given in the Chamber cheque roll (LC 3/24) which shows Lichfield being promoted from a supernumerary to fill Manchester’s place in April 1683. It also states that Arran was promoted from being a supernumerary in November 1682 when Mulgrave was ‘discharged’ and that Feversham succeeded him as a supernumerary. This may contradict the lists of Gentlemen in 1682 added to the 1661 and 1673 Bedchamber ordinances. (Nottingham U.L., Portland MS Pw V 92-3). These give Mulgrave, together with Macclesfield, Suffolk and Manchester, as being suspended while still listing Arran as a supernumerary and making no mention of Feversham. It may be that these lists were written prior to November 1682 and that Mulgrave’s suspension predated the Princess Anne incident, with his punishment then being increased to a dismissal. The 1684 list reveals that by then he had been restored. That none of their pensions were being paid during this period means that the Treasury records are no help on this question. See also E. Chamberlayne, *Angliae Notitia*, (1681), p. 161. However the exact figure was calculated (which is unclear), it would seem that the supernumeraries were being used to maintain the figure of twelve active Gentlemen, excluding the Groom of the Stole.
50 *Hatton Correspondence*, I, p. 159, Hatton to Hatton, 27 Nov 1677.
existing servants but this can only have been true for Churchill and (although he had not been one of his servants since 1680) Feversham. More significant is that the number of Gentlemen was reduced from the twelve laid down by the 1673 Bedchamber ordinances to only eight, the figure fixed in the 1661 ordinances but which had always been exceeded. The practice of appointing extraordinary Gentlemen was discontinued. Politics played only a secondary role in most of these changes. This may initially seem odd given that it is attested that the political sympathies of some of the Gentlemen had caused problems in the past. There had been the fact that, Bath excepted, all those then in office had voted against Stafford in December 1680 and in the weeks after the vote there had been rumours that a purge would take place. In truth, only Macclesfield, Manchester and Suffolk had been real causes for concern and it had been on these three that this speculation centred. They were, however, only suspended rather than dismissed. It was death which removed Manchester in 1683 and Macclesfield and Suffolk continued to be officially listed as Gentlemen, albeit under suspension, until the end of the reign.

The cases of these three should not overshadow the fact that most of the Gentlemen of the Bedchamber had been willing to support Charles II’s political agenda during the final years of the reign. Indeed, this had meant that those changes which had taken place among them over the past six years had been broadly neutral. In 1679 Sunderland had resigned on becoming Secretary of State, selling his place to Ranelagh, who was one of his clients and who had been promised such a place just a year before.
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50 Hatton Correspondence, I, p. 159, Hatton to Hatton, 27 Nov 1677.
senior extraordinaries, Latimer and Sussex. For Latimer, this had been a welcome promotion at a time when the career of his father, Danby, was eclipsed, although the reality was that it was mostly due to his father's former influence, with his original appointment to his extraordinary place having been made in 1674. Sussex, too, was a less obvious candidate than he had been in 1677 when he had become an extraordinary Gentleman. He had enjoyed royal favour principally because his wife, Anne FitzRoy, was one of the king's bastards by the duchess of Cleveland but the much-publicised affair she had had with Ralph Montagu in 1678 had diminished the political value of this marriage for Sussex. He would seem to have been politically inactive. Arran had been made an extraordinary Gentleman in January 1679 and, when Mulgrave was dismissed in November 1682 for his indiscretion with Princess Anne, it was he who was next in line. This proved to be inadvertently convenient as it neatly complemented Charles's policy at this time (most evident in his appointment of him to the Order of the Garter) of charming Arran's father, the duke of Hamilton, to encourage him to cooperate with the government in Edinburgh now that Lauderdale, his old enemy, was dead. Manchester's death resulted in the promotion of Lichfield, husband of another of the duchess of Cleveland's royal bastards, in April 1683. A tory, he had been an extraordinary Gentleman since July 1680. Finally, in January 1685, the place held by Lindsey, who had probably been unwell for some time, became vacant when he resigned. Strictly speaking, he should have been succeeded by the next most senior extraordinary but, possibly because this had happened to be Rochester who was about to become Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Lord Thomas Bruce, the eldest son of the earl of Ailesbury, was appointed over the heads of the other extraordinary Gentlemen. Bruce was as staunchly tory as Lindsey. As will be clear (Bruce notwithstanding), these Bedchamber appointments were largely determined by who was next in the queue of extraordinary Gentlemen. Of those still in this queue in 1685, Rochester had been an extraordinary Gentleman since 1680, Middleton and Feversham since 1682, and Shrewsbury and Lansdowne (Bath's eldest son) since 1683. These five were no less loyal than those who had succeeded to become Gentlemen-in-Ordinary since 1679.

That Ranelagh, Latimer, Sussex, Bruce, Rochester, Middleton, Shrewsbury and Lansdowne were not reappointed is not, in itself, evidence that James distrusted them. Rochester and Middleton became, of course, Lord Treasurer and Secretary of State while Bruce, who held Rochester responsible for his dismissal, would be reappointed within the year. Ranelagh was later that year appointed Paymaster-General. Regarding Shrewsbury, it would be premature to assume that the king's relations with him were already strained. He was, for the time being, retained as Lord Lieutenant of

51 Ailesbury, Memoirs, I, p. 84; HMC 5th Report, appendix, p. 186, Grenville to Gower, 17 Jan 1685.
Staffordshire and was appointed a regimental colonel in the Royal Horse Guards. Except, obviously, for Macclesfield and Suffolk, the same can be said of the four other Gentlemen of the Bedchamber who were not reappointed and whose appointments had dated back to the 1660s and the 1670s. Newcastle, Dorset, Albemarle and Oxford were all, roughly speaking, tories. Newcastle had voted against the exclusion bill and so probably had Dorset, although he may, alternatively, have been absent, in the way that Albemarle and Oxford had been. In Oxford’s case, he had altered his views enough so that, whereas Shaftesbury had considered in ‘worthy’ in 1677, he had become a Privy Councillor in 1681 and James now appointed him as Lord Lieutenant of Essex. In 1686 James would feel able, while spending several days hunting, to visit first Albemarle and then Dorset. These were mostly men who could have been reappointed but who were edged out because there were others whom James preferred to honour.

It was certainly the case that James wanted to honour Feversham. Their friendship had its origins in the fact that Feversham was Turenne’s nephew and in 1665, only three years after he had come to England from France, he had become James’s Keeper of the Privy Purse. Having succeeded to his father-in-law’s earldom in 1677, he had been appointed Lord Chamberlain to Queen Catherine in 1680 on the death of Ossory. Whatever others felt, James believed that he had some of his uncle’s military talents, appointing him lieutenant-general of the army in preference to Churchill later that year. Similarly, that James seems to have been fond of his wife, to whom he had written regularly over the previous four years, accounts for Lichfield’s reappointment. Ossory gained his place by being Ormond’s grandson and heir. His future father-in-law, Beaufort, may have been appointed in part because he was the nephew of the countess of Peterborough. He had served as Lord President of the Council of the Welsh Marches since 1672 and had been upgraded from a marquis to a duke in 1682 as a reward for his loyalty. One rumour had had him, rather than Clarendon, becoming Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, perhaps because he combined strong Irish connections through his mother with the fact that he was a convert from catholicism. Later that year he would defend Bristol against Monmouth’s attack and in September James would stay at Badminton. Like Beaufort, Somerset had acted as a supporter to Prince George as the chief mourner at Charles II’s funeral. Since 1682 he had become Lord Lieutenant of Somerset and the East Riding of Yorkshire, a Knight of

the Garter and a Privy Councillor. Only in the cases of Mulgrave and Arran is there evidence that their relationships with James had ever been anything other than friendly. Mulgrave’s case will be discussed in the next chapter. On the subject of Arran, at the time when Hamilton was refusing to take the Scottish declaration on the church and state in 1681, James had told Legge that he was not to be relyd on, after his having behaved himself as he has done, and keep such company, however some use may be made of him, but truly I do not thinke it fitt for his Majesty’s service, he should not be now put into his father’s places, or indeed at all till one is surer of him, and that he has satisfyed the world that he has quited the interest and princepals of those [he] used to keep company with at London although he was prepared to believe that Arran might have been acting on his mother’s orders. Since then, James seems to have concluded that Arran could be trusted and he would, indeed, prove to be a dependable servant. That, moreover, his place in the Bedchamber strengthened his father in the faction fighting in Edinburgh at least meant that James, through Arran and, subsequently, also Dumbarton, was sensitive enough to his views that Hamilton would never be alienated to such an extent that he began to cause serious trouble.

IV
The remaining examples of changes among the senior courtiers to accommodate members of James’s existing household were the appointments of Sir Peter Apsley and James Grahme. The Apsleys were a third-generation court family. Sir Peter’s grandfather had had the sense to marry the sister-in-law of the first duke of Buckingham and in 1617 had become the Lieutenant of the Tower. His father, Sir Allen, had in 1660 become James’s Treasurer of the Household. Although he was then aged only about eighteen, Peter had been knighted in 1675, by which time he was holding jointly with his father the Mastership of the Hawks. This had been granted to Sir Allen in 1660 and later in 1675 they had transferred it to Rochester (a cousin of Sir Allen) and Chiffinch. Meanwhile, one of his sisters, Isabella, the wife of Sir William Wentworth, had become Woman of the Bedchamber to the duchess of York while his other sister, Frances, had become the confidante of Princess Mary and she subsequently became as close to Princess Anne until, with both their marriages, Sarah Churchill supplanted her. By 1682 Sir Allen and Sir Peter, along with Sir Benjamin Bathurst who that year had married Frances, were acting as the Treasurers and

57 Memoirs of the Life, Family, and Character of Charles Seymour, Duke of Somerset, [1748].
58 HMC Dartmouth, I, p. 70, York to Legge, 5 Nov [1681]. However, see HMC Hamilton, II, pp. 164-5, Perth to Hamilton, 19 Dec 1681.
59 Arran is known to have particularly wanted to be reappointed to the Bedchamber. (HMC Buccleuch (Drumlanrig), II, p. 219, Lundin to Queensberry, 26 Feb 1685).
Receivers-General of James's revenue and, on his father's death in 1683, he and Bathurst had taken over the functions of the vacant Treasurership of his Household. Their financial responsibilities were extended when they and Grahme were granted the farm of the excise for £550,000 for three years on 5 February 1685 only to find themselves at the centre of the legal argument over its validity after Charles II inconveniently died the next day. As quickly as he could, James got the grant confirmed.

On the same day this grant was confirmed, the members of the Board of Greencloth were being reappointed but only after some confusion arising from the inclusion of Henry, Viscount Brouncker. The warrant of reappointment, as initially issued, had confirmed Brouncker in the position of Cofferer but this had been immediately recalled and another issued omitting his name. With it clear that Brouncker was being dismissed, Sir Stephen Fox, who had long coveted the Cofferership and who had just been confirmed as First Clerk of the Greencloth, must have looked on with frustration while everyone speculated that it would be Robert Werden, James's Comptroller of the Household, who would get the job. It then emerged that it was Apsley who was to be the replacement. Werden instead became Treasurer to Mary Beatrice. Brouncker cannot have been entirely surprised at his removal. In 1665, in the aftermath of the battle of Lowestoft, he had, claiming the authority of James who was then resting, commanded the English fleet to slow down, allowing the Dutch fleet to escape and depriving James of an even greater victory. He had then compounded the offence by joining the opposition to Clarendon. In 1667 James had therefore dismissed him as one of his Grooms of the Bedchamber and he now no doubt took even greater pleasure in dismissing him as Cofferer. It was all the more important that James have someone he trusted in control of the Household finances in view of the far-reaching plans he had for them and for this either Apsley or Werden would have done.

If the Apsleys had been established at court for three generations, the Grahmes had managed to become as firmly established within one and in 1685 it seemed certain...
that they would become a major court dynasty. This very rapid rise in their fortunes was principally due to James Grahme, who in 1685 was confirmed as James’s Keeper of the Privy Purse. To make way for him, Baptist May was dismissed and, as with Sidney and Brouncker, James was settling old scores by doing so. May had originally been a client of the duchess of Cleveland and had conspired with her in Clarendon’s downfall. More recently, his links with the whigs may have caused Charles II to suspend him from his duties. Of greater certainty is that the late king had come to trust Chiffinch much more.

Yet what made the rise of the Grahmes all the more remarkable is that they had once been even more suspect than May was. In 1670 Grahme’s elder brother, Sir Richard Grahme Bt., had married Lady Anne Howard, whose father, the earl of Carlisle, had, as early as 1674, been demanding that catholics should be excluded from the succession. When Sir Richard entered the Commons as MP for Cockermouth in his native Cumberland in 1675, he had allied himself with his father-in-law and during the following sessions had established himself as ‘worthy’ in the eyes of Shaftesbury. In May 1679 he moved the address against Lauderdale and, although he was probably absent from the division on the issue that month, his stance in favour of exclusion was clear. As well as being a member of the Green Ribbon Club, he told the Commons in November 1680 that ‘if the Duke be criminal, he is subject to Law as well as I am’ while in another speech, later that month, he declared ‘the Papists are enemies to all mankind’ and that, until the judiciary was purged of those sceptical about the existence of the ‘popish plot’, ‘neither our Religion nor Property can be safe’. In his other recorded speech from this period, he observed ‘that States fall and rise as natural bodies, and that States have times to prevent their ruin; by such steps Providence proceeds’, thereby revealing an interest in political maxims. This interest is confirmed by his annotations to Milton’s commonplace book which had passed into his possession. Although these annotations do reveal that he was familiar with the works of, among others, Aristotle, Bracton, Machiavelli, Augustine, Buchanan and especially Bodin, they are difficult to date and so cannot positively be ascribed to the late 1670s or early 1680s. Nevertheless, that the quotations copied by him included passages such as Bodin’s comment that

66 Grey, Debates, VII, p. 373.
most tyrants have ordinarily neare unto their owne persons some Minions, of whom they make great account and reckoning: whom they use as spungen to suck up their subjects blood, upon whom when occasion serveth they discharge themselves to the end that the people entring into furie, should seize upon them, and spare themselves. 67

indicates that his career in opposition might have reflected a distrust of the perceived corruptions of the court.

It had only been through the efforts of his brother that Sir Richard had been forgiven these earlier indiscretions of opposition. This was possible because at the time he was becoming known as one of the opponents of the court in parliament, his brother had instead managed to gain entry into York’s household. During most of the 1670s James Grahme had supported himself by a career in the army and in this he too had benefitted from some assistance from Carlisle, whom he had briefly served as captain of his regiment in 1673. Carlisle may also have helped him secure his wife. Dorothy Howard was Carlisle’s great niece and, when Grahme married her in 1675, this link had probably made her mother, who had had her doubts, somewhat more willing to consent. 68 Yet it was also by this marriage that he had escaped from any dependence on Carlisle and that his career had been able to diverge so startlingly from that of his brother. By marrying into this particular branch of the Howards, Grahme had obtained excellent connections to the court. His new father-in-law, William Howard, was the brother of Berkshire, a former Gentleman of the Bedchamber, as well as of Dryden’s wife. It was, perhaps, of less help to Grahme that he was also the brother of Sir Robert Howard, except that Howard’s estranged wife, Honoria O’Brien, was the sister of the countess of Peterborough. This distant link with her Groom of the Stole may explain why Grahme was able to become Keeper of the Privy Purse to Mary Beatrice shortly after his marriage, although that Berkshire was one of the leading catholic peers was probably at least as important. Once he had obtained this position it was a much smaller step to him succeeding Feversham as James’s Keeper of the Privy Purse in about 1680.

From this place of the utmost trust, he had then been able to smooth his brother’s transition from exclusionist to courtier. It seems likely that by the time he was elected to the Oxford parliament Sir Richard’s commitment to exclusion had been abandoned. He had already been added to the Westmorland commission of the peace and the following May he was rewarded by being raised to the Scottish peerage as Viscount Preston. A year later he had replaced Henry Savile as the envoy extraordinary to Paris. This had made it apt that it should have been his brother, along with Feversham, who was sent

67 A.J. Horwood (ed.), A Common-Place Book of John Milton, (Camden Society, n.s., XVI, revised edition, 1877), p. 34 -cp. J. Bodin, The Six Bookes of a Commonweale, (1606, reprinted in facsimile, Harvard, 1962), p. 226. His annotations suggest that he was most interested in what Bodin had to say about overthrowing a tyrant. It seems likely that Preston’s interest in this subject could date either from when he was an exclusionist or later from when he was a Jacobite.

in August 1682 on James's behalf to congratulate Louis XIV on the birth of the duc de Burgundy. In 1683 Preston had received the reversion to the Chancellorship of the Duchy of Lancaster and Godolphin thought highly enough of him in 1684 to recommend him to Charles II as one of his possible successors as Secretary of State. Meanwhile, their brothers were also gaining from their rises to favour, with William becoming a chaplain to Princess Anne and a prebend of Durham Cathedral and with Reginald becoming one of James's Pages of Honour.69

There was no interruption in the flow of these rewards to them once their royal patron ascended the throne. Reginald was confirmed as a Page of Honour. James was given the places of Master of the Buckhounds and Deputy-Lieutenant of Windsor Forest to hold in conjunction with the Privy Purse.70 It was, however, the eldest of the brothers who gained most from the accession. When the new parliament assembled Preston was asked to assist Middleton in the sensitive task of acting as the government spokesmen in the Commons. The first session did not pass entirely without trouble but then no parliamentary session ever did so when, that autumn, he returned permanently from Paris, having creditably completed his mission there, Preston's reputation was high. He was admitted to the Privy Council and one rumour had Middleton becoming Lord High Commissioner in Scotland and Preston succeeding him as Secretary of State. What did happen was that he was granted the Great Wardrobe. As a bonus he also succeeded Halifax as the Chancellor to Queen Catherine.71 The Mastership of the Great Wardrobe was one of those positions often used to confer official status on courtiers of the second rank viewed as having potential and he was obviously being marked out by the king as someone whom he expected in due course to place in a senior ministerial office. As the rumours bear out, it is not just hindsight which indicates that it was only a matter of time before he would become Secretary of State.

Whether Preston is to be seen as a whig collaborator is more questionable. Too little is known about what his original views had been to enable a firm judgement to be made as to how far he had altered them. There is one hint that he may have felt he had had to compromise his principles. In January 1684 he had explained to his brother that his previous visit to England had been difficult because certain courtiers had been using

70 He had been the Keeper of Bagshot Park since 1682 and this combination of offices gave him control over the king's favourite pastime: hunting. The costs of the king's hunting were met from the Privy Purse. If the enforcement of the forest laws at Windsor is anything to go by, he took these duties seriously. (J.P. Hore, History of the Royal Buckhounds, (Newmarket, 1895), pp. 177-83; B.L. Althorp papers D3, Privy Purse establishment, 1685; E.P. Thompson, Whigs and Hunters, (1977), p. 40, 46).
71 SP 44/336, p. 223, certificate, 3 Oct 1685; PRO 30/53/8, fol. 26, Brackley to Herbert, 9 Oct 1685; fol. 31, Newport to Herbert, 1 Dec 1685; Fox, History, appendix, p. cxxii, Barillon to Louis XIV, 26 Oct/5 Nov 1685; B.L. Add MS 63753, fols. 148-96, papers on the finances of Queen Catherine, temp. James II.
their influence against him and that, for this reason, 'I did not make my Court so much to those persons to whom both my inclinations and affections would have directed it, but sought protection from those that gave it me, and by doing so kept me a little in countenance'.

The reality was probably that the dilemma was somewhat less dramatic than might be thought from these comments. In fact, discounting the occasional tactical deviation, he was, by this period, mainly associated with anglican-tory courtiers. In 1682 he had been in correspondence with both Clarendon and Bishop Compton but it was with Dartmouth that he had the closest links, hence his sympathy for him in 1684 which has already been mentioned. The two of them were relatives and this alliance was an extension of Dartmouth's friendship with James Grahme, of which the appointment of their brother, Reginald, to James's Stables had been one consequence. There can be little doubt that it had been his brother, James, who had drawn Preston into the anglican-tory circle at court and it seems reasonable to suppose that a commitment to anglicanism had been one common element in his changing political views.

There was one other link in this anglican-tory grouping: Catherine Sedley. In about 1678 Sedley, who was then one of the Maids of Honour to Mary Beatrice, had been James Grahme's mistress. Once his master had replaced him as her lover, Grahme remained on friendly terms with her and in late 1685 he arranged her return to favour after James had tried to break off their affair on becoming king. In this, Grahme's positions as Master of the Buckhounds and Keeper of Bagshot Park proved useful, for the king resumed the affair by means of secret assignations at Grahme's house at Bagshot when he was supposed to be out hunting. Once Grahme had persuaded James to make his mistress the countess of Dorchester, Mary Beatrice took steps to block these attempts by Grahme to promote Sedley as an anglican rival to her and she eventually managed to persuade her husband to banish the new countess. Before it became clear that it was the queen's will which would prevail, Grahme's anglican-tory friends, including Rochester and probably Dartmouth, lined up to support Dorchester and her banishment was universally interpreted as a set-back for them.

---
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Dorchester-Dartmouth combination, nevertheless, survived and between 1689 and 1691 would be the nucleus of the leadership of the Jacobite underground in England.

Preston's appointment as Master of the Great Wardrobe was James's way of rewarding his repentance of his support for exclusion but by appointing Preston he had to offend another former supporter of exclusion who was insistent that he too had repented.\textsuperscript{6} So far as Montagu was concerned the Great Wardrobe belonged to him by right. He had spent £14,000 in 1671 buying the office of Master from his cousin, Sandwich, and his proprietorial attitude towards it was increased by the links between it and his tapestry factory at Mortlake.\textsuperscript{7} It had only been with some difficulty that the government had been able to eject him after he had become a political embarrassment. When his affair with the countess of Suffolk caused him in 1678 to be recalled in disgrace from his ambassadorial posting in Paris, Charles II had been able to have him dismissed as the queen's Master of the Horse but had been prevented by the life patent from dismissing him as Master of the Great Wardrobe. His continuing presence at the Great Wardrobe had become all the more mortifying when he had avenged himself against Danby by revealing the contents of the correspondence for the French subsidy. In an attempt to hit back, Danby had taken advice from Henry Guy on possible technicalities which could be used to force Montagu out of office. That Guy's suggestions included leaving Montagu in office but creating alternative Wardrobe departments to by-pass the official Wardrobe demonstrates how immovable he appeared to be.\textsuperscript{78} His own fall from office prevented Danby from acting on even Guy's limited advice while confirming that Montagu had managed to push the political situation over the edge. Charles II, with good reason, thereafter held him responsible for what ensued.

This, for the time being, had ruled out for him the political prizes far more glittering than the Great Wardrobe which he felt were just as much his by right. His excessive confidence had, nevertheless, driven him to play the 'exclusion crisis' for the highest stakes. In the short term the bridge appointments to the Privy Council in April 1679 had the unintended consequence of making his retention of office less incongruous and he gained the meagre measure of power that went with being an associate of Shaftesbury during his brief tenure as Lord President.

he offered potential mistresses of the king the advice, 'If you are wise, apply yourself betimes: / None highly merit now but by their crimes / And the King does whate'er he's bid by Grimes'. What weakens this hypothesis is that in 1685 Evelyn found her 'a prudent & vertuous Lady'. (J.K. Clark, \textit{Goodwin Wharton}, (1984), p. 211, 354-5; B. Harris (ed.), \textit{The Poems of Charles Sackville, Sixth Earl of Dorset}, (New York, 1979), p. 149, ll. 447-9; Evelyn, \textit{Diary}, IV, p. 468).

\textsuperscript{6} HMC \textit{Rutland}, II, p. 96, Bertie to countess of Rutland, 5 Dec 1685.


\textsuperscript{78} B.L. Add MS 38849, fols. 191-2, Guy to Danby, [c. 1678] -cp. \textit{HMC Ormond}, n.s. IV, p. 443, Southwell to Ormond, 13 July 1678; Bodl. MS Carte 103, fol. 230, newsletter, 17 July 1678.
leaders were forced back into opposition, Montagu continued to back them. Shaftesbury was, admittedly, soon at pains to distance himself from him but Montagu did not see this as a problem. Rather, in gambling his future on Monmouth as the eventual winner in the succession battle, he confidently expected to supplant Shaftesbury as his leading supporter. To this end he sought to exploit his experience as a diplomat by trying to intrigue with Barillon to gain French support for the whigs and to encourage the court into wanting to win him over to their side. Typically for Montagu, this was just too cynical and, in any case, he gave the French the impression (possibly accurate) that he was most interested in the pension they were paying him.79 He had still been trying to intrigue with the French government in late 1683 after the clamp-down following the 'Rye House plot' had forced him to flee to Paris. It had been this flight into exile which had finally enabled the government to wrest control of the Great Wardrobe from him. Despite efforts by the Deputy-Master, Robert Nott, and the Clerk, Charles Bland, to block the warrant, Halifax had been able to have the patent invalidated.80

The change of monarch made it all the more urgent that Montagu try to reestablish his claim to be the Master. His first move was to have his accounts up to Michaelmas 1681 passed by the Exchequer. He then petitioned the Court of Claims to be allowed to perform the coronation service of the Master of the Great Wardrobe; namely, the right to present the king with the pall of cloth-of-gold for the offering. Wary of endorsing his pretension to be the Master, the Commissioners advised him to pursue the matter in the law courts.81 These moves were accompanied by servile assurances that he was willing to accommodate himself to the new political circumstances. He informed Rochester of his hope that

his Majesty will be pleased to think the King is not to remember any thing that has passed in relation to the Duke of York; for whatever my opinions were when I delivered them, being trusted by the public, they are altered now I am become his subject, knowing myself obliged, by the laws of God and man, to hazard life and fortune in the defence of his sacred person, crown and dignity.82

His obsequiousness got him an audience with the king but not the Great Wardrobe or any other position. He then returned to France.83 His chances of getting something

81 E 351/1111-12; Bodl. MS Douce 197, fols. 29-30; F. Sandford, History of the Coronation, (1687), pp. 129-34.
82 Clarendon Correspondence, I, pp. 114-15, Montagu to Rochester, 4 April 1685.
83 Luttrell, Brief Historical Relation, I, p. 341; Fox, History, appendix, p. xcii, Barillon to Louis XIV, 23 May/2 June 1685.
from the new king had not, however, been impossibly remote. One reason why the Mastership of the Great Wardrobe was kept vacant until Preston's return in the autumn might have been to keep Montagu's hopes up while he was angling for office. Moreover, with the emergence as the most influential royal adviser of Sunderland, who saw in him a potentially useful ally, there would be much speculation that he was about to be rewarded with some position at court. The speculation reached a peak in the late summer of 1686 when an audience he had with the king meant that he would be widely tipped to become either the ambassador to Paris once again or Secretary of State. It was only natural that in March 1687, when the position of the anglican-tories looked precarious, some expected that Preston was about to be sacked and that Montagu would finally return to the Great Wardrobe. In early November 1688, after Preston became Secretary of State and at a time when some said that the queen would stay at Montagu's house near Portsmouth while the king was on campaign in the west, the rumours that he would get the Great Wardrobe reappeared.84 How serious all this speculation should be taken is uncertain but, as the example of Sunderland shows, James was entirely willing to employ talented opportunists. It was Montagu's bad luck that James felt he had to find a place for Preston and that the position of Master of the Great Wardrobe happened to be vacant. Had Montagu been still in office in 1685, James would probably, as with all the other senior household positions which did not have an opposite number in his existing household, have reappointed him as a demonstration of his moderation.

As it was, there were a number of leading courtiers who benefited from that moderation. Huntingdon, Newport and, to a lesser extent, Henry Savile had political records to which James might have taken exception but each was retained where they were. No less than was the case with Preston, Huntingdon had shown that it was possible for an exclusionist to become a loyal courtier. Between 1679 and 1681 he had been a regular participant in the public activities of the whigs.85 On 13 October 1681, however, Halifax had arranged for him to see the king and, in the words of Longford,

he threw himself upon his knees and begged his Majesty's pardon for his late errors, telling his Majesty, he was deluded and misled by the specious pretences

of some lords whom he thought truely loyal and zealous for the good of the kingdom, but having of late found by their actions, that they intended nothing less, he did in all humility cast himself at his Majesty's feet begging his Majesty's pardon, and assuring his Majesty, that his future actions should make amends for his past errors.\textsuperscript{86} 

There was some truth in his assertion that his involvement with the whigs had been a temporary aberration which he had come to regret.

During the 1670s, when he was still only in his twenties, he had not been especially active in politics but in 1673 he had been prepared to give his proxy to James and four years later Shaftesbury had thought him 'thrice vile'. It would seem that when Danby assessed his likely support in March 1679 he had thought that Huntingdon might back him, only to revise his assessment and in the event Huntingdon voted for the attainder.\textsuperscript{87} What explains this shift into opposition is that he was convinced that the 'popish plot' was real. When in 1685 Huntingdon attended his trial, Oates, in the middle of the proceedings,

prayed his Lo[rdshi]p would give in Evidence, what he believed of his Narative, w[hi]ch he did, & said that at the first he did give Credit to it as well others who, as well as himselfe are now much Concerned for it, but that he now believes all he swore was falce & that many in[n]ocent men lost theyre lives by it, & that he thinkes him [Oates] to be ye Greatest Villain that lives...\textsuperscript{88} 

A similar interpretation of the 'exclusion crisis' is to be found in notes, drawn up by him weeks before he made these comments at Oates's trial, in preparation for a speech he intended making to the second session of the 1685 parliament. His main theme was to be that the second Test Act should be repealed because it deprived catholic peers of their right to sit in the Lords, with him blaming Oates for spreading the misconception that there was a national emergency which had been used to justify its passage in 1678.\textsuperscript{89} Although his case for repeal was based on preserving the privileges of the peerage (a reflection of his antiquarian interests) and made no mention of altering the position for MPs, this lenity is difficult to square with the zealous anti-catholicism one might have expected from someone who had supported exclusion. In fact, what little else is known of his religious opinions, which would appear to have been orthodoxly

\textsuperscript{86} HMC Ormonde, n.s. VI, p. 204, Longford to Ormond, 18 Oct 1681 - see also, ibid, p. 208, 215; Huntington Library, Hastings MSS, HA 6000, Huntingdon to Geary, 10 Nov 1681; HMC 10th Report, appendix, part IV, p. 173, newsletter, 24 Oct 1681; Luttrell, Brief Historical Relation, I, p. 138.


\textsuperscript{88} Bodl. MS Carte 130, fol. 293, Harcourt to Beaufort, 9 May 1685. When he had written to John Geary, the archdeacon of Stow, in November 1678 about Bedloe's allegations he had implied that he believed him. (Hastings MSS, HA 5956, Huntingdon to Geary, 12 Nov 1678).

\textsuperscript{89} Bodl. MS Carte 78, fols. 403-4, notes on speech, 24 Sept 1685. At the time he had voted for the Lords amendment to protect the position of the catholic peers. (Swatland, 'House of Lords', pp. 388-9, 399).
anglican, contain nothing which would suggest that any prejudices he had against catholics were noteworthy and he would seem to have been more anti-French than anti-catholic.  

Huntingdon had not been the only person for whom the events of 1678 and 1679 had been bewildering. Once he had recovered his balance, however, he had fulfilled his promises of October 1681. In June 1682 he had succeeded Scarsdale as the Captain of the Gentlemen Pensioners, in 1683 he had been sworn to the Privy Council and in 1684 he had been appointed Lord Lieutenant of Leicestershire. In the latter office he had been energetic in his encouragement to the corporation of Leicester to surrender their charter. In 1685 James, as well as reappointing him to the Gentlemen Pensioners, made him a colonel in the infantry and Chief Justice-in-Eyre south of Trent. He thought the last appointment 'very advantageous besides the great Honor'.

Huntingdon and Preston had, at least, undergone conversion experiences which meant that their loyalties were now incontestable. That James also forgave Newport was an act of greater generosity because, although he had been more cautious in his support for the whigs, it was less obvious that he had come to feel any sense of contrition for what he had done. Despite holding court office, his leanings towards presbyterianism had meant that during the 1670s he had been tempted on a number of occasions to oppose the court line in parliament. In 1675, when he was associated with Monmouth, he had been one of those peers who had stirred up the dispute over Shirley v. Fagg and later that year had joined those who had called for parliament to be dissolved. In November 1678 he supported the exclusion of the catholic peers from the Lords and in March 1679 had gone into opposition against Danby. Thereafter, throughout the first two exclusion parliaments he had usually voted in support of the whig programme. Yet the one whig policy he had not supported was exclusion itself, with him having voted against the exclusion bill in November 1680. That eighteen

---

90 The Hastings MSS contain numerous references to show his concern for the upkeep of the church at Ashby de la Zouch. Some, moreover, had suspicions that he had catholic leanings. In 1684 he clashed with Compton and Tennison over the text of the monument he wanted to erect in his father's memory in St. Martin's-in-the-Fields because they felt it implied the existence of Purgatory. In August 1685 Bridget Croft expressed concern to him, probably because of his attitude towards the Test Acts, that he would convert to catholicism. (Hastings MSS, HA 6031, Huntingdon to Compton, 10 Aug 1684; HA 1785, Croft to Huntingdon, 21 Aug 1685). Inevitably, these rumours persisted for as long as he remained one of James's servants. Perhaps his real attitude had been revealed in 1675 when he had been sceptical of the supposed miraculous origins of a cross which had appeared on the wall of a Leicestershire church. (HA 5721, Hastings to Huntingdon, 13 Feb 1675). His prejudice against the French which is evident in his 1685 speech also appears in one of his letters from 1679. (HA 5967, Huntingdon to Geary, 13 Nov 1679).

91 Hastings MSS, HA 1370, Charles II to Huntingdon, 26 June 1682; PC 2/69, fol. 320, 28 Feb 1683.


93 SP 44/336, pp. 309-10, warrant to Attorney-General, 23 Dec 1685; Hastings MSS, HA 6051, Huntingdon to Geary, 19 Dec 1685.
anglican, contain nothing which would suggest that any prejudices he had against Catholics were noteworthy and he would seem to have been more anti-French than anti-Catholic.\(^{90}\)

Huntingdon had not been the only person for whom the events of 1678 and 1679 had been bewildering. Once he had recovered his balance, however, he had fulfilled his promises of October 1681. In June 1682 he had succeeded Scarsdale as the Captain of the Gentlemen Pensioners, in 1683 he had been sworn to the Privy Council and in 1684 he had been appointed Lord Lieutenant of Leicestershire.\(^{91}\) In the latter office he had been energetic in his encouragement to the corporation of Leicester to surrender their charter.\(^{92}\) In 1685 James, as well as reappointing him to the Gentlemen Pensioners, made him a colonel in the infantry and Chief Justice-in-Eyre south of Trent. He thought the last appointment 'very advantageous besides the great Honor'.\(^{93}\)

Huntingdon and Preston had, at least, undergone conversion experiences which meant that their loyalties were now incontestable. That James also forgave Newport was an act of greater generosity because, although he had been more cautious in his support for the Whigs, it was less obvious that he had come to feel any sense of contrition for what he had done. Despite holding court office, his leanings towards Presbyterianism had meant that during the 1670s he had been tempted on a number of occasions to oppose the court line in parliament. In 1675, when he was associated with Monmouth, he had been one of those peers who had stirred up the dispute over Shirley v. Fagg and later that year had joined those who had called for parliament to be dissolved. In November 1678 he supported the exclusion of the Catholic peers from the Lords and in March 1679 had gone into opposition against Danby. Thereafter, throughout the first two exclusion parliaments he had usually voted in support of the Whig programme. Yet the one Whig policy he had not supported was exclusion itself, with him having voted against the exclusion bill in November 1680. That eighteen

\(^{90}\) The Hastings MSS contain numerous references to show his concern for the upkeep of the church at Ashby de la Zouch. Some, moreover, had suspicions that he had Catholic leanings. In 1684 he clashed with Compton and Tennison over the text of the monument he wanted to erect in his father's memory in St. Martin's-in-the-Fields because they felt it implied the existence of Purgatory. In August 1685 Bridget Croft expressed concern to him, probably because of his attitude towards the Test Acts, that he would convert to Catholicism. (Hastings MSS, HA 6031, Huntingdon to Compton, 10 Aug 1684; HA 1785, Croft to Huntingdon, 21 Aug 1685). Inevitably, these rumours persisted for as long as he remained one of James's servants. Perhaps his real attitude had been revealed in 1675 when he had been sceptical of the supposed miraculous origins of a cross which had appeared on the wall of a Leicestershire church. (HA 5721, Hastings to Huntingdon, 13 Feb 1675). His prejudice against the French which is evident in his 1685 speech also appears in one of his letters from 1679. (HA 5967, Huntingdon to Geary, 13 Nov 1679).

\(^{91}\) Hastings MSS, HA 1370, Charles II to Huntingdon, 26 June 1682; PC 2/69, fol. 320, 28 Feb 1683.


\(^{93}\) SP 44/336, pp. 309-10, warrant to Attorney-General, 23 Dec 1685; Hastings MSS, HA 6051, Huntingdon to Geary, 19 Dec 1685.
months earlier, his eldest son, Richard Newport (who was one of the Equerries) had been absent from the Common's division on the first exclusion bill points to his opposition to exclusion having, if nothing else, been consistent. It was presumably that consistency which had enabled him to remain in office until 1685, even if it had not been without good reason that after the Oxford parliament he was, according to James, 'much afraid' that he would be dismissed as Treasurer of the Household. What he could not have expected was that James would reappoint him and it is, perhaps, equally surprising that he was willing to serve under him. Desire to retain office cannot be the entire answer and it is possible that his sense of duty, evident in his support for the royalists during the Civil War as well as in his opposition to exclusion, was not something he felt, at this stage, to be incompatible with honest disagreement with the king's religious policy.

What could have counted against Henry Savile was not his record on the issue of exclusion. He had been fortunate to have been the envoy extraordinary to Paris between 1679 and 1682 so his involvement in domestic politics during those years had only been at one remove. Less favourable to him was the fact that he was Halifax's brother. His position at court was not, it is true, entirely dependant on this link but it had been the case that his absence in France had increased that dependence as it had been through his brother that he had principally kept in touch with what was happening at Whitehall. In this, Halifax's superior astuteness had served him well. It had been he who had had the sense to warn him in June 1679, when he was pressing Coventry to have Oates's allegations and the proceedings at Coleman's trial translated for a French readership, that such a suggestion was unwise. Regarding exclusion, Savile had in January 1681 endorsed his brother's decision to oppose it. Had he remained in England it is less certain that he would not have supported it. In May 1676 he had implicitly criticised James's religious faith to his face when he had countered his observation that Burnet was a better preacher than any of the royal chaplains by pointing out that, given he never attended services in the Chapel Royal, James was not in a position to judge. He had added to the affront by criticising James's view that a strong army was required to keep public order, telling him that 'an army had turned out Richard and he feared might turn out others, and that he hoped to see England governed w[i]thout any soldiers'. For this he had been banished from the court. He had again shown a capacity to cause

---


95 Savile Correspondence, pp. 93-4, 98, 105, 172-3.

96 Hatton Correspondence, I, p. 129, Hatton to Hatton, 25 May 1676. A different version of this incident is given in Essex Papers, II, p. 50, Harbord to Essex, 27 May 1676.
trouble in 1678 when he had supported the opponents of Lauderdale in parliament. This proved to have been an unwise move, leading to his temporary suspension as a Groom of the Bedchamber which thwarted the deal by which he had planned to sell his Bedchamber post in order to enable him to buy the Mastership of the Robes from Laurence Hyde.97

This deal had been arranged for him by the duchess of Cleveland and represented an attempt to gain some sort of promotion. He had been a Groom of the Bedchamber, first to James and then to Charles, since 1665 and by 1678 was finding the duties irksome. When his colleague and close friend, Henry Guy, resigned in 1679 to become Secretary of the Treasury, he and Sunderland advised him to do the same. He would have done so gladly had he been able to find a replacement at a time when a retrenchment was in force. When in 1680 he agreed to become Vice-Chamberlain, obtained through the efforts of Sunderland and the duchess of Portsmouth, he did so in part to expedite his release from the Bedchamber. During the second half of 1681, with Halifax pushing Charles II to side with the Dutch in their growing dispute with the French, Savile’s position in Paris became uncomfortable and, on his brother’s advice, he had given notice that he would prefer to be recalled. As compensation he was added to the Admiralty Commission but at the price of having the king revoke their agreement that he could dispose his still-vacant Bedchamber place for a profit.98 Few of these events suggest that he was especially ambitious for very high office. Earlier in his career he had preferred to be one of the more notorious court rakes, leading his best friend (and probable lover), the late earl of Rochester, to compare him to Falstaff. By 1679 (when he was not yet aged forty) his health had already been undermined by the combination of alcoholism, obesity, venereal disease and mercury treatment.99 That in 1681 he claimed he was looking for a wife may indicate that illness and Rochester’s death had persuaded him to slow down. His health was by 1685 beginning to interfere with his court duties.100 There was no great risk on James’s part in keeping him in office.

Savile was no more lucky in being kept on than Newport, Halifax, Sunderland and Godolphin. Unlike many other courtiers, they were owed few favours by James (Halifax was an exception) and all of them must have realised that James could just as easily have decided to do without them. It was, in the circumstances, an appropriately

100 Savile Correspondence, p. 215, Halifax to Savile, 10/20 Aug 1681; HMC Montagu of Beaulieu, p. 190, Parker to Albemarle.
noble gesture to reappoint them. For those who viewed the accession of a catholic as inescapably calamitous, however, it was scarcely less astonishing that James also chose to reappoint the anglican-tories. That things remained much as they had been before came as a shock to the many who were primed to expect the worst. Continuity was at this juncture of more than ordinary significance. That James had no real plans to impose the sort of innovations the whigs feared made it all the easier for him to stress his commitment to continuity. With the same touching innocence he had displayed in his 1679 letter to Dartmouth, he did have hopes that by his example and some gentle encouragement, catholicism would inexorably acquire the sort of following at court he was certain it deserved. Ideally, there was to be no catholic elite promoted merely because of their faith. The existing elite was, instead, to transform itself. He was not interested in opportunistic conversions and said as much to his servants. 101 What he wanted was conviction. To James, confident that there would, in time, be plenty of his servants who would convert without being coerced, this transformation would confirm that his courtiers were the natural governors of the kingdom. They were already the cream of his subjects and, with due paternal care, he intended to guide them away from error. Loyalty was what it was all about. His anglican-tory servants had already shown themselves to be exemplarily loyal to the monarchy. All that was now required was to persuade them to show the same loyalty to the one true church.

With these delusions in mind, James confirmed the incumbent anglican-tories in the remaining court positions. Over and above what they stood to gain personally from reappointment, there was for these men, who had stood by the principle that one should serve the rightful king, whoever he was, a certain comfort in the smoothness of the accession. Together they represented, as they would have seen it, the timeless service beyond partisan interests. Grandison had been appointed Captain of the Yeoman of the Guard in 1662 for the simple reason that he was the uncle of the countess of Castlemaine. 102 This connection was of little use to him by 1685 but by then his twenty-three years of service meant he had no need of it. Similarly, the position of Comptroller of the Household had originally been obtained for Maynard in 1672 by Lauderdale. Over the years he had proved his dependability to the government so there seemed no reason why he should not be allowed to continue his service to the Crown. 103 Henry Bulkeley, the Master of the Household, had, like Maynard,
participated in the opposition to exclusion in parliament. That his wife, Sophia, who was appointed a Lady of the Bedchamber to Mary Beatrice, was a catholic gave James an additional reason to reappoint him. Edward Griffin’s continuation as Treasurer of the Chamber confirmed his family’s monopoly on the job, he and his father having held it continuously since 1660. The most forceful of all indications that the old guard was to remain in place, however, was that the occupants of the two highest ranking court posts were left undisturbed. Ormond and Arlington were to linger on as Lord Steward and Lord Chamberlain.

CHAPTER TWO: ORMOND, ARLINGTON, AILESBY AND MULGRAVE

When Charles II died, Ormond was still in Ireland, awaiting the arrival of Rochester so that he could surrender the Lord Lieutenancy to him. In his absence no arrangements were made to have his white stave broken at the late king’s interment. It was, instead, delivered up to the new king, who then returned it to him, thereby lending even greater symbolism to the renewal of his tenure as Lord Steward of the Household. It was, moreover, deliberately significant that he was appointed Lord High Steward for the coronation so that he could, once more, carry the St. Edward’s Crown, as he had done in 1661. Ormond as the foremost protector of the Crown was a cliche of tory propaganda which now found expression in ritual. It was a measure of his public eminence that by 1685 it was unthinkable that the most senior great officer of state could have been anyone else.

So enormous was Ormond’s standing as a tory icon that James’s relations with him required considerable tact. The previous October James had played the major part in having him dismissed as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland so that the purge of the Irish army could commence. Although, as shall be seen, this blow was softer than is usually supposed, his dismissal had had the appearance of an insult. His decision to return to England might also have appeared a departure in disgrace and there were those in Ireland who, as an alternative to the rumour that the crossing to Chester had killed him, soon heard it said that he was to be sent to the Tower. Working on the dubious assumption that Ormond had already given offence to James (hence his dismissal), this expectation that his fall from power would soon become incontrovertible was being fed by the near-universal anxiety regarding James’s intentions. Any further apparent insults to Ormond would have been interpreted in only one way, immediately destroying the ample benefits of James’s efforts to calm his subjects’ apprehensions. For him it was therefore essential to reassure both Ormond and those who were anticipating his marginalisation, especially given that he had no wish that their relationship should be anything other than amicable. Three years earlier James had respected him enough to ask him to become the godfather to his daughter, the short-lived Charlotte Maria. That respect was still undiminished. On his return to court Ormond’s own comment was ‘I

---

1 The orthodox interpretation of Ormond’s final years, from which what follows has been restated most recently in J.C. Beckett, The Cavalier Duke, (Belfast, 1990), pp. 125-45.
2 HMC Ormonde, n.s. VII, p. 324, Wyche to Ormond, 19 Feb 1685.
3 Although the St. Edward’s Crown had not been one of the pieces taken, that Blood’s bungled theft of the regalia in 1671 had been his attempt to overcome the embarrassment of his bungled assassination of Ormond five months earlier made this duty all the more poignant.
4 Bodl. MS Carte 217, fol. 137, Mountjoy to Ormond, 15 April 1685; HMC Ormonde, n.s. VII, p. 338, Wogan to Gascoigne, 8 April 1685.
5 Luttrell, Brief Historical Relation, I, p. 213.
am very well satisfied w[i]th my Reception & with his Ma[jes]ties Countenance towards mee ever since'.

Ormond had lost, as he put it to Sir Robert Southwell, ‘the best King, the best Master, and (if I may be so sawcy as to say so) the best friend that ever man had’. His immediate response on hearing the news had been to write to James to offer his condolences. For this task his uncomplicated ideals of loyalty (so similar to James’s own) rose above any uncertainties he may then have felt about his relationship with his new monarch. He observed

It is now within a few days half an age, fully fifty years, since I was first sworn into the service of the blessed King your father, and I thank God I never so much as in thought broke the oaths I took to him and his successor. If I had as many years to live they should all be laid at your Majesty’s feet, and dedicated to your service, as the short space that remains most humbly and most really is.

There is no reason to question these declarations of loyalty for with Ormond there has always to be a suspicion that his sincerity was grounded in his naivety. As his letter indicates, loyalty had been the organising principle of his life and he was too old to change, despite some misgivings about where things might be heading. These misgivings are hinted at in the covering letter he sent to Rochester but characteristically he preferred to suppress them. He wrote that ‘this has been a year of trial and calamity to me. The last the death of our good master is not so peculiar to me as other afflictions have been, and yet it is not the less sensible for the number of sharers I have in it. I quit the subject, and keep my thoughts and trouble to myself’.

By ‘afflictions’ he was not, however, thinking primarily of political matters. In July 1684 his wife had died and this had been only the most important in a series of bereavements. For those eager to promote Ormond as a public hero, these bereavements conveniently invested his life with the dimension of tragedy but in private his final years were ones of overwhelming melancholia. His reactions to James’s rule were to be conditioned by his fusing of this despondency with his commitment to unwavering loyalty to create the self-image of himself as the suffering royal servant: that is, the old royalist stereotype but on an heroic scale.

Ormond was dying. Two years before he had caught a fever and attacks of pleurisy had followed in October 1683 and March 1684. As was only to be expected for someone in their seventies, his health would continue to cause him serious problems. In August 1685 his hearing was permanently damaged by an ear infection

---

6 Bodl. MS Carte 220, fol. 116, Ormond to Longford, 2 April 1685.
8 HMC Ormonde, n.s. VII, p. 318, Ormond to James II, 11 Feb 1685.
10 The most revealing evidence for his melancholia are the prayers by him in B.L. Add MS 11498.
and in January 1686 he was too ill to attend Delamere’s trial. When he accompanied the king on his visit to Bristol in August 1686, illness forced him to return to London early. His gout, which had been causing him problems for over twenty years, became noticeably worse during early 1687 and his withdrawal from court became virtually permanent. When he tried to attend the king at Windsor in June 1687 he was unable to climb the Great Staircase and his gout thwarted his wish to take part in the 1687 western progress. When he passed through Gloucestershire, James had the courtesy to visit him at Badminton and they agreed that he was too ill to continue the active performance of his duties as Lord Steward. These final years of his life were, therefore, ones of dignified retirement. The first two winters of the reign were probably spent mainly at Hampton Court, where he could live less expensively than at Whitehall, while the rest of the year was spent mostly in prolonged visits to relatives. In February 1686 he took up residence at Cornbury, Clarendon’s Oxfordshire seat, where, in Southwell’s words, he relaxed ‘in exercise or in reading as the weather will allow, and I suppose has little thoughts of any other kind of life’. That summer he spent at Badminton as the guest of Beaufort, whose daughter, Lady Margaret Somerset, had married Ossory, his grandson and heir, the previous August. The following year this pattern was repeated, with addition of a visit to Bath in the spring. Searches were made

11 Carte, Ormonde, II, p. 534, 550-1; HMC Ormonde, n.s. VII, pp. 207-8, Clarke to Arran, 6 Mar 1684; p. 213, Ormond to Arran, 26 Mar 1684; B.L. Add MS 11498, fol. 3-4; Ellis Correspondence, I, p. 207, ---- to Ellis, 14 Dec 1686; HMC Ormonde, II, p. 303, Ormond to Southwell, 3 May 1686; T.B. Howell (ed.), A Complete Collection of State Trials, (1809-26), XI, col. 514; LC 5/201, fol. 472, account of Delamere’s trial, 1686; Bramston, Autobiography, p. 216. Lindsey had asked Ormond to deputize for him as Lord Great Chamberlain at Delamere’s trial. Mulgrave, however, challenged the right of the Lord Great Chamberlain to organise the preparations for the trial of a peer, claiming that this was the right of the Lord Chamberlain of the Household. Mulgrave’s arguments were accepted by the king although, on the day, Mulgrave, Black Rod and the Heralds fell out with each other, prompting an enraged Jeffreys, who was presiding as the Lord High Steward, to denounce them from the bench for being incompetent. (LC 5/2, fols. 173-4, report on Delamere’s trial, 1686 [copy]; HMC Ormonde, n.s. V, p. 392, Ormond to [Mulgrave], 18 Nov 1685; LC 5/122, 1686 warrants, no. 2, Mulgrave to Preston, 2 Jan 1686; W. Hamper (ed.), Life, Diary and Correspondence of Sir William Dugdale, (1827), pp. 468-9, Dugdale to Dugdale, 19 Jan 1686).

12 Carte, Ormonde, II, p. 545, 548, 550; HMC Ormonde, n.s. V, p. 86, Ormond to Ossory, May 1679; Ellis Correspondence, I, p. 273, ---- to Ellis, 19 April 1687; p. 286, J.F. to Ellis, 3 May 1687; B.L. Add MS 21484, fol. 68, Ormond to Southwell, 14 July 1687; Lansdowne (ed.), The Petty-Southwell Correspondence, 1676-1687, (1928), p. 285, Southwell to Petty, 10 Sept 1687.

13 Carte, Ormonde, II, p. 548. Carte’s information was partly derived from Bishop Hough who, in 1735, recalled to him that Ormond ‘was not turned out of his Stewardship of the Household by K[ing] James: but being very infirm for a year & [a] half before he died, & finding himself unable to attend at Court, resigned it, & Lord Ailesbury was put in his stead.’ (Bodl. MS Carter 266, fol. 19). Hough was wrong. He seems to have been confused by Ailesbury’s appointment as Lord Chamberlain and in the printed version Carte made no reference to Ailesbury or anyone else deputizing for Ormond. There would have been no need to have nominated a deputy as the Treasurer and the Comptroller of the Household automatically deputized for the Lord Steward in his absence.

14 HMC Ormonde, n.s. VII, p. 394, Ormond to Matthew, 21 Nov 1685; p. 410, Clarke to Gascoigne, 12 Feb 1686; p. 411, Rochester to Ormond, 25 Feb 1686; p. 437, Ormond to Clarendon, 3 Aug 1686; Lansdowne (ed.), The Petty-Southwell Correspondence, (1928), p. 185, Southwell to Petty, 10 Mar 1686; Ellis Correspondence, I, p. 65, ---- to Ellis, 15 Mar 1686; p. 104, ---- to Ellis, 17 April 1686; p. 132, ---- to Ellis, 30 June 1686.
for a suitable country residence for him to hire and by October 1687 he had moved into Kingston Lacy in Dorset.\(^{15}\) He would remain there until his death.

It is less than clear that this withdrawal from court was a political statement. He was an exhausted old man and had long looked forward to retirement from public life. In April 1679 Ossory, with his permission, had entered into talks with Winchester in the hope of selling him the Lord Stewardship for £10,000. On being consulted, Charles II had objected to the idea of Winchester as Ormond’s successor. After Ossory had managed to persuade the king to drop his objections to Winchester, the preparations for the 1679 retrenchment created an additional difficulty. By reducing the value of the office in question, it was probably this which caused these negotiations to fall through.\(^{16}\) This failure was not the end of the matter. Towards the end of 1681 John Fitzpatrick had offered it for sale, although to whom is not known. Arran was angered that this had been done behind his back but Ormond appears to have had no objections. Moreover, when he was granted his English dukedom a year later, he saw as the main reason to welcome this honour the fact that it would reduce the demotion in the order of precedence he would suffer if he ceased to be Lord Steward.\(^{17}\)

His attitude to the more contentious question of his future as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland had been much the same. Governing Ireland was stressful in a way being Lord Steward simply was not and Ormond had been as aware as his critics were that a younger man was needed. He confided to his son in December 1680 that

I have long wished for that retirement you would be pleased with for yourself, as much more suitable to my age, but the importunity of friends and their flattery that I might be of use to the public prevailed against my inclination, and now I am found in suspicious times, in an envied and slippery station which I cannot quit with honour against the command of my Master, nor hold with safety.\(^{18}\)

When Charles II the following year had confirmed him in office, he gave a strong hint, by writing in reply that ‘it is a burden that is, or (if I may flatter myself so far as to think it is not yet) will shortly be passed my strength to bear’, that, however undiminished his desire to serve him remained, he would not be too displeased if he was, after all, replaced.\(^{19}\) The truth was that he was disenchanted with all things Irish. In the middle of the negotiations with Winchester he had already been looking forward to retiring to a country house somewhere in the south of England, realising that ‘it is not like I shall have much joy or security in living in this kingdom, or perhaps at

\(^{15}\) HMC Ormonde, n.s. VII, pp. 482-3, Ormond to Matthew, 5 Feb 1687; p. 488, Ormond to Fitzpatrick, 12 Mar 1687; Ellis Correspondence, I, p. 263, ---- to Ellis, 22 Mar 1687; Lansdowne (ed.), The Southwell-Petty Correspondence, pp. 284-5, Southwell to Petty, 10 Sept 1687; Carte, Ormonde, II, p. 548. Kingston Lacy belonged to the Bankes family.


\(^{17}\) HMC Ormonde, n.s. VI, p. 276, Ormond to Fitzpatrick, 24 Dec 1681; pp. 312-13, Arran to Ormond, 14 Feb 1682; p. 486, Ormond to Matthew, 28 Nov 1682.

\(^{18}\) HMC Ormonde, n.s. V, pp. 523-4, Ormond to Arran, 13 Dec 1680.

\(^{19}\) HMC Ormonde, n.s. VI, p. 104, Ormond to Charles II, 23 July 1681.
London'.

When, at last, he was dismissed as Lord Lieutenant he was not in the least downhearted and not just because he would no longer be expected to purge the army. Apart from the question of whether Rochester had plotted against him to get the job, his only concern was to ascertain whether his removal was meant as a calculated insult, for this was rather difficult to judge at a distance of 300 miles. He immediately asked to be allowed to return to England.

Six days before what would be his final departure from Ireland he told Rochester, 'I am now as impatient to be in England as I was when our late Majesty was to pass from Holland to take his crown, being heartily weary of this place, which perpetually brings into my memory old and late irreparable losses.' He would later conclude that he would 'rather live and die in Carolina than in Ireland...'

There was another reason which mitigated his removal. His replacement, Rochester, was the person whom he saw as his obvious political heir. This was why it had been so important to him to be reassured that his appointment did not mean that he had been plotting against him. Four years previously, Rochester had, in conjunction with the duchess of Portsmouth, Sunderland and Godolphin, been doing just that, seeking to have Essex appointed as Lord Lieutenant and therefore opposing Ormond's attempts to have the Irish parliament summoned. Relations between them had changed somewhat by April 1682 when Arran told him that Ormond was as friendly with him as he had been with his father (a considerable compliment) and this friendship had been formalised three months later when (on James's suggestion) Ossory married his daughter, Anne Hyde. On returning to Ireland in 1684 it had, therefore, been natural for Ormond to regard Rochester as his principal ally at court. It was Rochester who warned him that he would be advised to cooperate in the forthcoming purges and, once the king had revealed that it was he who was going to replace him, Rochester was at pains to reassure Ormond he had 'done all that was in me to hinder it, and at last to delay it, and would yet contribute anything I could think of to keep the government there in the same hands it is.' Their roles were now reversed. It was now Ormond's turn to offer advice to Rochester on the purges, with him warning that they were unnecessary. In returning to England, moreover, Ormond was reducing the risk that Rochester would become isolated from the court. The plan was for Ossory to remain at
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20 HMC Ormonde, n.s. V, pp. 94-5, Ormond to Ossory, 13 May 1679.
21 HMC Ormonde, n.s. VII, pp. 280-335, esp. pp. 282-3, 292; HMC Egmont, II, p. 143, Southwell to Perceval, 12 Jan 1685; Clarendon Correspondence, I, pp. 96-100; Bodl. MS Carte 20, fol. 83, Ormond to Arran, 7 Nov 1684; fol. 90, Ormond to Arran, 19 Nov 1684.
22 HMC Ormonde, n.s. VII, p. 335, Ormond to Rochester, 4 Mar 1685.
23 HMC Ormonde, n.s. VII, p. 483, Ormond to Matthew, 5 Feb 1687.
Dublin so that his wife could be reunited with her father and that he (who was clearly being groomed as a future Lord Lieutenant) could assist Rochester. Kilkenny Castle was to be made available to Rochester for his own use. Meanwhile, Arran, despite feeling that he should have been consulted more often by him on Irish policy, had 'come to greater intimacy' with Rochester in London and had reached agreement with him that he should be his replacement as the colonel of his regiment of horse. To complete the new arrangements Arran was to travel to Ireland ahead of Rochester to take over the management of Ormond's interests there. 27

These plans suffered a major set-back when the countess of Ossory died, following a miscarriage, in January 1685. This was another of Ormond's 'afflictions'. It was equally devastating for Rochester who heard the news only six days before the death of Charles II made a further rethink of the arrangements necessary. 28 Although it was Clarendon who would instead be sent as Lord Lieutenant, the result of the rethink was that Ossory returned to England with his grandfather to become a Gentleman of the Bedchamber. Their links with the Hydes were not, however, severed. Ormond's stays at Cornbury in Clarendon's absence is just one indication of this. Another is that in 1686 Ormond would write to Clarendon from Hampton Court to complain that he was lonely, with all the courtiers away in the country and with Rochester being especially missed because he was usually his most frequent visitor. From Ireland Clarendon kept Ormond in touch with events, hoping that his support could be of assistance but found that Ormond (possibly through choice, although that is not what he told Clarendon) no longer played any part in the formulation of Irish policy. The one thing Ormond did do for him was to nominate him as High Steward of Oxford University in late 1686. This was a mere gesture but not completely without meaning at a time when it was obvious that Tyrconnell would soon dislodge him from the office of Lord Lieutenant. 29

As should be evident, a central concern for anyone posted to Dublin as Lord Lieutenant was that there should be someone in London able to put their point of view to senior ministers as well as able to keep them reliably up-to-date with developments at court. It was also important that when the Lord Lieutenant did travel to England there was someone whom he could trust who could be left behind to govern in his absence. Over the years Ormond had, for these purposes, relied on his two sons: first Ossory


29 HMC Ormonde, n.s. VII, p. 437, Ormond to Clarendon, 3 Aug 1686; p. 476, Clarendon to Ormond, 4 Dec 1686; Clarendon Correspondence, I, p. 405, Clarendon to Ormond, 25 May 1686; pp. 564-5, Clarendon to Ormond, 28 Aug 1686; II, p. 8, Clarendon to Ormond, 28 Sept 1686. See also Ellis Correspondence, I, pp. 140-1, ---- to Ellis, 13 July 1686.
and then, after Ossory's death, Arran. Ossory had acted as Lord Deputy while his father was in England between 1664 and 1665 and between 1668 and 1669. Arran had done so between 1682 and 1684. Conversely, when Ormond was in Ireland, they had written regularly to him from England, with these letters having been supplemented by correspondence from various clients, of whom the most useful were Anglesey, Longford and Sir Robert Southwell. Elaborate though these arrangements were, they would, of themselves, have been insufficient to prevent him becoming dangerously disconnected from the infighting at Whitehall. To survive (and his career had not been without its downfalls), it had been especially essential for him to have alliances with other senior ministers. For this protection he had tended to rely on one other major courtier. In all there had been three of these alliances. The first had been with Clarendon and the third was that with Rochester. The one which had come between these two had been with Arlington.

The basis of his alliance with Arlington had, like that with Rochester, been the marriage of his heir. In 1659 Ossory had married Emilia, the daughter of Lodewijk van Nassau-Beverweerds and the sister of Hendrik van Nassau-Ouwerkerk. Seven years later, Emilia's sister, Isabella, married Arlington and, through their wives, Ossory and Arlington had become close friends. There had, it is true, been times when this friendship had been strained by politics. Ormond had not approved of Arlington's role in Clarendon's downfall and during the events of 1668 and 1669 relations between them were tense. In facing the challenge to him from Buckingham and Ormery, Ormond had initially expected support from Arlington and he had, at least, recognised that he did have a certain obligation to do so. His accusations to Ormond that he was associating himself with James's faction (which may have been intended as no more than a pretext to justify his decision not to support him) only carried weight in the context of their supposed friendship and his promotion of the scheme whereby Ormond would have remained on as Lord Lieutenant in name only suggests that he was anxious to limit Ormond's humiliation.30 The damage done by these events, however, had time to heal. Ormond's presence was no longer required in Ireland and he remained at court until 1674, allowing him to look after his own interests. That the policies Charles II pursued on Arlington's advice in the years which followed were not ones which Ormond always approved of does not seem to have come between them. It was not just a coincidence that it was to Arlington that Charles II gave the delicate task in May 1671 of informing Ormond that Blood was to receive a royal pardon for his attempted assassination of him. By the end of 1673 Ormond was one of the leading supporters of

Arlington's peace policy, helping him draft the treaty of Westminster in February 1674.\textsuperscript{31} Ossory had in the mean time acted as his leading defender against the attempted impeachment in January 1674. When that autumn he resigned as Secretary of State to become Lord Chamberlain, it was Arlington who wrote to Ormond that

\begin{quote}
I shall much want the comfort and favor of your protection to the greate badge of it, my white staffe, which should support mee much. I offer out the company and society of your G[ra]ce and wish you might let it frequent my lodgings with much lesse danger to you of ill hazardes than it did my predecessours.\textsuperscript{32}
\end{quote}

Within a matter of weeks Arlington and Ossory were making their way to Holland in their unsuccessful bid to mediate between the prince of Orange and Louis XIV.

By the time of Arlington's appointment as Lord Chamberlain, Ormond had already returned to Ireland but it was not until he was reappointed as Lord Lieutenant in 1677 that there are clear indications of him using Arlington, in conjunction with Ossory, as his principal agent in London and it is during the next three years that their partnership is most in evidence. Particularly significant is that when Ossory visited Ireland in 1679, Ormond gave Arlington permission to open any letter addressed to him arriving in London.\textsuperscript{33} It was on the two of them that he routinely relied to undertake the business on his behalf in connection with the Irish finances, possibly feeling that Arlington had the appropriate experience where Ossory did not.\textsuperscript{34} When in 1679 Ormond wanted to come to England, it was Arlington who argued against Coventry's opposition and it was also he who obtained reassurances from the king that he did not intend to dismiss Ormond and who offered advice to Ossory on a disputed point about the commission appointed to carry out Ormond's duty as Lord Steward to swear in MPs. In 1680 he was to be found, in accordance with Ormond's wishes, pressing for the Irish parliament to be summoned.\textsuperscript{35} On a more personal note, he assisted Ossory in arranging the education of his son, Lord James Butler, and, when Ormond was trying to sell the Lord Stewardship to Winchester, he offered Ormond the use of Euston for his retirement.\textsuperscript{36}

Then, on 30 July 1680, Ossory had died. It was at Arlington House that the death took place. It fell to Arlington to arrange the funeral and about a fortnight later Lord James Butler (who now inherited his father's courtesy title) was presented at court by

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{32} Bodl. MS Carte 221, fol. 123, Arlington to Ormond, 6 Oct 1674, punctuation added.
\textsuperscript{33} \textit{HMC Ormonde}, n.s. IV, p. 302, Ormond to Arlington, 13 Jan 1679. That Arlington was the Postmaster-General would have made this all the easier.
\textsuperscript{34} \textit{HMC Ormonde}, n.s. IV, p. 54, 57, 95, 220, 385. See also \textit{HMC Ormonde}, n.s. VI, p. 81.
\textsuperscript{36} \textit{HMC Ormonde}, n.s. IV, p. 243, 261, 291, 296; \textit{HMC Ormonde}, n.s. V, p. 158.
\end{footnotesize}
him. It would be too simple to conclude that Ossory's death ended Ormond's alliance with Arlington. Nevertheless, by early 1682 Arlington was wanting the younger Ossory to marry Frances Bennet, the daughter of one of his distant relatives, Simon Bennet. Ormond was unimpressed, telling Arran that 'besides [the] portion there are few other inducements to make it desirable', adding that 'neither the quality or qualifications of the father and mother are great attractives', and he rejected the proposal. As has already been explained, Ossory was instead married to Anne Hyde, confirming the new alliance with Rochester. Although there is nothing to suggest that the friendship between Ormond and Arlington had diminished, there seems little doubt that Ormond was reassessing his political position. Rochester was in the ascendent whereas ill health and old age were steadily pushing Arlington towards retirement.

That it was only at this point that Ormond was prompted by Arlington's lack of involvement in court politics to look elsewhere may seem odd given the conventional assumption that he played little part in court politics after his resignation as Secretary of State in September 1674. That assumption is, in part, based on the further assumption that it was usual for a Lord Chamberlain to be politically dormant. In fact, his activities on behalf of Ormond of themselves raise questions about these assumptions. What is more, at the time, few had interpreted his appointment as Lord Chamberlain as a sign that his influence was waning. It had been a matter of some concern to James that 'he would still have some part in affairs'. When in December 1674 he and Ossory undertook their mission to William, the feeling was that he had become too powerful and that the only way to diminish his intimacy with the king would be to have him appointed Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. William Harbord's assessment was that he 'will as readily loose his head as change his place'. The consensus of opinion on his return from Holland was by no means that he had been seriously damaged by his mission's failure. If his intention in becoming Lord Chamberlain had been to withdraw from the limelight, he had obviously failed but then it is far from clear that that had been his intention. His decision to become Lord Chamberlain had not been a hasty one. The attempt to impeach him in January 1674 may have strengthened his
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40 Macpherson, Original Papers, I, p. 73.
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desire to vacate his Secretaryship of State (it is difficult to conceive of an impeachment against him based on anything he might have had to sign as Lord Chamberlain) but as early as the previous July he had been trying to get St.Albans to sell the Lord Chamberlaincy to him.\textsuperscript{43} May it not have been that he saw the position of Lord Chamberlain not as a refuge from being Secretary of State but as something for which it was worth sacrificing his existing position? There was probably a feeling among contemporaries that offices such as Lord Chamberlain or Lord Steward were properly meant for earls who were themselves the son of an earl. If he had not exactly come from nowhere, Arlington's father had been no more than a knight. He had already managed to get his daughter married to one of the king's bastards. He had, furthermore, received his earldom in 1672. No earl within living memory had been Secretary and he probably felt that it was time to pass its drudgery onto someone who was still a clerk: namely, Sir Joseph Williamson, who had formerly been Arlington's own clerk.

For Arlington to have hoped to retain his dominance in policy-making after he became Lord Chamberlain was far from having been totally impractical. The short answer to the question of why he, nevertheless, failed to retain that dominance is Danby. The two of them hated each other and it was Arlington who did most to resist Danby's rise to become his successor as chief minister. On the face of it, Arlington should have had little difficulty in at least checking his rival's encroachments, if only because Danby's inexperience in diplomacy could not be expected to match his own expertise. What had spoilt Arlington's chances was, after all, the very public failure of his visit to Holland in late 1674 but not, as is usually supposed, because he lost his reputation and his credit so much as that he lost the initiative. He had been given what appeared to be an opportunity to put fully into action his recommended policy and he had been unsuccessful. It was only understandable that Charles II should have responded by exploring alternative options. Yet when Danby got his chance to influence foreign policy the course he adopted was not dissimilar to that which Arlington had already tried. What made the negotiations with the prince of Orange in 1677 different from those of 1674 was that this time they did succeed in arranging Princess Mary's betrothal to William. The vital advantage which had enabled Danby rather than Arlington to gain the policy initiative in the mid-1670s was that his priorities had still been largely domestic ones. Arlington, on the other hand, may have had a tendency to see diplomacy as an end in itself which would have been a decisive weakness at a time when foreign policy was regularly subordinated to considerations about the government's debts and the management of parliament. There was nothing

\textsuperscript{43} Hatton Correspondence, I, pp. 111-12, Hatton to Hatton, 8 July 1673; Essex Papers, I, p. 133, Temple to Essex, 25 Oct 1673.
mysterious in the fact that it should have been the Lord Treasurer who had come to have the largest say in foreign policy.

Despite his lack of success in preventing Danby's ascendency in the 1670s, Arlington had survived as Lord Chamberlain, remaining a participant in decision-making. Apart, however, from the glimpses of his involvement with Ormond, his activities at court during the latter half of Charles II's reign remain shadowy. Any attempt to uncover his basic political and religious beliefs from these years would seem to be as difficult as to uncover those of Charles II and for much the same reasons. The central question, in both cases, is that of their crypto-catholicism. For what it is worth, White Kennett believed that as Secretary of State he was 'one who secretly espoused the Cause of Popery' while John Hough was of the opinion that he was 'always of the Popish faction & indeed was a Papist'. Dartmouth's son would go further, claiming that Arlington 'was esteemed so good a courtier, that it was said he died a Roman Catholic to make his court to king James. But whatever his religion might be, he always professed himself of the whig party, as many papists have done before'. Perhaps more reliable (it is at least contemporary) is the report by Barillon that the catholics objected when James reappointed him in 1685 because they blamed him for the weakness of royal policy under Charles as well as claiming that he had committed the grave indiscretion of placing bets against James becoming king. Just to confuse things further there is the fact that he is said to have become the Grand Master of the Freemasons in 1679.

As is only to be expected, more evidence exists to test the claims that he was a whig than for those that he was a crypto-catholic. That, in making his claim about Arlington's support for the whigs, the first earl of Dartmouth should have added that many catholics had done so is, for one thing, a warning that comments on the subject were likely to be influenced by the stock tory accusation that the catholics and the dissenters were nothing more than two forms of the same problem. What is more, there is no difficulty in demonstrating that Arlington's public stance had been to oppose exclusion. In the vote of 15 November 1680 he was among those peers who voted to reject the exclusion bill and the rest of his voting record between 1678 and 1681 hardly suggests support for the whigs. Especially noteworthy is that three weeks after the division on exclusion he voted with the minority for Stafford's innocence. This sympathy for the catholic peers (which may conceivably have been a reflection of an inclination towards their faith) is also evident in his support for episcopal voting rights.

44 [W. Kennett], A Complete History of England, (1706), III, p. 245; Bodl. MS Carte 266, fol. 15, conversation with Hough, 26 May 1735.
45 Burnet, History, I, p. 182n.
46 Fox, History, appendix, p. xlvii, Barillon to Louis XIV, 23 Feb/5 Mar 1685.
47 Complete Peerage, I, p. 217. The basis of this statement is not known. None of the histories of Freemasonry mention Arlington as having been Grand Master.
in capital cases. It may also be evident in his protest against the decision to proceed with their trials before that of Danby. The suspicion that this protest might also have been motivated by his old hostility towards Danby is weakened by the fact that five months before he had loyally voted against the motion that he be committed to the Tower.\textsuperscript{48} The king, moreover, would seem to have viewed him in 1679 as a safe pair of hands suitable to be appointed to head the Treasury Commission for he considered appointing him at least once during the course of that year. He did appoint him to the Committee for Intelligence.\textsuperscript{49} Against all this evidence there can, nevertheless be set two indications that his views might have been more complicated. The more inconclusive of the two is that it was he whom Shaftesbury contacted in October 1681 to pass onto the king his request to be allowed to emigrate and that Arlington advised that the request be granted.\textsuperscript{50} It is not known whether there was any recent connection which caused Shaftesbury to select Arlington for this task nor can it be ruled out that Arlington recommended that he be allowed to emigrate simply as a way of getting rid of him. The other piece of evidence depends on information reported by Barillon. In April 1681 he wrote to tell us\textsuperscript{51} that Arlington and Halifax wanted Princess Mary appointed regent when her father succeeded to the throne. The attraction of such regency schemes were that they sidestepped the ideological issues and so appealed to those politicians who rated themselves as pragmatists. If Arlington did support the idea of a regency by Mary, it would tell us little about his ideological principles, except that his commitment to them was weaker than his pragmatism. For him to have supported a regency would not have been incompatible with his opposition to exclusion.

Of his religious beliefs, the only certain facts are that he died a catholic and that he had hitherto conformed to the Church of England.\textsuperscript{52} Claims that he had long been a secret adherent to catholicism are mainly based, like the similar claims for Charles II, on the meeting of 25 January 1669. Assuming James's much disputed account is accurate, Arlington had been among the select group of courtiers to whom Charles II had made it known that he wished to convert.\textsuperscript{53} If something like this did happen, it would be strong evidence that Arlington (at that point) had leanings towards catholicism and would have an obvious bearing on our understanding of his eventual conversion. As it is, all that can legitimately be concluded is that he may well have been willing (at the very least) to play along with whatever it was Charles II was up to in 1669.

\textsuperscript{50} Luttrell, Brief Historical Relation, I, p. 136; Macpherson, Original Papers, I, pp. 128-9.
\textsuperscript{51} Dalrymple, Memoirs, II (a), p. 311, Barillon to Louis XIV, 14 April 1681 [N.S.].
\textsuperscript{52} Bramston, Autobiography, p. 204.
\textsuperscript{53} Clarke, Life, I, pp. 441-2.
Interestingly, however, James made no mention of any catholic sympathies by him when in February 1685 he explained to Barillon his reasons for reappointing him despite the opposition from the catholics. Neither had got on with each other ever since the 1650s when Arlington had served as his secretary. James, however, explained that he was prepared to be charitable. He clearly did not have long to live and he needed the money. This was an accurate enough assessment of Arlington’s situation. The previous November when he had fallen ill he had been expected to die and he was unable to attend either Charles II’s funeral or the coronation in 1685. He had large debts arising from his aristocratic lifestyle and he would die owing £20,000 to the Exchequer. In the weeks before Charles II’s death, Shrewsbury had probably been negotiating with him to buy the office of Lord Chamberlain from him. Had he known that Arlington was contemplating conversion, it would have been uncharacteristic of James not to have mentioned it to Barillon. Yet he did apparently have his suspicions. Shortly after Arlington died, he discussed his conversion with Pepys. When he subsequently spoke to Evelyn, Pepys reported that James had said of him that ‘as to his inclinations he had known him long wavering, but for feare of loosing his places he did not think convenient to declare himselfe’. There is just a hint that James found such spinelessness repugnant. In any case, we have James’s own words (as reported by Barillon) that, with him nearing death, it was an easy concession to reappoint him. His death was indeed near. He died on 28 July 1685.

Immediately following Arlington’s death, his son-in-law, the duke of Grafton, had some expectations of succeeding him only to find that prior arrangements had already been made. The late king had promised the earl of Ailesbury that he would make him either Lord Steward or Lord Chamberlain, depending on which became vacant first, and, although he need not have been bound by such a reversion granted by his brother, James now honoured the promise. On 30 July Ailesbury travelled to Windsor where the king delivered the white stave into his hands. There were few other candidates whose appointments would have reassured the tories so much.

54 Fox, History, appendix, pp. xlvii-xlviii, Barillon to Louis, 23 Feb/5 Mar 1685.
56 Evelyn, Diary, IV, p. 476.
57 There is little information about the deathbed scene. John Hough’s recollection that ‘in his last sickness he told his wife, that he was a Papist, requiring her to declare it after his death but to say nothing of it, if he recovered’ is hearsay but, given his links with Ormond, may have some value. (Bodl. MS Carte 266, fol. 15). If the anecdote does refer to him, James would later claim that Arlington died before a priest could attend him and so was a warning against deathbed conversions. (G. Davies (ed.), Papers of Devotion of James II, (Oxford, 1925), pp. 8-9). A copy of his will, signed on 25 July, can be found in LC 9/259, fols. 42-4.
58 Ailesbury, Memoirs, I, pp. 109-10; LC 3/30, p. 1; HMC Buccleuch (Drumlanrig), II, p. 90, Moray to Queensberry, 28 July 1685; HMC Rutland, II, p. 95, Bertie to countess of Rutland, 30 July 1685.
Years later, when he came to write his autobiography, his son, the former Lord Thomas Bruce, found it easy to pay tribute to his father. He considered that under Charles II Ailesbury had been a true patriot, and manifested it greatly in parliament in opposition to pernicious projects of double-dealing ministers, retaining at the same time a most dutiful behaviour towards his sovereign, who highly esteemed him, but was kept back from rewarding him by most false representations...he was always bent to support the prerogative of the crown, jointly with the good of his country, and the latter was little to the taste of time-serving ministers, who then had the good king's ear too much.59

Of course, these comments are little better than formulaic nostalgia. The second earl's portrait of his father is all too obviously idealistic and his recollection was erratic at the best of times. Yet, because the ideals he would impose onto his father's memory had much in common with the ideals which his father actually had had, these comments do preserve something of the first earl's political outlook. In 1660 and 1661 the then Lord Robert Bruce had been returned as one of the MPs for Bedfordshire. During the early sessions of the Cavalier parliament the committees of which he was a member included those on the bill of uniformity, on the bill against abuses in the buying of offices, on the retention of subjects in their obedience and on loyal and indigent officers. In December 1663 his father, the first earl of Elgin, had died and he had succeeded to his English barony, in addition to the Scottish earldom. He had been promoted in the English peerage in 1664 to become earl of Ailesbury. In the Lords he had established himself as a member of the high anglican faction there and had a respectably active record as a committee chairman.60 The form his support for anglicanism took did indeed have the strong sense of independence his son implies. In 1675 he was opposed to the non-resisting test bill and in 1677 Shaftesbury considered him 'twice worthy'.61 He then appears to have modified his position somewhat, having become strongly associated with Danby. Before this the most important offices he had held were as Lord Lieutenant of Bedfordshire and as one of the deputies appointed to act for the Earl Marshal. In October 1678, however, Danby had got him appointed to the Privy Council.62 Ailesbury repaid him by supporting him throughout his subsequent disgrace. As well as voting for him in the various divisions in the Lords, he was one of the main speakers in the debate on whether the bishops should be allowed to vote on

The promise of the reversion to Ailesbury was probably quite recent. Conway had been promised the Lord Chamberlaincy on Arlington's death when he was dismissed as Secretary of State in January 1683 but his death in August 1683 would have allowed Charles II to make a similar undertaking to Ailesbury. (HMC Hastings, II, p. 393, Conway to [Rawdon], 10 Feb 1683). Conway's widow still managed to become the wife of a Lord Chamberlain for in March 1686 she would marry Mulgrave. 59 Ailesbury, Memoirs, I, p. 11.


62 HMC Ormonde, n.s. IV, p. 460, Southwell to Ormond, 19 Oct 1678.
his impeachment, an energetic campaigner for bailing him, and, until his release, a
regular visitor to him in the Tower.63 This support for Danby had been coupled with
implacable opposition to exclusion. In a speech to the Lords on 15 November 1680 he
had argued that James's catholicism need not be a problem, observing that if he did not
re-convert, he could always worship in private and conform in public. He had summed
up his opposition to the idea that the succession could be altered with the dictum, 'God
not men makes heirs'.64

Ailesbury had been an infrequent visitor to the court and his poor health prevented
him altering his ways now that he was Lord Chamberlain. On 16 October 1685 he
withdrew on health grounds from London to his country seat at Ampthill, near
Bedford. Three days later Sir Charles Scarburgh, the king's Physician, was summoned
to his bedside and the next day James mentioned in one of his letters to William that
Ailesbury was seriously ill. By then it was already too late. It was on 20 October that
he died.65 On 22 October his son wrote to inform Archbishop Sancroft of his death.
Only a month before it had been Sancroft whom Ailesbury had asked to nominate him
after the king had declared that he wanted him appointed a governor of Charterhouse.66
Now his son described to the archbishop how

at his death w[hi]ch was blessed be god not suddain, he expressed himselfe the
same as hee professed in his wholle course of his life, praying to god for the
prosperity of the Church of England in w[hi]ch communion he died beseeching
your Prayers for the prosperity of his soull & easy passage in to the next world
forgiving all his enemies & praying they might do the same: he quietly left this
transitory life, w[i]th the hopes of quickly enjoing a more glorious & everlasting
one.67

He did not mention what he would subsequently claim were his father's dying words.
These were 'Dear Son, you will see melancholy days: God be thanked I shall not'.68

With Ailesbury dead, a second arrangement which had previously been made had
to be implemented. On 23 October the earl of Mulgrave was appointed Lord
Chamberlain.69 His place as a Gentleman of the Bedchamber was filled by the new earl
of Ailesbury, thereby restoring him to the position he had lost eight months earlier. The
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evidence that Mulgrave had had a reversion is admittedly circumstantial, being based on the second earl of Ailesbury's anecdote about one of Mulgrave's servants shadowing his father back to Ampthill so that he could be the first to bring news of the earl's death. There is, however, one problem with the anecdote. This is that throughout his memoirs the second earl used to the full every opportunity he had to blacken Mulgrave's reputation. The reason for this enmity is never revealed but the cumulative effect is that Mulgrave is represented as one of the servile opportunists who led James astray. In particular, it is alleged that Mulgrave became a secret convert to catholicism and that Father Petre held Masses for him each day. This is a serious allegation and Ailesbury, however inaccurate his memoirs often are, was sufficiently knowledgeable about events at court to mean that it cannot simply be dismissed out of hand. It is, nevertheless, almost certainly an unwarranted smear. The problems in recovering Mulgrave's religious opinions are insuperable enough as they are.

Finding out what Mulgrave thought about religion and politics should, on the face of it, be easy. His literary pretensions meant he wrote a number of poems and essays on autobiographical and political themes and, conveniently, one of the most substantial of the essays, his *Character of a Tory*, was probably written in the early weeks of 1685. This work, circulated as a reply to Halifax's *Character of a Trimmer*, is a deceptively clear statement of his views which he labels as being tory. Although he was prepared to acknowledge that the case for the royal prerogative could be overstated and that parliament had a legitimate place in the constitution, he felt that consensus was only possible if parliament treated the king with the respect he was entitled to. Monarchy, by its 'long settlement among us' had a 'just title to our defence and veneration'. To ensure stability he was in favour of a standing army, the dispensing power, the use of that dispensing power to relieve catholics from the effects of the penal laws and, if one party threatened his powers, the partisan involvement of the monarch in party politics. Until it was 'as preposterous to write a book in defence of loyalty, as of rebellion; no man in the world doubting the one, or endeavouring the other', he supported the publication by the government of works presenting its case to counter the propaganda of the whigs. Moreover, according to him, a tory's view of religion was that

71 ibid, I, pp. 146-7. See also, I, pp. 200-2, 215-16, 230.
74 ibid, II, p. 39.
he does not believe it a mere engine of Government, invented only by the fear of fools, and improved since by the wisdom of Magistrates; but yet he thinks is not below the divinest laws, to second or rather sanctify those made by our superiors; and he can never imagine any Religion likely to bring us to heaven, which hinders us from living peaceably and contentedly on earth. So that if principles of obedience to government be not the sure mark of a good religion (because then Mahomet's might pass as well as another) yet any that makes a disturbance is to be counted a bad one, and not fit to be suffered in a community of reasonable creatures.\textsuperscript{75}

What might appear to be the final confirmation of his tory credentials is that Rochester supported his appointment as Lord Chamberlain.\textsuperscript{76}

Against this, however, must be set the evidence of his record of opposition to the court during the 'exclusion crisis'. Even before then, the fact that he had become a Gentleman of the Bedchamber in 1673 had not ensured that he could be regularly depended on to support the government in the Lords. In November 1675 he was among those who supported the call for parliament to be dissolved, although, it is true, earlier that year he had supported the non-resisting test bill and in 1677 Shaftesbury thought him 'thrice vile'. In March 1679 Danby expected him to give him his support, only then to decide the king should speak with him to make sure of it. Danby's doubts proved correct for it had been at this point that Mulgrave clearly moved into opposition. Over the next two years he appears to have consistently supported the whigs, voting for Danby's attainder, for Buckingham's motion in November 1680 proposing a debate on the state of the kingdom, against the right of the bishops to vote in capital cases and for Stafford's guilt. The one thing he had not done was to vote for exclusion.\textsuperscript{77} It was, therefore, with some tact that Dryden, in including him in the list of loyalist peers in \textit{Absalom and Achitophel}, should have described Mulgrave, who was his principal patron, as

\begin{center}
Sharp-judging Adriel, the muses' friend;
Himself a muse - in Sanhedrin's debate
True to his prince, but not a slave of state\textsuperscript{78}
\end{center}

Dryden's words of praise are, in fact, all the more misleading given that Mulgrave's opposition to exclusion was not without certain private reservations. When he discussed the political situation with Henry Sidney in June 1680 the two of them had come to the conclusion that 'there would be no way to save this nation from great

\textsuperscript{75} ibid, II, p. 49.
\textsuperscript{76} Ailesbury, \textit{Memoirs}, I, p. 125.
trouble but for the Duke to resign, which we thought he would hardly do, being governed so much by his priests.\textsuperscript{79} Before concluding that Mulgrave in voting against the exclusion bill acted dishonestly, it should be borne in mind that support for the forcible ejection of James from the succession was something entirely different from support for the view that James would be advised voluntarily to sacrifice his claim to the throne as an act of fidelity to the national interests.

Other facts make it unlikely that Mulgrave did more than toy with the idea of supporting exclusion. In late 1679 he had used his \textit{Essay upon Satyr} to ridicule both Buckingham and Shaftesbury and the Rose Street incident suggests that somebody had not been pleased by it.\textsuperscript{80} It is also of some note that his attitude as reported by Sidney was one of concern to mollify the whigs and not one of hostility to James because, if anything, his relations with James were friendly. Sometime during 1679 he wrote his poem \textit{On the Duke of York, banished to Brussels} in which he paid tribute to his military achievements, claiming they were equalled only by those of Turenne, and looked forward to his homecoming, comparing it to the first rays of the Sun glimpsed through storm-clouds.\textsuperscript{81} In return, James seems to have respected Mulgrave’s own martial abilities. In 1674, when he quarrelled with Monmouth over the appointment of the colonel of the First Foot Guards, Mulgrave had been James’s preferred candidate and in 1681, when the position next became vacant, James had made another unsuccessful attempt to get him appointed.\textsuperscript{82} The one thing he had done to cause James offence, the Princess Anne incident, had had nothing to do with politics. In November 1682 he had been suspended or dismissed as a Gentleman of the Bedchamber and banished from court for making improper suggestions in a letter to Princess Anne. Exactly what these suggestions were remain unknown (Anne would have been easy to shock) but, whatever they were, he was soon restored to his place and this incident did no permanent damage to his relations with either James or his daughter.\textsuperscript{83}

\textsuperscript{79} Sidney, \textit{Diary}, I, p. 12. It cannot be discounted that Mulgrave was agreeing with Sidney out of politeness.
\textsuperscript{81} Buckingham, \textit{Works}, I, pp. 150-2.
\textsuperscript{82} ibid, II, pp. 23-7; Clarke, \textit{Life}, I, p. 667.
\textsuperscript{83} \textit{HMC Kenyon}, p. 143, Patten to Kenyon, 9 June 1682; \textit{HMC Egmont}, II, p. 121, Barnette to Percival, 31 Oct 1682; A.E. Newdigate-Newdegate (ed.), \textit{Cavalier and Puritan}, (1901), pp. 256-7, newsletter, 7 Nov 1682; p. 257, newsletter, 9 Nov 1682; B. Bathurst (ed.), \textit{Letters of Two Queens}, (1924), pp. 154-5, Mary to Lady Frances Bathurst, 27 Nov [1682]; Reresby, \textit{Memoirs}, p. 281; E. Gregg, \textit{Queen Anne}, (1980, reprinted 1984), pp. 27-8. Reresby’s statement that Mulgrave’s disgrace was partly due to his links with Monmouth is questionable. Mulgrave and Monmouth had probably been on bad terms with each other since 1674. It may have been through the influence of Middleton, an old friend, that he was restored to favour. (G.H. Jones, \textit{Charles Middleton}, (University of Chicago, 1967), p. 68).
Reconciling all these bits of evidence seems out of the question. It is not even possible to impose some sort of order on them by proposing a straightforward shift in opinion as could be done with Preston and Huntingdon. That there exists another bit of evidence still to be considered which links Mulgrave to the whigs and the dissenters might seem to raise hopes of partial clarification. It may, alternatively, be no more than a red herring. Although it was not written until 1689 and deals mainly with the events of 1688, the possibility that Mulgrave was the author of the essay *Humanum est Errare* does have a bearing on his opinions before 1685. This essay, a cynically balanced examination of James's overthrow which dissects in detail the mistakes made both by James and by William, would be written shortly after James's landing in Ireland in March 1689 and was circulated in manuscript in the years following to politicians as diverse as Leeds and Somers. Of the four surviving manuscripts, one is attributed to 'the Earl of M____ve' while one of the others is even more specific, attributing it to 'the Earl of Mulgrave now Marq: of Normanby'. This can only mean Mulgrave. What, however, is far from certain is whether the attribution is correct. For one thing, its form differs completely from that of his *Some Account of the Revolution*, his authenticated recollections of what happened in 1688, being analytical rather than narrative, and, in so far as his *Account of the Revolution* evaluates the matter, there are discrepancies between the reasons given for James's downfall. It also cannot be ignored that, unlike the *Account of the Revolution* and all his other known essays, it would not be included in the complete edition of his works. Whoever it is by, the internal evidence does reveal something of what they believed. As he clearly thought that James's biggest mistake was that he did not push hard enough to implement his policy of toleration while criticising William III's ministers for having been 'the Tools

84 B.L. Harleian MS 6274, fols. 81-109; Alnwick Castle, Northumberland MS 569 - cp. B.L. Egerton MS 3382, fols. 188-217; B.L. Add MS 27382, fols. 77-97. In the Alnwick MS the letters printed here in italics were added by another hand. Mulgrave became marquis of Normanby in 1694. Apart from the usual scribal variations, the four copies are identical. The handwriting is different in each case although that in Harleian MS 6274 appears to be the same as other unrelated MSS bound with it.

85 Even without the second attribution, it seems clear that it is Mulgrave who was meant. The only other possibility would be 'the Earl of Montaguie', because, although this copyist did distinguish between 'u' and 'v', there may conceivably have been an error in the transmission of the text. As the similarity in the attribution suggests that it may have been a recension of Harleian MS 6274, the Alnwick MS does not necessarily confirm that Mulgrave was the author.

86 Buckingham, *Works*, II, pp. 67-88. The clearest discrepancy between the two is that in *Some Account of the Revolution*, Mulgrave made his famous judgement about James's army, that 'his soldiers, if once blooded, would have gone on with him', whereas the author of *Humanum est Errare* accused James of failing to realise that the army could not be trusted, for to have used the army to enforce his policies would have been as difficult as 'Catching Hares with Lobsters'. (ibid, II, pp. 69-70; B.L. Add MS 27382, fol. 82). Strictly speaking, these views could be reconciled with each other and it is always possible that Mulgrave simply changed his mind. The non-inclusion in his *Works* could have been on political grounds. Pope, who acted as his literary executor and editor, is known to have encountered problems over the perceived Jacobitism of the *Account of the Revolution* and *The Feast of the Gods* which were omitted from the 1723 and 1729 editions of his *Works*. They were, however, included in the 1726,1740 and 1753 editions weakening the theory that *Humanum est Errare* was dropped by Pope. (*DNB*, XVIII, p. 15).
of the Monarchy in the worst of times' and responsible for the deaths of 'the pious L[or]d Russell' and 'the brave Sidney', the simplest conclusion would be that the author was a whig collaborator with dissenting sympathies who had supported exclusion but, because he wanted toleration, had then supported James. By stretching the evidence, this might just have been Mulgrave but, on balance, was probably not. What, more than anything else, counts against him as the author is that it contains nothing which suggests that it might have been written by someone who had been a member of the inner circle of James's courtiers. If it is the case that Mulgrave was not the author then it is just a coincidence (it is, after all, a literary commonplace) that his epitaph in Westminster Abbey includes, at his own request, a Latin poem (probably, but not certainly, of his own composition) with the line 'Humanum est Nescire et Errare'.

To accept that Mulgrave wrote *Humanum est Errare* would involve accepting that during the 1680s he had the sympathies for the dissenters evidently held by its author. This support would be at odds with what the *Character of a Tory* suggests were his attitudes towards dissent during the period. Instead of displaying sympathy for the dissenters, Mulgrave equates them with those whom it was necessary for reasonable tories to oppose. He rejects Halifax's view that the dissenters were as loyal as the catholics and it is because they were loyal that the sympathy he does display is for the situation of the catholics. As was mentioned above, he considered that there was a case for the penal laws against them to be dispensed. He also believed (as did Halifax) that the vast majority of catholics were not a danger. It might, of course, be thought that this lends some support to Ailesbury's contention that he converted. It is known that in February 1685 there were rumours that he did intend to do so. A rather different view is presented by Mulgrave's memoirs in which he is at pains to distance himself from the actions of the catholic faction at James's court. The impression, accurate or otherwise, which he clearly wanted to create is that he had been a loyal anglican. That Burnet, in trying to place the worst possible interpretation on his actions, in effect criticising him for not converting, suggests Ailesbury went too far in claiming that he formally abandoned the Church of England. In any case, his professed anglicanism was not without foundation. He had conformed to the Church of England. This was not simply

87 There is one comment related to the royal household. In complaining about William III's dependence on Bentinck (whom he compares to Piers Gaveston), the author states that 'we were very angry with Will Cheffinch's Cabinet asbelieving it had the direction of all our Affaryrs, tho' recomended under the Authority of more visible and allow'd Councils'. (B.L. Add MS 27382, fol. 26). This sounds more like popular prejudice than the informed opinion of an ex-Lord Chamberlain.


a question of meeting the requirements of the Test Acts. Mulgrave would be one of the courtiers appointed to the Ecclesiastical Commission and, whatever else might be said about his selections, James was undoubtedly aware that the Commissioners he appointed to oversee royal control of the Church of England needed to be credible if anglicans were to accept the Commission's authority. In 1689 when he would write his open letter to Tillotson explaining the reasons for his participation, he seems to have been able to assume that his anglicanism was not in question.\textsuperscript{92} During the 1690s, moreover, he would have no difficulty in adopting the role of a high tory.

There is one final possibility. Although there are problems with most of the evidence for it, due to difficulties in dating, it was without doubt a part of Mulgrave's outlook. It may simply be that he was unsure what he believed. Certainly, in \textit{On Philosophy}, he argues that most philosophical speculation, with the exception of discussions about morality, is pointless.\textsuperscript{93} Much the same opinion is expressed in his poem, \textit{On Mr Hobbs}, which seems most likely to have been written shortly after Hobbes's death in 1679.

\begin{quote}
While in dark ignorance we lay afraid
Of fancies, ghosts, and ev'ry empty shade;
Great Hobbs appear'd, and by plain reasons light
Put such fantastic forms to shameful flight.
Fond is their fear, who think men needs must be
To vice enslav'd, if from vain terrors free;
The wise and good, morality will guide,
And superstition all the world beside.\textsuperscript{94}
\end{quote}

It is a particularly noteworthy feature of Mulgrave's writings that it shows a lack of interest in theological questions most unusual in a seventeenth-century intellectual. It was, rather, the classical tradition which preoccupied him. One consequence of a belief in the futility of theology could have been anti-clericalism. There is no direct evidence for this although it could provide part of the explanation for why he supported much of the whig programme between 1679 and 1681.\textsuperscript{95} It has to be acknowledged that this would have combined uneasily with his later high-toryism but it was possible for a tory to be anti-clerical. Dryden is a case in point.

It would be wrong, however, to conclude that he had no religious beliefs. There is no particular reason to believe that Burnet had heard more than hearsay on the reasons why Mulgrave resisted the attempts by James's priests to convert him but he may not have been far wrong when he wrote that Mulgrave told them that 'he had taken much pains to bring himself to believe in God, who made the world and all men in it:

\textsuperscript{92} Buckingham, \textit{Works}, II, pp. 89-92.
\textsuperscript{93} ibid, II, pp. 202-4.
\textsuperscript{94} ibid, I, p. 134. One interpretation of this poem could be that he thought the events at the time of Hobbes's death showed that his ideas were finally being taken seriously.
\textsuperscript{95} There is a hint of anti-clericalism in his essay, \textit{Of Vulgar Errors}, when he observes that clergymen avoid immorality mainly to preserve their professional reputations. (Buckingham, \textit{Works}, II, p. 214).
but it must not be an ordinary force of argument, that could make him believe, that man was quits with God, and made God again’. Whether or not this is an accurate report on his views on the Incarnation, Burnet’s testimony is not needed for us to know that he considered that Charles II’s religion was ‘that which is vulgarly (tho’ unjustly) counted none at all, I mean Deism’ and this judgement was probably from a position of shared opinion. In On the Deity he expresses his sense of awe at the idea of God but again concludes that there are certain things which cannot be known, so that

While others vainly strive to know Thee more,  
Let me in silent reverence adore;  
Wishing that human pow’r were higher rais’d,  
Only that Thine might be more nobly prais’d!  
Thrice happy angels in their high degree;  
Created worthy of extolling Thee!

Similar sentiments are to be found in his Latin epitaph which, when it was placed on his tomb in 1721, would cause a scandal among some conventional believers for implying that his faith was weak. It reads

 Dubius, sed non Improbus, Vixt.  
 Incertus morior, non Perturbatus;  
 Humanum est Nescire et Errare.  
 Deo confido  
 Omnipotenti Benevolentissimo  
 Ens Entium miserere mei

Yet, however secular Mulgrave’s toryism was, he was not necessarily the amoral careerist willing to be manipulated by James some have supposed. Twenty years after 1688 he would be sharply critical of James’s failings. His views expressed then were the opposite of what the author of Humanum est Errare had thought in 1689. In A Feast of the Gods he describes how the Roman gods, when drunk, discuss the careers of various mortal rulers. One of these rulers

---

96 Burnet, History, III, p. 122.  
97 Buckingham, Works, II, p. 55.  
98 ibid, I, p. 153.  
99 M.I., Henry VII Chapel, Westminster Abbey. The full text of the epitaph is printed in [W. Combe], The History of the Abbey Church of St Peter’s, Westminster, (1812), II, pp. 153-4. For the controversy surrounding it, see R. Fiddes, A Letter in Answer to one from a Free-Thinker, (1721); idem, The Doctrine of a Future State, and that of the Soul’s Immortality, (1721); P. Bliss (ed.), Reliquae Hearniaeae, (Oxford, 1857), II, pp. 463-4; H.B. Wright and M.K. Spears (eds.), The Literary Works of Matthew Prior, (Oxford, 1959), I, p. 550, II, p. 993; Notes and Queries, fourth series, I, (1868), pp. 316-17, 447; T.J. Pettigrew, Chronicles of the Tombs, (1857, facsimile, New York, 1968), pp. 348-9. Attempts to trace a copy of An Address to Free-Thinkers by a Beneficed Clergyman, (1721), have been unsuccessful. The copy belonging to the British Library is missing. Mulgrave, by then duke of Buckingham, had requested that the verse be used in his will signed in 1716. Despite what some have assumed, there is no evidence that it was his own composition. The text requested by the will gives the fourth line as ‘Christum adveneror, Deo consido’ and that is how it is usually given in printed versions. Dean Atterbury had objected to the phrase ‘Christum adveneror’ and had it removed. (Buckingham, Works, II, p. 266; Biographia Britannica, (1747-66), VI, p. 3662n). See also, G.E.C., Complete Peerage, II, p. 400n.
but it must not be an ordinary force of argument, that could make him believe, that man was quits with God, and made God again'.\textsuperscript{96} Whether or not this is an accurate report on his views on the Incarnation, Burnet’s testimony is not needed for us to know that he considered that Charles II's religion was 'that which is vulgarly (tho' unjustly) counted none at all, I mean Deism' and this judgement was probably from a position of shared opinion.\textsuperscript{97} In \textit{On the Deity} he expresses his sense of awe at the idea of God but again concludes that there are certain things which cannot be known, so that

\begin{quote}
While others vainly strive to know Thee more,
Let me in silent reverence adore;
Wishing that human pow'r were higher rais'd,
Only that Thine might be more nobly prais'd!
Thrice happy angels in their high degree;
Created worthy of extolling Thee!\textsuperscript{98}
\end{quote}

Similar sentiments are to be found in his Latin epitaph which, when it was placed on his tomb in 1721, would cause a scandal among some conventional believers for implying that his faith was weak. It reads

\begin{quote}
Dubius, sed non Improbus, Vixt.
Incertus morior, non Perturbatus;
Humanum est Nescire et Errare.
Deo confido
Omnipotenti Benevolentissimo
Ens Entium miserere mei!\textsuperscript{99}
\end{quote}

Yet, however secular Mulgrave's toryism was, he was not necessarily the amoral careerist willing to be manipulated by James some have supposed. Twenty years after 1688 he would be sharply critical of James's failings. His views expressed then were the opposite of what the author of \textit{Humanum est Errare} had thought in 1689. In \textit{A Feast of the Gods} he describes how the Roman gods, when drunk, discuss the careers of various mortal rulers. One of these rulers

\begin{quote}
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\textsuperscript{97} Buckingham, \textit{Works}, II, p. 55.
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\textsuperscript{99} M.I., Henry VII Chapel, Westminster Abbey. The full text of the epitaph is printed in [W. Combe], \textit{The History of the Abbey Church of St.Peter's, Westminster}, (1812), II, pp. 153-4. For the controversy surrounding it, see R. Fiddes, \textit{A Letter in Answer to one from a Free-Thinker}, (1721); idem, \textit{The Doctrine of a Future State, and that of the Soul's Immortality}, (1721); P. Bliss (ed.), \textit{Reliquiae Hearnianae}, (Oxford, 1857), II, pp. 463-4; H.B. Wright and M.K. Spears (eds.), \textit{The Literary Works of Matthew Prior}, (Oxford, 1959), I, p. 550, II, p. 993; \textit{Notes and Queries}, fourth series, I, (1868), pp. 316-17, 447; T.J. Pettigrew, \textit{Chronicles of the Tombs}, (1857, facsimile, New York, 1968), pp. 348-9. Attempts to trace a copy of \textit{An Address to Free-Thinkers by a Beneficed Clergyman}, (1721), have been unsuccessful. The copy belonging to the British Library is missing. Mulgrave, by then duke of Buckingham, had requested that the verse be used in his will signed in 1716. Despite what some have assumed, there is no evidence that it was his own composition. The text requested by the will gives the fourth line as 'Christum adveneror, Deo consido' and that is how it is usually given in printed versions. Dean Atterbury had objected to the phrase 'Christum adveneror' and had it removed. (Buckingham, \textit{Works}, II, p. 266; \textit{Biographia Britannica}, (1747-66), VI, p. 3662n). See also, G.E.C., \textit{Complete Peerage}, II, p. 400n.
\end{quote}
lately deceas'd in exile, was censur'd also (yet with great compassion, amidst all their mirth) because, tho' he not only meant to govern well, but had Talents capable of it; yet, notwithstanding all that, he lost three Kingdoms, meerly for want of being wisely principled in his youth; and instructed, that Kings should indeed reverence the Gods, and appear decently devout, but never violently zealous for any thing besides Justice, and the publick Good: which Virtue alone (they said) without other Religion, is sufficient to make them Heroes on earth, and advance them afterwards to be Demi-Gods in Heaven.\footnote{Buckingham, Works, II, pp. 137-8.}

The judgement was not unfair. It was the case that James would be overthrown because of his excessive religious zeal and, given his own attitude towards religion, it was only to be expected that Mulgrave would be censorious. That he seems to have lacked the deep religious convictions of most other tories probably did make him much more open-minded about what James would propose. Equally, it probably also made him feel that those policies were unnecessary and therefore needlessly risky. He was not an obvious agent to be used to implement them with enthusiasm nor can he be said to have done so.

Without really planning it that way, James had arrived at a remarkably diverse alliance of courtiers. Amidst the old friends, loyal servants, professional opportunists and eternal courtiers, there were also former exclusionists and near-exclusionists. Nor was this just a random mixture. Preston, Huntingdon and Mulgrave had been fully assimilated or reassimilated into the ranks of the congenital loyalists. That this was possible is a fact of considerable importance. It has always been obvious that the strength of the monarchy was increased during the first half of the 1680s by the very unsubtle means of the energetic implementation of existing royal powers by Charles II.

What must also be recognised is that this was accompanied by the recruitment to the court elite of a number of prominent opposition peers and MPs. Each of these men had had their own reasons for doing so but there are two conclusions which emerge. One is that, as with other instances of opposition earlier in the century, it had been possible for some whigs to see their actions as its own form of loyalty to the Crown. The other is that the belief that the kingdom had been on the brink of another civil war had caused them to reconsider this assumption, effecting the reconstitution of a king's party. There had been more to the backlash than just the government-directed \textit{quo warranto} campaign. In this sense, 'Forty-One' had indeed come again.
CHAPTER THREE: THE 1685 HOUSEHOLD REFORMS AND THE FINANCIAL LEGACY OF CHARLES II

I

James II’s coronation ‘was magnificent in a very high Degree, but it was a momentary Splendour; and all state sunk, from that time, like a Meteor, to rise no more. There was scarcely a Body of Officers which was not in part reduced, and some even totally abolished, after they had served the purpose of that Cavalcade.’ This was to be the judgement of the late eighteenth-century antiquarian and Groom of the Privy Chamber to George III, Samuel Pegge, on a long forgotten aspect of the reign of James II: the household reforms of 1685. Although many subsequent historians, picking up and failing to recognise the significance of the occasional contemporary references to these reforms, have often contrasted the austerity of his court with the infamous laxity of that of his elder brother (for this conveniently reinforces both Charles’s reputation as a profligate and James’s reputation as an ascetic religious fanatic), no work printed since Pegge’s has made direct mention of the actual reforms. This neglect has obscured the fact that it was 1685, not 1689, which was almost the landmark in the history of the British monarchy.

Some rearrangement of court personnel was invariably necessary when a monarch died. Unless its size was to be inflated by the creation of (more) non-essential posts, merging the existing royal household with that of the successor was never easy. It was fortunate for James that he was not expected to undertake this delicate task in the nerve-racking days after his brother’s death and the customary confirmation of the Household establishment and of all the royal servants in office at the accession council conveniently coincided with his policy of minimising the changes among the senior courtiers so as to underline political continuity. It was assumed that the matter would not be addressed until the end of the quarter and, in fact, the change-over did not take place until the end of the quarter after that. In the meantime, the domestic arrangements at both Whitehall and St. James’s remained unaltered. The uncertainty created by this deferment encouraged speculation. Within days of Charles II’s death, Lady Margaret Mason had reported to her husband, Sir Richard, the Second Clerk Comptroller of the Greencloth, that ‘the whole family [is] to be dismissed; and the King will live as privately as when he was Duke till he sees what the Parliament will do to establish his

---

1 S. Pegge, Curialia, (1791), part III, p. 67 - cp. ibid, part I, p. 63.
3 PC 2/71, fol. 7, 6 Feb 1685; HMC Ormonde, n.s. VII, p. 323, Wyche to Ormond, 17 Feb 1685.
house; so that there will not be such a thing as a Green Cloth, though established by Act of Parliament. Some talk of resuming Crown lands, &c.’ and, adding that Queen Catherine planned to make redundant some of her staff, had observed ‘there will be great frugality in fashion’.4 By early March the planning for the reorganisation was under way and in the days following the coronation the scale of the intended changes became public knowledge.5 Nevertheless it does seem to have been the case that the organisation was not completed until after the assembling of parliament. Even now that it is known that the 1685 parliament was not as generous as was once supposed, it is easy to overlook that it could have been far less forthcoming.6 For the Commons a restricted settlement was a tempting option for, by limiting the king’s financial freedom, it would have lessened their fears concerning his catholicism and it was an issue James felt the need to address directly in his first speech from the throne. Possibly it was because he feared the worst that he had already indicated that the size of the household would be sharply reduced and it is most unlikely that the new establishment was finalised before 26 May when the revenues as granted to Charles II were voted to him for life. It was, moreover, not until 24 June, exactly one week before that establishment took effect, when the final elements of the financial settlement had only just been approved by the Commons, that the king and queen moved into Whitehall.7

At an early stage in the preparations for the new household, Arlington, Godolphin and Henry Savile submitted a report to the king suggesting extensive changes within the Chamber. In their covering letter, they explained...

...Wee presumeing the Change of tymes may incline y[ou]r Ma[jes]tie to some Enlargement of the former Strictnesse, have humbly offered here to y[ou]r Matij[Majesty] some Retrenchment of the Number of Servants retayneing the old Number onely in Offices, where the Service cannot bee performed with lesse; and some Officers wee have totally supprest as uselesse: And the payments & wages wee have reduced of most of them, for as they were payable in severall Offices, they did not appeare considerable in anyone Office, till ye whole came to bee seene together, For the better regulating of which Wee humbly offer, that for the

---

4 [C. Dickens (ed.),] 'Last moments of an English king', Household Words, no. 215, (May 1854), pp. 279-80. This account of the death of Charles II must have been written before the late king’s body was removed to the palace of Westminster on 12 February to lie in state in the Prince’s Lodgings. Terriesi, the Tuscan ambassador, knew about the retrenchment by 9 February. (Campana de Cavelli, Les Derniers Stuarts, II, p. 17, Terriesi to Tuscan Secretary of State, 9/19 Feb 1685).

5 HMC Ormonde, n.s. VII, pp. 335-6, [Southwell to Ormond], 5 Mar 1685; Campana de Cavelli, Les Derniers Stuarts, II, p. 25, report of Venetian ambassador, 9 Mar 1685; Luttrell, Brief Historical Relation, I, p. 340.


7 LS 9/96-97. These records of the meals served show that Queen Catherine moved out to Somerset House on 6 April and that the Grooms of the Bedchamber took up residence at Whitehall, in preparation for the king’s arrival, on 22 May. The second of these volumes commenced with the king’s arrival on 24 June.
Future all wages and allowances to all your Majesties servants may be paid in One Office.8

These were to be the basic principles of what followed both above and belowstairs.9 The staffs of the Household and the Chamber were streamlined while the method of paying them was simplified. Central to both was the decision to abolish boardwages, the sums which had been paid to royal servants in lieu of the diet they had once enjoyed. Instead of receiving both a wage and boardwages, servants were now paid a single salary. To achieve this the division between the duties of the Cofferer of the Household and those of the Treasurer of the Chamber was redrawn.

Hitherto most household servants got a wage from the Cofferer, the Treasurer of the Chamber or the Exchequer but those who were supposed, in theory, to be entitled to diet from the Household had received boardwages from the Cofferer as well. The Treasurer of the Chamber, moreover, had not paid the wages for all the Chamber servants with some being paid instead by the Cofferer. This had meant that in 1679 the Cofferer had paid £1,449 in wages and £3,790 in boardwages to 149 Chamber officials, excluding the musicians. With boardwages no longer to be paid, he stopped paying any money to those who had received only boardwages from him so that they henceforth got money only from either the Treasurer of the Chamber or the Exchequer. Among those thus affected were the Pages of the Bedchamber, the Master of the Jewelhouse, the Keeper of the Privy Purse, the Groom Porter, the Messengers, the Physicians, the Surgeons, the Apothecaries, the Musicians, the Masters of Requests and the Treasurer of the Chamber himself. The same also applied to all members of the queen’s household who had hitherto been paid boardwages. However sixty-six Chamber servants, including the Lord Chamberlain, the Secretaries of State, the Vice-Chamberlain, the Cupbearers, the Carvers, the Sewers, the Esquires of the Body, the Clerks of the Signet, the Clerks of the Privy Seal and the Groom of the Stole, continued to be paid on the Household establishment and so the apparent anomaly of the Cofferer paying Chamber staff persisted.10 As a further adjustment, the Master and the Clerk of the Jewelhouse, the Groom Porter, nine of the Falconers, the three Physicians and six of the Musicians, who all had patents for salaries from the

8 LC 5/201, fol. 247, Arlington, Godolphin and Savile to James II, n.d.
9 The most important single source for the changes is the 1685 establishment (LS 13/38) which should be compared against the preceding establishment, that of 1679 (LS 13/37). Another copy of the 1685 establishment, with subsequent additions, is in the possession of the earl of St.Germans and of this document there is a typescript copy in the Royal Archives (RA EB11).
10 The format of the Cofferer’s accounts was altered to reflect these changes. (LS 1/28). Moreover, the servants of the Chamber, the Chapel Royal and the Stables were no longer required to register their appointments with the Board of Greencloth. (LS 13/197, esp. fol. 100).
Exchequer for life, were instructed to surrender them so that the Treasurer of the Chamber could take over the paying of their salaries.\textsuperscript{11}

Other remnants of the old system suffered the same fate. The Household Kitchen had originally existed to prepare the meals, now very much reduced in number, which had been provided for the courtiers and servants. In fact, some diets were restored in 1685. The diets of the Queen’s Waiters, the Clerks of the Greencloth, the Clerk of the Kitchen, the Master Cooks, the Pages of the Backstairs and the Yeoman of the Guard, which had been suspended in 1679, were resumed but, together with those of the Maids of Honour and the Chaplains, this amounted to only twenty-nine dishes \textit{per diem} compared with the nineteen for the king and queen. For this reason the Household Kitchen was merged with the King’s Privy Kitchen with one of the Clerks, two Children, three Scourers and five Turnbroaches losing their jobs in the process.\textsuperscript{12} The Queen’s Privy Kitchen, while remaining separate, was cut from thirteen to seven people. Thomas Marshal, the Master Cook of the Household Kitchen, was pensioned off with an allowance and Queen Catherine retained the services of her Master Cook, Edward Smith. This enabled Patrick Lambe to remain as a Master Cook of the King’s Privy Kitchen serving as deputy to Claud Fourmont, whom James brought with him from his own household while Queen Mary continued to use her two Master Cooks, Richard Thomas and Phillip Lesserture. It was however understood that in time there would, as before, be only one Master Cook in each of the Privy Kitchens. Also merged were the Scaldinghouse and the Poultry at a saving of seven jobs with only two of the Grooms remaining, and the Pitcherhouse, with its two positions, was abolished. The Clerkships of the Bakehouse, the Poultry and the Woodyard were combined in the person of Charles Toll. A further eighty jobs were lost by slimming down the other departments where the workload was now far less than it had been when diets were being served on a large scale. The numbers employed by the Bakehouse, the Cellar, the Ewry, the Chaundry, the Larder, the Pastry, the Scullery, the Woodyard, the Harbingers and the Cartakers were all cut by at least a half. The two Yeomen and two Grooms of the Greencloth were told that, in both cases, the first vacancies among them would not be filled. In the Hall, where the lesser servants had at one time dined twice a day and where the staff were now only required for the occasional banquet, one of the Marshals, one of the Daily Waiters and the six Servitors were removed leaving only a Marshal and a Daily Waiter. Apart from the two extra Master Cooks, the only new posts created were a Yeoman of the Salt Store for the Accatry and a seventh Porter-at-

\textsuperscript{12} Use of the kitchens at Whitehall hitherto occupied by the Household Kitchen was granted to Mulgrave and the duchess of Mazarin. (LS 13/105, fol. 17, Greencloth to Mulgrave, 7 April 1686; LS 13/114, fol. 7, minute, 7 April 1686).
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12 Use of the kitchens at Whitehall hitherto occupied by the Household Kitchen was granted to Mulgrave and the duchess of Mazarin. (LS 13/105, fol. 17, Greencloth to Mulgrave, 7 April 1686; LS 13/114, fol. 7, minute, 7 April 1686).
Gate. To cushion the blow all the Household servants removed were created supernumeraries and given allowances or stipends worth in all £2,730. The size of the Household had been cut at a stroke by more than half from 208 to 102 and, in due course, that figure was envisaged to fall below three figures to ninety-eight.

Abovestairs, in the Chamber, the drastic reductions proposed by Arlington, Godolpin and Savile went ahead with few alterations. Instead of all six of the Grooms of the Privy Chamber being abolished, with the Pages of the Privy Chamber assuming their responsibilities of keeping the Privy Chamber clean, two of them were reprieved. The Cupbearers, the Carvers and the Sewers were not reduced from four each to two with only one of the Cupbearers and one of the Sewers, in the event, having their places suppressed. The idea of transferring the Trumpeters from the Chamber to the army was abandoned. On the other hand, the Office of the Tents, which it had been suggested should be abolished and its functions taken over by private contractors, became part of the Ordnance, which had, in any case, already been supplying it and where it would soon be put to use creating the encampment at Hounslow Heath.

Otherwise the recommendations were accepted. The eight Sewers of the Chamber, who were no longer needed to wait on the Lord Chamberlain and the Privy Council at mealtimes, and the six Gentlemen Waiters, whose only remaining function was to serve at banquets, were laid off, with the Gentlemen Ushers Quarter Waiters taking over their duties. The Gentleman Usher Daily Waiter Assistant, who had deputized for the First Gentleman Usher Daily Waiter when his duties as Black Rod detained him elsewhere, and the Surveyor of the Dresser, who had protected the king’s food when it was in transit from the Privy Kitchen, were abolished. It was also decided that the services of the two Grooms of the Privy Chamber Assistant, the Keeper of the Wardrobe at the Tower, the Jeweller, the staff of the Bears and Bulls, the Corncutters (the royal chiropodists), and the Chemist were no longer needed. Other categories of servants were reduced in number with those of the Sergeants-at-Arms (who had few non-ceremonial duties left), the Esquires of the Body and the Gentlemen Ushers Quarter Waiters being halved. The Pages of the Presence were cut back from six to four and the Grooms of the Great Chamber from fourteen to ten. Twenty-two Messengers and fourteen Musicians were dismissed. In all eighty-five Chamber posts (not counting the eight officials of the Tents) were lost, although five of these places were vacant at

14 SP 44/164, p. 263, warrant to Dartmouth, 4 Oct 1685; H.C. Tomlinson, Guns and Government, (1979), pp. 105-6 and n.
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---

14 SP 44/164, p. 263, warrant to Dartmouth, 4 Oct 1685; H.C. Tomlinson, Guns and Government, (1979), pp. 105-6 and n.
the time and the sixty-three who were removed from types of positions which still existed became supernumeraries.

In the Stables it had been envisaged in 1679 that fifty of the 152 places would be abolished as they became vacant so that in 1685 it was decided instead that these changes should take place immediately lowering the staffing level to eighty-eight. After they complained in May 1686 that they were ‘wretchedly poor, & great objects of Pity & Charity’, these former Stables servants would be given allowances amounting to £1,043 backdated to Ladyday 1686.\(^{15}\) The effect of halving the Household and reducing the Chamber and the Stables by over one-third was to cut the overall size of the household from over 1,000 to about 600.

Now that boardwages were abolished, the level of the wages could not be left unaltered and the redundancies gave scope to do something more thoroughgoing than merely lumping the sums formerly paid as wages and boardwages into one payment. They were ‘being chang’d from Wages and Board-wages to noble Salaries, Allowances and Stipends’\(^ {16}\) was how this process was described by Chamberlayne. In fact, in the cases of the Clerk of the Accatry, the Yeomen of the Bakehouse, the Chaundry and the Scullery; the Yeoman Garnitor of the Bakehouse; the Yeomen Porters-at-Gate; the Yeomen Cartakers; the Grooms of the Chaundry, the Larder, the Privy Kitchens, the Scullery and the Woodyard; the Groom Porters-at-Gate and the Groom Cartakers, the lumping together of their wages and boardwages was exactly what did happen. The Sub-Almoner, who had not been provided with boardwages, continued to receive his previous salary of £6 18s. while the Turnbroaches of the Privy Kitchen, the Pankeeper of the Scullery, the Grooms of the Woodyard and the Cock, who had been getting only boardwages now received the same amount in wages. Some servants even lost out. The Grooms of the Bakehouse, the Buttery, the Scaldinghouse, the Poultry and the Almonry; the Daily Waiter of the Hall and the Pages of the Scullery all had their pay cut to £20 from combined wages and boardwages of up to £30. The pay of the Chief Clerk of the Spicery also was reduced from £112 to £80, that of the Chief Clerk of the King’s Privy Kitchen from £202 10s. to £200, that of the Queen’s Master Cook from £91 8s. 11\(1/2\)d. to £80, that of the Yeoman of the Almonry from £40 to £30 and that of the Marshal of the Hall from £31 5s. 8\(1/2\)d. to £30. However, apart from the Chief Clerk of the King’s Privy Kitchen (whose loss was, in any case, minimal) and the Queen’s

\(^{15}\) PC 2/71, fol. 143, 14 May 1686. Although incorporated into the Household establishment (LS 13/38), there was originally a separate 1685 Stables establishment. Now lost along with the rest of the Stables archive, its contents are known from a copy (RA EB12). An abstract of the contents, as found in the Household establishment, can be found among the Treasury papers (T1/2, no. 2, fols. 7-8). The full copy, unlike the Household establishment, gives the text of the Stables ordinances issued by the king on 20 April 1685. With there being no known Stables ordinances from the reign of Charles II, it is not clear whether these were a reissue or newly drafted.

Master Cook, all these servants were promised wage increases as the declining numbers of supernumeraries made money available. The Clerk of the Spicery would thus eventually receive £150; the Clerk of the Accatry, £120; the Yeoman of the Greencloth, £78; the Groom of the Greencloth, £57 8s. 4d.; all other Yeomen, at least £50; all other Grooms, at least £40 and all other lesser servants, at least £30.¹⁷ In the Stables, moreover, the Purveyors, the Yeoman of the Close Carriages, the Yeomen and Groom Farriers, the Groom Coachmen and the Stablekeepers were also given wage cuts.

All other servants paid by the Cofferer, however, received increases in their payments with some of the increases being largest among the highest ranking officials. Thus, the Lord Steward’s pay increased from £600 to £1,460; the Treasurer of the Household’s from £623 14s. 8d. to £1,200; the Comptroller’s from £607 to £1,200; the Cofferer’s from £282 to £500; the Master of the Household’s from £149 3s. 4d. to £500; the Clerks of the Greencloth’s from £226 17s. 8d. to £500; the Lord Chamberlain’s from £600 to £1,200; the Groom of the Stole’s from £433 6s. 8d. to £1,000 and the Master of the Horse from £500 to £1,200. The reason for these very large increases would have been that it was these courtiers who had lost most from no longer being given diet for, when originally fixed, their boardwages had not been intended as full compensation for the loss of this privilege. Impressive though these were, they were surpassed, in proportionate terms, by the increase for the Pages of the Bedchamber who now got £80 instead of £20 18s. 8d., and, best of all, the Laundress, who got £120 instead of a mere £20. Before the Household servants had been paid a total of £9,897 in wages and boardwages. The redundancies made possible these large increases while restricting the new salary bill to only £10,642. Likewise, in spite of the staff cuts, the cost of the Stables salaries increased from £6,039 to £8,225. Those Chamber salaries still paid by the Cofferer amounted to £7,021 whereas previously the far larger number of individual wages and boardwages had come to only £5,239.

Substantial though these changes were, their impact on overall expenditure was not as great as might be supposed. The ordinary expenditure of the Cofferer went up from the £54,000 fixed by the 1679 establishment (historically, a very low figure) to £64,850. A Treasury estimate of forecasted expenditure compiled towards the beginning of the reign (and probably before the establishment was completed) had allocated £60,000 to the Household so the modest increase in expenditure was no doubt deliberate. The basic allocation for the Treasurer of the Chamber was £30,000, which meant that Chamber expenditure returned to what it had been in the 1670s before the

¹⁷ This promise was contained in the Household ordinances (LS 13/38, fol. 22). In February 1686 some of these increases were fulfilled. (LS 13/255, fols. 19-20, James II to Greencloth, 10 Feb 1686; RA EB11, fol. 49.)
1679 retrenchment had roughly halved that figure. The Great Wardrobe expenditure was to be £20,000; the Robes, £5,000; the Gentlemen Pensioners, £6,000 and the Privy Purse, £20,000: all of which were more or less unchanged from what they had been before. Total government expenditure, excluding contingencies, it was reckoned, would be £1,388,426 against expected revenues of £1,479,138. The stark conclusion to be drawn was that 'by this it appears how little can be Spared out of the present Revenues towards payment of the late Kings Debts which are very great not only to the Banquers but also in every Publique Office.'

This problem required separate treatment.

The vast arrears left by Charles II when he died were a direct legacy of the financial difficulties of his reign. The holding back of wages had been a normal method used by officials to cope with the shortage of available money. Without the money they had been promised there was little else they could do without turning to the expensive resort of borrowing. Often the delay in payment became so long as more recent arrears got priority that there seemed little prospect that sums due from years before would ever be paid. The Great Wardrobe, which by Ladyday 1685 owed £23,676 6s. 5d. in back payments, mostly in lieu of livery, still owed the Falconer, Thomas de Champe, money from 1660 and the Purveyor of Silk, Francis Manby, was due money for every year since 1664. Fifty-five people had arrears still from 1667. The extreme case was the Chamberlain of the Exchequer, Sir Nicholas Steward, who had received none of the fees due to him since Christmas 1660. For this reason, paying off these debts was one of the justifications James used when on 30 May 1685 he asked parliament to grant an extraordinary supply because, as he pointed out to them, 'the Debts of the King my Brother to his Servants and Family are such as deserve compassion...'. The Commons immediately responded by voting a tax on wines and vinegar, but it was rather the tax on tobacco and sugar, voted the next day, which would be used for this purpose. Nevertheless, it was not until April 1686 that an adequate scheme had been devised. At that point, Rochester presented the details to the Privy Council and it was agreed that the reduced payscales introduced in 1679 should be used to make the calculations even when the arrears dated from before. The scheme was to apply only to servants of the 'Household or Family', only to those in royal service at Charles II’s death, only to those still alive and only to ordinary wages, fees and allowances. Except in the case of the Cofferer, whose arrears were to be paid up to Midsummer 1685, the

---

18 T 1/2, no. 6, fol. 15, estimate of revenue and expenditure, [1685]. A precise figure for the expenditure by the Treasurer of the Chamber during James II’s reign is impossible as Griffin never completed the declaration of his accounts. The incomplete accounts which survive confirm, however, that it was approximately £30,000. (AO 1/405/126-127, 130; AO 1/406/133).

19 Bodl. MS Rawl. A 297, fols. 55-64, Great Wardrobe arrears, Ladyday 1685.

20 Grey, Debates, VIII, p. 347.
figures were calculated up to Christmas 1684. These conditions meant that the £23,676 6s. 5d. due from the Great Wardrobe to Ladyday 1685 were scaled down to only £17,476 18s. 8 1/2d. Likewise, the arrears from the Exchequer had been calculated at £259,790 18s. 3d., were provisionally reduced to £126,154 18s. 21/4d. and were then further whittled down to £111,841 8s. 0 3/4d. The Treasurer of the Chamber was to pay out £47,335 Is. 1P/4d.; the Works, £1,453 17s. 5d. and the Cofferer, £64,007 2s. 11d., making a total of £242,114 2s. 1Id. This had all to be paid from the tobacco and sugar revenues estimated to be just over £60,000 pa. so it was agreed that the 142 servants owed less than £20 would be paid first. 21 During May and June 1686 most of those concerned obtained the necessary warrants from the Treasury to enable the Auditor of the Receipt to pass the debentures to allow the arrears to be paid and by July 1687 this process had been completed. Although Griffin was able to pay off over £45,500 of the arrears owed by him as Treasurer of the Chamber, this was a problem which would outlast James’s reign. 22

Unconnected with all these financial changes but also contributing to the impression of thorough reform was the new set of Bedchamber ordinances. These had been due for an overhaul. In January 1683 a dispute had developed when one of the Pages of the Bedchamber tried to stop Arlington entering it. When Arlington objected, Bath had, at first, agreed but had then unearthed long-forgotten copies of the 1661 and 1673 ordinances to support the Page’s decision. A committee of the Privy Council had then been formed to adjudicate. On his right to enter the Bedchamber, as well as on his further points concerning the ordering of furnishings for the Bedchamber, the wearing of the treble key, the swearing of Bedchamber staff and the introduction of ambassadors, Arlington maintained that the ordinances in question could not be correct because they did not reflect existing practice nor (for they claimed to be reissues of the James I and Charles I ordinances) that of earlier reigns. On 15 June 1683 the committee had advised the king that the manuscripts were genuine but that Arlington was right to argue that they had never been properly implemented. 23 Charles II had not delivered a

21 PC 2/71, fol. 130, 16 April 1686; Bodl. MS Eng. Hist. b 99, abstract of arrears payable by Exchequer to Christmas 1684; Bodl. MS Eng. Hist. b 100, abstract of reduced arrears payable by Exchequer to Christmas 1684.
22 E 403/3035, fols. 1-210; LC 5/41, fols. 183-231; AO 3/133/7; B.L. Add MS 63779, fols. 1-23.
23 Nottingham University Library, Portland MS Pw 92, Bedchamber ordinances, 1661; Pw 93, Bedchamber ordinances, 1673; Hatton Correspondence, II, pp. 21-2, Lyttelton to Hatton, 30 Jan 1683; Savile Correspondence, p. 274, Savile to Halifax, 16 April 1683; CSPD, (Jan-June 1683), pp. 90-2, 134, 144, 146, 147, 154, 163, 165-6, 245, 285, 319-20; Bodl. MS Clarendon 87, fol. 254, Arlington to Privy Council committee, n.d.; fols. 256-7, memorandum by Arlington, [16 May 1683] - cp. HMC Ormonde, n.s. VII, pp. 27-32; LC 5/201, fols. 9-15, notes, 1683-89; fols. 15-47, 71-5, proceedings of the Privy Council committee, 1683; B.L. Add MS 61605, fols. 130-56, proceedings of the Privy Council committee, 1683. Another account of the proceedings of the committee, together with the final report, is to be found in the manuscript, ‘Points in dispute betweene the Lord Chamberlaine & Groome of the Stole, 1683’, which was formerly in the possession of the late Hugh Murray Baillie. I
definitive ruling on the disputed issues so it was now appropriate for the new king to lay down his own wishes. On 14 April 1685 the new ordinances were signed. The changes had something for both the Groom of the Stole and the Lord Chamberlain. They confirmed that the Lord Chamberlain did not have an automatic right of access (except first thing in the morning) and that keys to the Bedchamber were only to be given to servants of the Bedchamber but that the Groom of the Stole had to be sworn by the Lord Chamberlain, that he could only order linen from the Great Wardrobe with the king’s permission and that to ask the Lord Chamberlain to swear Bedchamber servants he must do so in writing. The Groom of the Stole’s right to appoint the Pages and the minor Bedchamber servants was also removed. Moreover, although when Peterborough and Churchill were sworn in by Arlington on 21 and 25 April the clause of obedience to him was omitted, by the time the other members of the Bedchamber came to be sworn in, it had been decided to amend the oath to include the requirement to be ‘obedient to the Lord Chamberlayne in His Majesty Service (that is) out of the Districts of the Bedchamber’. These and the other changes, being, for the most part, concerned with the details, did little to alter the way the Bedchamber operated. It was in the decision to produce a substantially altered text for the ordinances, even where the contents remained much the same, rather than just the tinkering with the wording which might have been expected, that James’s desire to make his presence felt was most evident.

am grateful to Dr. David Starkey for a copy of this MS. Neil Cuddy has assembled a formidable case for believing that, contrary to what the 1683 committee decided, the ordinances did reflect Bedchamber practice earlier in the century. (N. Cuddy, ‘The King’s Chambers’, (unpublished D.Phil thesis, Oxford, 1987), pp. 32-75). The one remaining doubt about the ordinances’ authenticity is that this was not the only occasion on which Bath was implicated in a possible forgery. In 1691, in the opening stages of his long-running battle against Montagu to secure control of the inheritance left by the second duke of Albemarle, he would be tried on the charge of forging a deed purportedly signed by Albemarle in 1681. On that occasion he would be acquitted, with the courts upholding the validity of the deed two years later. (The Arguments of the Lord Keeper, the two Lord Chief Justices and Mr Baron Powell when they gave judgment for the Earl of Bath, (1693); The Case of the Duchess of Albemarle and Christopher Monke, [1693]).

During the intervening period new Bedchamber servants had undergone an incomplete swearing ceremony, the Great Wardrobe continued to accept only the Lord Chamberlain’s warrants for furnishings and, when keys had been ordered for the Grooms and Pages of the Bedchamber, it had been Arlington who had done so. (LC 5/201, fols. 10-12; LC 3/24, cheque roll, 1660-84, unfoliated; LC 5/144, fol. 225, Arlington to Bach, 2 July 1683).

B.L. Althorp papers D4, Bedchamber ordinances, 1685. For copies, see Oxfordshire R.O. MS Dil xx/a/2 and B.L. Add MS 5017. Each of the Gentlemen of the Bedchamber were issued with a copy and the former is that given to Lichfield.

1685 ordinances, clauses 7-11, 16, 22 - cp. 1661 and 1673 ordinances, clauses 7, 8, 12, 13, 25. As a direct result of the evidence submitted by Arlington in 1683, the Esquires of the Body were no longer required to wait in the Withdrawing Chamber when, each evening, they came to receive the watch-word, with them being given the right to enter the Bedchamber. (1661 and 1673 ordinances, clause 24; 1685 ordinances, clause 21; B.L. Add MS 61605, fols. 139-41 - cp. S. Pegge, Curialia, (1791), part I , pp. 19-23.

LC 3/30, fol. 7; LC 5/201, fol. 12; LC 3/56, fol. 35. See also Alnwick Castle, Northumberland MS 20, fols. 10-12, swearing certificates of Somerset as Gentleman of the Bedchamber, 16 May 1685.
James had, therefore, abolished boardwages, reorganised the household in the light of this, and, in doing so, reduced the manpower of the household by over one-third, increased most wages, promised further wage increases in the future, made provision for many (but not all) those who had lost their jobs, permitted only a modest increase in expenditure, made a start at paying off his brother’s debts and revised the Bedchamber ordinances. By any standard, this was a major set of administrative reforms. They should not however be seen in isolation. Rather the real importance of the 1685 reforms was as one of a series of reforms of which it was, perhaps, the most important.

II

For the 1685 reforms to be understood in context, something must be said about what had happened during the previous reign. The main outlines of the developments under Charles II can be summarised briefly. As early as 1662 it had become evident to Charles II that to seek to recreate the court along the lines of that of his father was, in the short term at least, unrealistic. Amidst the outpouring of royalist jubilation which had marked his triumphal return, things had looked somewhat different and that objective had seemed natural, even obligatory. Within weeks the court was reconstituting itself more or less spontaneously, so that, by June 1660, there were already 307 salaried officials belowstairs, which almost exactly matched the number which had been employed by Charles I, and by August the final preparations were being made to bring the Household Kitchen back into operation to allow diet to be served to the royal servants according to the old manner. It was, moreover, to his father’s 1630 establishment that Charles II pointed as an exemplar to be followed, where at all possible, in the devising of the new establishment, which was soon felt necessary to regularise the hitherto ad hoc organisation of the Household.
Not all courtiers had observed these events with equanimity. Lord Treasurer Southampton seems to have had misgivings about the expenditure involved and to have found an ally in Hyde, for whom (according to his own version of events) these developments were a spineless betrayal of what the king had agreed when in exile. Blaming Ormond and Albemarle, Clarendon would subsequently recall how, on being appointed Lord Steward and Master of the Horse,

...they had both their tables erected according to the old models, and all those excesses, which the irregular precedents of former times had introduced, and which the king had so solemnly resolved to reform, before it could be said to trench upon the rights of particular persons. But the good humour the king was in, and the plenty which generally appeared, how much soever without a fund to support it, and especially the natural desire his majesty had to see every body pleased, banished all thoughts of such providence; instead whereof, he resolved forthwith to settle his house according to former rules, or rather without any rule, and to appoint the officers, who impatiently expected their promotion. He directed his own table to be more magnificently furnished than it had ever been in any time of his predecessors; which example was easily followed in all offices.32

These lapses of judgement would take a quarter of a century to undo completely.

It had only been a matter of time before change had been forced on Charles II by the seriousness of his fiscal problems. By December 1662 it had become unavoidable that there would be cutbacks at court. The diet which most royal servants had been receiving was suspended, with only the great officers continuing to receive their free meals. This made possible a reduction in the number of servants below stairs from about 350 to about 220. Those removed had become supernumeraries. Expenditure within the Lord Steward’s department was thereby cut from just under £170,000 to £120,000.33 This had still been too much and by August 1663 it was agreed that another retrenchment would have to take effect from Michaelmas of that year. That

---

32 Clarendon, Life, I, p. 367 - cp. ibid, I, p. 365; III, pp. 237-8. Although tantalisingly ambiguous and undated, one of Clarendon's notes appears to show that, at about this time, he and Southampton were attempting to limit increases in household expenditure. (W.D. Macray (ed.), Notes passed at meetings of the Privy Council between Charles II and the Earl of Clarendon, (1896), p. 9). Clarendon, it should be noted, also supported the decision to abolish purveyance. (Macpherson, Original Papers, I, p. 40). A fragment of a memorial on the royal finances which recommends either the payment of boardwages or a return to meals in the Hall probably dates from 1660. (SP 9/40, fol. 1).

33 LS 13/31, 1662 establishment. Unlike the later establishments, this does not conclude with a complete summary of projected expenditure. The figure of £120,000 is derived from a note attached to folio 18. (cp. CTB, (1660-67), pp. 526-7). Whether the establishment covered the queen’s domestic expenditure is not certain. Comparison with E 101/541/9A and with LS 13/32 suggests that it did and that this item of expenditure was about £20,000 pa. E 101/541/9A is a draft which had proposed even more drastic changes. It must predate Nicholas's removal from the Principal Secretaryship of State in October 1662 and was probably compiled after (or possibly in anticipation of) the queen’s arrival the previous May.
time, in order to cut expenditure to just over £60,000, all the boardwages and pensions were halted. Moreover, almost all the remaining diets were axed.34 This had been a landmark in the history of the English court. Never again would royal servants, except a few on immediate attendance on the king, receive the free meals that they had for centuries been entitled to. Whether this significance was realised at the time remains unclear. The Board of Greencloth, at least, did not seem to have believed that the change was entirely permanent.35 A year later, in October 1664, payment of the boardwages in lieu of these lost diets had been resumed but the suspension of the diets for the great officers had been confirmed. To reflect these changes, the Lord Steward’s department had been reorganised and the number of servants within it had been cut further, from 225 to 147. The savings enabled the salaries and boardwages for the remaining servants to be increased. Expenditure had, nevertheless, been kept to £100,000.36

Thereafter, the situation belowstairs had stabilised somewhat, although during the remainder of the reign the Household had still had to undergo periodic retrenchments. Thus between 1668 and 1669 and then between 1676 and 1677, the Treasury had imposed cuts across all government departments in attempts to deal with the mounting debts but, in both cases, the retrenchments had failed and all the money which had been withheld was promised to those to whom it should have been paid.37 Then, in early 1679, Danby had prepared plans for a retrenchment, both to pay off the army and to save his career.38 The following June the new Treasury Commission led by Essex had pushed through these plans. Belowstairs this had taken the form of cuts in boardwages to reduce expenditure from just over £100,000 to under £50,000. Although explicitly stated to be ‘A Temporary Settlement’, this retrenchment had remained in force for the six years until Charles II’s death.39

35 See the abandoned version of the 1664 establishment and the proposals presented by them to Ormond in August 1664. (LS 13/33; *HMC Ormonde*, n.s. III, pp. 177-8).
36 LS 13/34, 1664 establishment.
37 For the 1668-9 suspension, see PC 2/60, fols. 54, 79-81, 198-9; PC 2/61, fols. 12, 21-2; *CSPD*, (1667-68), p. 287-92, 296; T 1/1, no. 20, Arlington to Griffin, 16 Mar 1668; LS 13/35, 1669 establishment; *CTB*, (1667-68), p. xxx, 101, 203, 206, 208, 212, 515, 520, 522, 527, 535, 538, 562, 571; (1669-72), p. 81, 230, 242, 572, 589. For the 1676-7 suspension, see PC 2/65, fol. 43, 111-13; *CTB*, (1676-79), pp. 116-18, 476, 485, 553, 803; (1681-85), p. 559. The 1674 establishment (LS 13/36) was largely a reissue of the 1669 one.
38 *HMC Ormonde*, n.s. IV, p. 495, Southwell to Ormond, 31 Dec 1678; Bodl. MS Carte 232, fol. 33, Ellis to Ormond, 4 Jan 1679.
39 LS 13/37, 1679 establishment. The titlepage described it as ‘A Temporary Settlement of King Charles the 2nd Household Expence...’.
Viewed in the context of the preceding quarter-century, the 1685 reforms may seem no more than yet another reorganisation. It could even be argued that they were a tying-up of the loose ends left by, and a partial relaxation of, the 1679 retrenchment. Edward Chamberlayne, taking a longer perspective, discerned a trend and in 1687 lamented that 'in the Court of King James the first, there were many more Officers, and to many Offices there belonged many more Persons, which King Charles the first, and our late King Charles the second, much lessened, and the present King now reigning hath yet lessened much more.'

Seven years earlier, before the 1685 reforms, Sir William Boreman, one of the Clerks of the Greencloth, had estimated that during the course of the century the size of the Household had halved. Within the broad impression of decline one particular period, the early 1660s, appears especially important and the key component of the 1685 reforms, the abolition of boardwages, can seem little more than an upshot of the ending of the diets. On the surface and certainly in practice, the crucial shift from diet to boardwages in 1662, the formal dissolution of the Household in 1663 and the remodelling of the departments belowstairs in 1664, taken together, do seem to have marked the disintegration of the old system.

These changes must be considered part of a wider development in social customs. The practice of keeping open table had previously not been confined to the court. Among the higher ranks of society courtesy had required that it was the minimal form of hospitality for guests while it had also been the usual way of catering for servants and retainers. In a predominantly agricultural economy, rewarding servants in kind was easier than to do so in cash. In this way a nobleman could, like the king, have hoped to make his clients obliged to him, his servants dependant on him and his wealth and status visible. It was the most manifest expression of his social position. So, in providing them with large allocations of diet, the king was keeping them in the style to which they were accustomed. This encouraged them to attend his court but it also gave him direct control over the mass consumption of food which took place daily within his palace. It reminded them that they were his servants, underlining the hierarchy of the court and of the kingdom. When he abolished these diets, Charles II assumed that the greater courtiers would continue keeping open tables on a similar scale hence the compensation in the form of boardwages. Yet among the nobility this method of entertaining was already in decline and few of the greater courtiers resisted the trend.

40 Chamberlayne, Angliae Notitia, (1687), part I, p. 165.
41 HMC Ormonde, n.s. V, pp. 261-2, Boreman to Ormond, 3 Feb 1680.
One who did was Ormond. When in Ireland, ten large and four small dishes were served to his table at each course while a total of twenty-five dishes were served to the tables of his steward, his clerk of the kitchen and the female servants of his wife. When in 1679 Lord James Butler, the future second duke, went up to Oxford (where, as the grandson of the Chancellor of the university, he was to be lodged with the bishop), Ormond advised that 'it is in all respects better boarding inferior servants than giving them wages and liberty to shift for themselves; they will have fewer excuses for neglecting their attendance and be kept freer from temptations to debauchery.' Carte would claim that Ormond was the only peer to continue providing open table and that, in doing so as Lord Steward, he incurred debts of almost £90,000 by the time he died.\(^43\) That Ormond was the last member of the peerage to keep open table may not be quite true. At Badminton during the 1670s Beaufort still maintained a vast establishment along the old lines which Roger North, who stayed as a guest, praised as a model household but then added that 'I mention this entertainment as a handle of showing a princely way of living, which that noble duke used, above any other, except crowned heads, that I have had notice of in Europe; and, in some respects, greater than most of them, to whom he might have been an example.'\(^44\) The French and Spanish courts had already gone a considerable way towards abandoning such systems and English officials were aware of this.\(^45\) With this type of hospitality becoming rarer in royal and aristocratic circles, the fact that the king was retreating from it appeared less unnatural.

Be this as it may, there was a more immediate reason for the abolition of diet. The royal servants themselves knew exactly what to blame: the abolition of purveyance. Following the 1663 retrenchment they petitioned the king asking that parliament be told to reconsider the matter. Pointing out that while Charles I's Household had cost £70,000 pa. to operate, the ending of purveyance had increased the cost to £120,000 which was not being matched by the extra revenue. To counter the

\(^{43}\) Bodl. MS Clarendon 88, fol. 173, dishes served to Ormond, [1685]; HMC Ormonde II, p. 284, Ormond to Southwell, 1 Mar 1679; Carte, Ormonde, II, p. 410, 446, 522, 555; appendix, p. 101, Ormond to Southwell, 3 Feb 1682. See also Cambridge University Library, Mm I. 47, life of Roscromon, p. 38; HMC 12th Report, appendix, part VII, p. 165, Cooke to [Bruce], 13 Sept 1662. It should be noted that the list of dishes forms part of a group of papers detailing Ormond's household arrangements which were sent to Rochester in 1685 when he was preparing to assume the position of Lord Lieutenant of Ireland so it is possible that he would have dined in the same manner.


\(^{45}\) SP 9/40, fol. 1, fragment of memorial on royal finances, temp. Charles II. As in England, the system did not disappear entirely from the French court. In 1689 there were still 105 servants in the French royal household who were receiving diet. (National Library of Scotland, Adv. MS 33.7.32, copy of expenses and menus of French royal household, 1689).
claim that it was unpopular they argued that purveyance ‘in the severall counties did not yearly amount unto so much as they do cheerfully and willingly expend in Toyes and ffaireings [presents] for their little children or for a seed oate or harvest Sock [ploughshare] for their servants...’46 What makes this petition most interesting is that the passage just quoted is almost identical to a passage in the book The Antiquity, Legality, Reason, Duty and Necessity of Prae-emption and Pourveyance published in the same year by Fabian Philipps.47 Which was the original text is unclear but that some links connects the two is most tantalizing given that Philipps, a lawyer by profession and, from 1661, the Remembrancer of the Court of the Council and Marches of Wales, was the most exhaustive royalist critic of the Restoration settlement.

Philipps’s stance was unequivocal. He wanted nothing less than a return to thoroughgoing feudalism. This view was elaborated by him at great length in five books published between 1660 and 1664, but the fact that the first of these, his uncompromising defence of tenures in capite and knight service, Tenenda non Tollenda, is the best known has tended to distort interpretation of his works for, as the full effect of the abolition of purveyance on the Household finances became apparent, he increasingly shifted his attention away from the subject of feudal tenure and towards purveyance.48 This shift did not alter his basic point which was that abandoning the principles of feudalism would

unhinge the Government and take away the Tyes and Obligations which were betwixt the King and his Subjects, the Nobility and better part of the people, and the more common and inferior sort of them, untie their bonds of Obedience, and let them loose to a liberty of ruining and undoing themselves by not obeying their Sovereign.49

Whatever the wider point, in concentrating on the issue of purveyance as the weakest aspect of the 1660 settlement, Philipps deployed a range of arguments to defend purveyance in particular. Prominent among these arguments was detailed scrutiny of the shortcomings of the package of revenues parliament had voted in 1660. The excise which had replaced purveyance was an easy target and he was able to argue that not only had the excise revenues fallen far short of what had been promised but also that,

48 Tenenda non Tollenda, (1660); Ligeancia Lugens, (1661); Restauranda, (1662); The Antiquity...of Prae-emption and Pourveyance, (1663); The Mistaken Recompence, (1664). See also SP 29/137, fol. 190, ‘For the Conservation of the Honor of the King...’, 30 Nov 1665. A sympathetic account of Philipps’s work can be found in D.C. Douglas, English Scholars, (1939), pp. 160-4.
49 Ligeancia Lugens, (1661), pp. 25-6.
because the Household was now having to pay the full market rate for its provisions, even if the excise yielded the full amount, the revenue would still be insufficient.\textsuperscript{50}

 Needless to say, in his various works, Philipps highlighted the retrenchments of the diets as evidence of the damage being done because, to him, the lavish provision of hospitality was the prime example of how the splendour of the court should benefit the kingdom. Thus, he described how the Household had provided

entertainment for all comers for the Kings honour, where were great yearly Festivals, the Lord Stewards Table completely, and more then ordinarily furnished during all the time of the sitting of the Parliaments, to entertain such of the Lords and Commons as would come thither to dinner, and where when the Nobility and Persons of quality in the absence of Parliaments, came either to attend the King, or petition him in any of their Affairs, they were made Guests at some of the Tables of his great Officers, as well as those of meaner ranks were at the Table of the lesser: And the Chambers and Galleries searched for such strangers and fit persons as might deserve to be invited to the Tables and Diet of his servants, to the end that any that were fitting to partake of his hospitality might not be omitted.\textsuperscript{51}

His stress on the liberality of the king’s hospitality was important because only through old-style hospitality could ostentation avoid the sin of vanity and counterpoising his championing of the conviviality of the court were denunciations of the aristocracy for abandoning their obligations to be hospitable in favour of iniquitous luxury. Among his proposed solutions was the revival of sumptuary legislation and, for him, one of the main reasons for reintroducing purveyance would be that it would enable the government to impose economic regulation in the form of price-fixing using the

\textsuperscript{50} Philipps’s various figures for how much the king had lost defy any attempt to harmonise them. They are, however, worth more notice than Aylmer’s dismissal of them as obvious exaggerations. (Aylmer, ‘Last years of purveyance’, p. 85). Aylmer does not help his case when he states that the 1660 half-excise grant was for £100,000 and that it had not been altered to reflect the inclusion of purveyance among the feudal revenues to be abolished. The half-excise grant was for £150,000, of which £50,000 was compensation for purveyance. There is no doubt that this grant was initially insufficient and, on this point, Philipps was well-informed. (Aylmer, ‘Last years’, pp. 90-1; Chandaman, \textit{English Public Revenue}, pp. 38-9, 51-5, 308-12; \textit{Ligeancia Lugens}, (1661), p. 15; \textit{The Mistaken Recompence}, (1664), p. 9). Philipps’s argument that £50,000 was, in any case, inadequate is plausible. Aylmer seems to doubt that under Charles I purveyance was worth this much, basing this view on the fact that the known revenue from it appears never to have exceeded £38,000 during the 1630s. The known revenue, however, only includes the payments from compositions (that is, the revenue raised by ‘Method III’). How far this had remained the main means of payment is debatable. What evidence there is suggests that at least some of the counties had reverted to making payments in kind (‘Method II’). (Aylmer, ‘Last years’, pp. 86-8; K. Sharpe, \textit{The Personal Rule of Charles I}, (Yale, 1992), pp. 109-11). Some of the counties more distant from London may have preferred the older method because it meant that their money was spent locally. Given this, together with Charles I’s efforts to maximise the revenue from it, the total value of purveyance may well have exceeded £50,000 p.a. That Philipps believed Charles II was losing much more was understandable. The attempt between 1660 and 1662 to apply the 1629 establishment, which had assumed costs of £70,000 excluding purveyance, quickly led, as was described above, to expenditure of almost £170,000 p.a. and the reduction of expenditure to £120,000 (£70,000 plus £50,000) was only possible through the abolition of most of the diets. Aylmer’s conclusion that, from the Crown’s point of view, the deal in 1660 was not too bad would only be true in the long term.

\textsuperscript{51} \textit{The Mistaken Recompence}, (1664), p. 22.
reanimated powers of the Clerk of the Markets. Purveyance was, however, above all, a right inseparable from the notion of monarchy itself. It was something which

all Nations and People under the Sun, and even the naked, wild and savage part of them have by a Jure Gentium and eternall Law of Nature, derived from divine instinct, allowance, and patern of the infancy of the world, and through all the times and ages of it so well approved, as they could never think fit to lay aside or disuse the practise of it

and which was ‘as old as the first Generations of Mankind, and as antient as the duty or reverence of Children to their Parents’. For holding views like these Philipps has too often been disregarded as a crank yet there are good reasons to take him more seriously. The vast jumble of disconnected historical references scattered throughout his works show that he had an exceptionally wide, if ill-digested, knowledge of his subject. It is evident that he had contacts within the Household and he had access to the few remaining documents in the archive of the Board of Greencloth. In 1680 he was appointed a Gentleman of the Privy Chamber. His arguments remained well known and with the confirmation of the 1660 settlement in 1685 there was renewed interest in them. They may, indeed, have been one of the reasons why parliament was so willing to look sympathetically on James’s requests for additional supplies. Finally, whatever the precise accuracy of his calculations, his analysis of the Household finances was, in essence, correct.

Indeed, in the autumn of 1664 the government did seriously contemplate reintroducing purveyance. Moreover, it must be emphasised that the abolition of diet had not been a calculated part of the Restoration settlement. The contrary was rather the case. With purveyance being one of the discredited feudal duties, it had been assumed that the Crown had been adequately compensated for the loss of it in the grant of ordinary revenue. Without the shortfalls of the early 1660s there is little reason to suppose that the diets could not have been maintained in some form. What is more, the buoyancy of the revenue by the 1680s could have made their reinstatement possible. Estimating how much this would have cost is difficult but it should be noted that inflation since 1660 had been negligible and any reinstatement did not have to be complete. Had the will existed, James II could have, with little difficulty, returned the Household to the pre-1662 retrenchment level of expenditure which had been roughly twice what would be allowed in 1685. After all, during the course of his reign, combined expenditure for the army, the navy and the Ordnance would average not far short from the £1,200,000 pa. envisaged for total ordinary expenditure in 1660

pushing the actual figure for total ordinary expenditure during the late 1680s up to over £1,900,000.\textsuperscript{55} It was his decision not to reinstate the diets and, by abolishing boardwages, to signal that they never would be reinstated, which constituted the real importance of the 1685 reforms. The permanence of the earlier reforms had always been ambiguous and, so long as boardwages remained, the Household establishments retained a vestige of the old system. The importance was entirely psychological. The Household had been forced, by adverse circumstances, in the early 1660s to make a change it had resisted and the process of reconciling itself to that change was slow and uneven. The 1685 reforms represented the final recognition (or so it seemed) that the change was permanent.

From the Crown’s point of view there was much to commend the abolition of diet. Getting courtiers to make their own arrangements at mealtimes was unquestionably more efficient and any reform which produced economies freed money to be spent on other things. It was for this reason that the pressure for reform throughout this period came from within the court, not from without. The wastefulness of diet was not the subject of recurrent public stricture in the way that (since as early as 1309 and the Articles of Stamford) purveyance, in its various forms, had been. The finances of the household, in point of fact, attracted very little criticism during the Restoration period.\textsuperscript{56} This is not to say that ‘the court’ escaped censure. Criticism, when voiced, tended rather to be either precise disapproval on particular issues, which almost never involved the household finances, or unspecific denunciation, which presumably arose from feelings of disapproval on these same particular issues. The critique of the court centred on taxation, military affairs, catholic influence, placemen in the Commons, payments from the Secret Service to those placemen, the acquisitiveness of individual courtiers and the sexual promiscuity of the court and care must be exercised before using any of these issues as evidence of public dissatisfaction with the household departments. This, at least, is the impression given by the surviving records of parliamentary debates.\textsuperscript{57} It could be maintained that in these debates there existed, beyond mere political tact, an unspoken convention which extended to his domestic arrangements, the impropriety of personally criticising the king. Whether or not this was the case, the almost complete absence of any reference to the household finances during the debates in parliament is most striking.

\textsuperscript{55} Chandaman, \textit{English Public Revenue}, p. 363. These are only approximations being the annual averages of the Exchequer issues between Easter 1685 and Michaelmas 1688.

\textsuperscript{56} There had, it is true, been some in 1659 and 1660 who had used the likely expense of the court as an argument against a restoration of the king. (C.E. Edie, ‘The popular idea of monarchy on the eve of the Stuart Restoration’, \textit{Huntington Library Quarterly}, XXXIX, (1975-6), p. 353, 356.

\textsuperscript{57} Mainly Grey, \textit{Debates}, I-VIII, passim, supplemented by the other, more scattered, records in print.
Only two undoubted references, both from October 1675, are known. Neither is unequivocal. Both arose from the king’s request for additional supplies to pay off the government debts. In making this request in his speech from the throne, Charles II had blamed the war for these debts but had then gone on to admit that ‘I find, by a late Accompt I have take of My Expences, that I have not been altogether so good an Husband as I might have been, and as I resolve to be for the future; although, at the same Time, I have had the Satisfaction to find, that I have been far from such an Extravagancy in My own Expence, as some would have the world believe.’ This appears to show that there had been criticism of the household. That interpretation is probably the correct one, with him foreshadowing the 1676 suspension, although these comments could equally refer simply to the government finances in a general sense. Once this apparent allusion had been made by the king himself to his domestic finances, two MPs made reference to the subject in the subsequent debates. Sir John Holland, a frequent critic of government policy, in a speech whose apologetic tone should not be overlooked, announced that

He cannot but think himself bound in conscience to take this opportunity to say, that the charge of the Government is greater than the nation can bear - Cannot but say, the expenses of the Court may be reduced - especially the matters of the Treasury may be better managed. The truth is, the prodigal and excessive way of living now, was unknown to our forefathers, who kept hospitality. This last sentence gives a subtle twist to his reproach. The immorality of lifestyle is identified not just with the king and the court but also with all the descendants of ‘our forefathers’. The implication is that luxury is incompatible with ‘hospitality’ and that, if only things were better managed, the king could, and probably should, still be providing hospitality. Three days later, after the leading court speakers seem to have opposed the bill to appropriate the customs to the navy on the grounds that some of the money was needed to tackle the Household’s debts, Henry Powle, another noted opponent of the government, made a speech which shows that even critics could differentiate between the financial difficulties of the Household and the other financial difficulties facing the government. Powle argued "Tis objected “that the King wants bread”- Then appropriate another part of the Revenue to the Houshold, which expence, he believes, has not exceeded 150,000 l. per ann. But it seems a prodigy to him, that having no war, and such a Revenue, there should be such debts." This suggests that

---

58 There are a number of other references to non-financial aspects of the affairs of the household departments.
59 LJ, XIII, p. 4.
60 Grey, Debates, III, p. 295.
61 ibid, III, p. 138. The comments about lack of bread were to be echoed by Sir Robert Howard in 1679 in the speech mentioned by Reresby in the passage already cited. (Grey, Debates, VII, p. 279;
the Commons' insistence on the appropriation clause, which produced the prorogation by which the vital additional supplies were lost, was due not to a fear that the money intended for the navy would be diverted to the Household but to a fear that that money would be diverted to the army, which was, without question, the real issue of controversy. Moreover, there is no reason to suppose that these comments played any part in Danby's subsequent decision to press ahead with a Household retrenchment. Once the fear of a standing army created the appropriation deadlock (over which the government could not compromise because the army was as much in debt as the navy), ensuring the loss of the additional supplies, Danby had little choice.

Eighteen months later Danby was still concerned with the way in which the government's need for more money could not avoid becoming tangled up in other issues. In April 1677 he advised Charles II to consider also how fixt that resolution seemes to bee, even in this Parliament (then which I never hope to see a better), that they ought to meete often, and (though they are convinced your revenue is too narrow for your necessary expence), the Crowne ought from time to time to bee beholding to them for those additions which may bee wanting att the yeares end.62

If Danby's analysis is correct, it was not so much that the king's financial problems contributed to the tensions in his relations with parliament as that the tensions in his relations with parliament contributed to his financial problems. Danby does not seem to have believed that many MPs thought some of the 'necessary expence' wasteful. The costs of the royal household were not the subject of complaint in parliament. What is more, even if this meagre yield of anti-household rhetoric from throughout the Restoration period does hide mute disapproval, the fact that that disapproval remained mute precludes parliamentary criticism from having influenced any of the reforms.

There is even some evidence that in 1667 the Commons opposed the idea of retrenchment. In December of that year, when the committee of the Privy Council was putting the finishing touches to the 1668 retrenchment, George Cocke, the naval victualler, told Pepys that 'he did believe that there are jealousies in some of the House at this day against the Commissioners of the Treasury, that by their good husbandry they will bring the King to be out of debt and to save money; and so will not be in need of the Parliament, and then do what he please', which Pepys (or possibly Cocke) felt was 'a good piece of news, that there is such a thing to be hoped which they would be afeared of.'63 Furthermore, not even Marvell's 1675 mock speech from the throne, of
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Reresby, Memoirs, p. 181). Howard's point was principally about the lack of revenue and so is not directly relevant to the present discussion.
62 Campana de Cavelli, Les Derniers Stuarts, I, p. 195, Danby to Charles II, 4 April 1677 - printed from B.L. Add MS 28042, fol. 11.
63 Pepys, Diary, VIII, pp. 568-9.
which he left numerous unsigned copies scattered about the Commons’ chamber and which contained caustic comments on government policy, was completely unambivalent in its criticisms when it mentioned the subject of the household. In it he had had Charles II announce that

by my Lord Treasurer’s advice, I have made a considerable retrenchment upon my expenses in candles and charcoal, and do not intend to stop there, but will, with your help, look into the late embezzlements of my dripping-pans and kitchen-stuff; of which, by the way, upon my conscience, neither my Lord Treasurer nor my Lord Lauderdale are guilty. I tell you my opinion; but if you should find them dabling in that busyness, I tell you plainly, I leave ‘em to you; for, I would have the world to know, I am not a man to be cheated.64

Once one has stripped away the thick layers of Marvell’s irony, these comments are open to various interpretations. On the one hand, there are the clear allegations that peculation was a problem in the royal kitchens and that Danby and Lauderdale were corrupt. On the other hand, the obvious insignificance of ‘candles and charcoal’ and ‘dripping-pans and kitchen-stuff’ alerts one to the fact that his attack is much wider. These are for Marvell the least of the government’s financial problems and, although it is entirely possible that Marvell did believe that the government was overlooking major deficiencies in the way that the Household was run, the implication is probably meant to be that the real problems were to be found elsewhere. Two years later in his Account of the Growth of Popery, he would (albeit to set up a contrast with the reality) paint an idyllic picture of the harmony which the English political system should encourage which included loyal subjects voting taxation to their benevolent monarch ‘even to superfluity’ in order to ‘defray the ordinary expense of the Crown, and maintain its lustre’.65

Marvell’s mock speech apart, it would be rash to assert without a very thorough search that in contemporary political writings, serious or satirical, printed or unprinted, the court was never identified as being inefficient. What can, however, be said with far greater confidence is that such an identification was just about nonexistent in the better known anti-government works and that it almost never appeared in the more accessible literary texts on which so much of the spendthrift reputation of the Restoration court is founded. Indeed, it was one of the conventions of the ‘country house’ poems that the poet praise aristocratic hospitality. That this praise was meant to demonstrate the superiority of rural life hardly matters for, having promoted hospitality as a virtue,

---

64 D. Davison (ed.), Andrew Marvell - Selected Poetry and Prose, (1952), p. 212. Neither the real Gracious Speech nor that of Lord Keeper Finch delivered on the day on which this ‘speech’ was left in the Commons made any reference to the household. (LJ, XII, pp. 653-5).

65 [A. Marvell], An Account of the Growth of Popery, and Arbitrary Government in England, ('Amsterdam', 1677), pp. 4-5. His peroration to this pamphlet alludes to the royal touch. (p. 156)
these poets could not then claim that royal hospitality was wasteful. The literary attack on Charles II, instead, centred on sex. This was the subject most likely to enable moralistic denunciation to be combined with voyeuristic ribaldry and it does seem to have been the one subject, except popery, capable of encouraging popular dissatisfaction with the court. It was also the subject most likely to interest poets who were, in the more notable cases, as likely as not, courtiers themselves. The satirical works of such courtiers can perhaps best be interpreted as an inversion of the tradition of courtly poetry and when they denounced the immoralities of the court, they were replicating, rarely with much originality, the conventions of the pastoral tradition. Above all, their poems were jokes at the expense of their political rivals or of their friends and colleagues. Mockery of the personal morality of the king by his closest confidants should not, by itself, be interpreted as dissatisfaction with the political system. Yet on these very works have been grounded persistent assumptions about the presumed extravagance of the Restoration court which were not shared by the political elite of the time.

Dorset, a Gentleman of the Bedchamber and the man who would become William III’s Lord Chamberlain, was one of the better of these courtier-poets and his poem, Colon, is a perfect example of such courtly satire. Featuring an innocent rustic who experiences a culture-shock when he encounters the open debauchery and venality of the court, its use of the pastoral genre is unmistakeable. Colon is a shepherd who, when herding his flock past Whitehall, comes upon Charles II trying to sell the office of chief royal mistress, recently vacated by the duchess of Portsmouth, to one of the assembled crowd of eager courtesans. His bafflement is ended by one of the bystanders, Sir Edward Sutton.

“Colon,” said he, “this is the day, For which poor England long did pray; The day that sets our Monarch free From butter’d buns and slavery. This hour from French intrigues, ’tis said, He’ll clear his Council and his bed. Portsmouth, he now vouchsafes to know, Was the cast whore of Count de Sault. Each night with her dear was as sessions O’ th’ House, and fuller of petitions,

67 For public indignation at the sexual immorality of the court, see T.J.G. Harris, London Crowds in the reign of Charles II, (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 78-91. None of the evidence presented by Harris suggests that the household was unpopular.
68 Marvell is the most important exception but even he, a political satirist of the first order, except in the 1675 squib, ignored the subject of the household finances.
69 Even Christopher Hill recognises that ‘it is difficult to know how seriously to take Rochester’s republicanism’. (C. Hill, The World Turned Upside Down, (1972, reprinted 1984), p. 413).
Far from the provision of diet being a wasteful burden, Dorset implies that the retrenchments (in this case, particularly the 1679 one) were symptomatic of a debasement of the court, with the resort to boardwages being a dereliction of the royal duty. It is perhaps no accident that Sutton, who was a real person, should have been selected by him to voice these opinions. An octogenarian and Gentleman of the Privy Chamber, his is the judgement of an aged courtier, lamenting the immorality of the court and longing for a return to older and better ways. It was opinions something like these which Holland had expressed in 1675 and it was a view which may have been shared by Powle, who, in June 1679, less than a year before this poem must have been written, had married Dorset’s mother.

Although this attack on the king’s management of the Household was written when exclusion provided the principal focus for opposition to Charles II’s government, Dorset was not an exclusionist. Neither was Henry Powle, even if he did feel considerable unease at the idea of a catholic king. There were, however, some exclusionists who, remaining firmly committed to the idea of monarchy, held similar views and Sir John Holland, it should be observed, supported exclusion. One whig satire, *The Rabble*, again made a contrast between the treatment of the royal servants and the royal mistresses.

The rabble hates, the gentry fear  
And wise men want support;  
A rising country threatens there,  
And here a starving Court.  
Not for the nation, but the fair  
Our Treasury provides...  

The most explicit statement of this view was the 1681 pamphlet, *A Letter from a Person of Quality to his Friend concerning His Majesties Late Declaration*, which forthrightly attacked the decision to dissolve the Oxford parliament. The writer of this
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71 Sutton’s exact age is unknown but he must have been in his eighties when this poem was written if he was, as was said at the time, almost one hundred when he died in 1694. (Luttrell, *Brief Historical Relation*, III, p. 506). However, see G.E.C. (ed.), *Complete Baronetage*, (Exeter, 1900-4), index volume, p. 88, for the suggestion that Sutton may have aged no more than seventy when he died.  
73 A Letter from a Person of Quality to his Friend concerning His Majesties Late Declaration touching the Reason which moved Him to dissolve the Two Last Parliaments at Westminster and Oxford, [London, 1681]. Extracts from this work are reprinted in M.N. Brown (ed.), *The Works of George Savile, Marquis of Halifax*, (Oxford, 1989), I, pp. 169-77. It was occasioned by the printing of *His Majesties Declaration to all His Loving Subjects, touching the Causes & Reasons that moved Him to dissolve the Two Last Parliaments*, (London, 1681).
took the extreme stance that 'the King is a publick person, in his private capacity as a Man, he can only eat, and drink, and perform some other Acts of nature; but all his actings without himself are only as a King, and in his Politick capacity he ought not to Marry, Love, Hate, make War Friendship or Peace, but as a King and agreeable to the People, and their Interest he governs.' If the king had in his declaration justifying the dissolution condemned the Commons' resolution of 7 January 1681 which had claimed that those who lent to the government enabled it to avoid summoning parliament, this writer feared that Charles II intended to attempt a period of personal rule with the assistance of evil financiers. He therefore rejected the principle that 'the king should live of his own'. The king’s freedom to control the Crown’s finances had become dangerous and was something to be curtailed by appropriating the revenue. To illustrate this argument he pointed to the court.

The maintenance of the Household, the Tables at Court, and wages of the King’s Servants, were in our former Kings Reigns by Acts of Parliament so established, that the cofferer had his Money paid to him out of the Exchequer under very heavy *nomine poena*’s; and the Parliament, especially the Lords House took it always as part of their immediate care; it maintained the dignity and honor of the Government, it contributed exceedingly to love and good understanding betwixt the King and his People; no Country Farmer had business at Court, but he found those bid him welcome, so had all degrees; therefore the King’s Servants had justly the same return whenever they came; the Language of the Court was not then; who goes there, nor their outward Rooms were not to be diseemed by the smell of match [gun-fuses] but of Beef...'

If it is thought that this view (which echoes that reported by Pepys in 1667) was untypical, Southwell did not think so. The day before the 1679 retrenchment came into operation, he wrote to Ormond to tell him that the meals laid on for the Privy Councillors when they had to travel to Hampton Court for Council meetings were to be discontinued. This was, Southwell informed him, ‘soundly censured, as if the contriver of this good managery intended to find out the Philosopher’s stone, and to be able to live without a Parliament. How popular such a commendation is I leave your Grace to think.’

The *Letter from a Person of Quality* produced two pamphlets in reply. *His Majesties Declaration Defended*, parts of which may be by Dryden, confined its counter-attack on the section about the court to comparing the idea that all the king’s actions, except his bodily functions, should be subject to parliamentary interference to his treatment by the Covenanters in 1650 and 1651 and to pointing out that it was
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74 ibid, p. 6.
75 ibid, p. 6.
76 *HMC Ormonde*, n.s. IV, p. 529, Southwell to Ormond, 31 June 1679. It was usual when the king was staying at Windsor for meetings of the Privy Council to be held at Hampton Court. (G. Davies, 'Council and cabinet, 1679-88', *EHR*, XXXVII (1922), p. 64).
because parliament had failed to provide adequate revenues that Charles II had been unable to uphold the accustomed grandeur of the court. Considering his possible contribution to this work, it is worth mentioning that Dryden may, elsewhere in 1681, have characterized Newport, the whig-inclined Treasurer of the Household as ‘Fat turnspit Frank’ who ‘never miss’d the crust for which he whin’d’. The other reply, *Observations upon a Late Libel called a Letter from a Person of Quality*, chose instead to defend the principle of the retrenchments. He suggested that those who supported the *Letter from a Person of Quality*’s arguments take somuch care of the Household that one would almost suspect they had some Correspondence with the discontented Reformadoes of the Greene-cloth. I who live in the Countrey will never speake against the smell of Beefe, no more than I will recommend that of Match to be at Whitehall instead of it, but I am farr from apprehending the Country Farmers to be concerned in the late Retrenchments; for ever since the Tables were removed out of the Hall, and the Brewis [broth] turned into Fricassees, they have lost theyr part in them, and especially since the King’s coming in, not onely the Country Farmer, but the Country Gentleman, and if you will the Country Lord too, might have beene shrewdly disappointed if they had depended upon the hospitality of the White Staves for a dinner. That whole businesse was brought into soe unpopular a shape, that the Nation will hardly take up armes to restore three or four tables; they are rather pleased to see them put downe, Since they were so transformed, and wholey altered from their first institution.

Care must be taken if one is not to misunderstand the point which is being made here. This is not the full condemnation of diet which it may seem. The criticism is not being directed against the old system as such but rather against the much reduced version which had survived until 1679. It is implied that the restoration of the system as it had existed before 1662 might be justified but that to go back to what had survived since then was absurd. It must be conceded that the setting up of this unfavourable contrast may have been no more than a rhetorical device and it may well have been the case that the writer was only prepared to use this contrast because he was fully aware that the government was, by this stage, most unlikely to revert to the pre-1662 situation. That he was aware of this seems most probable because it was somewhat disingenuous of
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77 *His Majesties Declaration Defended: in a letter to a Friend being an Answer to a Seditious Pamphlet, called A Letter from a Person of Quality to his Friend concerning the King’s Late Declaration touching the Reasons which moved Him to Dissolve the Two Last Parliaments at Westminster and Oxford*, (London, 1681), esp. pp. 16-17. The view that this was by Dryden was proposed in R.G. Ham, ‘Dryden as Historiographer-Royal’, *Review of English Studies*, XI (1935), pp. 284-98. This was challenged in E.L. Saslow, ‘Dryden as Historiographer Royal, and the authorship of *His Majesties Declaration Defended*’, *Modern Philology*, LXXV, no. 3, (Feb 1978), pp. 261-72. Saslow’s argument that parts of it cannot be by Dryden is convincing. Winn, however, considers that at least parts of it are by him. (W.A. Winn, *John Dryden and his World*, (Yale, 1987), p. 343, 596).

78 *POAS*, II, p. 232, II. 73-7. That *An Heroic Poem* is by Dryden is not certain.

79 M.N. Brown (ed.), *The Works of George Savile, Marquis of Halifax*, (Oxford, 1989), I, pp. 150-69. In the seventeenth century the word ‘fricasse’ did not have its modern sense but was instead used to describe any food which had been fried. (S. Mennell, *All Manners of Food*, (Oxford, 1985, reprinted 1687), pp. 85-6).
this anonymous writer to represent himself as a country gentleman given that, as most contemporaries believed, he was most probably the earl of Halifax.

The polemical purpose of this dispute was, on both sides, manifestly pre-eminent. None of these three pamphlets had the question of diet as its foremost subject. The vital issue was the dissolution, with exclusion the all-too-obvious subtext. It was as much in the interests of the supporters of the dissolution to claim that diet had been an unjustifiable and unpopular burden to defend its abolition as it was in the interests of the dissolution’s opponents to claim that diet was a social obligation and was much missed. There is, nevertheless, more to their arguments than cynical points scoring for, taken together with the earlier evidence, something of a pattern emerges. Apart from court employees who opposed the changes because of self-interest, there does seem to have been a feeling among certain individuals that the reforms were unfortunate. This view was encouraged by the widespread misconception about the true state of the royal finances. In 1663 Evelyn noted that the suppression of the diets had produced a ‘greate murmuring, considering his Majesties vast revenue, and plenty of the Nation...’.

A similar, equally mistaken, viewpoint is indicated by the fact that in August 1667, when preparations for the 1668 retrenchment had already begun, Pepys attended a dinner party at which ‘it was well observed by some at the table, that they do not think this retrenching of the King’s charge will be so acceptable to the Parliament, they having given the King a revenue of so many 100000 l.’s a year more than his predecessors had, that he might live in pomp like a king.’ It can be conjectured that these individuals, although firmly loyal to the king, felt that the court fell short of perfection. They did not believe, as some did, that a royal court was necessarily wicked and characteristically idealised the courts of the past. As such, it formed one strand of the tangled ethos to which the description ‘country’ has often been applied. One, however, hesitates, given the lack of evidence, to equate this strand with that represented by the vocal critics of the government in parliament. Most of those who thought this way may have felt obliged to remain silent. So far as they were aware, the king had been adequately provided for and his domestic arrangements, however improper, were his own affair. In any case there were other, more important, issues. What it does mean is that there was no simple ‘court/country’ dichotomy.

As with everything else, attitudes on this issue had to be reconsidered in the light of the attempt to prevent the duke of York succeeding to the throne. Exclusion owed much to ‘country’ principles and to the most powerful of them, the fear of catholicism, above all. In some ways, the prospect of a catholic succession united many of the

80 Evelyn, Diary, III, pp. 360-1.
81 Pepys, Diary, VIII, p. 395.
disparate elements of the ‘country’ tradition as never before. On the one hand there was Essex, briefly, the leading proponent of the 1679 retrenchment, if not, at that stage, a committed exclusionist. Among the republican and near-republican exclusionists this, presumably, found some favour but just how influential anti-monarchists ideas were among the whigs remains open to debate. 82 One whig republican who would have approved was Slingsby Bethel for, on becoming one of the sheriffs of London in 1680, he declined to provide the hospitality which was customary for such an important civic dignitary and in doing so provoked a storm of protest. Of those who came to his defence in print, only one dared to adopt the obvious debating line. That writer, in glossing a topical reprint of Tudor regulations restricting the scale of entertaining by the City officials, alluded to the king’s own failure to provide hospitality. 83 Other whigs, like the author of the Letter from a Person of Quality, would have thought otherwise. This difference in attitude was nothing new. The decline in hospitality had never been an issue on which opinion neatly divided along religious lines. 84 For those whigs who disapproved of the changes, their case was strengthened once it was realised that, with their leaders no longer in office and their support based in parliament, retrenchment at court could be used as a means of thwarting their hopes. In any case, placing Monmouth on the throne was an improbable way of obtaining a low-cost court. Conversely, their opponents also had to reconsider their positions. Tory polemicists gleefully ridiculed Bethel’s parsimony but, to their hard-headed confederates, retrenchment at court became an inescapable policy which, if regrettable, was justified by the need to preserve the succession. Misgivings could be assuaged by believing that the cutbacks would be, as claimed, only temporary. Even once that succession had safely passed to James, the threats to the monarchy remained vivid in the minds of all tories and minimising those threats took priority over everything else. It is too much to think of both whigs and tories radically altering their views on this matter, being more a case of the exclusion crisis clarifying the issue for both sides as never before.

What can be noted is the parallel with attitudes towards the ‘ancient constitution’. Here was another idea rejected by the more adventurous of the tory thinkers in the early

---

83 An Act of Common-Council of the City of London... for Retrenching of the Expences of the Lord Mayor & Sheriffs, (1680), p. 7. - see also, [S. Bethel], The Vindication of Slingsby Bethel, (1681); W.W., Animadversions on the late Vindication of Slingsby Bethel, ('Hamborough', 1681); A Seasonable Answer to a Late Pamphlet, entitled, The Vindication of Slingsby Bethel, (1681); An Answer to a Pamphlet called, The True Protestants Appeal to the City and Country, (1681). I am grateful to Jonathan Scott for drawing my attention to this controversy.
84 Heal has shown that, although the Reformation had had an effect on notions of charity and some catholic families had made a point of maintaining the old ways as a religious statement, puritanism cannot straightforwardly be viewed as having been hostile to the tradition of hospitality. (F.Heal, Hospitality in Early Modern England, (Oxford, 1990), pp. 122-40, 169-78).
1680s and, in abandoning it, they likewise moved from a position based on historical precedent to one which believed that the monarch was not bound by any institutions and practices, no matter how ancient. That they lamented the decline of the court confirms that some whigs did look to a romanticised view of the past for a basis for political legitimacy. Indeed, unlike parliament, diet was a tradition which really did have Anglo-Saxon origins. It is entirely understandable that in the ending of the keeping of open tables at court they saw evidence of a lost age of benevolent monarchy in which kings had obligations as well as prerogatives, for in such a view there was a element of truth.

With the monarchy believed to be in danger, administrative reform was an important part of the ‘tory reaction’, bearing out that they did not share the whigs’ static view of government structures. Those behind this policy included Halifax, Rochester, Guilford and Sir Leoline Jenkins who in the early 1680s were meeting together regularly at Jenkins’s house to discuss such matters. These meetings were, admittedly, not without their tensions with Guilford objecting to Rochester’s view that patronage should be used for explicitly political ends. Guilford favoured appointments made on the basis of administrative merit alone. Discussions would have become even more stormy as the split developed in early 1683 between Rochester and Halifax (who had once seen Rochester as his own political heir) over the most immediate administrative question, the method of collecting the revenues. Nevertheless, while it existed, it would have provided a forum in which ideas for the reform of government departments, including those of the household, could have been discussed and it is known that the arguments about revenue collection raised the possibility that the revenue farmers would be asked to undertake the provisioning of the Household. Halifax’s views on the Household have already been touched on. Even if he did not, after all, write Observations upon a Late Libel, his known opinions must have been close to it.

Of the others, Guilford reformed Chancery, is known to have wanted greater professionalism among government employees and compiled a series of notes on how government finance could be improved. These notes testify to his interest in reform
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86 Tory administrative policy during the final years of Charles II's reign and the early years of James II’s reign is covered in most detail in J.R. Western, Monarchy and Revolution, (1972, reprinted 1985), pp. 46-155.
88 Lives of the Norths, I, pp. 260-5; B.L. Add. MS 32518, fols. 257-60, ‘Of ye Treasury’, n.d.. These notes are printed in Dalrymple, II (b), pp. 84-90. The MS is a copy made by Roger North. The version given in Dalrymple is in a different order and contains inaccuracies such as expanding a reference to a Master of the Great Wardrobe, the ‘Earle of S.’, as Southampton when Sandwich is obviously meant.
of the household. He was particularly critical of the practices of the Great Wardrobe and felt that it was wrong that the £30,000 which Sandwich had owed as Master at his death should have been written off. About the Household he perceived that ‘Old offices of the household are obsolete for New officers are intrusted for personall diligence, & after the place Continues. thus is the treasurer of the household, & Master of the Jewellhous Supplanted by the Cofferer, & the treasurer of the Chamber &c. & Divers others. The Privy Chambren are supplanted by the Bedchambermen &c.’ and so appreciated that ‘These changes of the Court & the Reasons of them were worth an history.’ Although warning that the number of supernumeraries was already too great, he thought such obsolescence could be reduced with the least pain by converting these officials to supernumeraries. Elsewhere among his private papers he drafted a maxim to the effect that a king should, at least at the beginning of his reign, avoid debt so that interest repayments did not become too burdensome. What Guilford’s views on hospitality were are not known but there is nothing in his papers to indicate that he shared the concerns his late father had had on the matter. In his Observations and Advices Oeconomicai, Dudley, Lord North, had advised that households keep hospitality and had said of the royal household that it

hath not its Peer in Christendom; exceeding all others, as well for Hospitality, as for Order. As touching the first, it hath no parallel; for consider it as it was in the time of former Princes (and as I hope now is) and we may justly say, That more Flesh and Fish, Bread and Drink is spent yearly there, then is consumed in some Italien Cities, whose Bishops are capable of sitting in general Councels.

By the time these views had been published in 1669 they were already out of date. North had not visited London since 1660 and it is evident that he was still unaware of more recent developments. Guilford was, at least, better informed. Support for the reforms would also have come from Arlington, Godolphin and Savile for their covering letter to their proposals for the changes abovestairs gives every impression of having been unsolicited and of them whole-heartedly agreeing with what they were proposing. Significantly they wrote that

The original notes may not have been made at the same time but a reference to Chicheley as Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster must postdate November 1682 while a reference to a ‘King James’ in the past tense suggests they predate James II’s accession.

90 B.L. Add. MS 32520, fol. 212. This is another MS copied by Roger North from his brother’s papers.
92 Guilford was not the only law officer who would have had views on the subject. The Lord Advocate, Sir George Mackenzie would, in his Moral History of Frugality published in 1691, question the purpose of keeping open table. (G. Mackenzie, Works, I, second pagination, esp. p. 163). While it is most improbable that Mackenzie directly influenced policy on this matter, it is worth noting that he had come to know James well when he was resident in Edinburgh.
having considered of the State of your Majesty's Household we Doe finde that when the Dietts were served in kind in the Reigne of your Royall Father of Blessed Memory there was a necessity of having a great number of Servants to provide that dyett: which being now reduced to Boardwages & a small Dyett in kind remaingy the Quantity of Servants below Stayres may well suffer a great Retrenchment...

thus correctly anticipating the redundancies in the Household. It may be doubted how far his health enabled Arlington to participate in the preparation of the alterations abovesstairs but Savile could easily have shared his brother's views while Godolphin's involvement in drafting these proposals must have been in another capacity, possibly unofficial, than as Lord Chamberlain to the Queen for the report did not cover her household. Arlington and Savile may have turned to him for his financial expertise and it is known that in early 1685 he did not expect parliament to be generous. It is, however, most probably Rochester who deserves the bulk of the credit (or the blame) for the 1685 reforms.

In the position of Second Lord of the Treasury between March and November 1679 and then as First Lord until September 1684, Rochester had dominated the development of financial policy during these years. Working harder than any of his fellow Commissioners, he was largely responsible for the assertion by the Treasury of its control over all aspects of government. It was he, moreover, who had pushed through, against opposition from Halifax, the most important component of this centralisation, the move away from the farming of the revenues. The 1679 retrenchment had been implemented when he was second only to Essex in the Treasury hierarchy and kept it in force throughout the period in which he headed the Commission. In July 1684 Shadwell, after describing him as being a 'wasp in business', accused him of only paying out to the 'slaves, who starve the while,/ The decri’d copper of his faithless smile...'. As the most important courtier of unquestioned loyalty to the duke of York, there is little doubt that he did see the retrenchment as a way of increasing the king's financial room for manoeuvre and, indeed, the whole programme to strengthen the 'Treasury's authority can be viewed in this way. In December 1680 James told him that his presence at the Treasury was indispensable and he spent much of 1683 and 1684 attempting to persuade the king that Rochester should become Lord Treasurer. Any doubts about James's regard for him

93 LC 5/201, fol. 247, Arlington, Godolphin and Savile to James II, [1685].
96 Clarendon Correspondence, I, pp. 48-9, York to Hyde, 14 Dec 1680.
which may have been created by his removal from the Treasury in September 1684 were ended when, in a conspicuous indication of royal favour, he became sole Lord Treasurer in 1685. If this was an act of nepotism, it was so because he had proved his worth to his former brother-in-law but, in any case, he deserved the position on merit alone. Only Sunderland would prevent him during the first two years of the reign from establishing himself as chief minister and, as Sunderland had yet to build up the political credit with the new king which he had done in the years before, this could not in 1685 have been foreseen. His task, to retain the support of the tories for a catholic king while upholding and strengthening the powers of that king against the schemes of the whigs was one which few of the other courtiers could credibly have undertaken. As Ailesbury would later judge of his Lord Treasurership, 'I must do him all justice (more than he did to me) as to attribute the king’s wise measures to that minister, and all went on then prosperously and well.'97

In the early months of the reign Rochester was one of those pessimistic about the likelihood that a suspicious Commons would fail to vote adequate supplies and so supported the attempts to persuade Louis XIV to provide aid. In anticipation of meagre funding from parliament, keeping control on expenditure as the household was being adjusted for the new reign made sense. The knowledge that the revenues were healthier than most people supposed helped but decisions had to be taken before parliament assembled. Given his existing commitment to the 1679 retrenchment it would have been understandable if Rochester resisted the temptation to allow household expenditure to increase by very much once again and instead used the opportunity provided by the change of king to consolidate the gains of the emergency 1679 ‘Temporary Settlement’ by transforming it into a permanent one. If so it was another case of the Treasury imposing reform on the household as had been the pattern since 1662.

It is, in any case, difficult to imagine that such sweeping changes would have been implemented without the approval of the newly-appointed Lord Treasurer. Rather, it was probably his strong support for them which neutralised any opposition from the Board of Greencloth. It is known that Sir Stephen Fox had misgivings about the reforms for they would contribute to his estrangement from the Board of Greencloth in the next reign. Fox resented that he was removed from the Treasury to make way for Rochester and had probably used his place on the Treasury Commission to block further reforms of the Household until then. This is what he had promised to do on being appointed to the Commission in 1679, gaining Ormond’s approval for him to combine a place on it with that of First Clerk of the Greencloth so that he could

represent the Household in the Treasury’s decision-making. Believing that even £107,000 had not been enough to support the Household, he pledged to use his new power to obtain a relaxation of the 1679 retrenchment and Ormond appears to have considered this a reasonable objective.98 What occurred in 1685 is unlikely to be what he had in mind. Fox and Ormond were not alone among the royal servants in having misgivings. Mulgrave (perhaps revealing his own attitude to the reforms) would later claim that such misgivings were one of the reasons why some of the king’s servants were prepared in 1688 to overthrow him.99 The combination of Rochester, Ormond and Fox in opposition to these reforms was a potentially powerful one capable of swaying substantial forces in the imminent parliament but, on balance, it was an unlikely one. This was not because they were not politically close. As has been argued the opposite was the case with Rochester and Ormond being inseparable allies. Instead it is more likely that Ormond and Fox, around whom any opposition within the Household would have to have formed if it was to have had any chance of success, yielded to Rochester’s influence. There is, in fact, little evidence that, whatever misgivings he must have had, Ormond had done much to oppose the changes since he courteously registered his disapproval of the ‘dissolution’ of the Household in 1663. His interest in financial matters in the Household, where he adopted a ‘hands-off’ approach, had never been strong and it may have declined as his interest in Irish financial affairs had done in the preceding years, which had meant that he had come to defer completely to Rochester on the subject, reflecting his increasing political dependence on him.100 Moreover Fox’s relations with Rochester, despite his displacement from the Treasury, were close, with him being even closer to Clarendon. In November 1685 Rochester stood security for money which Fox lent to Clarendon and in March 1686 Clarendon used his brother as intermediary to suggest to Fox that his daughter should marry Cornbury.101 Moreover, with Rochester the leader of the anglican-tories at court, neither Ormond nor Fox could afford to alienate him.

The final piece of circumstantial evidence which points to Rochester as being the architect of the 1685 reforms was that James II’s respect for his administrative abilities survived the breach between them, which was not due to any shortcomings in his

98 B.L. Add. MS 51324, fols. 43-5, observations on the Treasury Commissioners, n.d.; HMC Ormonde, n.s. V, p. 214, Ormond to Wyche, 26 Sept 1679; p. 239, Fox to Ormond, 18 Nov 1679; p. 243, Ormond to Fox, 26 Nov 1679.
99 Buckingham, Works, II, p. 67. This claim is weakened by the fact that Mulgrave suggests the rebel courtiers were offended by cuts in their salaries. As has been shown, most of the salaries were increased.
101 B.L. Add. MS 51323, letterbook relating to loan to Clarendon; Clarendon Correspondence, I, pp. 303-4, Clarendon to Rochester, 14 Mar 1686.
conduct as Lord Treasurer. In dismissing him James made clear that his admiration of Rochester's administrative abilities was undiminished, telling the Privy Council that 'He was not induced to it by any dissatisfaction against the late Lord Treasurer: for he had served him very well both before His coming to the Crowne and since.' To indicate his continuing gratitude, he presented Rochester with the estates in Northumberland and the palatinate of Durham which had been forfeited from Lord Grey and with a pension of £4,000 pa. from the Post Office 'as a reward for his faithful and prudent management and administration of our revenue which he hath manifested in the offices of our High Treasurer of England and Treasurer of our Exchequer'. In voicing such praise, James must have had the household reforms, at least partly, in mind. Not only were they an integral component of the 1685 financial settlement, which had been Rochester's most valuable political service as Lord Treasurer, they were also the most important administrative reforms of the reign. They were, arguably, the high point of Rochester's career as a financial and administrative reformer. They were also the realisation of what his father had probably wanted in 1660.

The ultimate decision would, however, have been that of the king. Although he may well have acted on Rochester's advice and left the precise details to him to work out, the final say about what was his own household could only have been made by James II alone, and, once the planning had started, he was said to be 'intent to know the distribution of all payments, and, as I am told, keeps a particular account thereof to himself' and he had Sunderland send for the rulebooks of the Board of Green Cloth so that he could personally consult them. He would later recall that his purpose had been 'to endeavour the recovering the credit of the Exchequer which had been so shaken in the Earle of Shaftesbury's time, and to take care that the Civil and Military Lists as well as the Household might be punctually paid...'. In 1692 in his memorandum prepared for his son he would advise him to adopt prudent financial policies to avoid recourse to parliament, warn him not to debase the court by allowing offices to be sold and recommend that the fees claimed by the great officers be restricted. This interest in ensuring that his domestic affairs were in order is in character with the impression one gets of his handling of his financial affairs when duke of York. When, in 1667, it became apparent 'that Notwithstanding the Powers & Instructions formerly given by mee for the managem[en]t of my Household &

102 PC 2/71, fol. 194, 7 Jan 1687.
103 CTB, (1685-89), p. 1103; C 66/3290, nos. iv-v. See also Clarke, Life, II, p. 98.
104 HMC Ormonde, n.s. VI, [Southwell to Ormond], pp. 335-6; SP 44/56, p. 192, Sunderland to Ormond, 3 April 1685.
105 Clarke, Life, II, pp. 7-8, memoirs.
106 ibid, II, pp. 633-4, 639, 641.
Regulating the expenses thereof several abuses have crept in, and divers great and unnecessary Charges have beene brought upon mee, by which I am engaged in a very great debt' he had been prudent enough to appoint a commission consisting of his dozen senior servants, headed by Peterborough, to manage his household. This remained the basis for the running of his domestic affairs until September 1682 when, with stability returning to his life, he refined this system by limiting its membership to Sir Allen Apsley, Robert Werden, Sir John Werden, Sir Nicholas Butler, Richard Graham, Sir Peter Apsley and Sir Benjamin Bathurst, those of his servants with the most experience of financial matters, who then set about seeking out economies. This, unlike in 1667, was not prompted by financial distress. Despite the subsequent discovery that his principal agent in Ireland, Sir William Talbot, was defrauding him of revenue from his Irish estates, James had no difficulty covering his expenses by a considerable margin and between 1677 and his accession, in contrast to his brother, he was able to keep the number of his servants and their salaries static. It would appear that he had provided diet to few (if any) of his servants after it was withdrawn from his Clerk of the Kitchen and the Cooks to himself and his wife in 1668 and by 1685 all payments to his servants were in the form of salaries. In exile his servants would also only be paid salaries. That James was prepared to continue his previous good practice on becoming king says much about his willingness and ability to rethink the structures of government. His interest in (even talent for) administration, especially when Lord High Admiral, has always been recognised. The keynote of his kingship was his eagerness to challenge the accepted dogmas of English politics and government. Yet, in contrast to most of his policies as king, the 1685 household

107 Cambridge University Library Add. MS 7091, fol. 106, York to household commissioners, 20 Dec 1667.

108 The main sources for James II's household in the decade before his accession are Bodl. MS Clarenceon 88, fols. 95-100, 149-53, papers concerning York's Irish estates, 1673-84; B.L. Add. MS 18958, household establishment, 1677; HMC Ormonde, n.s. VI, p. 442, Gwyn to Arran, 9 Sept 1682; B.L. Althorp papers D1, household establishment, 1682; B.L. Add. MS 38863, copy of 1682 household establishment; B.L. Add. MS 15896, fol. 40, 54-5, papers on York's finances, 1682-5; B.L. Add MS 24927, minutes of York's commissioners of the revenue, 1683-5; B.L. Add MS 24928, reports to York from his commissioners of the revenue, 1683-5; B.L. Althorp papers D2, household establishment, [c. 1685]; B.L. Add MS 15897, fols. 8-9, stables establishment, [Feb 1685]; Bodl. MS Rawl. C 987, fol. 39, report of the commissioners of the revenue of the king when duke of York, [1686]; HMC Townshend, p. 35, James to Apsley and Bathurst, 20 Mar 1688. In 1679 he was apparently able to give his brother £60,000 to ease his financial difficulties. (B.L. Add MS 10118, fol. 59). By an order of 15 December 1683, his son-in-law, Prince George, provided diet only to his Gentlemen Ushers, one Gentleman Waiter, one Page of Honour, the Clerk to his Commissioners, his chaplain and the Page of the Privy Chamber. (RA EB56, fol. 9, household book of Prince George of Denmark, 1683-91).

109Sizergh Castle, Strickland MS R.4, ledger of Robert Strickland, Treasurer to Mary Beatrice, 1696. I wish to thank Dr. Edward Corp for providing me with details of the contents of this volume.

reforms were, primarily, administrative innovations with ideological consequences, not ideological innovations with administrative consequences. They, also, did not go wrong. It was not until 1687, when the stakes were getting much higher and when Rochester was no longer by his side, that he began to become careless about administrative details.

It is difficult not to wonder if there was a religious motive behind the reforms. One of the reasons James promoted the changes may well have been that he viewed the diminishing of the splendour of his court (in much the way he saw his banishment of Catherine Sedley) as an act of piety to demonstrate the superior moral standards of catholics. In the notes he would compile for his own edification he would observe that a good catholic should 'give all one can spare in charitys and pious uses, so as not to run in debt, and to hinder on[e]s paying servants wages'.\(^{111}\) What is more, some of the catholic courtiers appreciated that it could be useful for presenting positive images of James's catholicism. When Bonaventura Giffard used the 1687 Christmas Day sermon for the king and queen to condemn that, in contrast to the poverty of the stable at Bethlehem, 'men place all their Glory in great Riches, magnificent Houses, brave Apparel, sumptuous Entertainments, numerous Attendants, and such like Supports of their Vanity and Misery', his remarks could have been considered advice to James to maintain his reputation for frugality. They could equally have been considered advice to others to follow the king's example.\(^{112}\) Earlier that year, a more complex use of the king's reputation had been made by Dryden in the Fable of the Pigeons at the end of *The Hind and the Panther*.

Ostensibly the story of the Pigeons who endanger themselves by seeking to use the Buzzard to attack their enemies, the Poultry, there is more to this fable than just the traditional interpretation of it as an allegorical warning to the anglicans against joining with Burnet to oppose the catholics.\(^{113}\) Dryden delighted in multiple-level allegory and early on in the fable he introduced a third theme when he included a clear reference to the 1685 reforms. Describing the farmer, who obviously represents James, he mentions that, on inheriting the farm, he neither

\[...rack'd his Tenants with increase of Rent,\]
\[Nor liv'd too sparing, nor too largely spent;\]
\[But overlook'd his Hinds, their Pay was just,\]

\(^{112}\) A *Select Collection of Catholick Sermons*, (1741), I, pp. 95-124, esp. p. 96. On 1 November 1687 Philip Ellis, the king's Benedictine chaplain, had preached a similar sermon to the court warning of the sinfulness of luxury. (ibid, I, pp. 3-31).
And ready, for he scorn'd to go on trust.\(^{114}\)

This would be no more than conventional praise intended to confirm that it is James who is being referred to were it not that distribution of food to the birds figures prominently thereafter. To establish the greed of the Pigeons, we are told that

> Like Harpy's they could scent a plenteous board,  
> Then to be sure they never fail'd their Lord.  
> The rest was form, and bare Attendance paid,  
> They drunk, and eat, and grudgingly obey'd.  
> The more they fed, they raven'd still for more,  
> They drain'd from Dan, and left Beer-sheba poor.\(^{115}\)

Dryden goes on to indicate that this greed is meant as an allusion to the way in which the anglican clergymen benefitted inordinately from the monopoly of the Church of England. Yet the imagery he uses recalls not so much this monopoly nor pigeons being fed by a farmer but rather abuse of the king's hospitality. Images of royal hospitality recur in the lines in which he first alludes to the catholics.

> Another Farm he had behind his House,  
> Not overstock't, but barely for his use;  
> Wherein his poor Domestick Poultry fed,  
> And from His Pious Hands receiv'd their Bread.  
> Our pamper'd Pigeons with malignant Eyes,  
> Beheld these Inmates, and their Nurseries:  
> Tho' hard their fare, at Ev'ning, and at Morn  
> A Cruise of Water and an Ear of Corn;  
> Yet still they grudg'd that Modicum, and thought  
> A Sheaf in ev'ry single Grain was brought;  
> Fain would they filch that little Food away,  
> While unrestrain'd those happy Gluttons prey.\(^{116}\)

This contrast between the greedy anglicans and the abstemious catholics is a major motif of the poem but here its use is especially skilful. For one thing, the phrase 'Domestick Poultry' is most suggestive and, with neither the Pigeons nor the Poultry standing exclusively for the anglican and catholic clergymen, the thought that he also had the royal servants in mind must be taken seriously. Allowing for his use of sweeping categorisations, it is especially noteworthy that he should have represented James's anglican opponents as those anxious to defend their access to his hospitality. As has been seen, the issue of financial reform at court was not one on which catholic and protestant opinion appears to have divided but that James was associated with the moves away from old-style hospitality enabled Dryden to twist the facts with little difficulty. It is not being proposed that this part of the fable is primarily about the reforms in the royal household but it does seem that Dryden was using this association,

\(^{114}\) Part III, ll. 917-20.  
\(^{115}\) Part III, ll. 960-5.  
\(^{116}\) Part III, ll. 993-1004.
which would have been familiar to many of his readers, to fill out his portrait of James. It also enabled him to make an audacious connection between the various themes. Of the Pigeons, he states

Their Flesh was never to the Table serv’d,  
Tho’ ’tis not thence inferr’d the Birds were starv’d; 
But that their Master did not like the Food, 
Nor did it with His Gracious Nature suite, 
Ev’n tho’ they were not Doves, to persecute: 
Yet He refus’d, (nor could they take Offence) 
Their Glutton Kind should teach him abstinence. 
Nor Consecrated Grain their Wheat he thought, 
Which new from treading in their Bills they brought: 
But left his Hinds each in his Private Pow’r, 
He for himself, and not for others chose, 
Nor would He be impos’d on, nor impose.117

Only in the three lines after this did he completely suppress the ambiguity so that it becomes evident that he could only be talking about James’s policy of toleration.

Dryden was, as usual, exaggerating for effect. It is Giffard who probably provides a more accurate indication of catholic attitudes and on his denunciation of luxury he placed a crucial qualification by conceding that ‘To wear rich Apparel, to have a House well furnish’d, to receive the Respects and Submissions of Men, may be a Decency due to the Rank God Almighty has placed you in...’. It was only gaining pleasure from wealth which was sinful.118 James agreed, for he would later advise the pious ‘not to be any way extravagant in on[e]s clothes, table or equipage, but meerly to have what is decent, and sub[i]table to on[e]s condition’.119 There was, of course, nothing specifically catholic about such an argument. Nor was it an uncommon one, especially among the political elite. A divinely ordained conception of society not only placed restrictions on the lower orders; it also placed the opposite restrictions on their masters. For the king not to have had the most splendid household in the kingdom would have been unnatural. Yet, how was one to ascertain the ‘Decency due to the Rank God Almighty has placed you in’ except by conforming to the existing social norms? Circumstances had compelled Charles II to evade those norms by venturing to reduce the size of and alter the functions of his household. James II chose to go even further. By disregarding what many of their subjects considered to be a basic purpose of a royal court, the provision of hospitality, they tacitly promoted the idea that the king’s domestic arrangements were his own affair and so implied, perhaps

117 Part III, II. 974-87. 
118 A Select Collection of Catholick Sermons, (1741), I, p. 118. 
unintentionally, that there was a distinction to be made between the public and the private aspects of the monarch’s life. William III had other ideas.
CHAPTER FOUR: THE CATHOLIC PRESENCE IN THE HOUSEHOLD DEPARTMENTS

I

The 1687 declaration of indulgence appears to provide an unambiguous statement of James's attitude towards religious toleration. If one takes it at face value (as most historians have, in recent years, tended to do), James seems to have supported the principle that all citizens should be able to worship God however and with whomever they liked and, on such matters, he can even be portrayed, without distorting the evidence too much, as an enlightened progressive. He had, by any standards, a radical programme.

What he was far less clear about was how this policy would have been carried out in practice had he been able to fulfil his objectives. Just exactly how he viewed the futures of the Church of England and the Church of Rome remained unstated and nothing was said in detail about how extensive the role of catholics in government would be. In fact, it is not even necessarily the case that James himself had fixed views on these issues. Much depended on how responsive his subjects were to the lure of catholicism and only God could determine whether he would have a catholic heir. There is little doubt that, leaving aside daydreams, his aims changed once optimism about mass conversions faded (the 1687 declaration being the first time that James implied publicly that he realised they would not) and when the queen became pregnant. Yet by placing all the emphasis on freedom of worship and claiming the moral high ground in the process, he was doing himself no favours. Freedom of worship, in itself, was an idea which stood a chance of being accepted. Admittedly support for it can be overestimated, nevertheless the toleration bill of 1680, the returns from the three questions and the form of the 1689 religious settlement all suggest that James stood a reasonable chance of winning sufficient support to have got his way on it. It was the further questions he left unanswered which caused him his real problems. However much he gave assurances that toleration was not a threat to the Church of England and that he would protect its future, doubts among anglicans about what exactly he had in mind not only remained but multiplied as the reign progressed. But it was not just the anglicans who remained suspicious. It was these issues without answers which divided the dissenters and even the catholics. Perhaps the most important of all these issues was that concerning the role of catholics in government and this was of particular

interest to members of the royal household. James’s clear wish to appoint catholics to
government office was a potential threat to all existing officeholders and they had every
reason to be concerned. Whatever fears may have caused others to worry about such
appointments, royal servants faced the prospect of redundancy if James chose to favour
his co-religionists with places at court. To add to their discomfort, there was the
pressure imposed on them by the king’s early expectation that large numbers of his
servants would seize the opportunity to convert and many had also to confront the
moral dilemma of whether to cooperate with catholic colleagues whose appointments
they believed to be illegal. Assessing how real the threat of large scale catholic
appointments at court was is essential if one is to understand the policy which many
believed was an attempt to subvert the government of the kingdom. Sadly, no final
answers can be promised to the question of what was it James wanted to do but some
can be supplied about what he did do.

No secret was made of the king’s wish to undo the 1673 Test Act. His evident
desire to disregard this statute, with him considering it a discrimination against his
fellow catholics and a infringement on his prerogative, however, met head on with the
long standing fear that catholics were plotting to corrupt the morals of the court. To
many the ban on catholics entering employment within government departments or the
duke of York’s household introduced by the 1673 Act was an elementary precaution.
The issue was wider than whether catholics should be allowed to become royal
servants. Public apprehension arose not so much from a sense that it was wrong for
catholics to receive the material benefits from royal service (although such envy no
doubt played its part) as that the access gained thereby to the king and to his courtiers
could be used to impart evil counsel. This meant that the 1673 Act had only partly
tackled the problem since it had blocked only one of the routes to the royal ear and
contemporary paranoia about catholics is as much illustrated by the subsequent attempts
to close this loophole as by the original Act. To supplement the Act’s powers,
therefore, in November 1673 an order-in-council instructed the Lord Steward and the
Lord Chamberlain to prevent catholics frequenting Whitehall and this ban had soon
been extended to cover St.James’s Park and St.James’s Palace. Arlington, on
becoming Lord Chamberlain, rigourously enforced this rule in the hope of dispelling
any doubts about his pro-protestant credentials, causing Danby, in an attempt to outdo
him, to have the zone forbidden to them enlarged to encompass everywhere within a ten
mile radius of London in February 1675.2 In the wake of Oates’s claims, with
hysterical fears for the king’s safety prompting the Commons ‘to command the Lord

2 PC 2/64, fol. 134, 14 Nov 1673; fol. 144, 10 Dec 1673; G. Treby (ed.), A Collection of Letters,
(1681), pp. 113-14, Coleman to La Chaise, 29 Sept 1675; J.A. Williams, ‘English catholicism under
Chamberlain, and all other the Officers of Your Majesty’s Household, to take a strict
Care, that no unknown or suspicious Persons may have Access near Your Majesty’s
Person’ and with the preamble to the second Test Act declaring that existing anti-
catholic laws ‘have not had the desired Effects by reason of the free accessse which
Popish Recusants have had to his Majestyes Court’, the ban was reiterated and steps
taken to enforce it.3 On 6 December 1678, in response to an address from parliament,
the Privy Council agreed that the royal palaces should be searched and on 26 December
the Commons instructed the queen’s Vice-Chamberlain, together with Ashburnham,
Fox and Churchill, the three members of the Board of Greencloth who were sitting as
M.P.s, to compile lists of catholics living at Whitehall, St.James’s or Somerset House;
a task which the Board of Greencloth had already begun.4 A year later the effort to
uncover catholics was resumed with greater vigour. A bounty of £10 was offered for
every suspect found, with the royal messengers and the Knight Marshal being given
powers to bring them before the Board of Greencloth who were then to give them the
opportunity to clear themselves by taking the oaths and the tests. Over the next two
months William Greene and Richard Jarvis brought in four catholics (including two
servants of Mary Crane, the queen’s Dresser) and in March 1680 Dates was paid the
£10 for his assistance during the searches. By May 1680 the searchers had shifted their
attentions to Windsor and the information that catholics were hiding there in the castle
and the park led to the Board of Greencloth being authorized to seize them.5

A number of exceptions to this ban were allowed, with Antonio Verrio and his
assistants (who were being employed by Hugh May at Windsor to decorate the newly-
completed Star Building), certain senior Scottish army officers, most notably
Dumbarton, and the servants of foreign ambassadors being among them.6 More
controversially, Charles II had attempted to get the servants of his wife and his sister-
in-law exempted. Two days after the 1678 ban was imposed, the Council, ignoring
widespread concern on the subject, agreed that it should not apply to any of their
servants.7 That these servants were viewed with suspicion was understandable. In
August 1676 Anthony d’Marevile, the secretary to Chesterfield, the queen’s Lord
Chamberlain, had been arrested for attempting to publish an English edition of the

3 CJ, IX, p. 520; Statutes of the Realm, V, p. 894 (30 Chas II, ii, c. 1).
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5 HMC Ormonde, n.s. V, pp. 255-6, Gwyn to Ormond, 19 Dec 1679; PC 2/68, fols. 330, 332, 19
Dec 1679; fol. 351, 14 Jan 1680; fol. 379, 4 Feb 1680; fol. 385, 11 Feb 1680; fol. 388, 14 Feb 1680;
fol. 411, 3 Mar 1680; fols. 426-7, 9 Mar 1680; fols. 532-3, 26 May 1680.
6 PC 2/66, fol. 446, 15 Nov 1678; PC 2/68, fol. 29, 12 May 1679; fol. 335, 21 Dec 1679; LJ, XIII, p. 357; HMC 11th Report, II, pp. 131-2, petition from Dumbarton, 24 May 1679; p. 159, petition
from Dumbarton, 26 Oct 1680.
7 PC 2/66, fol. 439, 2 Nov 1678.
Mass, which had led to the discovery of an illicit hoard of catholic books above the stables at Somerset House.\(^8\) Even worse, Coleman was the duchess of York’s secretary. As an alternative safeguard, the House of Lords ordered that lists of the catholic servants belonging to the queen and to the duchess of York be compiled by Ossory (the Lord Chamberlain to Queen Catherine) and by Peterborough. The Council confirmed this order two days later but this was not enough to satisfy the Commons who, on 12 November 1678, asked that a commission be appointed to administer the oaths on all servants within the royal palaces, except the queen’s Portuguese attendants. The king’s response to this was to suggest that the queen’s and the duchess’s lesser servants should not have to take the oaths, only for the Commons to vote unanimously to stand by their original demands.\(^9\) This defeat was confirmed in the new Test Act, in spite of attempts by the Lords to argue that the servants of the queen and the duchess of York were special cases. When first sent up to them, their lordships had amended it to give the queen the right to nominate nine female and twelve male servants (who were not to include her Lord Chamberlain or her Master of the Horse) to be exempt from it in addition to her Portuguese attendants, with the duchess of York being given the same privilege for her Italian servants and ten others to be nominated by her. This was rejected by the Commons.\(^10\) As they pointed out, ‘we cannot think it advisable to admit them now to continue and settle in his Majesty’s Houses, where they may be much more dangerous than in any other Place’.\(^11\) After then unsuccessfully proposing that all references to the queen’s servants be dropped, thereby leaving them open to prosecution under existing anti-recusant legislation, the Lords revised their position, abandoning the idea that the queen should be allowed to employ catholic Englishmen and changing the quota for female servants for the duchess of York to five. The Commons agreed to compromise on nine Portuguese and nine other female servants for the queen but refused to allow the duchess of York to have any catholic servants and these were the terms which formed the provisions of the Act.\(^12\) In 1673 the Lords had likewise clashed with the Commons over who should have to take the tests, except that then they had argued for circumscribing the bill even further. If they had had their way all servants in royal households other than that of the king would not have had to take
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the tests but the Commons had thought differently. Although Anglesey reported to the Lords that 'the Commons disagree in leaving out the Servants of the Queen Consort, and his Royal Highness the Duke of York, because Offices in their Service are eminent, and will occasion Resort to the Court' and they agreed to drop most of their amendments including that excluding the duke of York's household, the Lords insisted on resisting the tests being imposed on the queen's servants. In the face of the peers' insistence, the lower house accepted the arguments that the original draft contravened the marriage treaty with Portugal and that Queen Catherine had shown restraint in the number of catholics and foreigners she had appointed (even if the real reason for this was not restraint but the punishment inflicted on her after the 1662 'Bedchamber crisis') which had meant that no mention was made in the 1673 Act of any royal households except those of the king and the duke of York. Both these attempts to claim that certain royal servants should not be forced to take the tests established lines of argument which could have been of use to James II had he chosen to deploy them.

A case could have been made for arguing that the king's household was his own affair and that he should have been able to appoint whosoever he wished. To many the idea of a distinction between royal servants and civil servants was still a contradiction and it was not one which was usually encouraged by the Crown in case it was thought to imply that, in some sense, royal authority over its employees varied between departments. Even so, it was used occasionally, for strictly tactical purposes, to resist interference in the affairs of the household. In the contexts of the tests, it could have been maintained that most positions within the king's household were really non-political and that therefore employing catholics in them did not give them any power. The dangers of this argument had been appreciated by Henry Powle who, in 1673, in opposing the Lords' amendments, had pointed out that underlying the Lords' position was the notion that household servants were not 'public offices'. It was a notion which threatened the tests where they seemed most necessary because the most private of the royal servants, the body servants of the Bedchamber, were also those with the
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greatest access to and intimacy with the king. While James’s catholicism eliminated the
fear that he would be the target for a crazed catholic assassin, he could have turned the
argument around and appointed catholics on the grounds that he had to have personal
servants whom he could trust absolutely, giving rise to the possibility that his inner
circle of courtiers would come to be made up of catholics and that he would be cut off
from sound protestant advice. That parliament had in 1678 agreed to exempt from the
tests the nine Portuguese attendants and the nine women who were all, necessarily,
members of the queen’s Bedchamber (for her senior Portuguese servants were female
and she employed few women outside of her Bedchamber) did not mean that parliament
would be equally accommodating for James II. The 1678 compromise was only
possible because of the sexist assumption that such women, unlike their male
counterparts, would have minimal influence in politics. All the indications from the
debates on the tests in 1673, 1678 and 1685 are that even in the unlikely event that
James would be able to persuade the Commons (the Lords were another matter) that his
household should be exempted as a special case, the exemption would not have been
extended to any household positions which were, in any respect, politically sensitive.
James was, in any case, thinking in far wider terms and did not want household offices
to be the only government positions to which catholics could be appointed. He may,
nevertheless, have believed that the catholic presence in certain household departments
should have been especially pronounced. When in 1692 he would draw up a memorial
on statecraft for the benefit of his son should he ever become king, he suggested how
the government offices should be distributed between catholics and protestants. The
distribution was not fixed arbitrarily. Having a catholic and a protestant Secretaries of
State had some diplomatic justification while a protestant Secretary of the Navy was a
recognition of his failure to catholicize the fleet. Advising that the army should be
predominantly catholic, with a catholic Secretary of War, was unquestionably a serious
error which, by then, James should have known better not to have made but he would
have felt that a catholic army was indispensable for exactly the same reason his former
subjects would object to one; namely, the memory of the New Model Army. The other
two government departments which he earmarked for large scale appointments of
catholics were, significantly, the Household and the Bedchamber. One can only
assume that it was the argument that the servants belowstairs were non-political which
led him to specify the former and the argument that his closest servants should be his
co-religionists, the latter. How far these proposals were influenced by hindsight is
impossible to say. They reveal an awareness on his part that he would not be able to
govern without protestant participation in government which many of his subjects

19 Clarke, Life, II, p. 642, 'For my son the prince of Wales'.
would have argued he had not demonstrated when king. Those appointments of catholics which he had made do not suggest that he had followed any such scheme indicating instead that he merely appointed them where and when he could. He may have had plans to concentrate their appointments in the household however, if this had been his intention, he had been markedly unsuccessful, except, that is, in one special and limited field.

II

Rather more so than with his domestic concerns, James could, with some reason, have maintained that his religious devotions were his own affair. Few tories would have disputed this for it was a basic element in the implicit compromise by which, in the full knowledge that he was a catholic, they had worked to secure his accession. Short of his reconversion, the best that they could hope for was that James would continue to practice his catholicism with the same scrupulous discretion he had observed when heir to the throne. This did not even involve acknowledging the validity of the principle of toleration because the precedents of the chapels for the catholic royal consorts and foreign ambassadors meant that a catholic chapel at court did not have to be an alarming breach in the anglican monopoly on public worship.\(^{20}\) That monopoly had supposedly been protected by the 1662 decree (confirmed in 1667, 1676, 1681 and 1682) which barred entry to the royal and ambassadorial catholic chapels to all except the households of the queen, the queen dowager and any of the ambassadors, underlining that these were private chapels. Admittedly, if this rule was enforced at all, it was done so only patchily until after 1676 when the archbishop of Canterbury and the bishop of London were given authority to use the royal messengers to stop unauthorised persons gaining entry to them.\(^{21}\) In fact, not even this circumscribed privilege of being allowed her own chapel had been extended to the duchess of York and she had been forced to make do with priests borrowed from the queen. Charles II had thus ensured that she and James had had to receive Mass in secret. Most of his subjects would have preferred if things had stayed that way. Nevertheless there does

\(^{20}\) Admittedly, the arrangements for catholic worship for Henrietta Maria had been a major cause for concern for the Long Parliament. (C. Russell, The Causes of the English Civil War, (Oxford, 1990), pp. 60-1, 105-6, 193-4).

seem to have been a willingness in 1685 to recognise that the new king should be allowed the same freedoms as were already accorded to Queen Catherine.22

The initial indications were that James would opt for circumspection. The late king was buried according to the anglican rites, although it may have taken the advice of Queen Catherine to dissuade James from going ahead with a catholic ceremony. Furthermore, a pro-catholic newsletter reported that the king had promised to the courtiers 'that the King's chappell should be continued in its splendour and order for their use and conveniences, but as for himself he would content himselfe with his Wife's little chappell' and, as James himself would later point out, 'to avoid all reasonable cause of complaint he took care to leave the Chappell of Whitehall to the Protestants'.23 To have abolished the Chapel Royal would have been a dangerous miscalculation and, in any case, provision still had to be made for Princess Anne, Prince George and the bulk of the royal servants. Significantly, care was taken to minimise the ceremonial problems arising from the fact that the king was no longer attending its services. These problems were greater than might be supposed. The court rituals had hitherto exploited to the full the symbolism of the Head of the Church of England attending divine service each Sunday, making the occasion the highpoint of the weekly ceremonial cycle. It was the antithesis of private devotion (making visible the plain fact that for no early modern monarch could his religion just be his own affair).

The response to the unprecedented situation of the king's steadfast non-attendance was the amending of the chapel protocol so that those in attendance had to act as if the king was still present. In this way, the royal chair in the closet above (which had for long been a symbol of royal majesty) became a substitute for the absent monarch while acting as a reminder that it was still his chapel and that he was still the Head of the Church of England.24

Yet this studied preservation of the forms of the anglican chapel did not defuse it as a political issue because some of the most contentious ecclesiastical appointments of the reign were made to its senior offices. As was befitting in the light of his undertakings, James made no alterations among its senior officials at his accession.25 Within the year, however, Compton was chastised for his opposition to the commissioning of catholic officers into the army by being removed as Dean. Nathaniel

---

22 Fox, History, appendix, p. xxxviii, Barillon to Louis XIV, 19 Feb/1 Mar 1685.
23 'Documents at Everingham', Miscellanea, Catholic Record Society, IV, p. 271; Clarke, Life, II, p. 79, memoirs.
24 Evelyn, Diary, IV, p. 433; LC 5/147, fol. 224, Mulgrave to Dunkley, 12 Nov 1686; LC 5/201, fol. 189, orders for the royal closet, temp. James II.
25 Lists of the senior officials (with occasional inaccuracies) can be found as an appendix to the semi-official history of the Chapel Royal. (D. Baldwin, The Chapel Royal: Ancient and Modern, (1990), appendix II, pp. 410-43). This work has little to say about the Chapel Royal during James II's reign.
Crewe, the bishop of Durham, was promoted from Clerk of the Closet to be Compton’s successor, with the king then compounding the offence by appointing Thomas Sprat, the bishop of Rochester, to the Clerkship of the Closet. Neither Crewe nor Sprat can be said to have distinguished themselves in these positions. From James’s point of view, Crewe, who was very much his own protege, was a natural candidate for royal favour. A sermon he had delivered to the Chapel Royal on Ladyday 1669, shortly before he had become Clerk of the Closet, arguing that the Virgin Mary was worthy of more devotion than was usual from anglicans, had hinted at an affinity with catholicism which enabled him to remain close to James as he moved towards Rome and in 1673 it was Crewe who had conducted his marriage. The following year it was James who persuaded the king to translate him from Oxford to Durham and his royal patron’s regard for him had been sufficiently great for him to press in 1677 for his appointment, against the claims of Compton, as archbishop of Canterbury. Just how dependant he was on James had been revealed when, at the time of the impeachment proceedings against Danby, he had told Sancroft that he would not support Danby ‘because he is an enemy to the Duke of York my Principal Friend’. Moreover, by the time of his appointment as Dean, he had already displayed an overeagerness to accommodate James’s religious policies. On hearing that the new king had attended Mass in the closet at St. James’s he had reacted by sealing up the private closet at Whitehall, only to be told by James to reopen it. If accurate, what he is reputed to have answered on being offered the Deanery, which was that ‘since your Majesty is resolved upon it, & I cannot have the Honour of being so near to your Majesty, as I was to your Royal Brother in the Chapple, I shall be very glad to receive this mark of your Majesty’s favour’, revealed the same obsequiousness. Sprat, likewise, had already proved his loyalty, for his appointment, which with James’s non-attendance had become honorific, was his reward for producing A True Account and Declaration of the Horrid Conspiracy, his recently published, government-sponsored, vilification of the Rye House plotters.

That the king considered Crewe and Sprat to be the most compliant of the bench of bishops was confirmed in July 1686, when (apart from the token presence of

---


27 Clark, Memoirs of Nathaniel, Lord Crewe, p. 19. That Danby had supported Compton’s candidature for the see of Canterbury would have been another reason for this refusal.

28 Evelyn, Diary, IV, p. 418.

29 Clark, Memoirs of Nathaniel, Lord Crewe, pp. 20-1. Crewe was referring to what was the principal duty of the Clerk of the Closet which was to sit to the right of the king during services ‘to resolve all Doubts concerning Spiritual Matters’ (Chamberlayne, Angliae Notitia, (1687), part I, p. 138).
Sancroft) they became the only two clergymen appointed to the new Ecclesiastical Commission, although they would be joined by a third cleric, Cartwright of Chester, the following year. In time both, of course, sought to play down their involvements but, in Sprat's case at least, there is evidence that he did experience a genuine personal crisis over the Commission's actions. To his credit he resigned in August 1688 rather than support the indictment of his seven colleagues and in early 1689 he was able to publish two detailed open letters to Dorset disassociating himself from most of the Commission's policies. In truth, that he should have maintained that he was both unaware of the Commission's illegality and yet had served (along with Rochester) 'with a purpose of doing as much Good as we were able, and of hindering as much Evil, as we possibly could, in that Unfortunate Juncture of Affairs' suggests hazy good intentions and feeble compliance rather than dedicated commitment. The case for absolving Crewe is more dubious. He may have stopped attending the Privy Council once Petre had been included on it but this perhaps reflected resentment at the greater influence of the man who was the king's real spiritual counsellor. Moreover, that he is said to have dissuaded the king from including him in the party of commissioners which carried out the visitation of Magdalen should not obscure the fact that in the Commission's key vote on 28 November 1687 he, unlike Sprat, supported the decision to proceed against the fellows of Magdalen. A year earlier, shortly after Crewe's appointment to the Commission, Huntingdon had been able to comment that 'I find the king likes those who are most forward to his service, the B[isho]p of Durham is very well w[i]th the king.' But Crewe did have some scruples. When offered the archbishopric of York in 1687 he turned it down and made clear that this was due to more than modesty by also advising against the appointments of Massey as dean of Christ Church and of Joshua Basset as master of Sidney Sussex. Furthermore, however their conduct as Ecclesiastical Commissioners is interpreted, the opportunities which Crewe and Sprat had, in their capacities as Dean and Clerk of the Closet, to do any real damage appear to have been limited. The nomination of royal chaplains was a matter for the Lord Chamberlain and the comments of Mulgrave on the subject imply that he tried to avoid seeking advice from either. In any case, with senior anglican clergymen maintaining a largely united front of 'non-assistance', it would have been

33 Huntington Library, Hastings MSS, HA 6055, Huntingdon to Geary, 31 Aug 1686.
34 SP 31/3, fol. 64, Crewe to James II, [1687].
futile to try to appoint only chaplains willing to give unthinking support to James’s religious policies and the names of those appointed support Mulgrave’s claim to have protected the Chapel Royal from creeping infiltration. He even managed in April 1686 to appoint John Sharp only twelve days before he delivered the first of his two belligerent anti-catholic sermons to his congregation of St.Giles-in-the-Fields thereby starting the controversy which ended with Compton’s suspension. A year later, it was possible for Tillotson to use the pulpit of the Chapel Royal to make remarks which Bishop Cartwright had no difficulty decoding as an attack on those anglicans who were abandoning the Church of England for short-term political gain.35

If the Chapel Royal remained largely immune to real interference from James this was because his efforts were directed elsewhere. The first indication of what would follow came on the second Sunday after his accession when he openly attended Mass in his wife’s private closet at St.James’s Palace. Public opinion was scandalised. It was distressing enough that he thereby became the first sovereign in over one and a quarter centuries to participate in a catholic communion service, confirming his subject’s fears, but it cannot be said that they were not prepared for the revelation that their new king was indeed a catholic. It seems rather to have been the openness with which he acted which made this event so notably offensive to so many. It was not that the openness was unthinking. By having the doors left open, he was able, at last, to do what he had been impatient to do since his conversion: to declare honestly his catholic faith. He was, moreover, setting a conspicuous example which he devoutly hoped his courtiers would follow.36 It was this awareness of the promotional value of his actions which determined much of what followed. Once he had committed himself to unconcealed worship it became impossible to avoid confronting the question of how many of the usual ceremonies were to be carried forward in the changed circumstances and the objection that they would only add visual splendour to the exotic spectacle of the

35 B.L. Add MS 4292, fols. 261-2, Mulgrave to Tillotson, 27 Mar 1689 - printed in Buckingham, Works, II, pp. 89-92; DNB, XVII, p. 1346; T. Newcombe, The Life of John Sharp, D.D., Lord Archbishop of York, (1825), I, pp. 65-88; R. Barker (ed.), The works of the most reverend Dr. Tillotson, (1712), I, pp. 21-9; T. Cartwright, The Diary of Thomas Cartwright, Bishop of Chester, (Camden Society, old series, XXII, 1843), p. 44. Lists of James’s anglican chaplains are to be found in LC 3/30, fols. 61-4 and Chamberlayne, Angliae Notitia, (1687), part I, pp. 157-8. These should be supplemented with the records of their warrants of appointment. (LC 5/145-8, passim). The doctrine of ‘non-assistance’ meant that clergymen were able to accept an appointment as a royal chaplain to James, with the public platform that went with, without feeling compromised. (M. Goldie, ‘The political thought of the Anglican Revolution’ in R. Beddard (ed.), The Revolutions of 1688, (Oxford, 1991), pp. 102-36).

36 Evelyn, Diary, IV, p. 416; Fox, History, appendix, pp. xxxii-xxxiii, Barillon to Louis XIV, 16/26 Feb 1685; Campana de Cavelli, Les Derniers Stuarts, II, p. 22, Gennari to Gennari, 16/26 Feb 1685; Burnet, History, III, p. 11; J. Lowther, first Viscount Lonsdale, Memoir of the reign of James II, (York, 1808), p. 2; Clarke, Life, II, pp. 5-6. James’s catholicism had never been officially confirmed. Even his speech to the accession council had gone no further than implying it. (PC 2/71, fol. 6, 6 Feb 1685).
Roman liturgy was not one to dissuade James. So great were the imperatives of tradition (together with the expediency of compliance) that even courtiers whose commitment to anglicanism was impeccable appear to have assumed that it was still their duty to attend the king to chapel. It seems that, in the absence of firm royal direction, they simply provided his escort as they had always done, even if they did then wait outside in the antechamber before leaving when the elevation of the host was reached. It was not until Easter that James chose to make an issue of the matter. A collar-day, Easter Sunday was traditionally one of the occasions when the king descended from the closet above and received the sacrament with the greatest possible solemnity and in 1685 marked the beginning of the week which would climax with the coronation. For these reasons, it was understandable that James should have felt that he had an obligation to insist on the full ritual. Bearing in mind that he had already been receiving a semi-formal escort, he may merely have meant to have himself preceded by the sword of state (if, that is, this was not the case already) and to have the Gentlemen Pensioners turn out to take their customary place at the rear of the procession. In the event he gave Rochester, the only courtier who appears to have had any qualms, the opportunity to make himself conspicuously absent. This apart, there is every reason to believe that the reintroduction of the full ritual went smoothly and it was not until the end of the year that, for other reasons, it flared up into a serious quarrel. On his appointment as Lord Chamberlain, Mulgrave faced claims from Norfolk and Oxford that responsibility for such matters rested with them as Earl Marshal and Lord Great Chamberlain. This suggests that the ill-health suffered by both Arlington and Ailesbury had prevented them from diligently defending their rights. After resisting this attempt by Norfolk and Oxford to interfere, Mulgrave would exercise his confirmed authority by endorsing the existing arrangements on the grounds that it conformed to what had been done in the time of Charles I.

38 Fox, History, appendix, pp. lxvi-lxvii, Barillon to Louis XIV, 20/30 April 1685. The Maundy ceremonies, which, for this year at least, remained the preserve of the anglican rather than the catholic chaplains, had foreshadowed the restoration of the full ritual. James told Queensberry that he found them exhausting. (Campana de Cavelli, Les Derniers Stuarts, II, pp. 37-8, Terriesi to Tuscan Secretary of State, 25 April 1685; HMC Buccleuch (Drumlanrig), I, p. 106, James VII to Queensberry, 16 April 1685).
39 Bodl. MS Carte 117, fols. 31-2, memorandum by Mulgrave, 31 Dec 1685; Bodl. MS Carte 78, fols. 36-7, Norfolk's reply and Mulgrave's counterreply, [1686]; LC 5/201, fols. 355-69, notes on dispute between Mulgrave, Norfolk and Oxford, [1686]; SP 44/56, p. 229, Sunderland to Norfolk, 29 Mar 1686; p. 319, Sunderland to Lindsey, 23 Jan 1686; SP 31/3, fol. 316, Lindsey to Sunderland, 1 Feb 1686; SP 44/337, fols. 13-14, judgement on dispute between Mulgrave, Norfolk and Oxford, 30 April 1686. It had been the order of the procession to the Chapel Royal which had determined the order of Charles II's funeral procession and on that occasion Savile, as Arlington's deputy, had preceded the coffin. (PC 1/13/49, fol. 3, 5). It may have been as a consolation for his disappointment in this dispute that James honoured Norfolk with the task of carrying the sword-of-state before him on the
Meanwhile, James was eager to obtain a setting for his devotions more spacious than the cramped accommodation provided by the private closet. In October 1685, when the court returned to Whitehall after spending three months at Windsor, he began instead to use the Queen's Chapel at St.James's, a building about half the size of the official Chapel Royal on the other side of the park.40 The convenience of this chapel was, unfortunately, not matched by the provision of a similar chapel at Windsor, which created a problem when the court returned in May 1686 to spend the summer there. Rather than make do with his closet chapel as before, James took the momentous step of using the Chapel Royal adjacent to St.George's Hall. Not only did this mean that the displaced anglican chaplains and servants had to use St.George's Chapel instead, it also meant, more controversially, that he had taken over a consecrated anglican chapel for catholic worship. At about the same time, moreover, he began to use his own catholic priests when touching for the king's evil and revived the pre-Reformation form of the ceremony. Predictably, many interpreted these events (wrongly, as it happened) as meaning that it was only a matter of time before the anglican chaplains were all dismissed.41 The anglican chaplains remained in place but by the end of 1686 James had his own catholic chapel to rival theirs. Designed by Wren and exuberantly furbished by Gibbons, Verrio and Gennari, the new catholic chapel at Whitehall, which was the most important part of the major rebuilding scheme James had pushed through there, was consecrated on Christmas Day 1686. Being about two-thirds larger than the Queen's Chapel and with the new Privy Gallery connecting it with the royal apartments providing the appropriate processional route, it was the perfect setting in which James could be seen to perform his devotions.42 Meanwhile in Scotland similar arrangements

---

40 Clarke, Life, II, p. 79, memoirs; Luttrell, Brief Historical Relation, I, p. 359; A Select Collection of Catholic Sermons, (1741), I, pp. 3-31; II, pp. 463-81.

41 Evelyn, Diary, IV, p. 518; The Ceremonies us'd in the time of King Henry VII for the healing of them that be diseas'd with the King's Evil, (1686); Campana de Cavelli, Les Derniers Stuarts, II, p. 108, Terriesi to Tuscan Secretary of State, 7/17 June 1686; Luttrell, Brief Relation of State Affairs, I, p. 378; Savile Correspondence, p. 290, Savile to Halifax, 29 May 1686; Bramston, Autobiography, p. 231; HMC Rutland, II, p. 109, Howe to [countess of Rutland], 2 June [1686]; H. Farquhar, 'Royal Charities', British Numismatic Journal, (1918), XIV, pp. 103-7. James had already been in the habit of touching after attending Mass each Sunday but this need not mean that he used catholic priests in the ceremony. Similarly, although Bramston's comments imply otherwise, Farquhar's view that the anglican ceremony was continued alongside the catholic one is probably correct, until at least October 1687. Certainly James Grahme continued to provide Sprat with healing medals from the Privy Purse until then. That thereafter (as far as is known) they were supplied to Petre does not necessarily indicate that from October 1687 onwards only the catholic ceremony was used. (CTB, (1685-89), pp. 2112-13. - cp. E 351/2797).

for royal worship were also being organised. In September 1686 James had ordered that catholics should be able to worship in their own houses. At the same time he had extended this concession to himself and had ordered that the Council Chamber at Holyrood (which Sir William Bruce and Robert Mylne had originally envisaged would be the Chapel Royal before their 1671 scheme for rebuilding the palace had been amended by Charles II) should be converted into a catholic chapel. Following the year the adjacent abbey-church would become the chapel for the ‘revived’ Order of the Thistle.

Judging the opening of the English chapel to be the right moment for him to create his own chapel establishment separate from that of his wife, he placed the twenty-eight servants (including six preachers and four chaplains) taken on to staff it, (plus expenditure on sundries such as candles, wafers, wine and incense) onto the Household establishment, at an additional cost of £2,042 p.a. Heading the musicians was Innocenzo Fede, the former maestro di cappella to S.Giacomo degli Spagnuoli in

144, 154, 155, 162, 169, 175, 179, 180, 182, 196, 209). Several months after the consecration the Works were ordered to build an extension onto the new chapel. (LC S/147, fol. 324, Mulgrave to Wren, 10 April 1687).

43 The best available architectural history of the Palace of Holyroodhouse is to be found in J. Gifford, C. McWilliam, D. Walker and C. Wilson (eds.), The Buildings of Scotland - Edinburgh, (1984), pp. 125-48. See also R. Fawsett, The Palace of Holyroodhouse, (HMSO, n.d.); H. Fenwick, Architect Royal: The Life and Work of Sir William Bruce, 1630-1710, (Kineton, 1970), pp. 24-40, 54-65, 70-72; J.H. Burton et al. (eds.), The Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, (Edinburgh, 1877-), third series, XII, p. xii, 435; XXXV. The Council Chamber is now the West Drawing Room. In 1679 the Queen’s Presence Chamber (or more probably a closet adjacent to it) had been used as a chapel by Mary Beatrice. The statement by W. Sinclair in The Chapels Royal, (1912), p. 269, that James had then used the Council Chamber as a chapel is probably a confusion of the evidence. At that stage it is much more likely that James used his wife’s chapel.

44 W. Maitland, History of Edinburgh, (Edinburgh, 1753), p. 142; Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, XIII, p. xvi; [W. Adam], Vitruvius Scoticus, (Edinburgh, [?1780]), plate 5; National Library of Scotland, Adv. MS 31.1.13. The Canongate congregation which had used the abbey-church initially worshipped at Lady Mary Yester’s Church until a new church was built for them. The unusual Latin-cross design by James Smith for this new church encouraged speculation that it was built with a view to using it for catholic worship. (The Buildings of Scotland - Edinburgh, (1984), p. 149). Furthermore, the warrant of 29 May 1687 which authorised the passing of the letter patent to revive the Order of the Thistle had distinct catholic overtones. As well as retelling at length the sub-Constantine legend of how Achaius, the tenth-century King of Scots, founded the Order after having a vision of a white cross in the sky prior to defeating Athelstan, it made reference to the Virgin Mary as the traditional protectress of the Order and blamed its dissolution on the 1567 rebellion of the Lords of the Covenant. (Statutes of the Most Ancient and Most Noble Order of the Thistle, (HMSO, Edinburgh, 1798), pp. 1-10). When the Order was again ‘revived’ in 1703 an almost identical warrant was issued which retained the Achaius legend but dropped the overtly pro-catholic references. The statutes were also amended so that a new knight had to promise to ‘defend the true reformed Protestant religion’ rather than ‘the Christian religion’. (ibid, p. 7, 11-14, 17). The reference to Achaius in the 1687 warrant was an endorsement of the official line, publicly maintained in print by the Lord Advocate, Sir George Mackenzie, during the preceding three years, that all the Scottish kings back to Fergus I were historical figures. Bishop Lloyd and Stillington had questioned this claim but Mackenzie had responded with Jus Regium, A Defence of the Antiquity of the Royal Line of Scotland and The Antiquity of the Royal Line of Scotland. (G. Mackenzie, Works, (Edinburgh, 1716-22), II, pp. 355-483). The point was important because, had Mackenzie been correct, the Stuarts would have been by far the oldest European royal dynasty.
Rome and to Queen Christina of Sweden. Not all the musicians under him, however, were catholics. The Gentlemen of the Chapel and the Gregorian singers do seem to have been but seven of the nine instrumentalists were probably not, for these seven were also among the thirty-two musicians of the Private Music and had been during the previous reign. One of the other two was the Moravian musician, Gottfried Finger, who had come to England in 1685 and who, in 1688, would publish some of the music composed for the chapel in his book *Sonatae XII pro diversis instrumentis*. From Ladyday 1687 sixteen vocalists and nine musicians, costing in all £1,500, were added to reinforce them, with further increases taking effect from Christmas 1687, mainly due to higher salaries for the senior singers and the employing of extra musicians, increasing the total cost of the chapel to £3,983. This compared with less than £2,600 provided for the anglican chapel.\(^{45}\)

Since 1685 Petre had been acting as an alternative Clerk of the Closet and he now assumed control over the new chapel.\(^{46}\) James had retained the services of his existing confessor, Mansuete, at his accession but, in March 1687, Petre would be able to oust the Capuchin and have his fellow Jesuit, John Warner, appointed as Confessor.\(^{47}\) They were now officially joined as the king’s spiritual advisers by the six preachers and four chaplains. Foremost among the preachers was John Betham, the vicar-general of the eastern district, who, until 1685, had been president of the Secular College of Saint-Gregory in Paris and whose doctorate from the Sorbonne equipped him for the task ahead. Thomas Codrington was presumably appointed with the backing of Cardinal Howard, the Lord Almoner to Queen Catherine and the protector of England, whose

---

\(^{45}\) LS 13/255, fols. 46-7, James II to Greencloth, 26 April 1687; fols. 53-4, James II to Greencloth, 5 July 1687; fols. 56-7, James II to Greencloth, 20 Mar 1688 - cp. CTB, (1685-89), p. 1326, 1441-2, 1822-3. That, in each case, these payments were backdated from the time they were officially authorised by the king is shown by the successive quarterly totals for the Chapel Royal in the Household accounts. (LS 1/30; LS 8/25; LS 1/31). For the careers of Fede and Finger, see S. Sadie (ed.), *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, (1980), VI, p. 446, 565-6; J. Lionnet, 'Innocenzo Fede et la musique a la cour des Jacobites a Saint-Germain-en-Laye', *Revue de la Bibliotheque Nationale*, no. 46 (Hiver 1992), pp. 14-18. The nine musicians of the Private Music employed as instrumentalists were William Hall, Thomas Farmer, Edward Hooten, John Crouch, John Goodwyn, Robert Carr and James Paisible. They were later joined by another of their colleagues, Edward Flower, who had also been employed under Charles II. The cases of the two other Private Musicians who were members of the chapel, John Abel and Balthazar Reading, are discussed below.

\(^{46}\) The statement that Petre served as Clerk of the Closet from 1685 is universally accepted. However the exact status of his appointment can be questioned because it was not until 5 November 1687 (was the date chosen for its symbolism?) that he was officially sworn in as Clerk (LC 3/30, fol. 5; LC 5/148, fol. 41; Campana de Cavelli, *Les Derniers Stuarts*, II, p. 149, Terriesi to Tuscan Secretary of State, 14/24 Nov 1687; B.L. Add MS 10118, fol. 160). It is perhaps relevant that this nearly coincides with the date at which he began to receive healing medals from the Privy Purse. (see footnote 41 above). While Sprat’s subsequent silence when defending his conduct during the reign argues against the idea, it is not inconceivable that Petre (who had undoubtedly been performing the Clerk’s duties for some time) thus formally replaced Sprat. More likely is that both continued to hold the position.

\(^{47}\) The confessor was paid a salary of £200 p.a. which Mansuete received from the Privy Purse and which Warner received from the Secret Service. (B.L. Althorp papers D3, Privy Purse establishment, 1685; Akerman, *Secret Services*, p. 182, 188, 199, 210).
secretary he had been. A member of the Institute of Secular Priests, he had left Howard’s service in Rome in July 1684 to return to England on a mission (which, after encountering opposition from priests already resident there, proved to be a failure) to set up an English branch of the Institute. The Jesuits were represented among the preachers by John Purcell and John Huddleston. The latter, who used the alias ‘Dormer’ and who is known to have been active in Lincolnshire in the late 1670s, should not be confused with his more famous namesake. The other John Huddleston retained his chaplaincy to the queen dowager. This one, the son of Sir Robert Huddleston of Clavering in Essex, had been brought up as an anglican until converting as an adolescent. A third regular cleric was William Hall, a Cæthusian educated at the English College at Lisbon and ordained as recently as 1684. The identity of the original sixth preacher is not known but it may have been Dominick White who later became James’s chaplain in exile. What is known is that, by late 1687, this position was filled by Silvester Jenks. Like Betham and Codrington, a product of Douai, Jenks had taught philosophy there from 1680 until September 1686, when he had left to become chaplain to the patroness who had paid for his education, Lady Mary Yates of Harvington Hall, Chaddesley in Worcestershire. He only came to the king’s attention when, on his western progress, he heard him preach at Worcester in August 1687. James was sufficiently impressed to appoint him to his court office.

The process of sidelining the anglicans in the religious affairs of the court was completed in November 1687 when Francis Turner, the bishop of Ely, was dismissed as Lord High Almoner. Turner’s original appointment in 1683 had been one aspect of his astonishing rise up the ecclesiastical hierarchy in which he had moved from being senior chaplain to James to be dean of Windsor, then bishop of Rochester, before being
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49 The only list of the catholic preachers is that in the warrant of March 1688. (LS 12/255, fols. 56-8, James II to Greencloth, 20 Mar 1688; CTB, (1685-89), pp. 1822-3). In it, Purcell is spelt ’Percall’ and Huddleston is listed under his alias. Unfortunately the names of the four French chaplains are not given. The biographical details of the preachers are to be found in D.A. Bellenger (ed.), English and Welsh Priests, 1558-1800, (Downside Abbey, Bath, 1984), p. 39 [Betham], 49 [Codrington], 67 [Hall], 73 [Huddleston], 76 [Jenks], 100 [Purcell]; J. Gillow (ed.), A Literary and Biographical Dictionary of the English Catholics, (1885), I, pp. 204-5 [Betham], 520-2 [Codrington], III, 96 [Hall], 616-21 [Jenks]; G. Anstruther (ed.), The Seminary Priests, III, pp. 13-14 [Betham], 37-8 [Codrington], 90 [Hall], 114-17 [Jenks]; J.H. Pollen and E. Burton (eds.), Biographies of English Catholics in the Eighteenth Century, (1909, reprinted 1968), pp. 50-1 [Codrington]; [C. Dodd], The Church History of England, (Brussels, 1737-42), III, p. 482 [Hall], 482 [Hall], 484 [Codrington], 485-6 [Betham], 494 [Purcell and Dormer/Huddleston]; G. Scott, ’John Betham et l’éducation du prince de Galles’, Revue de la Bibliothèque Nationale, no. 46 (Hiver 1992), pp. 32-9. For a collection of sermons preached by them before the king, including that delivered by Jenks at Worcester, see A Select Collection of Catholic Sermons, (1741).
translated to Ely, all within the space of two years. In 1685 he had been given the
honour of preaching the coronation sermon but an inflammatory sermon delivered later
that year on the anniversary of the Gunpowder Plot harmed his friendship with the king
and that relationship would reach its lowpoint in 1688 when he would be one of the
seven bishops. It is perhaps surprising that he retained the office of Almoner for as
long as he did.\textsuperscript{50} His replacement was Cardinal Howard, with John Leyburne, bishop
of Adrumetum \textit{in partibus} and vicar-apostolic of England, to perform the duties in his
absence.\textsuperscript{51} At the same time William Holder, the Sub-Dean of the anglican Chapel
Royal, was probably removed as Sub-Almoner to make way for Petre.\textsuperscript{52} Given that the
daily alms and the Royal Maundy were the main responsibility of the Lord High
Almoner, this appointment may mean that thenceforth the distribution of the daily alms
and of the 1688 Maundy was restricted to catholic recipients.\textsuperscript{53} The main significance
of Leyburne’s appointment was that it was the only undoubted occasion on which
James displaced an anglican clergyman from a position at court and installed a catholic
one instead. In all other cases, a new position, usually duplicating one in the anglican
chapel, had been specially created when James wanted to appoint a catholic priest. As
such it was one of the relatively few incontrovertible blemishes which marred what

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{footnotes}
\item[50] Ellis Correspondence, I, p. 4, newsletter, 5 Jan 1686. Turner’s role as a protege of James and
pp. 24-30. See also G.V. Bennett, ‘The Seven Bishops: a reconsideration’, pp. 280-3, in D. Baker
\item[51] B.L. Add MS 10118, fol. 161; Luttrell, \textit{Brief Historical Relation}, I, p. 423; LC 5/201, fol. 57;
Campana de Cavelli, \textit{Les Derniers Stuarts}, II, pp. 153-4, Terriresi to Tuscan Secretary of State, 21
Nov/1 Dec 1687. In December 1687 Howard, as Lord Almoner, was granted a dispensation under the
Great Seal to enable him to receive the assets of suicides. (\textit{HMC} 12th Report, appendix, part VI, p.
302). Since the beginning of 1687 Leyburne had been receiving an allowance of £1,000 p.a. from the
Secret Service. However, these payments would have been unconnected with this appointment as the
Almoner did not normally get a salary. (Akerman, \textit{Secret Services}, p. 162, 166, 172, 184, 188, 190-1,
Stuart Papers}, XV (1980).
\item[52] Luttrell, \textit{Brief Historical Relation}, I, p. 423. That Ralph Benet Weldon states that Petre became
‘Clerc du Cabinet ou premier Aumônier’ with Leyburne deputizing for Howard as ‘Sous Aumônier’
suggests confusion, on his part, as to which offices they had been appointed to. (B.L. Add MS 10118,
fols. 160-1). If it was the case that Petre had become sole Clerk of the Closet and the officiant at all the
healing ceremonies at this time, then this appointment was clearly part of a wider policy of promoting
him as the leading catholic ecclesiastical court official. Luttrell’s statement later that month that Holder
was to be removed as Sub-Dean cannot be confirmed by the other available evidence. (Luttrell, \textit{Brief
Historical Relation}, I, p. 425; E.F. Rimbault (ed.), \textit{Old Cheque Book of the Chapel Royal}, (Camden
Society, n.s. III, 1872), pp. 18-19, 217-18; \textit{DNB}, IX, pp. 1015-16). One of the satires circulated in
December 1688 accused Petre of keeping mistresses and of diverting funds from the Almonry to them.
(\textit{The Hue and Cry after Father Peters}, (1688), p. 1).
\item[53] For details of this aspect of the Almoner’s duties, see Chamberlayne, \textit{Angliae Notitia}, (1687), part
I, p. 195; H. Farquhar, ‘Royal Charities (second series) - The Maundy’, \textit{British Numismatic Journal},
(1921-2), XVI, pp. 195-228; ’II - Alms at the Gate, the Daily Alms and the Privy Alms’, \textit{British
Numismatic Journal}, (1923-4), XVII, pp. 133-64; ’V - The Maundy Pennies and Small Currencies’,
\textit{British Numismatic Journal}, (1929-30), XX, pp. 215-50. The twenty-four recipients of the daily alms
were already vetted for godliness by the Sub-Almoner who required them to recite the Creed and the
Lord’s Prayer.
\end{footnotes}
\end{footnotesize}
otherwise does seem to have been an honourable attempt by James to create his own arrangements for worship (suitable to his royal status) without directly tampering with the existing anglican chapel. Whether he envisaged this as the permanent solution to this particular problem cannot be known, but, if it was, it is suggestive of a wider interpretation.

The Chapel Royal, the most personal of the royal peculiar, was the area of anglican ecclesiastical administration over which he had the greatest immediate control and that, in this case, he chose to leave the anglican chapel largely undisturbed, while creating an equivalent catholic body alongside it, may indicate that his ultimate aim as king (and it is a big assumption that he did have an ultimate aim clearly thought out) was to extend this principle onto the largest possible scale and create an established catholic church in parallel with the Church of England. Within the framework of a policy of religious toleration, such a scheme of having duplicate state churches, whatever its impracticalities, would have had its attractions and an interpretation along these lines is the kindest that can be made of many of James's most questionable actions, most notably those concerning the universities. The idea seems less absurd given that anglicanism was already uneasily co-habiting with catholicism, which was, under him, in many ways, the alternative state religion, and that by 1707 there would be two established churches (admittedly territorially distinct and both protestant) within the one kingdom.

Similar room for manoeuvre to enable James to appoint catholics was not however available in the other court departments. In these, duplication of jobs was out of the question and positions could only be given to catholics if they were denied to anglicans. With the exception of the purge of the senior courtiers in 1687, James was to be reluctant to remove anglicans to appoint catholics in their places and at the beginning of the reign he applied to all ranks the policy of minimising the upheaval. The explanation he gave to Barillon was that those who held offices at court were much more likely to support him if they retained their offices than if they were removed to make way for catholic replacements. An any less cynical explanation for his failure to advance the catholic cause would have been unlikely to have satisfied Louis XIV and, in fairness to James, this policy was probably determined less by these calculating considerations than by a reluctance to produce too much disruption and by a royal sense of obligation towards his own and his brother's existing servants. Either way, it was
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54 Fox, History, appendix, p. xlvii, Barillon to Louis XIV, 23 Feb/5 Mar 1685.
not a policy particularly determined by the view that the Test Acts were major obstacles. James did not have to wait for the Godden v. Hales verdict to know that the dispensing power was an inseparable part of the royal prerogative and it was not the verdict which broke the Test Acts. Like the trial itself, the passing of the Great Seal of the dispensations in question in November 1685 and January 1686 was nothing more than an attempt to give the greatest possible legal authority to the king’s defiance of his critics in parliament. This was why all the 123 individuals dispensed were soldiers. The same predominance of army officers would again be evident in the only other attempt to dispense officials in bulk. Of the thirty-five individuals who were dispensed in July 1687, only eleven were being granted dispensations to enable them to hold civil offices. These eleven did included Waldegrave, Lord Thomas Howard and James Porter but this only underlines that dispensations were reserved for those whose appointments were most likely to be called into question. Both before November 1685 and after the verdict, catholics were able to evade the tests without resorting to the formality of a letter patent.

In any case, even under Charles II neither Act had succeeded in entirely sealing off from catholics all government positions. This was true even of the army, although only in the most exceptional of circumstances. Regarding court offices, catholics had managed to hold them between 1673 and 1685. The most flagrant breach had been the 1680 appointment of Eleanor Oglethorpe as Laundress of the Body and Sempstress to the king. She was not reappointed in 1685. The other known instance was someone else who had links with the duchess of Portsmouth. In 1678 the duchess had persuaded Charles II to appoint one of her servants, Peter de Rains, a French catholic, as the Yeoman of the Confectionary, which caused one pamphleteer to fear that the 'said confectioner doth daily prepare sweet-meats and other banquetings, in triumph over the late fresh act of parliament [the 1678 Test Act], for his Majesty at her lodgings; so that his Majesty may be in eminent danger from the aforesaid French papist, who has such opportunity to poison his sacred Majesty, by mixing poison in the sweet-
meats, whom God long preserve!'\textsuperscript{59} This appointment had not been made without opposition. Fox and Coventry had resorted to underhand methods to try to fool the king into appointing him only as a supernumerary, justifying themselves by pointing out that the tenure of the incumbent Yeoman, Peter de la Hay, prevented him from being removed. To minimise the upheaval within the Confectionary, it was therefore arranged for De Rains to act as De la Hay's deputy. Under this compromise De Rains was not officially sworn but, had he been, he made it clear that he would be prepared to forswear himself by taking the oaths. However, his catholicism did not bring him any advantages in 1685 when the position of Yeoman of the Confectionary was abolished and he was kept on only as a supernumerary.\textsuperscript{60}

Other servants of Charles II could have been crypto-catholics. This may have been the case with John Abel, the Scottish composer and musician whose exact religious history remains unclear. What is known is that he became a royal musician in 1679 and continued in office until the end of James's reign. His visit to Italy in 1680 may indicate something of his religious persuasion at that point and he was presumably a catholic by the time he married 'Lady' Frances Knollys in December 1685. Abel was all the more exceptional because it would appear that, under Charles II, the tests had been effective in ending the tradition of importing foreigners who were catholics to serve as royal musicians.\textsuperscript{61} The former leveller, independent, anabaptist, adulterer and

\textsuperscript{59} Articles of High-Treason, and other High-Crimes and Misdemeanours, against the Duchess of Portsmouth, [1680], reprinted in W. Oldys and T. Park (eds.), Harleian Miscellany, (1803-13), III, p. 509.

\textsuperscript{60} HMC Ormonde, n.s. IV, p. 139, Fox to Gascoigne, 27 April 1678; LS 13/38, fol. 12. Fox's account in his letter to Gascoigne, although written at the time, is difficult to reconcile with the official records. The original warrant from the king dated 14 April, had ordered that De Rains be appointed Yeoman of the Confectionary in place of De la Hay. (LS 13/253, p. 145). According to the Household cheque roll (LS 13/9, unfol.), De la Hay and James Frontine were not the joint Grooms in 1678 but rather the Yeoman and the Groom respectively. Frontine only became the Yeoman in December 1684, succeeding him eight days before De la Hay died. As De Rains is also listed as the joint Yeoman with De la Hay from 6 June 1678, these entries cannot have been meant to deceive. The confusion on Fox's part might be understandable if Frontine had hitherto been performing De la Hay's duties.

\textsuperscript{61} S. Sadie (ed.), The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians, (1980), I, pp. 15-16; H.G. Farmer, 'A king's musician for the lute and voice: John Abell (1652/3-1724)', Hinrichsen's Musical Year Book, VII (1952), pp. 445-56; J. Gillow (ed.), A Literary and Biographical History or Biographical Dictionary of English Catholics, (1885), I, pp. 2-3; HMC Rutland, II, p. 100, Bertie to countess of Rutland, 1 Jan 1686; pp. 100-1, Noel to countess of Rutland, [c. 6 Jan 1686]; A. Ashbee (ed.), List of Payments to the King's Musick, (Snodland, 1981), pp. 35, 36, 40, 41, 96, 100, 102, 103; idem (ed.), Records of English Court Music, (Snodland, 1986- ), I, p. 185, 186, 197, 202, 205, 208, 231, 232, II, 3, 4, 5, 6, 12, 16, 21, 22, 24, 122, 136, 137, 138, 139, 202, 209; Akerman, Secret Services, p. 92. See the lists printed by Ashbee for the absence of Italian and French musicians. Abel was probably also the Groom of the Privy Chamber to Mary Beatrice of that name. It would not have been unprecedented for one of the Musicians to have held another court office. Thomas Purcell (d. 1682), the man who may have been Henry Purcell's father, had been both a Gentleman of the Chapel Royal and Groom of the Robes. John Abel the musician travelled abroad during the 1690s while the Groom of the Privy Chamber is now known to have served at Saint-Germain. It is also known that in 1690 his wife was issued with a pass to travel to Flanders. (CSPD, (1689-90), p. 555, passes, 16 April
official printer to the Protectorate, Henry Hills, despite taking communion to prove otherwise, was accused of being a catholic when nominated as master of the Stationers’ Company in 1684. These suspicions were revealed to be well founded when James subsequently allowed him to profess his catholicism openly. James duly recognised the possibilities presented by having a catholic in the key position of royal printer, giving him permission in January 1686 to publish catholic books for his chapel and then in March (once the opposition from Evelyn acting as one of the deputies to the absent Clarendon as Lord Privy Seal had been overcome) for public consumption. Hills, who had a reputation for using underhand methods against competitors, would surpass his already considerable notoriety in September 1688 when he would threaten Oxford University with a *quo warranto* over its right to publish Bibles and anglican devotional works, reopening a long-standing dispute in an attempt to gain for himself and the government a monopoly over all such books. This was all the more provocative given that since December 1687 his son, Robert, had been one of the intruded demys at Magdalen College.  

Before 1685 James had also managed to retain the services of at least five catholic servants whom he now reappointed. Most of them were foreigners. This made Michael Bedingfield, who was named as one of the royal barbers, the same capacity in which he had served James before his accession, something of an exception. The Bedingfields were a notable catholic family and Michael was probably related to the late Thomas Bedingfield who had been James’s confessor until the Popish Plot. Of the foreigners, Frenchmen predominated, although Jean Delatre, the Gentleman Armorer, was originally from Flanders. James de Labadie, a Frenchman who would not receive denization until 1687, had combined his duties as one of his Pages of the Backstairs with his wine importation business by also acting as James’s wine purveyor and in May 1685 he was confirmed as a Page of the Backstairs. In 1688 his wife, who

1689). I am grateful to Dr. Edward Corp for suggesting to me this possibility and for convincing me that they probably were the same person.


64 CSPD, (1679-80), p. 159, pass, 31 May 1679.
was also a catholic, would become nurse to the prince of Wales. Also French and Catholic were Philip Lesserture, the Second Cook to the duchess of York who became Master Cook of the Queen's Privy Kitchen, and Nicholas le Point, the Queen's Yeoman of the Mouth, both presumably appointed because Mary Beatrice feared poisoning by Protestants.

Mention must also be made of the Depuy family, who were of French extraction. Lawrence Depuy had been the Yeoman of the Robes to the duke of York and in 1664 Robert Phelips had told Pepys that 'Monsieur du Puis, that is so great a man at the Duke of Yorkes, and this man's [Phelip's] great opponent, is a knave and by quality but a tailor'. It had probably been he who had been one of only three courtiers to have been in on the secret of the conversion of James's first wife. Their humble and foreign origins had not thereafter held them back and, through James's patronage, they had extended their foothold at court. James, Thomas and Lawrence Depuy were appointed joint-keepers of the Pall Mall in 1672 and Lawrence and James would be formally reappointed in 1687. It was, furthermore, probably Lawrence who was sent in December 1686 to Ostend to collect James and Henry Fitzjames, because it was he who in 1688 was paid one of the instalments of the Secret Service pension for their youngest sister, Arabella, then resident at Pontoise. He would subsequently become a servant at Saint-Germain. One of the family may also have been Mulgrave's butler. The most prominent member of the family, Elizabeth Depuy, who was Eleanor Oglethorpe's replacement as Sempstress and Laundress, having been brought by him from his own household, was English and professed to be an Anglican but she seems to have contemplated conversion. When her nephew, John Ashton, the former clerk of the commissioners to the duke of York, stood trial as a Jacobite conspirator in 1691, the non-juror, Dr. John Fitzwilliam would testify in his defence that Ashton had asked him several years previously to speak with his aunt, whom he suspected of waiving from Anglicanism. When Fitzwilliam approached her to express concern for her faith 'because of her husband who was a Papist, and the great resort of Popish priests to
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66 Pepys, Diary, V, p. 279.
67 Macpherson, Original Papers, I, p. 57.
68 Bodl. MS Eng. Hist. b. 79, fol. 36, 82; Ellis Correspondence, I, p. 208; Akerman, Secret Services, p. 112, 211; Jacobite Peerage, p. 217, 219; LS 13/105, fol. 7, Greencloth to Mulgrave, 22 July 1685. It is probable that there was more than one member of the family called Lawrence. An Eliaz and Elizabeth Depuy from Bordeaux (who were presumably related to them), together with their children, were endenized in 1687 and were included in the unsuccessful 1690 naturalisation bill. (W.A. Shaw (ed.), Letters of Denization and Acts of Naturalization, (Huguenot Society of London, 1911, 1923), XVIII, p. 184, 217).
their lodgings', she had replied that 'she was satisfied in every thing'. Fitzwilliam later observed her slipping out early from an anglican service at court. On being challenged, she had explained that she was going to prepare an urgent delivery of linen for the king. Shortly after this incident she had left for France, where one of her sons was still living, causing Ashton to fear that she had converted and it remains a possibility that she had done so before she died in 1687.69

Part of the evidence for the catholicism of Lessiture, Delatre, Le Point and the Depuys are entries in the registers of the parish of Saint-Germain from after 1689. Although it cannot be discounted that they may have subsequently converted, these registers also suggest that a number of other servants appointed in 1685 were catholics. In the cases of John Thomas, the Sewer of the Presence Chamber, Michael Noble, the Yeoman of the Confectionary, and Nicholas Miller, one of the Footmen of the Stables, they too had been servants to the duke of York while John Lewin, the new Riding Purveyor, seems already to have had connections with his wife's Stables.70 Others were being appointed to household offices for the first time. William Chanvoys, the Brusher of the Robes, was another Frenchman and almost certainly a catholic while Alexander Prieur, Page of the Bedchamber, Thomas Fox, Groom of the Bedchamber, Francis Miner, Child of the Queen's Privy Kitchen, and Thomas Bray, another of the Footmen, were probably so.71

This does not end James's catholic appointments on his accession. Other evidence suggests that Balthazar Reading, who became one of the Private Musicians, may have been one.72 Verrio, moreover, was appointed gardener of St.James's Park. Finally, later that year the soldiers granted dispensations included Patrick Whitley and William Darnell to allow them to continue as Yeomen of the Guard. Significantly, it had been these two who had earlier in the year been given the task of keeping Monmouth, Robert Ferguson and others of the rebels in custody. Yet that Whitley and Darnell were the only two Yeomen mentioned in this grant strongly suggests that of the forty new Yeomen (a sizable alteration in a corp of one hundred men) they were the only ones who were not conforming anglicans.73 There was also one notable convert in the person of Dryden. In his poetic tribute to the late king, Threnodia Augustalis, published

69 State Trials, XII, cols. 792-3.
70 In 1680 Lewin had been employed by Mary Beatrice to purchase horses in Flanders and Holland. (CSPD, (1679-80), p. 441, pass, 21 April 1680).
71 I am grateful to Dr. Edward Corp whose work on the registers of Saint-Germain has made possible these and other tentative identifications of catholics among James's servants. See also C.E. Lart (ed.), Jacobite Extracts from the Parish Registers of St.Germain-en-Laye, (1910, 1912), passim).
72 The reason for suspecting that Reading was a catholic is that he later became one of the Gregorian singers in the catholic chapel whereas, with the exception of Abel, all the other Private Musicians employed in the chapel were only instrumentalists. He is not known to have been employed by Charles II, although he was employed from the beginning of James's reign. (AO 1/405/126).
73 C 66/3270, m. 32r; C 66/3272, m. 20r; Akerman, Secret Services, p. 150.
in March 1685, there are hints that he might have been edging towards catholicism and it is possible that his wife had always had such leanings. By January 1686 he was reported to be openly attending Mass. What all these appointments reveal is that James was not much troubled by the provisions of the Test Acts during the first year of his reign. Even more revealing is that, Dryden’s conversion apart, none of them gave rise to any adverse public comment. There was, furthermore, to be no influx to join them once the judges in King’s Bench obediently found their appointments to be legal.

In fact the only three catholics are known to have been appointed as servants-in-ordinary during the whole of 1686. The first two were the Irishman, Dennis Carney, and the Italien, Joseph Ronchi, who that May became Gentlemen Ushers, Quarter Waiters of the Presence Chamber. Ronchi had three brothers who were already priests to the queen. Carney also had an exotic background. Not only had he been one of the suspects in the Popish Plot, he had in 1679 married Margaret, the dowager marchioness of Worcester, in bizarre circumstances. In late 1678 the marchioness had become deranged and had been placed in the custody of her cousin, the countess of Peterborough, but, in the words of the countess on appealing to the Privy Council in June 1681 to get this grant confirmed, ‘the said Marchionesse to avoid the said Grant was prevayled upon to marry with a mean inferior Person Donogh Karney’. On 15 January 1679 Carney, for reasons which are unclear, was arrested and, in return for security of £100, was ordered by the Privy Council to leave England. This he did when, a month later, the Privy Council confirmed the order which Carney claimed he had failed to comply with because of ill-health. It was perhaps not without significance that, three days before the Council did so, Sir William Waller had made a discovery of five catholic priests in the marchioness’s London house. Later that year there came the first suggestions that he had been involved in the Popish Plot. Although Oates had spoken of the assassins hired to kill the king at Windsor as being ‘Four Irish Ruffians’, he had always maintained that he did not know their names. In July 1679 Robert Jenison came forward with supposedly additional information to support Oates’s claims and on 2 August gave a sworn statement that the ‘ruffians’ were Carney, Richard Lavallyan, Thomas Brahall and James Wilson. The government responded by offering

75 PC 2/69, fol. 154, 23 June 1681.
76 *CSPD*, (1679-80), p. 33, 80-1, 82.
them pardons if they cooperated and then by putting up rewards for their arrests. Why Jenison singled out these four is anyone’s guess. All four, like him, had attended Gray’s Inn and still lived in that area of London while Wilson, who was not in fact Irish at all, and Jenison both originally came from the Durham area. Carney remained in Ireland for another two years before making contact with the authorities. When he make contact, he did so through another notorious rumour-monger, Edmund Everard, to whom he was related (both came from County Tipperary). He also approached Henry Savile and these moves coincided with the countess of Peterborough’s request that the custody order be confirmed. Within weeks, however, on 26 July 1681, the dowager marchioness died. The following November Carney surrendered himself to justice. He claimed that he had been recovering from illness but the decision presumably had as much to do with the fact that the case against him was collapsing and that Shaftesbury himself was due to stand trial within a matter of weeks. In June 1682, after Jenison failed to appear as a witness for the prosecution, he was acquitted.

Why it was that Carney should have been selected for this place in the Presence Chamber is open to speculation. Beaufort, as his stepson, was one possible candidate for his patron but his attitude to his stepmother’s marriage is not known. Another possibility would be Peterborough or his wife, although this would be difficult to square with the countess’s comments to the Privy Council in June 1681. On that occasion she had not only called him a ‘mean inferior Person’ but also described how he was ‘one of the Ruffians, who undertooke to assassinate his Ma[jes]ty:, and is fled from Justice & outlawed thereupon, whereby his Estate is forfeited to his Ma[jes]ty:, and the said Marchionesse still a Lunatick, left distressed & helplesse, without any to take care of her Person or Estate’. Yet these comments should not automatically be taken at face value. As Groom of the Stole to the duchess of York, it would have been
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78 J. Foster (ed.), The Register of Admissions to Gray’s Inn, 1521-1889, (1889), p. 308, 314, 315, 319, 323; R. Jenison, The Informations of Robert Jenison, (1680), p. 3. It is just possible that Carney was singled out because he was married to Worcester’s stepmother. Worcester (who later became Beaufort) had been born a catholic and was widely suspected to be involved in the Plot. Although Bedloe himself always denied that Worcester was involved, several of those accused by him were connected with Worcester for one of his major allegations was that the catholics were planning to seize Chepstow, of which he was a native and where Worcester was the governor of the castle. (HMC 12th Report, appendix, part IX, pp. 68-82, 114; CSPD, (1678), pp. 550-1, 544-5, 593; CSPD, (1680-81), pp. 461-2, 559; H. Durant, Henry, 1st Duke of Beaufort, (1973), p. 47).
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dangerous for the countess to be seen to be assisting the wife of one of the supposed plotters. Getting the grant of custody confirmed by the Privy Council reduced the likelihood that her actions would be misunderstood and that she, in doing so, distanced herself from Carney may have been a pretence. In the situation she could hardly have done otherwise and, in any case, she is unlikely to have believed that there had been a ‘popish plot’. There remains the possibility that Carney had other links with the court. He was probably related to Elizabeth, George and Philip Karney who had been servants in the York household and he was said to have been a friend of Edward Coleman.\(^\text{81}\)

Towards the end of the year James Porter joined the Bedchamber as a one of the Grooms. This was something of a family tradition for he was the youngest son of Endymion Porter, the late Groom of the Bedchamber (and artistic adviser) to Charles I, and his brother, George, had also been one between 1663 and his death in 1683.\(^\text{82}\) It also needs to be said that in late 1686 there was speculation that Dartmouth was about to be replaced as Master of the Horse by James Fitzjames. These rumours, which were obviously inspired by the precedents of Monmouth and Richmond, came to nothing.\(^\text{83}\) Despite this absence of an influx of catholic servants, the catholic hard-liners could have taken some consolation in the conversion of George Benyon, the Comptroller of the Great Wardrobe and a Gentleman of the Privy Chamber. The timing of his conversion, June 1686, makes it difficult not to conclude that he was taking advantage of the ruling in Hales’s favour. If so, he was to be an isolated example. It was, nevertheless, a move which almost brought him speedy advancement at court. When Sir William Boreman, the Second Clerk of the Greencloth, died on 3 July, only days after Benyon’s conversion had become public knowledge, he was tipped for promotion to the Board of Greencloth. Although ‘several pretended obstinately’ for him, the traditional sequence of promotion outweighed any reward the king may have wished to give to Benyon and John Sparrow, who as Chief Clerk of the Kitchen had the prior claim, was appointed instead. Benyon did not go unrewarded, however, for he was granted a bounty of £300 pa. from the Secret Service.\(^\text{84}\) Of rather less importance was the fact that in May 1686 Richard Boweke and Peter Shatlet, who had both at some point in the past been dismissed as Footmen from the Stables because they were


\(^{82}\) G. Huxley, Endymion Porter - The Life of a Courtier, 1587-1649, (1959), p. 227, 286, 309; DNB, XVI, p. 175; CTB, (1685-89), p. 1231, 1343, 1436; Akerman, Secret Services, p. 169. The time he spent in this job before moving on to greater things was too short for a warrant of appointment to be issued or for him to be sworn in.

\(^{83}\) Clarendon Correspondence, II, p. 52, Clarendon to Rochester, 29 Oct 1686; Ellis Correspondence, I, p. 215, ---- to Ellis, 1 Jan 1687.

\(^{84}\) Ellis Correspondence, I, p. 126, ---- to Ellis, 26 June 1686; p. 141, ---- to Ellis, 13 July 1686; Akerman, Secret Services, p. 176, 188, 197, 206.
catholics, were among the sixty-one former employees of the Stables granted allowances. 85

The year 1687 was the one which seemed to mark the most decisive shift towards a more catholic court. It began with the dismissal of Rochester as Lord Treasurer only two weeks after the new catholic chapel at Whitehall had been consecrated and the climax would come in April with the promulgation of James’s first declaration of indulgence. Contributing to the build-up to the declaration was that, with Maynard, Savile and Herbert being dismissed for refusing to endorse the policy it represented, James was able in February and March to appoint catholics to take their places. Sir Henry Waldegrave had in 1684 married Henrietta Fitzjames, the king’s illegitimate daughter by Arabella Churchill, and, in order to increase the number of catholic peers, James had in January 1686 made him Baron Waldegrave. 86 He now became Comptroller of the Household. Lord Thomas Howard, who became Master of the Robes, was another member of an old catholic family, being the son of the sixth duke of Norfolk. Between 1675 and 1678 he had lived with his uncle, Cardinal Howard, in Rome and in 1677 had acted for him as a courier with Coleman. This experience of the papal court would have been one reason why James would in 1688 send him as envoy extraordinary to Rome to try to persuade Innocent XI to accept Furstenberg as elector of Cologne. In 1688 he would also become Lord Lieutenant of the West Riding of Yorkshire. 87 Savile’s place as Vice-Chamberlain was filled by the promotion of James Porter from the Bedchamber. This was not all. When Somerset resigned as a Gentleman of the Bedchamber that July James was also able to appoint Dumbarton. Writing to his brother, the duke of Hamilton, Dumbarton noted that

Never place was more soght from the King, who has been plaised to give it me although I was in the camp when the Duke of Sumerset was turned out, w[hi]ch I am wery sorry for, for he is extraimly my frind and I did what I could to hinder him to dow what maid the King putt him out of all his employments. I have bein also extraimly obliged to the Queen who spok for me... 88

As lieutenant-general of the army in Scotland and colonel of the Royal Regiment of Foot in England, he was already the most prominent of the catholic army officers so it can be assumed that James placed some value on his counsel and this new appointment only made it easier for him to work with his nephew and fellow Gentleman of the

85 PC 2/71, fol. 143, 14 May 1686; LS 13/38, fol. 24.
88 HMC Hamilton, supplement, p. 111, Dumbarton to Hamilton, 9 July 1687.
Bedchamber, Arran, in representing the Douglas interest at court. The death of Sir Henry Progers also enabled Thomas Stradling to be appointed Sergeant Porter in January 1687. Stradling’s exact religious affiliations at this time are unclear but later that year the author of the satirical poem, *The Converts*, (alluding to him with the lines, ‘A thick, short colonel next does come/ With straddling legs and massy bum’), would include him in his list of the recently converted.\(^9\) These appointments were, however, surpassed in significance by another conversion. Sensationally, in March 1687 Peterborough made public the fact that he had become a catholic.\(^9\)

Here, at last, was the conversion of a senior anglican courtier of the sort James had been hoping for. That it was Peterborough made it all the more gratifying. As with all conversions under James, this was an obvious target for scepticism about motives. Later that year *The Converts* would suggest that

\[
\ldots \text{’twas not conscience, or devotion,} \\
\text{The hopes of riches or promotion} \\
\text{That made his lordship first to vary,} \\
\text{But ’twas to please his daughter Mary;} \\
\text{And she to make retaliation,} \\
\text{Is full as lewd in her vocation.}\(^9\)
\]

and, if nothing else, there was some justice in these accusations of sexual misbehaviour on the part of his daughter, the estranged wife of the ‘protestant duke’ of Norfolk and the mistress of Sir John Germain. Whether Ailesbury’s claim that Peterborough retained his pew in St.Margaret’s, Westminster, telling the churchwarden that he might need it again, is any more trustworthy is open to dispute.\(^9\) There could, in any case, have been a number of reasons why he might have insisted on retaining it which did not involve anticipating that he might find it opportune to reconvert at some point in the future and there was still a real possibility that one of James’s successors would again compel conformity to the Church of England. What can be shown is that when, just over a year before, he had published his *Succinct Genealogies*, he had made a number of comments consistent with a conventional protestant faith. Thus, he described how, when acting as proxy to James at his wedding at Modena in 1673, he was ‘conducted to a Chamber near the Chapel, where he reposed himself till so much of the Service was done as seem’d obnoxious to the Religion he did profess’ while of James’s own conversion all he had been prepared to say was that ‘upon what grounds this was


resolv’d, and with whose concurrence is yet a secret and a mystery’.
In Peterborough’s favour it can be pointed out that, as he already held one of the major court offices, he had little to gain from conversion and he lost his seat in the Lords as a direct result. It cannot even be said that he appeared to have something to lose by not converting for it should already have been evident that James was not going to dismiss any of his servants just because they remained as anglicans. It was also the case that his commitment to his new faith extended so far as having his brother, George, removed from Eton and sent to the Jesuit school in the Savoy. Above all, it is to his credit that he did not apostatize a second time after 1689. Yet it cannot be ignored that he converted when he did. The timing, suggestive though it is, need not be thought dishonourable. It was only understandable that there were some individuals for whom conversion only became thinkable after James began to relax the legal prohibitions against catholicism. The part James played in influencing his decision can only be guessed at but that it was probably considerable suggests not so much political manipulation as concern for the well-being of a friend.

To signify his intensified purpose, James had Kneller’s newly painted masterpiece, *The Chinese Convert*, hung in the Presence Chamber at Windsor. Few courtiers who saw this superb portrait of Michael Alphonsus Shen Fu-Tseng, a member of the Jesuit community attached to the Queen’s Chapel at St.James’s, would have missed the message implicit in its celebration of the Jesuit missions to the unbelievers of the Orient. It was to no avail. No courtiers, Peterborough (and possibly Stradling) apart, were to convert and below the highest ranks there were few catholics given places within the household. One of the small number who were was Dudley Bagenal, another Irishman, who became an Esquire of the Body in April. There is little doubt that it had been through Ormond, his father’s cousin, that he had obtained this place. Four decades earlier his father, Walter Bagenal, had participated in the Irish rebellion becoming a colonel in the Leinster army of confederate catholics and had been executed at Kilkenny by the Commonwealth forces in 1652. In 1661 Ormond, who had ‘good Hopes’ for Bagenal (then in his early twenties) and who considered himself ‘bound to value his concernment’, had intervened to get the family estates restored, informing the Lords Justices that Walter Bagenal, regretting the rebellion, had made contact with him and had then ‘applied himselfe with much industry Boldness & Sucrosse to dispose the confederates to returne to their Obedience upon all occasions

---

94 *CJ*, X, p. 207.
and suffered much for those endeavours’. By 1686 the indebtedness had been reversed
for by then it was Ormond who had borrowed money from Bagenal. In addition to this
place at court, Bagenal also became Lord Lieutenant of County Carlow.96 Two further
catholics obtained office at court that autumn. Francis Beaulieu, who was an army
surgeon and who had been one of those dispensed in November 1685, became one of
the royal surgeons while the count de Rovere, on a diplomatic mission from Duke
Vittorio Amedeo II of Savoy, became a Gentleman of the Privy Chamber, an unusual
honour to be given to a foreign ambassador.97 In December 1687, moreover, Thomas
Wyvil joined Carney and Ronchi among the Gentlemen Ushers, Quarter Waiters and he
too may have been a catholic.98

The remaining catholics rewarded with court office were not appointed until the
very end of the reign. One of them was Ralph Sheldon, promoted from Equerry to the
prince of Wales to be Equerry to the king in October 1688. These were not his first
links with the Stables for he had already been supplying it with hay and straw. A
lieutenant in the troop of horse raised by Lord Thomas Howard in 1685, it had also
been he who had been sent to interrogate Monmouth on his final journey to London,
eliciting from him, it was said, the disclosure that Sunderland was in league with the
rebels. His usefulness continued with him becoming one of the most active individuals
working on behalf of the government in the localities in the years which followed. He
served as a J.P. in Worcestershire (his native county), Northamptonshire and
Berkshire, was recommended as a deputy lieutenant in Worcestershire and Berkshire in
March 1688 and served on the commission of enquiry into recusants’ forfeitures in
Buckinghamshire later in 1688.99 Behind this fidelity to the king lay a history of
service to the royal family by the Sheldons. One of his sisters, Frances, had been a
Maid of Honour to Queen Catherine; another, Mary, had been her Dresser, and a

96 P.H. Bagenal, Vicissitudes of an Anglo-Irish Family, 1530-1800, (1925), pp. 84-122; H.
Montgomery-Massingberd (ed.), Burke’s Irish Family Records, (1976), sub. Bagenal; Bodl. MS Carte
49, Ormond to Lords Justices of Ireland, 2 Mar 1661; fol. 50, Ormond to Lane, 2 Mar 1661; Bodl. MS
Carte 40, fol. 553, state of Ormond’s revenue, [1686]. Bagenal was distantly related to the second earl
of Ailesbury. He would also have known James Porter under whom he had served in the Second Dutch
War. At about this time a James Bagenal was a Gentleman Usher Quarter-Waiter to Queen Catherine.
97 De Rovere would return the following year when he was sent to offer congratulations on the birth of
the prince of Wales. (London Gazette, nos. 2373, 2375, 2384, 2385, 2387, 2399, 2406).
98 Again this possibility is indicated by an entry in the registers at Saint-Germain. (C.E. Lart (ed.),
Jacobite Extracts, I, p. 30).
99 CTB, (1685-89), p. 1982, 2116; LS 13/114, fol. 20, minute, 30 April 1688; C. Dalton, English
Army Lists and Commission Registers, 1661-1714, (1892-1904), II, p. 16 Clarke, Life, II, p. 34;
Macpherson, Original Papers, I, p. 57, 144; G. Duckett (ed.), ‘Original letters of the duke of
10, Jebb to Rawlinson, 1 Mar 1743; G. Duckett (ed.), Penal Laws and Test Act, (1882-3), I, p. 236,
88’, Worcester Recusant, XXVI, (1975); M. Goldie, ‘James II and the dissenters’ revenge: the
allowing me to see this last article before it was published.
brother, Dominick, was a colonel of horse in the Irish army.  

His eldest brother, Lionel, a Benedictine, had, moreover, been chaplain to James's first wife and had exercised influence over his second. A leading player in the catholic intrigues of the 1670s within the York household, Lionel Sheldon had from 1675 onwards allied with Peter Talbot, the titular archbishop of Dublin and elder brother to Tyrconnel. Talbot, then in exile in Rome after clashing with Oliver Plunkett, archbishop of Armagh, over the primacy of the catholic church in Ireland, had, in 1676, supported by Lionel Sheldon, attempted to supplant Cardinal Norfolk as James’s link with the papal court and Sheldon may also have assisted Talbot in his tussle with Plunkett.  

After Lionel Sheldon’s death (in 1678 from the plague in Brussels where he had fled from the Popish Plot), the Sheldons had had further dealings with Plunkett in rather different circumstances because in 1681 it had probably been Ralph’s wife, Elizabeth, acting on behalf of the Benedictine, James Corker, who had received Plunkett’s body after his execution. Why someone with so close connections with court should have done so

---


102 Plunkett’s corpse disappeared after his execution and did not reappear until 1721 when the head was obtained from the English Benedictine abbey at Lamspring (where Corker had been abbot) by Plunkett’s niece for the newly-founded Dominican convent of St. Catherine of Sienna at Drogheda of which she was the superior. However, a certificate from 1682 exists authenticating the relics, signed by an Elizabeth Sheldon and a surgeon, John Ridley, who both claimed to have received the body after the execution. The certificate was witnessed by an Edward and a Ralph Sheldon. (P.F. Moran, Memoirs of the Most Rev. Oliver Plunket, (Dublin, 1861), pp. 367-9, 377-8 - cp. J. Hanly (ed.), The Letters of Saint Oliver Plunkett, 1625-1681, (Dublin, 1979), p. 568, 575, Plunkett to Plunket, 22 June 1681; p. 581, Plunkett to Corker, [30 June 1681]). Moreover, Elizabeth Sheldon was probably the recipient of the letter printed by Dodd from Corker describing Plunket’s preparations for death. (C. Dodd, The Church History of England, (Brussels, 1737-42), III, pp. 514-19 - cp. III, pp. 283-4). The traditional assumption that this Ralph Sheldon was the antiquarian of that name (1623-84), who was the Equerry’s cousin, and that Elizabeth was his mother and Edward his brother, has been thoroughly disproved. The Equerry, together with his wife and his father, the translator, Edward Sheldon (1599-1687), are now the most plausible candidates. (F.A. Onslow, ‘Saint Oliver Plunket and the Sheldons: a partial answer’, Worcestershire Recusant, XXVII (1976), pp. 27-30). The fact that the casket at Drogheda containing the head bears the armorial achievements of Elizabeth Sheldon, wife of John Cotton of Madingley Hall, Cambridge, proves nothing. (J.M., ‘Notes on some other relics and portraits of the Ven. Oliver Plunkett’, Downside Review, (1898), XVII, pp. 51-9). This must be the wrong coat-of-arms because that Elizabeth Sheldon had an impeccable anglican background. Daughter of Sir Joseph Sheldon, Lord Mayor of London in 1675, she was the niece of John Dolben, bishop of Rochester and future archbishop of York, and the great-niece of Archbishop Sheldon. Her husband (the son of Sir John Cotton, Bt. and Kt., Gentleman of the Privy Chamber to both Charles II and James II) may later have had Jacobite sympathies, voting in 1689 that the throne was not vacant. However, he was removed as a Cambridgeshire J.P. in 1687 and so is most unlikely to have been married to a catholic. (J.R. Woodhead (ed.), The Rulers of London, 1660-1689, (1965), p. 147; Henning, History of Parliament, II, p. 141; G.E.C[okayne], Complete Baronetage, (Exeter, 1900-4), II, p. 100).
is not known. The authorities possibly thought of her as someone who could be trusted to dispose of the corpse discreetly and that Corker had been a chaplain to the queen may also have had something to do with it.

Another appointed at this time was Salisbury, who had converted earlier in the reign and who became a Gentleman of the Bedchamber, in succession to Ormond, on 1 December 1688. Richard Biddulph was similarly appointed to fill a vacancy in the Bedchamber created by one of the desertions to William with him being given Richard Leveson’s place as a Groom. He had probably come to the king’s attention through his service in the army. In June 1685 he had been commissioned as a cornet in one of the independent troops of horse and had been among those dispensed in November 1685. In 1687 he had been commissioned into the First Troop of Horse Guards. There is one other possible catholic appointed in late 1688. John Darnell was one of the Messengers specially appointed in October 1688 in response to the threat from William. His surname suggests that he may have been related to William Darnell, the Yeoman of the Guard mentioned above.

This does not, however, exhaust the number of catholics employed by James in the royal household. The king’s Chemical Physician, Sir Thomas Williams, declared himself to be a catholic at some indeterminate point during the reign. In other cases the identification of an individual as a catholic can only be made with varying degrees of uncertainty. Thomas Mannock, who did not become the royal woollen-draper until 1686, may have been the fourth son of Sir Francis Mannock of Gifford Hall, Suffolk, in which case he came from a family with a history of catholicism. Ralph Crofts, the Yeoman of the Stirrup, was possibly related to the lieutenant-governor of Carlisle of that name and may have been the resident of Golborne in Lancashire convicted of recusancy in 1667. Finally, there was the case of Sir Thomas Rowe. The father of Anthony Rowe (who would become the Avenor of the Stables and a Clerk of the Greencloth under William III), he had been knighted in 1685 at the coronation and reappointed as a Gentleman Pensioner. By 1687 he was one of the Middlesex J.P.s who asked the king to be excused from taking the test and in 1688 he was added to the

---

105 It is possible that Williams had previously been a crypto-catholic. (J.K. Clark, Goodwin Wharton, (1984, reprinted 1989), pp. 333-4n.).
Oxfordshire commission of the peace.\textsuperscript{108} On balance, he was more probably a dissenter than a catholic but, if so, his appointment cannot be interpreted as being part of James's attempt to win protestant non-conformist support for his policies. There is, indeed, no evidence that that attempt influenced any household appointment except, perhaps, that of the whig collaborator, Edward Nosworthy, as a Gentleman of the Privy Chamber in 1688.

To summarise, the number of catholics appointed by James II may have been as few as twenty-four, with only a further five existing office-holders undoubtedly identified as having converted, giving a minimum of twenty-nine. There are grounds, with a greater or lesser degree of probability, for suspecting that another fourteen individuals were also catholics. The actual figure is unlikely to have been very much higher. During the course of the reign, 1,908 individuals from throughout all government departments and royal offices are known to have taken the tests with 1,101 doing so during 1685 and with up to 505 doing so after the \textit{Godden v. Hales} ruling. Given that just over one hundred household servants were sworn in after the ruling and that at least forty-three can be shown to have subscribed, the maximum figure for those who failed to take the tests is approximately fifty. There are many other reasons, however, to explain the failure of newly appointed officials to subscribe and it cannot be assumed that all those who failed to do so were catholics. In the circumstances, it is noteworthy that the procedure for subscribing to the tests was maintained and that so many officials went to the trouble to do what was legally no longer required of them.\textsuperscript{109} Forty is probably about right as the figure for catholic servants employed by James II.

This did not go unnoticed by Dryden. In \textit{The Hind and the Panther} he felt able to praise the catholics because they

\begin{quote}
Pay small attendance at the Lyon's court,
Nor rise with early crowds, nor flatter late
(For silently they beg who daily wait).
Preferment is bestow'd that comes unsought,
Attendance is a bribe, their fortune is untry'd
For not to ask, is not to be deny'd.\textsuperscript{110}
\end{quote}

The verdict must be that James had made only modest progress in eroding the anglican grip on the royal household. The same has been found to be true of the navy and even


\textsuperscript{109} KB 24/1. This large sack contains fifteen swearing rolls dating from between 1673 and 1697. One of them records the signatures of those subscribing to the test during James II's reign arranged by legal terms. Not all the names are legible. Officials took the tests in either Chancery or King's Bench.

in the army the influx of catholics was far less than overwhelming. In view of the current absence of comparable research on the catholic presence in other civil departments, any general conclusion cannot yet be final but the evidence from the household departments suggests that the headline catholic appointments, those which historians have always known about because they were noted in the most frequently consulted sources, were not the tip of a large iceberg but rather a significant segment of all catholics appointed. This is not to diminish the fear and resentment among the public in response to those appointments which were made.

Just how far the number of appointments should be viewed as success or failure is open to debate. James himself seems to have believed that the 'non-conformists' (among whom he probably included catholics) formed almost half the population and this would explain why his schemes drawn up for the prince of Wales took the form they did. It would therefore seem to be accidental that the number of catholics appointed was, in fact, not disproportionate. With the size of James's household peaking at about 700 servants, forty catholics appointed would work out at about six percent of the total. That represents about the same percentage as there was among the English gentry at this time. This notwithstanding, James had failed in his own terms and should not be given the credit for being reasonable in a way he had not intended.

The biggest obstacle in his way had been that there were already anglican officials in place. Compounding this was the sweeping reduction in the number of royal servants he had effected at his accession which contrasted sharply with the rapid expansion in the size of the army. Not least of the effects of the household reforms was that they had created a queue of anglican supernumeraries to whom James had pledged places as vacancies arose. In this way, James's financial policy placed an important restriction on his religious policy. Had he been determined to appoint more catholics, he could always have forced more anglicans to resign. Yet James was always unwilling to remove anglicans, doing so only with the greatest reluctance. He was reluctant to do so with good reason.

112 Macpherson, Original Papers, I, p. 409, James II to Louis XIV, 27 Jan 1692; Clarke, Life, II, p. 642. It has to be appreciated that the only evidence to suggest that this view was wildly inaccurate was the 'Compton census' and James may have discounted such findings which were compiled by anglican clergymen.
CHAPTER FIVE: THE REACTION OF THE ANGLICAN SERVANTS

I

With James’s household remaining throughout his reign an institution dominated by anglicans, it is important to consider how those anglicans viewed his religious policies. Did his anglican servants aid or resist his attempts to alter the position of his catholic subjects and how did they react to such catholic appointments as were made alongside them?

To begin with, the royal servants appeared to have little to fear. The main concern for those with places at court immediately following James’s accession would have been the scale of the redundancies imposed by the sweeping financial reforms. These meant that those changes which James did make among the middle and lower ranking members of his household were mostly made for non-political reasons. For those involved, they would have been no less inconvenient. Beyond this restructuring, James seemed, at all levels, content to confirm the household’s existing political complexion. There were 1,051 individuals who were given court offices by him during the four years of his reign and at least 646 of them had been members of Charles II’s household at the beginning of 1685. A further fifty-five servants were brought by James from his own household out of the eighty-one servants he had been employing when his brother died.1 This influx of his existing servants was especially marked in the Bedchamber, partly because these were the servants whom he knew he could trust and partly because it had been the one department of his household which had been manned on a scale comparable to that of his brother. All twelve Grooms who had served the late king made way for James’s eight while he retained only two of his brother’s six Pages, William Chiffinch and John Caplin, added three of his own, Thomas Heywood, George Man and James de Labadie, and employed one newcomer, Alexander Prieur.2 Elsewhere the appointment of James’s servants made less impact, allowing Charles II’s servants to be reappointed. In the Privy and Presence Chambers (excluding, for the moment, the Gentlemen of the former), twenty-three of those appointed to the thirty-four positions had already held their place, with six of James’s existing servants being given the remaining places in the Presence Chamber. Two of his Gentlemen Waiters, Sir Richard Browne and John Loving, became Carvers and a third, John Thomas, a

---

1 The establishment of the duke of York’s household compiled in early 1685 but never implemented gives a list of his servants (B.L. Althorp papers D2). The figures for his servants given above do not include his watermen who were not named in this document.
2 These Bedchamber servants had a fair idea that they could expect to be dismissed. (HMC 5th Report, appendix, p. 186, Grenville to Gower, 10 Feb 1685).
Sewer. Sir Charles and Edward Carteret, who had both been his Gentlemen Waiters, became a Gentleman Usher Daily Waiter and a Cupbearer respectively. John Fenn moved from being his Groom of the Presence Chamber to being his Page of the Presence. In other Chamber departments Edward Carleton remained as a Harbinger while Joseph Thomlinson and James Rondile accompanied Herbert to the Robes. Belowstairs most of those appointed were being reappointed. This was the case in seventy-three of the 102 places with a further nine, including Claude Fourmont, the Master Cook, and John Sparrow, the Clerk of the Kitchens, were brought in from James’s kitchens. Other appointments from the household at St.James’s included five in the Stables where Thomas Morley became Avenor, William Banks, the Surveyor and Ranald Grahme (younger brother to Preston and James Grahme), Thomas Windsor and James Levingstone, Pages of Honour. In time both Sparrow and Morley would be promoted to the Board of Greencloth and their appointments in 1685 to these offices marked them out for such future favours. It would, therefore, be fair to say that in 1685 James in general gave preference to his own servants but beyond that he tended to favour those who had already served Charles II.

He had sound political reasons for doing so because, due to past events, he did not have look any further for support. Members of the royal household prided themselves on their loyalty. The experience of the 1640s and 1650s had given many royalists a sense of having shared their misfortunes and for some within the household, their professions of loyalty had had to be more than just boasts. When their master died in 1685 there were at least fourteen of those who had been his servants in exile still in office while belowstairs there remained eight who had been servants to Charles I.3 The belief that his household had formed the nucleus of Charles I’s support set the tone for royal service under his sons. Those who had suffered provided models of devotion for those who came after them and it remained a possibility that the monarchy, if faced with a recurrence of its former difficulties, would again demand such commitment from its servants. There was no question of royal servants being coerced into loyalty. For them, loyalty was a point of honour and to be disloyal was to surrender one’s main

---

3 The fourteen who had been in exile were Ormond, Bath, Arlington, Brouncker, Sir Stephen Fox, Sir Charles Cotterell (Master of the Ceremonies), Sir Charles Scarburgh (Physician), Richard Pyle (Surgeon), Tobias Rustat (Yeoman of the Robes), Theodore Randu (Page of the Bedchamber), and Henry Seymour, Robert Philips, Edward Progers and Thomas Wyndham (Grooms of the Bedchamber). Those of them who were members of the Bedchamber were dismissed by James, as was Brouncker, although Randu was continued as Housekeeper at Windsor. Pyle took the opportunity provided by James’s accession to retire. John Beaumont, who had also been in exile, was appointed as an Equerry under James. The eight servants belowstairs were Sir William Boreman (Clerk of the Greencloth), Lawrence Ball (Sergeant of the Bakehouse), Robert Hope (Clerk of the Spicery), Luke Smith (Yeoman of the Larder), Jasper Lisney (Groom of the Larder), Robert Fenn (Clerk of the Accatry), James Halsey (Sergeant of the Accatry) and Arthur Bray (Wine-Cooper). As a result of the reforms in 1685, only Boreman retained his job with Ball, Hope, Smith, Lisney and Halsey becoming supernumeraries. For a list of those Household servants of Charles I reappointed in 1660, see Bodl. MS Carte 59, fol. 123-4.
qualification for royal service. As with any subject, loyalty need not preclude honest concern about royal decisions which seemed ill-advised but the strict hierarchy of the court made sure that the king’s servants were the least likely not to know their proper places.

Assumptions about loyalty were most evident in the expectation that those sitting in the Commons would support the king on those occasions when he made it known that he desired a particular outcome. Hence concerns about the number of placemen. Yet even those who were thus concerned never questioned the assumption that placemen should obey the king. A king whose own servants did not obey him was one who was not worthy of respect. The placemen, in general, did do what was expected of them. Cases in point are most of the twenty-nine who served in James’s household when king and who had been MPs in the parliaments of Charles II. Almost all twenty-three who had sat in the ‘Cavalier’ parliament had more or less supported the government throughout and it had been those who had not yet received office who had done otherwise. The same was true of the fourteen who had been MPs in 1679 or 1681.

Similar assumptions appear also to have extended to the participation by royal servants in parliamentary elections. This had been reflected in the attempts by the Commons in 1679 to reduce their influence in certain key constituencies. The electoral influence of the servants was probably greatest at New Windsor. There in February

---

4 In his recent essay on the court party, John Ferris may wish to imply otherwise but the evidence he presents is not incompatible with this statement. (J. Ferris, ‘Official Members in the Commons, 1660-1690’, in J.S. Morrill, P. Slack and D.R. Woolf (eds.), Public and Private Conscience in Seventeenth-Century England, (Oxford, 1993), pp. 279-303). Ferris’s convincing argument that greater use was being made of pensions by the court managers as a means of influencing the Commons does not mean that there was any less expectation that royal servants would support the court. Even if the pensioners were more reliable, they would have been thought of as a supplement to the small numbers of available placemen. It must be remembered that these small numbers could have a disproportionate effect because for the courtiers to be seen to act together was an indication that the king thought the matter important.

5 See in particular the entries in the Henning volumes of the History of Parliament on Sir Adam Browne, Sir Winston Churchill, Sir Francis Clerke, Sir Charles Cotterell, Marmaduke Darcy, Sir John Elwes, Sir Stephen Fox, Bernard Grenville, Sir William Hawarde, George Legge (Dartmouth), Robert Phelps, Thomas Prise, Sir Samuel Sandys, Henry Savile, Sir Gilbert Talbot, Sir William Tyringham and Sir Thomas Williams. Not all of these men were royal servants when elected but, if not, they soon became so. William Paston (Yarmouth) regularly supported the court but did not become a royal servant until 1687. Lord Robert Bruce (Ailesbury) and Henry Bennet (Arlington) had been elevated to the Lords in 1664 and 1665. Sir Francis Lawley had supported the downfall of Clarendon but thereafter had supported the court while Thomas Neale had sided with the opposition prior to his appointment as Groom Porter in 1678. As has been explained in a previous chapter, Sir Richard Grahme (Preston) had opposed the court during the later 1670s.

6 Henry Bulkeley, Sir Francis Clerke, Bernard Grenville, Sir Richard Mason and Thomas Neale, as servants to Charles II, and George Legge and John Churchill, as servants to the duke of York, had been anti-exclusionists. Sir Samuel Sandys was absent from the vote on 21 May 1679 and Sir Stephen Fox may also have been. Robert Brady, Lord Thomas Bruce (Ailesbury), Sir Richard Grahme, Edward Nosworthy and William Paston had not yet been royal servants but Brady, Bruce and Paston had opposed exclusion whereas Grahme and Nosworthy had supported it.
1679 the corporation had returned the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir John Ernle, together with John Powney, one of the Corporals of the Yeomen of the Guard, who was a local man and who had business interests connected with the Household. Their opponents, Richard Winwood and Samuel Starkey, complained and unseated them by getting the franchise widened to include all inhabitants, only to find themselves defeated in August of that year when the two court candidates, Powney again and John Carey, the Master of the Buckhounds, got themselves elected on the basis of the extended franchise. This result, however, had only been possible due to the large numbers of royal servants voting on their behalf in a notably violent contest. One account reported that ‘they cuff and cudgel one another every day, and there is so much hollowing that they disturb the King’s fishing.’ Winwood and Starkey again complained and again unseated their opponents, this time by getting the Commons to restrict the franchise to those paying scot and lot. Royal servants, exempted from all forms of local taxation, did not qualify. This had enabled Winwood and Starkey to achieve the remarkable feat in 1681 of being elected unopposed as pro-exclusion candidates at Windsor. At Westminster the electorate of 25,000 meant that the royal servants could not be as decisive but they had still concerned the whigs. In the elections of February 1679 Sir Stephen Fox had been returned after the royal brewer, Michael Arnold, stepped aside, with Sir William Pulteney (not yet an exclusionist) also having been elected. Sir William Waller and Sir Philip Matthews were the unsuccessful candidates. The following September, with Fox declining to stand and Pulteney no longer reliable, the court’s candidates were Francis Wythens, the deputy to Ormond as high steward of Westminster, and Sir John Cutler. After Pulteney and Wythens defeated Waller, Matthews and Cutler, it was believed that the arrival of royal servants from Windsor had been vital in securing Wythen’s victory. The Commons had responded by expelling him, replacing him with Waller and declaring that ‘the King’s menial Servants, not having proper Houses of their own within the City of Westminster, have not Right to give Voices in the Election of Citizens to serve in Parliament in the said City’.

Closer inspection of some of the appointments and dismissals in 1685 confirms that, because of this tradition of loyalty, James was generally satisfied with those of his servants he had inherited from his brother. Had it been the case that James was attempting some sort of political purge it would have been most evident among the Gentlemen of the Privy Chamber, who formed the largest concentration of courtiers

---

who were, if not directly involved in the high politics of the court, important enough to be worth cultivating or punishing for the purposes of political advantage. Unfortunately, although it is clear that the number of Gentlemen was cut from about forty-eight to fewer than thirty-eight as part of the administrative reforms at the beginning of the reign, it is impossible to be sure exactly who was a Gentleman at the end of the previous reign. This means that any analysis of the changes among them can be no more than inconclusive guess-work. It is possible, nevertheless, to say that only six of the thirty-eight Gentlemen appointed in 1685 had not been a Gentleman before and there are few among those who might have been dismissed in 1685 who are known to have given cause for offence. Only Sir John Morton and John Hall had probably supported exclusion. Morton, who during the 1670s had supported attacks in the Commons on ministers such as Buckingham, Arlington and Lauderdale and who had backed the tests, had in 1680 been one of the committee to draft the address against Halifax while Hall may have been a member of the Green Ribbon Club. That Sir John St.Barbe had possibly supported exclusion was, however, not held against him and he was reappointed. Similarly, as has already been mentioned, Edward Nosworthy, who had belonged to the Green Ribbon Club and who became a whig

9 There were probably several hundred men who were Gentlemen of the Privy Chamber in 1685 but, apart from the forty-eight on the quarterly waiting rota, the position would have been an honorary one. The list printed by Nicholas Carlisle in An Inquiry into the Place and Quality of the Gentlemen of His Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Chamber, (1829), pp. 164-95, does not distinguish between the two types nor does it record the appointment of a Gentleman to be one of the forty-eight when that occurred some time after his original appointment. Chamberlayne, his 1684 edition of Angliae Notitia gives the names of thirty-one of the forty-eight but not those of the other seventeen. (part 1, p. 164). These can be supplemented with names from the Chamber rough establishment which probably shows most of those appointed to the forty-eight ('in ordinary with fee') between 1674 and 1685. (LC 3/28, fols. 8-9, 10-11). Twenty-five of these thirty names do not appear on Chamberlayne’s list. There is, however, no certainty that this information is complete and, to confuse matters, the two lists in the Chamber cheque roll (LC 3/24, unfoliated), which appear to show those in waiting at unspecified dates, have a further forty-one names. Care must therefore be taken when using the entries compiled by the History of Parliament Trust for their 1660-1690 volumes as these relied only on the information given by Chamberlayne and Carlisle. Of the total of forty-five MPs who are listed as having been, or possibly having been, a Gentleman at the start of 1685, at least thirty are unlikely to have then been among the forty-eight. These thirty are Sir Jacob Astley, John Burrard, Sir Thomas Byde, George Evelyn, Sir John Fenwick, Sir Gilbert Gerrard, Sir William Glascock, Richard Graham, Coleraine [Henry Hare], Sir Roger Hill, Sir John Holman, Thomas King, William Lenthall, Sir Edward Littleton, Sir James Long, Edward Montagu II, Sir John Moore, Sir Richard Newdigate, Richard Newport, Sir John Pettus, John Pollexfen, Hender Robartes, Simon Smith, Strangford [Philip Smythe], Sir Thomas Stringer, John Strode II, Sir John Talbot, John Thynne, Sir Joseph Tredenham and Humphrey Weld. In the case of Sir Gilbert Gerrard a note in the second cheque roll list reveals that he was replaced by Richard Lloyd in 1677. Despite these drawbacks, this chapter, as the footnotes testify, is indebted to the work of the History of Parliament Trust for having already undertaken the biographical groundwork on the most politically active members of the Restoration court.

10 Of the thirty-two who had been Gentlemen before, only Sir Jacob Astley and Sir Augustine Palgrave can with any certainty be said not to have been one of the forty-eight.

collaborator after incurring heavy legal expenses in a property dispute with Maynard, would manage to be named as a Gentleman in 1688 despite his past.\textsuperscript{12} Against these cases must be set the fact that a number of those who may have been dismissed had opposed exclusion.\textsuperscript{13}

Outside the Privy Chamber there is little more evidence of a political purge. The most likely instance was the removal of Arthur Bray as the royal wine-cooper, a position he had held since the reign of Charles I. A Common Councilman in the City until 1683, it is known that in 1682 he supported the whigs.\textsuperscript{14} It is also possible that some of the changes in the Stables were intended as a final clearout of those who had been associated with Buckingham or Monmouth. Anthony Rowe, Sir Thomas’s son, who had been closely connected with Monmouth, serving as his adjutant between 1678 and 1683, ceased to be the Yeoman Purveyor and was soon after arrested on suspicion of supporting his former master’s invasion. Moreover the changes among the Equerries may also have been made with a view to strengthening control over the Stables. Only two Equerries of the Hunting Stables were retained and both these two, Roger Pope and Charles Adderley, had been Commissioners of the Stables in the years before. Another of the Commissioners, Theophilus Oglethorpe, on handing over control of the Stables to Dartmouth, became an Equerry as well. One of the other three new Equerries, Richard Carter, was the deputy-governor of Southsea Castle and so would already have been an acquaintance of Dartmouth, who was the former governor of Portsmouth.\textsuperscript{15} Only one of the Equerries of the Crown Stables, Gilbert Eagles, was reappointed because the other three places were abolished. In the Stables, as elsewhere, the main impression is that most dismissals were made for administrative rather than political reasons, although these purposes were not necessarily incompatible.

As it happens, the Equerry dismissed who had the closest links with Buckingham soon after wrote down his feelings. Bryan Fairfax, the cousin of the third Lord Fairfax whose memoirs he would edit, had connections with the duke which dated back to 1657 and Buckingham’s marriage into the Fairfax family. Among the duties which he had performed on behalf of Lord Fairfax during the Interregnum (which had also included negotiating with Monck in 1659), Bryan Fairfax had acted as his secret messenger with the duke. He later entered Buckingham’s service and, through him,

\textsuperscript{12} Henning, \textit{History of Parliament}, III, pp. 165-6, 381.
\textsuperscript{13} Ancram, Fitzhardinge and Sir Richard Franklin may fall into this category. Coleraine, Fenwick, Long, Moore, Talbot and Tredenham, who were among those who were probably not still Gentlemen by 1685, had also opposed exclusion.
\textsuperscript{15} Dalton, \textit{Army Lists}, I, p. 293, II, 37, 41, 135.
became an Equerry in 1670. His brief autobiographical work composed for his children, which is of particular importance because it was written before James's downfall, reveals that the desire that he should not continue in his place was mutual; a possibility which must be borne in mind when considering others whose careers at court terminated on James's accession.

I left Whit-hall when the Mass came into it, I saw a new King who would not know mee nor did I desire to wayte on him, to the House of Rimmon, not but that I know many good Protestants who continue in his service, but I had been particularly noted in the King my Master's tyme to be a free speaker in all company against idolatrous Popery, though in other things I ever behaved myself with all due respect and observance to the D[uke] as the King's Brother, and never had to do with those who were given to change. However much he may have wanted out anyway, it was the lack of gratitude for the fact that he had not supported exclusion which he resented most.

If so much as a false witness could have been found to say any thing ag[ains]t mee, that I had been in any cabal, or had said anything ag[ains]t the King or his Governm[en], I doubt not but he would have been produced against me, but being none I may justly say that I have been unjustly delt with. But I am thought unfit to serve a Popish King, and I think the same, reserving to myself the allegiance due to a lawful successor, as I think my master's brother is.

It had presumably been his unwillingness to support exclusion which had meant that Fairfax had not been removed before this and it can be conjectured that it was the fact that any exclusionists had already been removed which made an extensive political purge unnecessary.

II

In accepting office under him in 1685, James's servants affirmed that they did not see the problems created by his religious faith as being insuperable or, at any rate, that they considered the dangers of holding office under him to be outweighed by the benefits. What these dangers were was uncertain and it was this uncertainty which in the early stages of the reign constituted the prevailing mood, for it was not necessary to accept all the warnings of the whigs to be apprehensive. This was the attitude which

---

17 C.R. Markham, Life of Robert Fairfax, (1885), 'Narrative of Brian Fairfax', p. 146. The phrase 'the House of Rimmon' is a reference to the words of Naaman in II Kings 5, v. 18 - 'In this thing the Lord pardon thy servant, that when my master goeth into the house of Rimmon to worship there, and leaneth on my hand, and I bow myself in the house of Rimmon: when I bow down myself in the house of Rimmon, the Lord pardon thy servant in this thing.'
18 ibid, p. 146.
would be expressed by a preacher at Dorchester who, when Bishop Trelawney made his visitation of Dorset in 1686, warned that 'though we were not in any certaine feares of popery yet we were not wholly free from some apprehensions of it'. When he threatened to suspend the preacher, it was Sir Winston Churchill, the Clerk Comptroller of the Greencloth, who intervened to dissuade Trelawney. In doing so, Churchill (who was the author of the ultra-royalist history of the monarchy, Divi Britannici) would not, for one moment, have thought that he was being disloyal. It was one thing to be apprehensive, another entirely to be in open opposition. Most of his subjects, and his servants more than most, hoped that James would prove to be a worthy monarch. His choice of religion apart, there was little in 1685 which made that hope improbable and, so long as he continued to respect the sensitivities of the Church of England, the prospects for the new reign did not seem inauspicious. This goodwill was an asset whose value James showed some appreciation of and it was to be useful in balancing the suspicions created by his first appointments of catholic officers. Furthermore, one must not overestimate the rate at which the value of that goodwill depreciated. Those who, by and large, trusted him at the very beginning of his reign would have, in all probability, been able at the close of 1685 and beyond to persuade themselves that he had done nothing which necessarily gave cause for concern. The continuing possibility of such wishful delusion meant that those who had a stake in James's success would constantly be tempted to misread his intentions in this way and few, apart from the catholics, had greater stakes in his success than his anglican

19 SP 31/3, fol. 70, Trelawney to [Sunderland], 21 May 1686 - cp. W.D. Cooper (ed.), 'Trelawney Papers', pp. 14-15 in Camden Miscellany II, (Camden Society, LV, 1853). For the significance of this visitation, see D. Underdown, Fire from Heaven: Life in an English town in the Seventeenth Century, (1992), p. 261. Sir Winston Churchill's seat at Mintene Magna was about ten miles to the north of Dorchester and he was distantly related to the Churchills of Colliton, one of the leading families of the town. In 1675 John Churchill, the M.P. for Dorchester and the then head of the Colliton branch, had been linked by one parliamentary list to Sir Winston's cousin, Sir John Churchill, the Attorney-General. (W. Coxe, Memoirs of John Duke of Marlborough, (1818), I, p. xxxix; Browning, Danby, III, p. 83).

20 When it had been published in 1675, Divi Britannici had been controversial, with his comments concerning benevolences in the section about the prerogative to raise taxation earning him the greatest notoriety. He had originally written 'we find by the Stat. of the twentieth of Hen. the Sixth, The King demanded it in right of his Soveraignty, and by Law, and accordingly appointed Commissioners for gathering it, who extorted it with Penalties; so in the seventeenth of the said King, the same was demanded upon pain of Imprisonment and Consiscation [sic] of Goods. 'Tis true that Statute of H.6 seems to be branded by a Repeal of Queen Mary: But that Law that Repeal'd it being afterwards it self Repealed, the King seems now in Remitter to his antient Right, a Right so antient, that it suffers more perhaps by its Antiquity, than any unreasonableness in the thing.' This leaf, sig. [g2], was cancelled and the passage amended to read 'for the many Inconveniencies it brought upon the Subject, has been long since annulled, by several Acts of Parliament, new supplies (esteemed less grievous) being granted in the room thereof, to the no less satisfaction of the King, than of his good People, whilst their Benevolence appears to be truly such, by being given bona magis exemplo quam concessu Jure'. (see W. Coxe, Memoirs of John Duke of Marlborough, (1818-19), I, p. xliii n.; A Seasonable Argument, ('Amsterdam', 1677), pp. 7-8). Of the three copies in Cambridge University Library, one (Sel.2.36) contains the cancellans. For a favourable view of Churchill's abilities as an historian, see Biographia Britannica, (1747-66), II, p. 1331n. See also D.C. Douglas, English Scholars, (1939), p. 168.
courtiers. If in doubt, moreover, compliantly conforming, or, to put it another way, passively obeying, was the least troublesome course.

With what misgivings they had resting specifically on the extent to which James would attempt to upset the Restoration religious settlement, royal servants had to be careful that their anxieties were not misinterpreted by him as being more widely critical than was actually the case. Warnings could not be sounded indiscriminately by them. This caution is evident in the proceedings of the 1685 parliament. Contrary to what one might have anticipated, the number of royal servants returned in 1685 was not exceptionally large, being only thirty-two.\(^{21}\) This was just two more than in 1681 and fewer than in either of the 1679 parliaments. Only in regard to the number of servants in the other royal households elected, which was eleven, can the returns of royal servants be thought especially numerous.\(^{22}\) If the contest at Lichfield, where Ashmole, Richard Leveson, the Groom of the Bedchamber, Thomas Orme (one of the Corporals of the Yeoman of the Guard) and Sir Francis Lawley, the Gentleman of the Privy Chamber, all stood as court candidates, is anything to go by, the court campaign had lacked coordination.\(^{23}\) That the court presence in the 1685 parliament was not on the same scale as in the Cavalier Parliament makes it all the more significant that James should have singled out his servants for particular censure after the Grand Committee on Religion called for the laws against the dissenters to be enforced.\(^{24}\) Possibly a manoeuvre by Rochester in his struggle against Sunderland, this was certainly something more subtle than a full-scale parliamentary rebellion.\(^{25}\) James's promises at his accession had included the undertaking 'to preserve this Government both in

---

\(^{21}\) Thomas, Lord Bruce was also elected but he was not appointed to the Bedchamber until after his father's death had sent him to the Lords as earl of Ailesbury.

\(^{22}\) Calculating the number of royal servants who had sat in Charles II's parliaments is problematic. The History of Parliament states that 15% of MPs in the Cavalier parliament had been 'government officials' and that between 20% and 25% had held 'offices at court'. Neither the terms 'government officials' nor 'offices at court' are defined, making it unclear whether the latter refers only to household positions. (Henning, History of Parliament, I, p. 10, 26). Calculating from the individual entries produces smaller figures, with forty-six royal servants sitting in 1661 and with this rising to sixty-one when the Cavalier parliament was dissolved. In the first elections of 1679 only thirty-four servants were returned and in the second elections of that year the figure was forty. It dropped again, to thirty-one, in 1681. These figures, however, include all those listed as Gentlemen of the Privy Chamber and so must be overestimates. This error will increase as the reign progresses. For the other royal households, there were two in 1661, ten at the dissolution in 1679, three and two in 1679, and two in 1681.

\(^{23}\) C.H. Josten (ed.), Elias Ashmole, (Oxford, 1968), IV, pp. 1759-93; SP 31/1, no. 80, Lawley to Sunderland, 4 April 1685; SP 44/56, p. 193, Sunderland to Lawley, 6 April 1685. See also R.H. George, 'Parliamentary elections and electioneering in 1685', TRHS, fourth series, XIX (1936), pp. 167-95. The evidence assembled by George does not, as he supposed, reveal an extensive attempt by the government to interfere with the elections. What it does reveal is that, with little prompting, the Tory magnates were active at a local level in support of their favoured candidates.

\(^{24}\) Fox, History, appendix, p. xcvi, Barillon to Louis XIV, 28 May/7 June 1685; Grey, Debates, VIII, p. 347; Reresby, Memoirs, pp. 368-9.

Church & State as it is now by Law Established\textsuperscript{26} and the resolution of 27 May was as much the seeking of clarification as to whether that promise had had any unstated qualifications as anything else. James's enraged reaction rather suggested that it did but, preferring not to offend him, the Commons agreed instead to confine their address to the thanking of him for his original promise. His servants took his hint. When the tories next tried to probe his assurances, by amending the general naturalisation bill so that all French congregations would have to use the anglican liturgy, it was Henry Savile and the 'mere courtiers' who opposed the amendment to prevent James being slighted.\textsuperscript{27}

This same hesitancy can be discerned in the arguments, once more connected with the issue of the tests, which arose the following November. When the Commons voted by 183 to 182 on 13 November to debate the king's speech rather than proceed with the supply, James complained that the division had been lost 'by his own officers'.\textsuperscript{28} That among those who voted with the majority was Sir Stephen Fox and that Ambrose Browne, a Gentleman of the Privy Chamber, was one of those dismissed from the army for their role in this government defeat and in the vote the following day on catholic affairs, means it cannot be discounted that some others of the royal servants had once again acted to display their support for the Test Acts. It was, it should be observed, 'his servants and officers of his army' whom James, almost two weeks later, would forgive for their actions.\textsuperscript{29} Yet no one appears to have lost a place in the household as a result. In Fox's case, that his son, Charles, who had also voted against the court, was replaced as Paymaster of the Forces by Ranelagh was a sufficient rebuke for this particular misdemeanour while Browne's successor as captain to the Earl of Plymouth's Regiment of Foot was another court MP, Sir Thomas Bludworth, the Standard-Bearer of the Gentlemen Pensioners, who was also Jeffreys' brother-in-law. Only Bishop Compton, removed as Dean of the Chapel Royal, suffered for his involvement in the parallel rebellion in the Lords. In so far as can be judged from the known names, the rebel 'officers' seem mainly to have been army officers: the government employees with the most immediate vested interest in the issue.\textsuperscript{30} In any case, although the number of rebels is unknown, the fragility of the court grouping should not be exaggerated. When the Commons did get round to debating the supply three days later, the outcome was, admittedly, hardly what the government wanted and

\textsuperscript{26} PC 2/71, fol. 6, 6 Feb 1685.
\textsuperscript{27} Lives of the Norths, III, p. 181; CJ, IX, p. 755.
\textsuperscript{28} Reresby, Memoirs, p. 395.
\textsuperscript{29} HMC Hamilton, p. 169, Perth to Hamilton, 26 Nov 1685.
was, in some ways, a bigger embarrassment because the king could always (and did) ignore the address against catholic officers. Yet, that the issue could still be seen as being basically the same (fear of a standing army composed of catholics) makes it all the more interesting that what support there was for a supply of £1,200,000 came mainly from a solid core of individuals linked with the court. This, at least, is what was implied by Reresby and is borne out by those who spoke in favour of Ernly's motion. It cannot be overlooked that some courtiers might have voted against had the House divided on the figure of £1,200,000 (for it would have been wise for potential rebels to make their disobedience as discreet as possible) but none of them are said to have been among the 170 who then voted against the still substantial figure of £700,000.

As the debate on the supply had made evident, the apprehensions of his anglican subjects were focussed by late 1685 on the question of whether James could be trusted with a large standing army. Fears of this nature do not, however, appear to have been uppermost in the minds of the large number of royal servants whom James would commission into his growing army. It is, in particular, relevant to the issue of the role of the courtiers in the debate on the supply that of the thirty-two royal servants in the Commons, at least eleven (including Browne) had already received commissions from James. Added to this, they also included a rear-admiral in the person of Arthur Herbert while a further four had had military experience during the previous reign. These figures mean that these royal servants were approximately twice as likely to be officers in the army or the navy as the rest of the membership of the Commons in this parliament. Other servants were just as willing to serve in the army and, in all, seventy-four of James's servants were officers in it at some point during his reign. This was especially true during 1685 with the rapid increase in numbers in response to the threat from Monmouth requiring the speedy appointment of large numbers of new officers and with the household departments providing one obvious and convenient reservoir of loyal gentlemen suitable to be appointed to them. The result was that fifty-five servants accepted commissions by the end of 1685. Considered against the fact that by then there were 1,350 commissioned officers in the army, the figure of fifty-five may seem small but it was a significant proportion within the higher ranks of the household. It, moreover, does not convey just how senior many of the individuals were because it includes Feversham, Churchill, Peterborough, Arran, Somerset, 31 Reresby, Memoirs, p. 396; Grey, Debates, VIII, p. 354, 364, 366-7.

32 Henning, History of Parliament, I, p. 10. The eleven were John Beaumont, Bludworth, Browne, James Griffin, Richard Leveson, Oliver Nicholas, Sir Theophilus Oglethorpe, Thomas Orme, Roger Pope, Henry Slingsby and Thomas Windsor. Henry Bulkeley, James Grahme and Philip Bickerstaffe had earlier experience. Heneage Finch had been a captain in the Coldstream Guards in 1682 and he may well have continued in this place until he was appointed a lieutenant-colonel in that regiment in 1687.
Dumbarton, Percy Kirke, Mulgrave, Oglethorpe, Dartmouth, Beaufort and Huntingdon, all of whom were regimental colonels. In the years which followed these numbers subsided somewhat, falling to thirty-three in 1686 as temporary units were disbanded, before increasing again to forty during 1687. Then, rather surprisingly, despite the final desperate expansion to meet the Dutch invasion, this figure increased to only forty-one during 1688 even although in October of that year both Henry Slingsby and Bevil Skelton became colonels and then both Northumberland and Salisbury became royal servants. For most of these servants, this was a new experience with only seventeen known to have done military service before, although forty-five of the other servants had had commissions under Charles II, thereby further heightening the military character of James's court.\(^{33}\)

In contrast to this marked army presence in James's household, almost none of his servants had been or were officers in the navy. Mulgrave, Henry Savile, Oliver Nicholas and Sir Hugh Middleton had served at sea in the past but apart from Dartmouth (who, until 1688, had retired from active service with the fleet) and Herbert, only David Lloyd, one of the Grooms of the Bedchamber, kept up a parallel career at sea but then he had managed to do this ever since he had entered James's service in 1672 after the death of his original patron, Sandwich.\(^{34}\) In view of James's very close links with the Admiralty, this absence of naval personnel seems odd but is less inexplicable than it may at first appear. Not only did the navy employ fewer officers than the army, it was becoming a more professional service and it was probably more practical to combine a place at court with a commission in the army rather than with one requiring regular service with the fleet. Similar practical difficulties faced those who wanted to serve in either the Scottish or Irish armies. In Scotland the one royal servant with a commission was Dumbarton, the absentee lieutenant-general and commander-in-chief, while in Ireland, apart from Ormond and Ossory who were nominally regimental colonels, the only examples seem to have been Ranald Grahme, the Page of Honour, who also held a commission in the English army, and Rene Mezandieu, who was no more than the supernumerary Sergeant of the Poultry.\(^{35}\)

It is evident that certain types of royal servants were recruited to be officers in James's army. The preponderance of peers with court office among the regimental colonels is an indication that any able-bodied peer in favour at court and without heavy

\(^{33}\) The commission lists are to be found in Dalton, *Army Lists*, I-II. For the expansion of the officer corp under James II, see Childs, *Army*, pp. 22-3.


ministerial duties would have been expected to put himself forward. Likewise, the Grooms of the Bedchamber were expected to be equally willing to serve (although not as colonels unless they had military experience) with eight of the nine doing so. In contrast, of the six Pages of the Bedchamber, only Thomas Heywood did so. In the Stables, where the staffs' knowledge of horses had obvious military applications, six of the seven Equerries also served in the army while the logistical expertise of Robert Gargrave, the Sergeant of the Carriages, was put to use where it was needed most in October 1688 when he became the captain-conductor of the carriages of the army. There were other instances of servants with specialist skills given military positions similar to that which they held at court. Thus, James Pearce, who had been James's personal surgeon since 1660, had a long career as a military surgeon. He had been attached to the Holland Regiment as early as 1665 and in 1667 (presumably because of his links with James) had become surgeon to the Duke of York's Troop of Guards. In 1681 he assumed the position of surgeon-general to the army and the navy, being confirmed in this position, as well as that of James's surgeon, in 1685. Moreover, that Thomas Hobbs was already surgeon to the Life Guards was probably an advantage in getting for him the place of Surgeon of the Household in 1685. The Drum-Major, John Mawgridge, and the Sergeant Trumpeter, Matthias Shore, were both responsible in the autumn of 1688 for the recruitment of drummers, fifes and trumpeters to serve in the army and the navy. 36

Most noteworthy of all was the number of appointments made from the ranks of the Band of Gentlemen Pensioners. Sir Thomas Bludworth has already been mentioned but ten of his colleagues (excluding Huntingdon) had commissions. That they benefitted from their membership of the Band in obtaining them seems likely given that three of them, Francis Villiers, Charnock Heron and John Tidcombe, served in Huntingdon's own regiment. With there being only five officers and forty men in the Band there would appear to have been a concerted attempt to recruit from this source and the numbers recruited become all the more striking when it is known that only two of the Gentlemen had had previous military experience and that only one of these two, Francis Villiers, who was the second son of the previous Captain, Grandison, and who had been captain in his uncle's Regiment of Foot in 1678, was among those commissioned under James II. Such recruitment was natural. As Chamberlayne put it, the Band was 'a Nursery to breed up hopeful Gentlemen and fit them for Imployments both Civil and Military, as well abroad as at home, as Deputies of Ireland, Ambassadors in Foreign Parts, Consellors of State, Captain of the Guard, Governours

36 SP 44/165, p. 78, warrant to Mawgridge, 28 Sept 1688; p. 92, warrant to Shore, 2 Oct 1688.
of Places, and Commanders in the Wars, both by Land and Sea'\textsuperscript{37} so James was simply putting the Band’s traditional purpose to effective use. The same, however, did not apply to its counterpart, the Yeoman of the Guard. Apart from the two catholics, Francis Beaulieu and William Darnell, commissions among them were confined to its officers and even of them, only Thomas Manley and Thomas Orme (who was a Corporal of the Yeoman of the Guard before he transferred in 1687 to the Gentlemen Pensioners) received them during James’s reign. This contrast is attributable to the difference in social status of the two bodies. As the names imply, the Gentlemen Pensioners were gentlemen who were, therefore, able to hold army commissions whereas the Yeomen of the Guard, with the exception of its officers, were not. It may also have been the case, with four of them having done military service before 1685, that the positions of officer rank in the Yeomen of the Guard were viewed more as places for former rather than future army officers. Yet, whatever the numbers from them becoming army officers, it should not be overlooked that both the Gentlemen Pensioners and the Yeomen of the Guard were not without military potential if James did intend to use armed might to achieve his objectives. Admittedly, some professional soldiers may have questioned their value. During the debates of November 1685 on the standing army Sir William Clifton had scathingly rejected arguments that the militia was an effective force by commenting that ‘the Beef-Eaters, at this rate, may be called an Army’.\textsuperscript{38} Nevertheless, whatever Clifton may have thought, it seems possible that the Gentlemen Pensioners and the Yeomen of the Guard were still generally seen as being, in some way, connected with the army. Both were the precursors of the Household Regiments and the Gentlemen Pensioners had within living memory participated in a battle, having been present at Edgehill when they had saved the lives of James and his elder brother. In October 1688 it was regarded as newsworthy that the Yeomen of the Guard would accompany the king on the campaign against William.\textsuperscript{39} It cannot

\textsuperscript{37} Chamberlayne, \textit{Angliae Notitia}, (1687), part I, p. 188 - cp. T. Delaune, \textit{Angliae Metropolis}, (1690), p. 111.

\textsuperscript{38} Grey, \textit{Debates}, VIII, p. 359. In the MS. this speech is incorrectly attributed to Sir Winston Churchill, who, no doubt, had a higher regard for the Yeomen of the Guard. (Henning, \textit{History of Parliament}, II, p. 73, 97). This is one of the earliest known uses of the nickname ‘Beefeaters’, with the earliest recorded use in the \textit{Oxford English Dictionary} dating from 1671. As a name for the Yeomen of the Guard, it was probably of relatively recent origin for, although its precise etymology has long been disputed, if, as is most likely, it does derive from the fact that they received diet, it presumably only came into use after most other royal servants stopped receiving it, leaving them as one of the few groups of servants who still ate the king’s beef.

\textsuperscript{39} \textit{Revolution Politicks}, (1733), book VII, p. 3. Fifty of the Yeoman went with the king to Salisbury although they probably did so only in their usual roles as royal bodyguards. (LC 5/148, fol. 283, list of servants to attend the king on progress, [Nov 1688]).
therefore be completely discounted that they played some (small) part in James’s plans for his expanded army.  

That army officers surpassed even members of the royal household as the group most immediately affected by James’s determination to disregard the 1673 Test Act means that those protestant royal servants commissioned into the army cannot be assumed to have been entirely happy with this aspect of his policies. Equally, it must also not be assumed that most of them viewed this as being a major problem in the way that some of the king’s subjects did. In England where, without mass conversions on the scale James was dreaming of, the number of available catholics was small and where the size of the officer corp was expanding rapidly, the possibility that there would be a wholesale purge of protestants to make way for catholics was, frankly, remote. To any astute observer, convinced of the strength of devotion to anglicanism, the most likely outcome of James’s recruitment policies would have seemed (and would have been) an army employing both catholics and protestants, with the former enjoying advantages of opportunity over the latter which would have been comparatively modest. Reassured by the apparent impracticalities of a catholic takeover, protestant courtiers would have been able to regard the developments in the army as a welcome enhancement of royal power.

In Ireland, of course, the situation was completely different and there the protestant officers were purged with thorough ruthlessness by Tyrconnel. Yet, when faced with this unabashed catholicization, anglicans of the calibre of Clarendon and Ormond dared not differ with the king. In the spring of 1686 Ormond was comparatively sanguine about the danger, telling Southwell that

the Protestants of Ireland are afraid and that they do not conceal their fears, I do not wonder at; but I think they are something mistaken in the grounds of them. It must be by degrees and it will take a considerable time and it will require some art to destroy that interest by juries and judgments, and time produces many unthought of accidents, whereas insurrections or armed power makes short and irreparable havoc.

Only once Tyrconnel had replaced Clarendon (by which time it was too late) did he begin to become seriously concerned, for he

---

40 Chamberlayne, Delaune and Miege all included the Gentlemen Pensioners and the Yeomen of the Guard in their descriptions of the army. (Chamberlayne, Angliae Notitia, (1687), part I, pp. 176-92; T. Delaune, Angliae Metropolis, (1690), pp. 110-111; [G. Miege], The New State of England, (1693), part II, pp. 156-8 - but cp. Chamberlayne, Angliae Notitia, (1692), part I, pp. 137-9, 153-60). Childs has made the reciprocal point that in peacetime the Restoration army 'can be regarded as a department of the royal household'. (Childs, Army, p. xvii). The Royal Company of Archers, founded as recently as 1676, was still no more than a gentleman’s club for the encouragement of archery. It did not become the Scottish royal bodyguard until 1822. (J.B. Paul, The History of the Royal Company of Archers, (Edinburgh, 1875), pp. 18-40, 141-6).

41 HMC Ormonde, II, p. 303, Ormond to Southwell, 3 May 1686.
did not think it probable that without war, pestilence, or famine, Ireland could be brought to the condition it is in, and to the desolation that threatens it, or that during the reign of any of the race of King Charles the First, I should be in danger of falling into such necessities as I have some reason to apprehend.42

His concern, however, did not, so far as can be ascertained, actually cause him to do anything to oppose the developments. He seems to have taken the view that this was no longer his problem. Being less eminent royal servants, the pressures for Grahme and Mezandieu to acquiesce were more demanding still.43 In Grahme’s case, he clashed with Tyrconnel over the seemingly trivial question of whether he had precedence over one of his colleagues but, as he then appealed to Clarendon, this came to be seen as yet another episode in the struggle between them. Ormond’s response to this incident was less than clear-cut. Still anxious to believe the best of James, he pointed out to Longford that it was only to be expected if the king supported Tyrconnel for it was important that he upheld the decisions taken by those exercising his authority on the ground.44

This apparent complacency over events in Ireland is of some note.45 Ormond was not alone in having to think again in the light of Tyrconnel’s success. What had seemed unlikely in Ireland now seemed less unlikely in England. Nevertheless, Ireland was different. Many would have been more sensible than to suppose that there could be achieved with quite the same ease in England what had already happened in a colony which seemed to them no more than a papist-infested bog. The obvious inferences which everyone was aware could be made from the Irish purges were not necessarily the ones that most people did make. The fact was that Tyrconnel’s purges were without parallel in England so that protestant officers in the English army were not faced with the same dilemmas presented to their Irish counterparts.

42 HMC Ormonde, n.s. VII, p. 494, Ormond to Temple, 15 June 1687. For his disapproval of the way in which Clarendon was forced from office, see B.L. Add MS 21484, fol. 66, Ormond to Southwell, 13 Jan 1687.
43 It is not possible here to deal in detail with Mezandieu’s role in the panic which spread through Longford, Westmeath and Roscommon during November 1686 but it appears to have been connected with his decision to abandon involvement with those opposed to Tyrconnel and join those who supported the purges. See P. Melvin (ed.), ‘Sir Paul Rycaut’s memoranda and letters from Ireland, 1686-7’, Analecta Hibernica, XXVII, (1972), pp. 129-30, 157, 175; Clarendon Correspondence, I, p. 502, 505; II, pp. 79-82, 105-7; HMC Ormonde, n.s. VI, p. 344; HMC Ormonde, n.s. VII, p. 418, 423, 472-5, 477-9, 486; SP 63/340, pp. 222-3; Childs, Army, p. 76.
44 HMC Ormonde, n.s. VII, pp. 430-1, Longford to Ormond, 20 July 1686; p. 436, Ormond to Longford, 3 Aug 1686.
III

In February 1687 the issue of the repeal of the Test Acts became one on which none of the most senior servants, whether they were army officers or not, could avoid taking a side on. James made sure of this by privately interviewing each of them to ask directly if they were prepared to support their repeal. Everyone was aware that this would be followed by the dismissals of those unwilling to comply.46 The sackings of Rochester and Clarendon had made that clear. How far this processing of ‘closeting’ extended down the court hierarchy is not known but, if the usual assumption that its primary purpose was to establish the attitudes of likely or possible parliamentary candidates is correct, it may not have been as systematic as is sometimes implied. What can be established is who was subsequently dismissed.

On 12 February Newport and Maynard were replaced as the Treasurer and the Comptroller of the Household. A month later (which suggests that Chamber servants were interviewed after those of the Household), Henry Savile and Arthur Herbert were replaced as the Vice-Chamberlain and the Master of the Robes. That Newport and Savile had not been prepared to endorse his wishes cannot have been a major surprise to James. It would have given Newport all the more reasons to have misgivings if, as he later claimed, Sunderland had responded to his observation that the Lords would be less easy to manipulate than the Commons by declaring that, if necessary, there would be a mass grant of peerages to Churchill’s regiment.47 Maynard’s reasons appear to have been straightforward anglican scruples. The version provided by Bramston of what happened was that

the Lord Maynard alledged his conscience would not permit him to part with the lawes made for the preservation of the religion he professed. The Kinge sayd, there was no matter of conscience in it. No, Sir? he replied; is not conscience concerned in defence of religion? I pray, if the test alone be gon; what hinders but you may bringe whome you please, and as many as you thincke fit, into the House of Lords? and so having the ma[j]ority you may make what laws you please, even against the religion established. To which the King made no reply, but bid his Lordship thinck better, and speake with him again.48

46 PRO 30/53/8, fol. 67, Newport to Lady Herbert, 27 Nov 1686; fol. 71, Newport to Herbert, 20 Jan 1687; Ellis Correspondence, I, p. 238, ---- to Ellis, 12 Feb 1687.
47 Burnet, History, III, p. 262, footnote by Dartmouth. Without supporting evidence, Ralph Benet Weldon’s claim that the position of Vice-Chamberlain became vacant ‘par la demission volontaire du Sieur Savil’ must be considered suspect. (B.L. Add MS 10118, fol. 146). Confusion arose when, on vacating his lodgings at Whitehall, Newport refused to give the keys to Black Rod, Sir Thomas Duppa, arguing that he had to return them to the Board of Greencloth so that they could be given to his successor. The king ruled that Duppa was correct as it was the Lord Chamberlain who was responsible for allocating accommodation within the royal palaces. (LC 5/201, fol. 457).
To compensate him for the loss of his salary, Godolphin obtained for him a Secret Service pension of £1,000 p.a.\(^49\) Herbert, in his celebrated confrontation with the king, adopted a similarly principled stance. This seems to have disconcerted James who, perhaps unfairly but with some reason, had not expected him to claim the moral high ground so audaciously. Two years before he had ordered Herbert to mend the rift with his wife and he now used Herbert’s lax personal morals to accuse him of hypocrisy.\(^50\)

This was a rather lame reason to support the repeal of the Test Acts but, assuming Bramston was accurate, his comments to Maynard had already indicated that, for James, the issue was not one of conscience so much as of obedience.\(^51\)

Apart from these four, no other royal servants were dismissed. Sir Thomas Chicheley, removed as Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, and Clarendon, removed now as Lord Privy Seal to complete his expulsion from power, seem to have been the only other casualties. Even allowing for the fact that the proportion would be more significant if it was the case that only the very highest officials were questioned, Sir John Lowther’s claim that ‘there was suddainlie a verie great change in the household’ must have been overstated.\(^52\) Most of the peers and most of those who had sat in the 1685 parliament remained undisturbed. This means that, although the replacements as Vice-Chamberlain, Comptroller and Master of the Robes, were catholics, it is far too simple to speak of James abandoning the tories and of the tories abandoning him. It was the case that behind the changes was the clear aim to appoint, for the first time, catholics to some of the senior court offices, as an extension of the policy by which Powis, Arundel, Belasyse, Dover and Tyrconnel had been appointed to the Privy Council the previous year. Equally, the changes were meant to demonstrate that that policy need not endanger the positions of anglicans prepared to remain loyal. Indeed, to focus on the numbers of catholics who were brought in to replace anglicans is to miss


\(^{51}\) The assertion that James made sure Herbert encountered difficulties in passing his Robes accounts seems doubtful. In May 1687 the Treasury had calculated that, for the year to Ladyday 1687, Herbert was still due £1,623 19s. 10d. The following December James authorised the payment of £5,080 11s. 6d. to Herbert. Of this, £1,600 (a slightly reduced figure) was for the Robes debts. The rest was for his expenses as rear-admiral and it is true that his claim for £1,887 4s. lOd. was disallowed. Between January and June 1688, the £5,080 11s. 6d. was paid off in seven instalments. Although Shaw’s editing of the *Treasury Books* confuses the point, the first two instalments of £800 each, ordered by Guy on 24 and 31 January, were to clear the Robes debt. (CTB, (1685-89), p. 1316, 1355, 1657-8, 1727-8, 1732, 1735, 1785, 1796, 1813, 1833-4, 1940). The delay in making these payments was not in the least unusual. Although the Pipe Office declared account is missing, his account for the year to Ladyday 1686 was probably passed in 1690 and, again, this delay should not be thought noteworthy. (AO 1/2054/35). More interesting is that the account to Ladyday 1687 was not passed until 1715 but that cannot be attributed to James. When this account was passed, the 1687 calculations were accepted. (E 351/2837 - cp. LC 9/386, loose papers; AO 3/933).

\(^{52}\) Lonsdale, *Memoirs*, p. 15.
the point. Numbers were a side issue partly because the aim was to establish precedents for appointments of catholics to offices of real power. Establishing these precedents was an important step for James, whether or not he intended to use them to create a numerically-dominant catholic faction in the future. In fact, until (or perhaps unless) there occurred the change in the number of available catholics he was hoping for, the ratio between senior catholic and anglican courtiers achieved in early 1687 was probably one James was happy to live with. There was another reason why the numbers alone were only part of the story. This is that, with Belasyse, Dover and Arundel being given official positions, the role of the catholic camarilla was strengthened. Added to the fact that Sunderland no longer had Rochester as a rival, this was a purge which had a disproportionate effect on the innermost circle of royal advisers.

In saying that Sunderland and the catholics had become the most important source of advice to James should not obscure that they did not have a monopoly on that advice. There were still plenty of trusted anglican servants who would have been able to attempt the usual forms of backstairs influence; if, that is, James was prepared to listen. If he was not, and that is what most of those around him must rapidly have concluded, it should not be assumed that their confidence in him was immediately withdrawn. Having been ordered to obey, all (except those already discussed) appear to have obeyed. Particularly striking is the case of Yarmouth who was now appointed to Newport's place as Treasurer of the Household. As Lord William Paston, he had assisted his father, the first earl, in his strenuous use of his territorial influence in Norfolk to uphold the tory cause during the early years of the decade and he himself had been returned to all three exclusion parliaments by the city of Norwich as an anti-exclusionist. His late wife, Charlotte, had been the bastard daughter of Charles II by Viscountess Shannon and twenty-six days after his new appointment he married the sister of Sir Dudley and Roger North, thereby forming a link with one of the other leading tory families.53 The fact that he was appointed at this stage means that there can be no doubt that his opinions on the tests were acceptable to James. For most of the other leading tories still in office, there is, apart from their continuation in office, little to establish their views.

In a few cases there are hints that they may only just have retained office. One of these hints is the rumour about Dartmouth being replaced as Master of the Horse by James Fitzjames. Another rumour claimed that Bulkeley had given an unsatisfactory reply to the king, only to be retained the influence of his wife who, it was said, 'hath

53 B.L. Add MS 27448; Add MS 36988; J. Hildeyard, Sermon preached at the funeral of...Yarmouth, (1683), pp. 21-3; Henning, History of Parliament, III, p. 213; Lives of the Norths, I, pp. 304-5.
two strings to her bow, that of her Religion and the other'. These rumours were, however, being fed by expectations that the purge would be much larger than it turned out to be. More certainty surrounds Ormond’s situation. He is known to have proved uncooperative and it would have been at about the same time as he was questioned that he and the other governors of the Charterhouse began their attempts to block the appointment of Andrew Popham. Even so, as one source close to him put it to John Ellis, ‘I think the large notions our old gentleman has of loyalty, keep him upon his ground. He is more jocose at Court of late, and his name more civilly treated by the red sort [the catholics]’. What is interesting is not so much that Ormond was not dismissed (there were plenty of reasons for retaining him) as that his loyalty was seen as the main reason against doing so. If James was most interested in obedience, it may be that in ‘closeting’ those who had their doubts, he was prepared to be flexible for those he trusted and respected. Bishop Cartwright, for one, felt that the purge in the household had not gone far enough.

As what most of the senior servants might have said to James in his closet can only be guessed at, recourse must be made to the lists compiled by Lord Willoughby in late April and early May 1687 and by the special French envoy, Bonrepaux, in about November 1687. These can be supplemented with the undated lists drawn up by Danby and by an unknown individual and which appear to show those opposed to the king. Lists like these are not without their drawbacks and it is a particular problem that the information on courtiers may have done no more than reflect their public positions. One assumes that Willoughby and Danby would have been better informed about where those opposition peers without links to the court stood whereas Bonrepaux (who possibly had access to Willoughby’s conclusions) might have had some advantages in assessing the views of the courtiers. That Bonrepaux was interested in the ostensibly more precise matter of attitudes towards the tests, rather than general support or

---

54 Ellis Correspondence, I, p. 215, ---- to Ellis, 1 Jan 1687; p. 223, ---- to Ellis, 4 Jan 1687; PRO 30/53/8, fol. 75, ---- to Herbert, 8 Mar 1687.
55 [T. Burnet], A Relation of the Proceedings at Charter-House, (1689); Carte, Ormonde, II, p. 546; A. Quick, Charterhouse, (1990), p. 25. Interpreting the Charterhouse dispute requires care. It must be remembered that it had nothing to do with the tests but rather with the oaths of allegiance and supremacy. Moreover, the governors were entitled to query the error in Popham's letter patent. Whether they would have stood their ground had James not let the matter drop is unclear. Ormond's celebrated remark that 'an Act of Parliament was not so slight a thing, but that it deserv'd to be consider'd' sounds more like advice that careful thought should be given to the issues involved than his final view on the dispensing power.
56 Ellis Correspondence, I, p. 241, ---- to Ellis, 12 Feb 1687. For Ormond's opposition to the tests, see Carte, Ormonde, II, p. 547, as well as the discussion of the Willoughby and Bonrepaux lists below. Cartwright, Diary, p. 51.
opposition to James, is only a superficial difference. On the other hand, if the other two lists do represent evidence of an organised opposition grouping against James (they probably don’t), the listing of a courtier would be all the more significant. Taking the evidence of Willoughby and Bonrepaux first, both agreed that Peterborough and Waldegrave were Catholics. More interesting is that both agreed Mulgrave, Huntingdon, Dartmouth, Yarmouth, Lichfield, Churchill and Ailesbury were all in favour of James’s policies. Willoughby was unsure where Feversham stood and Bonrepaux had Beaufort down among those yet to declare but, in both case, if the other list is to be believed, they nevertheless supported the king. It may be to read too much into this to conclude that Feversham’s support was strengthening whereas Beaufort’s was weakening. Neither Danby nor the unknown compiler included them on their lists. Willoughby and Bonrepaux agreed that only Ormond and Somerset disagreed with the king while Danby included Somerset, as well as Ossory (who had been ignored by Willoughby and Bonrepaux), but not his grandfather. The fourth list has the names of none of the peers holding court office although, admittedly, the names of the dukes may be missing from it.

By the time Bonrepaux came to compile his list, this assessment of Somerset’s views by Willoughby had been confirmed by his resignation from the Bedchamber. That in late April, at about the time Willoughby was drawing up his list, Somerset paid £5,000 towards Devonshire’s bail (following his confrontation with Colonel Culpepper within the verge of the palace) might have been interpreted, not necessarily correctly, as early evidence of his disaffection. When he did resign, it was over a legal technicality. According to some, participation in the reception of D’Adda as papal nuncio constituted recognition of the pope and so was treasonable. It had been Ailesbury who was supposed to be on duty as Gentleman of the Bedchamber in the week D’Adda was to be received but, foreseeing that this might prove awkward, he had (rather duplicitously) persuaded Somerset to take his place. Only once he had accepted did Somerset realise what was involved and therefore explained to James that he conceived it to be against the law; to which the K[in]g said he would pardon him. The Duke replied, he was no very good lawyer, but he thought he had heard it said, that a pardon granted to a person offending, under the assurance of obtaining it, was void. This offended the K[in]g extreamlie: he said publicklie, he wondered at his insolence; and told the Duke he would make him fear him as well as the laws. To which the Duke answered, that as he was his sovereign, he should ever have all the dutie and reverence ffor his person that was due from a

59 Warrington, Works, (1694), p. 564; Luttrell, Brief Historical Relation, I, p. 401. Delamere and Thomas Wharton also stood bail for Devonshire but then so did Clifford who was a Catholic.
subject to his prince; but whilst he was no traitor or criminal, he was so secure in his justice, that he could not fear him as offenders do.\textsuperscript{60}

None of the other servants involved in the ceremony would seem to have shared his qualms and Grafton took his place. Somerset, however, did not remain completely aloof from the court. At the end of the year he returned and did homage.\textsuperscript{61}

Somerset’s departure from royal service left Ormond, Ossory and Beaufort as the only English peers in the royal household who were thought of as being at odds with the king’s policies. That Beaufort was Ossory’s father-in-law is not without significance. Most, however, gave every impression of supporting the king. It has to be conceded that appearances were possibly misleading. Retention of lucrative office, the fear that one’s place would only be filled by a catholic or simply the wish to keep one’s head down were all reasons which may have swayed some. Yet none of the senior courtiers could have avoided the issues merely by getting on with their jobs. All of them would have had to work with catholic servants and some of them had appointed them. It was, moreover, to the senior protestant servants that James turned when he began to remove those lord lieutenants he distrusted. During 1687 Mulgrave replaced Somerset in the East Riding, Lichfield replaced Abingdon in Oxfordshire, Preston replaced Thanet in Cumberland and Westmorland and Huntingdon replaced Scarsdale in Derbyshire. Huntingdon also became lord lieutenant of Leicestershire on the death of Rutland. In early 1688 Yarmouth would, along with Pembroke, become lord lieutenant of Wiltshire. That Mulgrave and Huntingdon were prepared to serve on the Commission of Ecclesiastical Causes associated them even more closely with what James was doing.

As an independent-thinking deist and as a former whig, Mulgrave and Huntingdon do appear to have been somewhat unusual choices for membership of the Commission.\textsuperscript{62} Their motives have ever since been imputed and it hardly helps their

\textsuperscript{60}Lonsdale, \textit{Memoirs}, p. 24. In this passage Sir John Lowther was repeating what Somerset had told him. See also Ailesbury, \textit{Memoirs}, I, p. 153; Clarke, \textit{Life}, II, pp. 118-19; Burnet, \textit{History}, III, pp. 188-9. Somerset was probably not expected to introduce D’Adda but rather only to attend on the king during the ceremony. There is, admittedly, some doubt about the procedures for receiving diplomatic representatives, with this having been one of the issues disputed by Bath and Arlington in 1683. It was probably the Lord Chamberlain who had the right to perform the introduction and the 1685 Bedchamber ordinances appear to have reduced the role of the Gentlemen of the Bedchamber in the ceremony. (B.L. Althorp papers D4, clauses 1 and 5).

\textsuperscript{61}Luttrell, \textit{Brief Historical Relation}, I, p. 426; B.L. Add MS 10118, fol. 162. A possible indication of his religious views may be provided by the MS tract among his papers, entitled ‘Some of the most principal Reasons moving one to withhold my Joyning my Selfe to the Roman Church’. The reasons given are the standard objections to catholicism. (Alnwick Castle, Northumberland MS 20, fols. 158-9).

\textsuperscript{62}There is a frequently repeated misconception that Huntingdon converted to catholicism. (M. Ashley, \textit{James II}, (1977), p. 207; D.L. Jones, \textit{A Parliamentary History of the Glorious Revolution}, (1988), p. 35; J.R. Jones, \textit{Marlborough}, (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 24-5). This appears to be founded on the fact that his patent as Lord Lieutenant of Derbyshire in December 1687 included the clause of dispensation and it is true that there were rumours that he had or was about to convert. (C 66/3299, dorse, no. xi,
reputations that they were not even James’s first choices, with Mulgrave appointed in November 1686 as the replacement for Rochester. When they subsequently tried to excuse their involvements, they could only come up with explanations which were feeble. Both claimed that they had been unaware that the Commission was illegal and that they did not realise this was why Sancroft had refused to take part in it. Mulgrave would state that he had been under the impression Sancroft had declined because of old age while Huntingdon was under the alternative misapprehension that it was because the Commission encroached onto his authority as primate. Before these excuses are dismissed, it should at least be recognised that they were not without some weight. There was an argument which could be made, and it was the one which the government did make, that the Ecclesiastical Commission was not a revival of High Commission, in which case it only became illegal after the Declaration of Right made it so retrospectively. Moreover, the reasons attributed to Sancroft to explain his non-participation do sound like the type of things the archbishop, unwilling to provoke a confrontation, might well have told the king. What do strain credibility are Mulgrave’s and Huntingdon’s claims that they knew nothing of the possibility that the Commission might be illegal and that Sancroft might have considered it so. In trying to claim this, they must have been resorting to humbug.

To assess their involvement in the proceedings of the Commission, one is not entirely dependent on their assertions that they acted with the interests of the Church of England at heart. The minutebook kept by the registrar, William Bridgeman, survives (albeit in mutilated form) and this, by recording attendance and the infrequent votes, gives some clues on how they performed as Commissioners. Taking those meetings for which attendance details survive, Mulgrave was present at thirty of the thirty-nine meetings he could have attended. Huntingdon was a slightly less regular attender,
going to twenty-six of the thirty-seven meetings during his time on the Commission. These figures give some plausibility to his claim that he was the least active Commissioner, for, as he would be quick to point out, he was abroad when its actions against Magdalen College were at their height. He did, however, attend four of the ten meetings between 28 May and 12 December inclusive during which Magdalen was on the agenda, including that on 8 December at which he voted for proceeding against the college. He was also present on three of the four occasions at which the issue was raised in 1688. It is possible that, had he been available, he would have participated in the visitation of the college during October and November 1687. On this issue Mulgrave had a clearer record of opposition. Although he did attend the six meetings on the subject up to 28 November, including the two after the visitation, he did not himself take part in the visitation. Moreover, at the meeting on 28 November he argued that fellows should not be expelled ‘till the powers of the Court be considered of’. Thereafter he seems to have made a point of avoiding those meetings at which the subject would arise, with this accounting for eight of his nine known absences. The only other insight the minute book reveals about them is their stance towards the suspension of the vice-chancellor of Cambridge, John Pechell, as master of Magdalene for refusing to admit Alban Francis. Both had on 7 May 1687 voted for the suspension.

There is little doubt that Huntingdon supported the king’s religious policies. He approved of the declarations of indulgence, citing Romans xiv as scriptural justification for it, and would later defend it on the grounds that the consensus of legal opinion had thought the dispensing power valid. This loyalty earned him further court office. At the very end of 1687 he was appointed Groom of the Stole to Prince George after James insisted that Scarsdale be dismissed as his punishment for refusing, as Lord Lieutenant of Derbyshire, to ask the ‘three questions’. Mulgrave’s position as Lord Chamberlain may have been less secure. In August 1687, when the court was at Bath, he managed to offend the queen and was suspended from office for several weeks. In what many could only have taken as an ominous sign, his place was taken temporarily

66 Bodl. MS Carte 76, fol. 35. This foreign visit, which apparently lasted four months, would have occurred during the second half of 1687. Where and why he went is not known. The trip does not seem to have been a diplomatic mission.
67 Bodl. MS Rawl D 365, esp. fol. 24.
68 ibid, fol. 23.
69 ibid, fol. 18.
70 Huntington Library, Hastings MSS, HA 1793, Croft to Huntingdon, 27 Feb 1688; Bodl. MS Carte 76, fol. 35. That in her letter to him, Bridget Croft defended the fellows of Magdalen suggests that Huntingdon had tried to convince her that the actions of the Ecclesiastical Commission were correct.
71 E. Gregg, Queen Anne, (1984), p. 54. It is also just possible that by 1688 he had been added to the Cabinet Council. (Hatton Correspondence, II, p. 88, Hatton to Hatton, 21 July 1688; G. Davies, ‘Council and Cabinet, 1679-88’, EHR, XXXVIII (1922), p. 61).
by Dover. With him proving less amenable to the idea of conversion than they may initially have thought, this could be evidence that the catholic party wanted to have him removed. On the other hand, it may have been the catholics who ensured that he retained his place. Whichever was the case, his willingness to endorse most of what the king was doing made him too valuable to lose. His distrust of religious sophistry, instead of debarring him from the Ecclesiastical Commission, may well, by making him sympathetic to James’s wish to reduce sectarian tensions, explain his appointment to it. Equally, it was only to be expected if he was less approving when, as appeared to be the case with Magdalen, the policy of toleration went astray.

IV

In late 1687 all seven of the protestant royal servants who were lord lieutenants (Beaufort, Huntingdon, Lichfield, Mulgrave, Ailesbury, Yarmouth and Preston) cooperated with the asking of the ‘three questions’. Another of them, Dartmouth, had been present at the meeting of the Cabinet Council at which the whole process had been authorised. Disappointingly, the number of royal servants involved in asking the questions almost exceeded the number of those known to have been asked them. It would seem that, in the forty-five counties for which returns survive, only fifteen of the king’s servants had the questions put to them, making this otherwise invaluable source of information on reactions to James’s policies among the higher levels of society of less use for analysing the views of his servants than might have been hoped. It is, in particular, disappointing that the returns for Middlesex and London, where the commissions of the peace probably had a higher than usual proportion of JPs who were employees of the household departments, should be among those which have been lost. In any case, not all servants who were JPs were asked the questions, with some of them being senior enough for their lord lieutenant not to bother them. In some of these cases they had probably already been closeted by the king and, in most instances, it was easier for the authorities in London to ascertain the views of royal servants than it was for the lord lieutenant in the localities. From Herefordshire Beaufort reported that Thomas Price was ‘always at Whitehall: & his minde I suppose known to the King’

72 Ellis Correspondence, I, p. 344, Wynne to Ellis, 27 Aug 1687; Luttrell, Brief Historical Relation, I, p. 413; B.L. Add MS 10118, fol. 156; F. Bracher (ed.), Letters of Sir George Etherege, (University of California, 1974), p. 150, Etherege to Mulgrave, 13 Oct 1687.
73 HMC Rutland, II, p. 116, countess of Northampton to countess of Rutland, 27 Aug [1687].
74 HMC Beaufort, p. 91, memorandum, [Oct 1687].
and he also said much the same thing about Sir Thomas Duppa.\textsuperscript{76} What the king knew obviously pleased him for both were retained on the commission of the peace. Price and Duppa are examples of the six servants who, in addition to the fifteen to whom the questions were put, were recorded as being absent but, as with them (and unlike most cases of absenteeism), for a royal servant to be elsewhere need not be interpreted as a deliberate attempt to avoid answering the questions. Thus, another Herefordshire JP, Jeremiah Bubb, who was a captain in Cornwal’s Regiment of Foot as well as being a Gentleman Usher, Quarter Waiter, was away at the time Beaufort made his inquiries but he wrote to indicate that he would do whatever the king wanted and so here has been counted among those who unequivocally answered ‘yes’. Charnock Heron was away from Huntingdonshire with his regiment while Sir Francis Lawley was stated not to be regularly resident in Staffordshire. Only the absences of Sir Peter Killigrew from Cornwall and of John Beaumont from both Northamptonshire and Leicestershire arouse suspicions. Killigrew was subsequently removed as a JP but, whatever subsequent events might suggest, Beaumont’s absence may have been innocent. With places both at court and in the army, he could well have been elsewhere. If this absence is regarded as early evidence of his dissatisfaction, it must be realised that, at the time, he was still considered reliable enough to be continued on the Leicestershire commission and probably on the Northamptonshire one as well.\textsuperscript{77}

Nine of the fifteen demonstrated their support for the king’s policies in the most direct way possible by answering ‘yes’ to each of the questions. That seven of these nine were also army officers may say something about the loyalty of the other royal servants with places in the army.\textsuperscript{78} Of the five servants whose answers were not ‘yes’ to each of the questions, Sir Robert Dashwood was the most openly opposed to the options proposed, answering ‘no’ to the first two and then, like almost everyone, ‘yes’ to the third while Sir Henry Palmer resorted to evasion, simply refusing to answer the first two.\textsuperscript{79} Philip Bickerstaffe, in conjunction with Sir Ralph Delaval, Sir Ralph Jennison and Henry Lambton, adopted the alternative tactic of ambiguity, telling Newcastle that ‘it shall be our cheifest care and study to doe nothing there contrary to our duty to God, and our Loyaltye to our Dread Soveraigne’ and that

\textsuperscript{76} Duckett, \textit{Penal Laws and Test Act}, I, p. 264.
\textsuperscript{78} The nine servants were Sir Richard Browne, Jeremiah Bubb, Richard Carter, Edward Griffin, Thomas Manning, Robert Saintclaire, Henry Slingsby, Sir Gilbert Talbot and Sir Charles Wyndham. Only Griffin and Talbot were not army officers. Ralph Sheldon also gave satisfactory replies and was an army officer but he was not yet a royal servant. (Duckett, \textit{Penal Laws and Test Act}, I, p. 214, 236, 265, 402, 423, II, 84, 86, 88).
...we will modestly assist to the election of such Members as wee conceive will faithfully discharge their duty to God, and with their lives and fortunes will preserve and maintain their fidelity to their Prince, and carefully and sedulously watch all opportunities to performe that great trust reposed in them, both for the good of the King and the whole Kingdome.\textsuperscript{80} leaving one unsure, as was their intention, whether they supported or opposed the tests and the penal laws. In contrast, Sir Jacob Astley spelt out exactly what his position was, making clear ‘that some of the penal Lawes may admitt of a review and amend[men]t, but Hee cannot by any means consent to the repealing of the Tests’.\textsuperscript{81} Finally, there was Sir Augustine Palgrave who managed to take up the seemingly contradictory (or selfish) position of agreeing to vote for the repeal of the penal laws and the Test Acts if elected while simultaneously stating that he would not campaign for anyone else who held these views.\textsuperscript{82}

The nine who had loyally replied ‘yes’ three times, together with Beaumont, Duppa, Palgrave and Price, were reappointed to their places on their local commissions, with Sir Richard Browne, Edward Griffin and Sir Charles Wyndham being deemed worthy to be rewarded with promotion to the rank of deputy-lieutenants. In contrast, at least five of the others, that is Astley, Bickerstaffe, Dashwood, Killigrew and Lawley, were chastised for their unhelpfulness by being included in the wave of purges from the commissions James implemented during the first half of 1688.\textsuperscript{83} All, however, retained their court offices. Information about the fates of the rest of the royal servants who were JPs or deputy-lieutenants is not so readily obtainable but, although it is known that Sir John Elwes, a Gentleman of the Privy Chamber and the Receiver-General of the Duchy of Lancaster, was removed from the commissions in both Middlesex and Westminster in February 1688, at least ten others are known to have been continued in local offices.\textsuperscript{84} They were joined by the five royal servants who were among those the government felt able to add to the commissions to replace those removed for recalcitrance. That they included the catholic Sir Thomas Williams in Brecknockshire and the probable dissenter Sir Thomas Rowe in Oxfordshire bears out

\textsuperscript{80} ibid, I, p. 128.
\textsuperscript{81} ibid, I, p. 301.
\textsuperscript{82} ibid, I, p. 300.
\textsuperscript{84} These cases are known from the entries in the \textit{History of Parliament} volumes. The ten were Michael Arnold, Sir Thomas Bludworth, Robert Brady, Henry Bulkeley, Sir James Butler, William Chiffinch, Henage Finch, Sir Stephen Fox, Thomas Neale and Thomas Orme. For some reason it would appear that there was an interruption in Fox’s service as a JP in Middlesex between 1687 and about May 1688 however he was nevertheless continued on the commissions in Westminster and Wilts. Elwes was reappointed to the Middlesex and Westminster commissions in September 1688.
the reliance on catholics and dissenters which characterised so many of James’s alterations in local office-holding during the latter part of his reign but, equally, one should note that the other three, Roger Pope, Sir Robert Dacres and John Dormer, were anglicans.85 In the meantime, Sir Robert Vyner, Sir William Goslyn, Sir Thomas Bludworth and Sir Edmund Wiseman were serving under Jeffreys on the commission of the lieutenancy of London.86 As always, the leading courtiers were expected to encourage the surrender of charters by any corporations they had connections with.87 That almost none of his servants were appointed to the commissions of enquiry into recusant fines set up between December 1687 and August 1688 underlines that, in so far as his household was a reservoir of support, it was still a predominantly anglican one.88

For some royal servants it was the remodelling of bodies other than corporations or commissions of the peace which was more immediately important. This was the case with the medical servants who were affected more by the government’s interference in the affairs of the College of Physicians. In 1685 the College, on the recommendation of its president, Sir Thomas Witherley, one of the royal physicians, had decided to pre-empt a threatened quo warranto by surrendering its charter. The issue of the new charter in March 1687 gave the government the opportunity to purge those fellows it considered politically undesirable as well as allowing the Commons’ resolution of 1679, which had requested that catholic fellows be expelled, to be officially overruled. It had, in fact, been possible for the ex-royal physician, John Betts, to retain his membership of the College despite his catholicism and the queen’s physician, William Waldegrave (who was one of Lord Waldegrave’s relatives), may have done so as well. They were now joined by three other catholics, including Ferdinando Mendez, the physician to Queen Catherine. The charter further confirmed the College’s links with the court by continuing Witherley as president, appointing Sir Charles Scarburgh as one of the elects and reappointing the other royal physicians, Edmund Dickinson, Robert Brady and Charles Frazier, and the queen’s physician, William Waldegrave, as

85 Henning, History of Parliament, III, pp. 262-3, 726-7; Duckett, Penal Laws and Test Act, I, p. 273, 328, 333, 335, 336, 371, 449, III, 76-7, 183, 217, 266. It is assumed that, having been recommended, Dacres and Dormer were appointed. Dormer, however, may have been undertaking extensive travels abroad at this time. (SP 44/337, p. 193, warrant to Dormer, 10 Feb 1687).
86 SP 44/164, p. 416, warrant to Attorney-General, 21 Aug 1687. Other commissioners with links to the court included Sir Basil Firebrace, Sir John Werden and Sir William Dodson.
87 A good example of this was the way Huntingdon is known to have been behind the remodellings at Leicester, Derby and Nottingham. (Huntington Library, Hastings MSS, boxes 50 and 51).
88 Apart from Ralph Sheldon, who was appointed before he became an Equerry, Robert Jeggon was appointed as a commissioner in Yorkshire in July 1688, which was about the time he was appointed a Gentleman Usher, Quarter-Waiter. Edward Lloyd, who was a Gentleman Usher, Quarter-Waiter to the queen, was also appointed as a commissioner. See M. Goldie, ‘James II and the dissenters’ revenge: the Commissions of Enquiry of 1688’, HJ, LXVI (1993), p. 62.
fellows. It, however, also gave rise to a dispute with the College's old rivals, the Company of Apothecaries, which was exacerbated by the College's decision to set up a scheme for the charitable distribution of free medicine to those in need of it. When Jeffreys as the visitor stepped in to adjudicate, it was the Apothecaries, led by their master, James St.Amand, the senior apothecary to the king, who seemed to have the edge. What favoured them was that they had given greater proofs of their loyalty for in 1687 the Company had presented an address (which had been drafted by Robert Lightfoot, a former royal apothecary, and James Chase, St.Amand's junior as apothecary to the king) congratulating James on the declaration of indulgence. The dispute was still unresolved in October 1688 when all the new charters were reversed.89

Motives behind all these remodellings varied although all shared the aim of removing undesirable individuals from socially important institutions. In the case of the Society of Physicians, the purpose was little more complex than this, whereas the commissions of the peace and, especially, the corporations in the boroughs had had to be purged as much as anything else as a preliminary to the election of a parliament which James was determined would confirm the provisions of the declarations of indulgence. Given this, James also needed dependable supporters whom he could allow to be returned by these corporations into which he had put so much effort to have reconstructed. To this end, as the electoral preparations became more intense during the summer and early autumn of 1688, the government endorsed at least thirteen of the courtiers who had sat in 1685 in the hope of securing their re-elections for their old constituencies.90 In the case, at least, of Thomas Neale, who was standing once again at Lugershall, the royal agents considered that he was 'supposed right, being ambitious to please your Majesty'.91 Sir Stephen Fox and Sir Charles Scarburgh also intended to stand as court candidates, although, in the case of the former, he decided to stand at Cricklade, where his local influence would have ensured his return, rather than at Salisbury, his previous seat.92 Scarburgh likewise intended to change seats, planning to transfer from one Cornish borough, Camelford, to another, Grampound, but this was connected with the attempt by Edward Nosworthy to displace the electoral

influence of Bath. After Bath allowed the Cornish boroughs, including Camelford and Grampound, to indicate that they would accept nominees as their MPs if they were protestants, Cornishmen and nominated by Bath, Nosworthy set about constructing an electoral interest at Bath's expense. The two candidates whom Bath nominated at Camelford instead of Scarburgh were purged from the corporation there but Scarburgh had, anyhow, already found his alternative seat at Grampound. There the government had rejected Bath's recommendations to make way for him, despite his brief service as MP for Camelford in 1685 being the only link with Cornwall he could claim. Meanwhile, at St.Ives, where his family had formerly had their electoral base, Nosworthy made headway in his attempts to reverse the damage Bath had inflicted on that interest by a *quo warranto* in 1684 as a punishment for his support for exclusion. Following that remodelling, it had been James St.Amand whom Bath had had returned in 1685 on behalf of the court and, after Nosworthy made clear that he would get elected 'who the king pleases', it was St.Amand who in September 1688 was selected by Sunderland as the court candidate. While this was pushing Bath towards rebellion, Nosworthy’s links with the court were strengthening for it was at about this time his services were being recognised by his appointment as a Gentleman of the Privy Chamber.93

Nosworthy's efforts notwithstanding and leaving aside the fact that had the elections taken place other courtiers would without doubt have stood, James does not seem to have set out to expand the household representation in parliament, only to consolidate it. It was not, in the light of the above findings at any rate, that he could not find members of his household who were willing to support his policies. Against the six who are known to have been purged from the commissions of the peace must be set the thirty-five who are known to have been appointed or reappointed to them in 1688 and/or been willing to stand for parliament. As for the rest of the royal servants, it cannot simply be assumed that because they played no part in these developments that they were unwilling to do so. For one thing, James may have been confident enough of success that he thought it unnecessary to draw on their support any more than he did.94 If, alternatively, he was less optimistic about the likely outcome of his electioneering efforts and had hoped to use his household as a source of reliable supporters, not all servants, even of the middle ranks, would have been able to serve in the offices in question. There was little point in packing commissions of the peace with absentee


94 Such optimism would not necessarily have been excessively unrealistic. (Jones, *Revolution of 1688*, pp. 128-75; Henning, *History of Parliament*, I, pp. 41-2).
officials given that residents, no matter how obscure, were going to be more useful for effective enforcement of the royal wishes on the ground. There was a limit to how far the government, based in London, could use its own employees as agents in the localities and it was, after all, for this reason that the commissions of the peace existed in the form in which they did. The complication was that, because they were still, above all else, local events, this limit applied just as much to parliamentary elections. It may have been the case that, once again, James had had to face these, the fundamental constraints in the governance of early-modern England. This, nevertheless, need not have been an especially big problem for him. The impracticalities of mobilising his servants on anything more than the scale possible in previous parliaments was not preventing him making what seemed considerable headway in his plans for a compliant parliament.
On 26 March 1688 Sir Winston Churchill, the Second Clerk of the Greencloth, died. Four months later, on 21 July, his long-standing patron, the duke of Ormond, died. In their separate ways, both these men can be said to have been the epitome of old-style royalism. The passing, in particular, of Ormond, the last of the major protagonists of the Civil War, seemed to mark the end of an era. As it happened, it did. Four months later both their heirs, despite being Gentlemen of his Bedchamber, entered into rebellion against James II. What had gone wrong?

It is not just because his electioneering efforts seemed to have a fair chance of success that one must conclude that during much of 1688 James’s position was formidable. That crisis would soon engulf him might suggest otherwise but that crisis would be produced as much by the strengths as by the weaknesses of the royal position. Rebellion is invariably an act of desperation. Yet James’s position had been formidable from the very beginning and if he now appeared to be the one who was setting the agenda, it should be remembered that not only had he, as king, always done so, his stated agenda was still the same as it had been three years before. He still wanted catholics and dissenters to have the same liberties as anglicans; in particular, the freedom to worship and to hold government and military office. Once Fagel’s reply to Stewart had been published, the issue, despite the misgivings of many anglicans, was, for practical purposes, narrowed to the latter. Everything now centred on the tests. Moreover, whatever his clumsiness in doing so, James had done nothing beyond what could broadly be reconciled within this agenda.

That the repeal of the Test Acts was still the main political issue in 1688 in the same way it had been in 1685 means that one cannot accept uncritically the idea that opposition to James’s policies had been building up steadily during the intervening period. The debate on the issue had hardly progressed and there is little that would lead one to believe that there had been a decisive shift in support either way. In this the views of most of James’s servants would have been little different from those of his other subjects although, with more knowledge about what was actually happening at court, they probably had a more informed outlook on events. Those of them who were discerning would have realised that the king’s attempts to increase the proportion of

1 In the case of Churchill, the pen-portraits by W.S Churchill and A.L. Rowse both see him as such although both can be suspected of doing so for literary effect.
catholic officers in the army had long ago ground to a halt. More obviously evident was that he had also only had minimal success in appointing catholics to government office. To these facts there were several possible attitudes which could have been adopted by anglicans. They could think of all catholics as being dangerous and so oppose all appointments of them. A more subtle approach was to take a restricted view of the royal prerogative to dispense statutes and to deplore the appointment of any catholic as being illegal. Alternatively, a more flexible stance was possible. Not all catholics need have been regarded as undesirable appointees and, although some protestants would have paranoiacally disputed the contention, a number of them had held office before 1673 without causing trouble. Kept within reasonable limits, catholics could, and did, hold office once again without causing offence to many moderate anglicans. Thus, Dartmouth had been able during the previous year to welcome the appointment of Sir Roger Strickland as a vice-admiral.

These anglicans were prepared to set to one side their preference that the terms of the Test Acts be strictly adhered to in the hope that being flexible would help placate James. It was not as if the politics of the catholics were to them as questionable as those of the dissenters and that almost no whig-collaborators had been given places within the royal household is not without significance.

The existence of the dispensing power meant that the 1673 Test Act need not legally stand in the way of limited catholic appointments. Nothing James had said publicly suggested that he wanted anything more than this. The real concern was whether he nevertheless planned an influx of catholics far beyond anything their numbers warranted. In the minds of some, his determination to repeal the Test Acts outright when he was already able to dispense those who were unable to comply with them lent support to such an interpretation, but his record up to then, to those who took the trouble to examine it carefully, was capable of a more reassuring interpretation. The point, indeed, must be stressed that James had not confirmed the worst fears of his anglican subjects. Protestant apprehensions had been much more vivid than anything he had done so far. What he had done was to make them uneasy about the direction of his policies. Thus they viewed with nothing except trepidation the possibility that his declared policies were deceits and that he was planning to go as far as many feared. Yet it was (and is) still possible, insensitive though he had been, to believe that James wanted only what he said he did. With the question of his intentions thus far

---

unanswered, to do more than advise caution seemed premature and few were sure what it was they could do if this was to prove insufficient. Unease does not translate directly into rebellion.

Nevertheless, throughout most of the first three quarters of 1688 there was a persistent feeling that events might be moving towards a crisis. The year had begun controversially with the appointment of twelve catholics to the vacant fellowships at Magdalen College. To appreciate the significance of this development it is important not to exaggerate the impact of the preceding events. Initially the major issue had again been whether to allow the appointment of a catholic to senior public office. It was only because the fellows had had other grounds on which to disqualify Anthony Farmer (although they were not ones which would, in normal circumstances, have been allowed to stand in the way of a royal mandate) that this had escalated into something more serious than the cases of John Massey, Obediah Walker, Robert Charnock or, for that matter, any of the other catholics holding public office. Even then, it had taken the perverseness of the fellows’ refusal to elect Bishop Parker to bring James to eject most of them. Three of them did in the end feel able to retain their places throughout all the upheavals which followed. One of them, John Younger, was chaplain to Princess Anne and may have survived through a combination of this royal link and his convenient absences at court. More is known of the position of Jasper Thompson who survived because he believed that submission to the king’s commands was the only valid course. Although he had signed the initial petition to the king explaining that Farmer was not qualified to become president, he punctiliously obeyed all the royal mandates. The only time he questioned a decision of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners was when they demanded that he sign the submission acknowledging the fellows’ fault in opposing the appointment of Parker. Thompson had openly supported Parker’s candidature and he was excused after he had declared that he could not ‘own himself disobedient to the King nor ever will be’. As it happens, Thompson was also a Gentleman Pensioner. He would have been mindful that Huntingdon was one of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners but it seems doubtful that this was his main reason for cooperating. His stance was sufficiently consistent to suggest that he was acting on principle.

So far there had been no real indications that those other royal servants involved in the affair had responded very differently than Thompson had done. That Huntingdon and (until December 1687) Mulgrave had given every impression of supporting the

---

policy of the Ecclesiastical Commission has been discussed already. The same was true
of Bishop Crewe. The previous spring he had told Thomas Smith and Francis
Bagshaw that he would not ‘intermeddle’ in the matter because ‘hee was of opinion,
th[a]t the Kinges resolution was unalterable’ and on 28 November he was among those
Commissioners who voted for expulsion of the fellows.\(^7\) Ormond also had an interest
in what was happening. John Hough had been his chaplain and in April 1687 the
fellows (excluding Thompson and Younger) had written to him as the chancellor of the
university to request his assistance. Ormond did nothing.\(^8\) His ill-health can only be
part of the explanation for this failure.

There is no question that it was widely anticipated that the outcome of events in
Oxford would be of importance and, along the way, both sides had, through their
intransigence, made blunders. It had developed into, more than anything else, a test of
the powers of the Ecclesiastical Commission. With the appointment of catholics to
replace the ejected anglican fellows, the affair entered a new phase. The appointment of
the four fellows of whom two were catholics on 16 November had been ominous but
the royal mandate of 31 December, nominating the twelve catholics, changed
everything.\(^9\) That it was at this point that Mulgrave began to distance himself from the
decisions on the subject by his fellow members of the Ecclesiastical Commission
suggests that he grasped its significance. What had started as a dispute over the
appointment of a single catholic had become an attempt to overwhelm the college with
catholic fellows. By appointing them, James ended the hopes that he would attempt
conciliation by nominating anglican replacements. The inevitable effect of the decision
was to confirm the warnings made by those who had argued that Farmer’s appointment
would have been the first step to the wholesale appointments of catholics. By appearing
to endorse this view, hindsight distorted interpretations of James’s actions. After this
point it was difficult to believe the less interesting but more accurate interpretation
which was that James had had no clear plans and was merely reacting to events. It is
not impossible that Dicconson was correct when he claimed that James had to appoint
catholic replacements because there were no anglicans willing to accept.\(^10\) What is clear
is that James now systematically began working to make Magdalen a predominantly
catholic institution and with the appointment of Bonaventure Giffard as Parker’s
successor in March 1688 he had largely succeeded. James had won. In this test of its

\(^7\) Bloxam, *Magdalen College*, p. 18, Smith to Aldworth, [10 April 1687]; Bodl. MS Rawl. D365, fol. 23.
\(^8\) Bloxam, *Magdalen College*, pp. 36-7, fellows of Magdalen to Ormond, 19 April 1687; *Magdalen
college and the Crown*, pp. 42-3.
powers, the Ecclesiastical Commission had, with comparative ease, been able to confiscate an entire Oxford college. Only the moral victory had eluded James.

With this success, anglican unease reached new heights. James had gone further than most anglicans were prepared to accept without serious misgivings. Their apprehensions had now to be reassessed. More than ever, what was important was not so much the exact ground James gained as that a clear limit be laid down somewhere. For this reason, Ailesbury, as an act of appeasement towards James, had stated that he would be willing to help endow a new catholic college at Oxford to stop him ejecting the anglican fellows and other anglicans would, once the catholic takeover at Magdalen had been accomplished, have been able, in similar ways, to rationalise the existence of a catholic college, just so long as James went no further.\textsuperscript{11} This is what they had been doing since 1685. There is nothing to suppose that further advances by James would not have been submitted to with the same stoicism. For all the increase they had generated in the political temperature, the events at Magdalen had not produced a crisis. It was what had gone before, only more so. It is true that the unease surrounding these events did nothing to allay the atmosphere of impending crisis but there were other developments which seemed as if they would be the ones which would prove decisive.

It was clear that the queen's pregnancy and the promised parliament would each have consequences which could not be foreseen and the prosecution of the seven bishops would later add to the uncertainty. If there was going to be a crisis, it seemed plausible to suppose that one of them would provide the immediate cause. However, no one (not even William) could be sure that there would be a crisis and, as they unfolded, it could not be said that events were all going against James. This is not the same as to say that his long-term chances of success were good. Imminent successes would eventually have tempted the tactless James to have gone too far, but none of the difficulties which beset him prior to November 1688 should be thought of as having been disastrous.

There is no denying that the events of June 1688 were intensely embarrassing for James with the acquittal of the seven bishops compounding his discomfiture over stories concerning the prince of Wales. The doubts in the minds of some about the prince’s legitimacy called into question his honour and the humiliation implied by the public rejoicing at the verdict on 30 June should not be underestimated. It is important, nevertheless, not to confuse embarrassment with weakness and, where it mattered, James’s position remained strong. Indeed, now that he had a male heir it seemed stronger than ever. The birth of his son was not just an apparent indication of divine favour: it transformed the political situation. It is usually supposed that the main

\textsuperscript{11} Bloxam, \textit{Magdalen College}, p. 211n.
consequence was to disaffect many who could not accept the idea of a catholic dynasty but there must also have been some who came to realise, or would have done, that with the easy solution of Princess Mary succeeding in due course after her father’s death a diminishing prospect, the hard facts of the situation could no longer be evaded and that it made sense for moderate anglicans to think about reaching some sort of accommodation with the king. It was certainly the case that Sir Stephen Fox thought it worthwhile to seize the opportunity to begin constructing a reversion interest. When the household for the prince was being set up, Fox was ‘said to have had a hand, and in most places to have put those that are or were his own servants and relations’. Heading his clients among the prince’s servants was his nephew, John Fox, the Clerk Comptroller, who, being already the Clerk of the Spicery, was one of the five existing servants of the king who came forward to serve the new heir.

Admittedly, the result of the trial of the seven bishops carried with it no similar bonus. It would have given James little comfort had he realised that the humiliation was due more to carelessness than to any real weakness. The carelessness had certainly not been in short supply. Such was the lack of foresight evident in the government’s confused responses to the bishops’ protest that it must be considered sufficient to refute any theory that the requirement to read the declaration had been devised to bring about such a clash. James had, in all likelihood, never doubted that the clergy would comply and may have conceived the reading of the declaration to be a holy vow made before God and his subjects to fulfil the promises made in it. It would also have been a clear demonstration of the extent of anglican obedience to him. This was not, as an assessment of how the bishops would respond, so unrealistic. It could even be argued that, in presenting their petition, the bishops had come close to clamping down on the more defiant positions being adopted by many among the London clergy. Whereas the statement circulated among these clergymen had declared that the dispensing power ‘appears to us illegal’, the bishops watered this down to state that they did not wish to distribute the declaration ‘because that declaration is founded upon such a dispensing power, as hath been often declared illegal in parliament’. The bishops would have

---

12 Ellis Correspondence, II, p. 59, ---- to Ellis, 21 July 1688.
13 B.L. Add MS 51320, fol. 85-6, establishment of the prince of Wales’s household, 18 Sept 1688. Apart from John Fox, those who were already servants of the king were James St.Amand, Humphrey Prescott, Thomas Whitmore and Joshua Nightingale. The Table Laundress, Mary Johnson, and the Footman, Edmund Johnson, may have been related to Sir Stephen’s sister, Margaret, the wife of Nicholas Johnson.
14 The Attorney-General, Sir Thomas Powis, would claim that the declaration was to be read so that those who could not purchase a copy could hear it and so that the king ‘might be under the solemn tie and obligation to keep his word, by remembering that his promises had, by his own command, been published in time of divine service, in the house of God’. (State Trials, XII, col. 282).
15 R. Thomas, ‘The Seven Bishops and their petition, 18 May 1688’, Journal of Ecclesiastical History, XII (1961), pp. 56-70. Although the bishops included more examples of occasions on which
been fully aware that they did not, strictly speaking, state that the dispensing power or the declaration of indulgence were illegal. Instead, they merely queried them. They said nothing about the legality of the order-in-council. Combined with the assurances to the dissenters, which amounted to a promise to consider the idea of comprehension, the petition was hardly a manifesto of opposition. Its conciliatory spirit was lost on James. All the indications are that, on reading it, he misunderstood the contents. His initial rage fixed the official response and thereafter to have backed down would have been to lose face. The result was the sort of unseemly encounter neither the bishops nor James had wanted.

Several weeks before the trial took place, Huntingdon was able to tell Reresby that had James realised that it would lead to the bishops standing trial, he would not have ordered the clergy to read the declaration. This may have been meant by him as a coded criticism of the king, attributing to him a reasonable opinion he did not in fact hold. The alternative, assuming he was not simply deluding himself, is that Huntingdon was accurately reporting something of James's attitude, although that attitude may perhaps have not been so much regret as irritation, at finding himself in an embarrassing situation he had failed to foresee. The implication, of course, was that Huntingdon himself felt that the order to read the declaration had been a mistake. Yet, whether he thought it wrong, as opposed to unwise, is unclear and it cannot be deduced from these comments that he opposed the proceedings against the bishops. As a Privy Councillor, he signed the warrant for their committal. Mulgrave and Preston did so too. Even Dartmouth, whose Whitehall apartments had (significantly or otherwise) been where the other five had waited while Lloyd had arranged for them to see James, was prepared to sign it. There was nothing impossible in believing that James had a duty to uphold his prerogatives and that, for this reason, it would have been more desirable had he not placed the bishops in an impossible position which caused those prerogatives to be brought into question. Mortification at the fact that the bishops had been inadvertently placed in that impossible position already need not have diminished the feeling among James's closest anglican supporters that it was still important that the king's prerogatives be seen to be upheld. This made it all the more difficult for the

the Commons had complained about the dispensing power, Thomas must be considered wrong when he judged that 'the wording and substance of the objection to the dispensing power was strengthened'. (ibid, p. 64). Note, in particular, the precise use of the phrase 'in parliament'.

16 The care with which the bishops had thought out their positions is revealed by what was said during the audience with James. When Bishop White explained that 'the reading this declaration is against our conscience', James asked for clarification, demanding 'Do you question my dispensing power?' White replied, 'Sir, what we say of the dispensing power refers only to what was declared in parliament'. (State Trials, XII, col. 455).

17 Reresby, Memoirs, p. 499.

18 State Trials, XII, cols. 196-201, 454, 462-3, 523.
government to find a means of escape from the dilemma it had created for itself. Just as
the bishops had probably been innocently hoping that a way could be found to avoid
disagreement over the declaration of indulgence without either themselves or the king
making fundamental concessions, so the senior anglican courtiers probably continued
to hold out for such a hope. It seems likely that this expectation was abandoned only
after Dartmouth’s visit to Bishop Turner the day before the trial opened to propose,
without success, that a meeting with the king be arranged to facilitate the negotiation of
a last-minute deal.19

The desire to avoid, as far as possible, a direct confrontation with the bishops on
the issues of substance may explain why the proceedings against them took the form
they did. Even allowing for the fact that Sprat, at least, would have resigned earlier than
he did do so over the issue, it was would have been less risky to have used the
Ecclesiastical Commission rather than the Court of King’s Bench. The decision to use
the latter suggests an awareness of the fact that a judgment against the bishops there
would have commanded far greater authority than one by the nominees on the former.
A trial in the civil courts also had an important bearing on the nature of the charges
brought against the bishops. Whereas the Ecclesiastical Commission would, it has to be
assumed, have accused them of obstructing the reading of the declaration (the bishops
themselves were not required to read it), the trial at common law was on what, in the
circumstances, appeared a technicality, that of seditious libel. Trying them on a
technicality made some sense. The all-inclusiveness of the prosecution’s definition of
libel, to cover actions which could not credibly be thought to be seditious, invited
ridicule but did enable it to be implied that, for all their moderation, the bishops were,
nevertheless, seditious libellers because it was an easy mistake to make. Had they been
found guilty, this would have made it that much easier for James to have pardoned
them, on the grounds that it was a proper use of his prerogative to alleviate the law
when it restrained the freedoms of upstanding individuals. A more straightforward
argument was that, in law, the prosecution had a strong case.20

That case was, however, flawed. For one thing, there was the fact, as pointed out
above, that the bishops had done no more than imply that the use of the dispensing
power by the government might be illegal. Understandably, all that the prosecution
lawyers said during the trial assumed that they had clearly denied its legality. Sir Robert
Sawyer, on the other hand, thought it important enough that, in opening for the

19 *Clarendon Correspondence*, II, p. 179.
defence, he began by making this point. The prosecution left it unanswered, not even resorting to the argument that implied criticism of the king could be enough to count as libel. The defence, in any case, with their own agenda to argue, had another, more contentious, line of attack. The opportunity to dispute the legality of the dispensing power was too obvious for them to miss and so, as the central thrust of their case, they argued a position which the bishops had originally taken great care to avoid. It cannot be supposed that the bishops themselves agreed with all that was said in their defence. The prosecution legitimately responded that the bishops’ lawyers were raising irrelevant matters, only to find this argument sabotaged by Lord Chief Justice Wright in his most serious miscalculation. By allowing his fellow judges to pronounce on the prosecution’s definition of libel, he enabled Holloway to question that interpretation, Powell to make his sensational (and perverse) comments on the dispensing power and Alibone to appear ill-informed. This was the culminating act of carelessness. It is, nevertheless, unlikely to have affected the verdict. What more than anything else flawed the prosecution was that there can be little doubt that the minds of the jury, like those of everyone else, had been already made up before the trial commenced.

This was probably true of Michael Arnold, the royal brewer, who after being picked for the jury for the trial is said to have declared that ‘let the Tryal of the Bishops go which Way it would, he was undone on both Sides; for if he voted not against the Bishops, he should lose his Major’s Place being the King’s Brewer: and if he voted not on the Side of the Bishops, all his Customers had publickly assured him, that he should lose all their Custom’. Although this is a story which sounds as if it should be

21 State Trials, XII, cols. 358-61. There was the complication that the original draft, with the unambiguous objection to the dispensing power, had been the one printed and had had the bishops’ names appended. This, however, did not figure in the charges against the bishops.

22 State Trials, XII, cols. 421-9. Wright knew what Powell was likely to say and was therefore aware that what he had said in his summing-up would be forthrightly challenged by him. (ibid, XII, cols. 361-2n). That said, the view that Wright deliberately referred the question of whether the petition constituted libel to the jury as a way of evading responsibility does not really fit the facts. In summing-up he had made a clear distinction between publication as a question of fact to be decided by the jury and libel as a question of law to be decided by the judges. Irregular though the procedure was, when he asked the other three for their views, he stated that he was doing so because libel was a question of law. Indeed, possibly disconcerted, he reprimanded Holloway for commenting on the evidence, even although, if the surviving record is anything to go by, his remarks had been entirely confined to the definition of libel. The key fact is probably that Wright seems to have felt that, given the immense public interest in the case, it was important for the arguments about the dispensing power to be fully aired, even if they were besides the point and wrong. It can only be assumed that he discounted the impact of Powell’s views because he mistakenly thought Holloway, as well as Alibone, would wholeheartedly agree with his view that the petition was a seditious libel. The only sense in which the libel issue was then referred to the jury was by default, the judges having failed to give consistent directions on the matter. Powell’s famous remark about the dispensing power that ‘I do not remember, in any case in all our law (and I have taken some pains upon this occasion to look into it), that there is any such power in the king’ was all the more perverse given that he had been one of the judges who had found for Hales two years previously.

23 Revolution Politics, (1733), book V, p. 56. This is best known in the version polished from the above source by Macauley as ‘Whatever I do I am sure to be half ruined. If I say Not Guilty, I shall
apocryphal, at the time it was generally reported that it was Arnold who had been the one who had held out until the next morning before agreeing to an acquittal. Whether he held out simply because of self-interest is another question. Earlier in the year he had been retained as a JP in Westminster and as major of the Westminster and Middlesex militia, as well as being appointed a deputy-lieutenant in Middlesex, which suggests that he was seen as being sympathetic to the government’s policies. That he was selected for the jury is as much evidence of this as that he was because he was financially dependent on the king. Whatever his reasons, it may have taken physical intimidation to get him to relent (some, less probably, claimed he did so on orders from the Privy Council) but, once he had done so, it did not have the consequences he had feared. He retained his position as major of the Westminster and Middlesex militia and he continued to supply beer to the palace for the remainder of the reign.24

In substantive terms, the implications of the trial’s outcome were ambiguous. The contradictory directions given by the judges meant that it was not clear what it was the jury had decided the bishops were not guilty of. Whatever was widely thought at the time, the belief that the verdict demonstrated that the declarations of indulgence had been illegal was too simple. That on 12 July the Ecclesiastical Commission began preparations to discipline those clergymen who had refused to read the declaration was, perhaps, ill-advised but could nevertheless be reconciled with another, entirely tenable, interpretation of the verdict. The Commissioners may well have realised already that attempting to punish the recalcitrant clerics was bound to be futile and threatened to do so mainly to emphasise that the order-in-council of 4 May could still be considered valid. This was not the only thing which could be salvaged from the setback. Cool reflection, of the sort James was temperamentally reluctant to undertake, would have suggested that the reading of the declaration had been, or rather should have been, a secondary matter. Only his stubbornness, blinding him to what was really at issue, had turned it into a major one, causing him to repeat the process of blundering policy improvisation which had occurred over Magdalen College. As it was, there was still no practical obstacles preventing him continuing to disregard the Test Acts and, if he was now more determined than ever to get parliamentary approval for this policy, if only to

bree no more for the King; and if I say Guilty, I shall bree no more for anybody else.’ (T.B. Macauley, The History of England from the Accession of James the Second, (1848-61, reprinted 1889), I, p. 513).

24 Bodl. MS Tanner 28, fol. 104, Ince to [Sancroft], 30 June 1688; Bodl. MS Carte 130, fol. 317, Price to Beaufort, 30 June 1688; Ellis Correspondence, II, p. 5, Wynne to Ellis, 30 June 1688; T.B. Macauley, The History of England, I, pp. 516-17; Revolution Politicks, (1733), book V, p. 57; Henning, History of Parliament, I, p. 547; R. Beddard (ed.), Kingdom without a King, (Oxford, 1988) p. 89; T 1/4, fol. 42, Household arrears, 10 June 1689. An annotation against Arnold’s name in a list of the jury among Sancroft’s papers indicates that he owed money to the king. (Bodl. MS Tanner 28, fol. 96).
spite his critics, the plans to manipulate the forthcoming elections were already well advanced. These vital advantages were undiminished but to be set against them were developments which needed careful handling. Most obviously, he could not ignore the fact that the anglican episcopacy were now mostly included among his critics. Of even greater significance was that everyone else, for the first time, had come to realise this too. The bishops had shown their capacity to be figureheads for anglican discontent and the links established by them with the leaders of the dissenters overturned a number of the government’s calculations. It did not require any great foresight to realise that, when parliament assembled, his opponents would have the numerous questions raised but left unresolved by the bishops’ case to use as means of diverting the proceedings. The possibility of parliament doing no more than agreeing to approve his toleration proposals now seemed remote. Yet, for a skilled tactician (one thing James was not but which Sunderland, when not neurotic, was), there was still much to be played for.

The realisation that the bishops were in opposition to the king muddled the situation. That the trial had dramatised the fact that the bishops and the king appeared to be on a collision course was the thing which, more than anything else, loyal anglicans did not want to believe. The bishops themselves had been reluctant to believe it. Their moderation, contrasting with the apparent vindictiveness with which the government proceeded against them, had won them sympathy and, among the many who understood little of the constitutional issues at stake, support for them was unquestioning because it was inconceivable that the bishops could possibly have libelled the king. Supporters and critics of episcopacy could agree that, whatever some of the lawyers and judges might say, this was something bishops just did not do. The joy which greeted their acquittal was an expression of relief that an obviously unnatural situation had seemingly been brought to an end. Most of those celebrating may have believed, in some vaguely defined way, that the result was in the king’s best interests, with the celebrations being an appeal to him to remember that his subjects remained devoted to the Church of England, with all that that devotion implied. There was also a feeling that a limit of sorts had, at last, been laid down. The idea that a display of support for anglicanism might amount to disobedience was one many were still reluctant to face.25 To face it meant recognising that, with the bishops having refused to obey the king on the grounds of conscience, the trial might foreshadow a complete disregarding by James of the wishes of his anglican subjects, in which event their consciences could only be reconciled by resort to passive obedience. The thought that they had no more adequate solution was what really worried anglicans.

Their quandary was added to by the rumours that the prince of Wales was spurious. Just how widely these rumours were believed is, admittedly, difficult to assess. That the extraordinary meeting of the Privy Council to counter them was not held until 22 October indicates that the government did not attach much importance to them until they were incorporated into William’s declaration of 20 September. It is not wholly impossible that these stories first emerged from the Whitehall rumour mill, however it cannot be ignored that it was senior members of the royal household who, more than almost anyone else, would have known that James Francis Edward really was of the royal blood. Scarburgh, Witherley, Brady and St.Amand had all been on duty at the birth and subsequently confirmed the official version. Waldegrave and St.Amand also became the prince’s physician and apothecary. Most of the great officers had similarly been present and while they had had the discretion as gentlemen to stand well back, many of them had wives who had been among those around the queen’s bed. Much more probable is that the sources of this hearsay were whigs who were spreading the story in attempts to discredit the king. Confined to such circles the rumours would have been comparatively harmless, only serving to confirm the existing whig prejudice that catholics were capable of any iniquity. It was that they were believed by tories which made them dangerous. To those anglican-royalists who were wrestling with the conundrum of how to respond to a proselytizing catholic king whose succession to the throne they had supported in order to uphold the principle of hereditary monarchy, the idea that the principle of hereditary monarchy had been violated by the king was most distressing. It also made it tempting to believe that the ideological circle might, after all, be squared. It was this fiction which served to calm the vexed consciences of a number of those tories, most notably Princess Anne, who would engage in rebellion later that year, until this fiction was superseded by a more satisfying one, that of James’s ‘abdication’ (it was at least demonstrable that James had fled), whereupon it was quietly abandoned by all except those who were still prepared to believe anything about catholics. It did not, however, provide an answer to the question of what it was that anglicans should do.

The options available did not include rebellion. It was not just that the idea was taboo (although, if anything, memories of the Civil War meant that this was even more of a taboo than it had been in 1642) but also that James possessed a huge army which (whatever the reality) appeared to many to be too strong and too loyal. In any case, in the previous two centuries only one group in England had taken on the Crown in an

---

26 PC 2/72, fols. 166-76, 178; C 212/7, mm. 16-17, declarations concerning the birth of the prince of Wales, 27 Oct 1688. The role of the witnesses in the controversy about the prince’s birth is discussed in R.J. Weil, ‘The politics of legitimacy: women and the warming-pan scandal’ in L.G. Schwoerer (ed.), The Revolution of 1688-89, (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 65-82.
armed rebellion and won. That group, or rather institution, parliament, was about to be summoned. Any potential rebel with any sense of recent history would have wanted to wait to see what happened when it met, in the hope of utilising its moral authority against the king. For everyone else, the new parliament also seemed to hold out the best hope for only it seemed capable of achieving a peaceable resolution. That was what parliaments were for. That in their petition the bishops had promised that on the issue of the status of the dissenters they were ‘willing to come to such a temper as shall be thought fit when that matter shall be considered and settled in Parliament and Convocation’\textsuperscript{27} made waiting to see its outcome the official anglican policy. Yet, the petition’s mention of Convocation was not without significance because no one could be sure just how successful James’s strenuous efforts to sway the elections to parliament would be and, had the worst come to the worst, the bishops might have attempted to present Convocation as a more legitimate representative of the nation than a subservient parliament.

That, however, would have been very much something to be used only in the last resort. The bishops, who, had the parliament been allowed to meet, would have been expected to have led the defence of the anglican position, were not ones to seek confrontation. Everything they stood for means that it is difficult to imagine most of them doing other than seeking an honourable compromise with the king as quickly as possible, presumably along the same lines as they had already probably been considering. Some of the elements of the compromise they would have worked for are obvious: comprehension and less than complete toleration, together with the disbanding of the Ecclesiastical Commission and a ban on catholics holding (at least) military positions, set against recognition of the legitimacy of the prince of Wales and agreement to his upbringing as a catholic. For the details beyond this, the possibilities were endless. Willingness on James’s part to compromise would have produced disproportionate goodwill, probably enabling him to have retained, with parliamentary backing, almost all the real gains he had made. The major snag was that James was almost certainly too pig-headedly stupid to have realised this. This was the reason why, despite all the expectations placed on it, the unpalatable reality was that the new parliament would have been most unlikely to have solved anything. A parliament willing to do everything James wanted it to would have led to calls, as did happen, for a ‘free parliament’ whereas one which was not would have been quickly dissolved.\textsuperscript{28}

\textsuperscript{27} A. Browning (ed.), \textit{English Historical Documents, 1660-1714}, (1953), p. 84.
\textsuperscript{28} As late as September 1688 Dartmouth and (perhaps with less honesty) Churchill were telling James that they would assist him in getting the new parliament to agree to his policies. (Sidney, \textit{Diary}, II, pp. 274-5, Countess of Sunderland to Sidney, 3 Sept 1688).
The brutal truth was that, in any struggle with a wilful parliament, James did not share the disadvantages his father had had. Crucially, unlike he had been, James was solvent.

II

As in 1639 the decisive turn in events came from outside. William was, truly, a providential deliverer. Only his intervention made rebellion a realistic course of action and, even then, what followed was, more than anything else, a Dutch invasion in the guise of a baronial revolt. Apart from James, no else except William had the big battalions. When he landed at Brixham with them (and, arguably, not until then), it was clear that the crisis which earlier in the year it had seemed might be developing was, at last, under way. If few would at the beginning of the year have predicted that the crisis would take the form of a Dutch invasion, it was not as if, by November, William’s intervention had been unforeseen. For some time many of the likely rebels of consequence had known something of what was being planned. By the time it happened, it was over six weeks since James had revealed that an invasion was expected and most of the government’s most contentious policies had already been reversed, further confusing the situation for those unhappy with them.

Nevertheless, it is important to remember that however much the invasion had been anticipated, that it would take place had never been certain. That William had decided by late April that he would try, if possible, to intervene had not meant that thereafter there had been any assurance that the invasion would happen. By the time the ‘invitation’ was sent there had seemed every likelihood that he would instead have to fight Louis XIV. Furthermore, once he had committed himself to invading England rather than, for the time being, repulsing the French from the Rhineland, there had been much cause to suppose that the invaders could be stopped before they landed. Interception by the English fleet had been a real risk and at the first attempt the Dutch had been forced back

30 Among the measures which James had taken to prepare for the invasion was to appoint ten new Messengers on 3 October to bring their complement up to thirty and in the months which followed there would be much to keep them busy. (LC 5/148, fol. 251, 255, 256, 278, 297; SP 44/338, pp. 131-2).
31 Just when William did decide to invade has been the subject of varying interpretations. Jones argues for late April whereas Miller argues that it could have been as late as August. (J.R. Jones, The Revolution of 1688, (1972, reprinted 1988), p. 250; J. Miller, James II, (1978), p. 192) This discrepancy is partly because there are degrees of resolution.
into port by the weather. William’s armada had stood little better chance of reaching England intact than that of Philip II had done one hundred years earlier.\textsuperscript{32}

This utter uncertainty about whether or not William would be able to invade impinged upon the activities of those who knew something of what was being planned. Whatever they may have told William or Zuylenstein who, in any case, may have appreciated their difficulties, the conspirators had to keep their options open. As much as when some of them became Jacobite conspirators during the 1690s, they were taking out a political insurance policy. Furthermore, just how much they did commit themselves or how much they were told in return may well have been rather less than it is usual to suppose.\textsuperscript{33} The conspirators needed little detailed information beyond that William would try to intervene personally in some way as soon as was practical and, for some, just a nod and a wink might have been sufficient. Operating on a need-to-know basis reduced the possibility of leaks and the really important pieces of information, the time and location of the landing, may not have been finalised until the last moment.\textsuperscript{34} In this way, the innocent contacts previously made by Dijkvelt and Zuylenstein quietly yielded recruits. Best informed would have been those who would lead the provincial rebellions. Most of this group had been in regular contact with William for some time although it was probably only with the arrival in England of Zuylenstein in the middle of June that they, in any sense, began to be a conspiracy rather than a reversion interest. This group consisted basically of the ‘immortal seven’, although there would have been more than seven had Halifax, Nottingham and Bath responded more positively to the advances from Zuylenstein, Russell and Sidney. They would later be joined by Delamere and Lovelace. All of them can be said to have been out of favour at court but they were recruited first to the conspiracy as much because this meant that they would be able to rebel as that they were more willing to do so. To legitimate the invasion it was imperative that there be noblemen willing not only to sign the ‘invitation’ but also to take up arms against James. William probably never envisaged that the provincial rebellions would be of great military significance (an assumption which would have been correct) but politically their significance was paramount because the long tradition of aristocratic rebellion against unsatisfactory

\textsuperscript{32} See, however, the argument that the 1688 fleet was much better organised than that of 1588 in J.I. Israel and G. Parker, 'Of Providence and Protestant winds', in J.I. Israel (ed.), \textit{The Anglo-Dutch Moment}, (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 341-63. Monmouth had also experienced a difficult crossing in 1685.

\textsuperscript{33} There have been many accounts of the conspiracy. Of them the best is W.A. Speck, 'The Orangist conspiracy against James II', \textit{Historical Journal}, XXX, (1987), pp. 453-62, although the inevitable paucity of evidence means that different conjectures can be made regarding some of the details.

monarchs was the one thing which might conceivably overcome the stigma attached to disloyalty to the Crown. Moreover, such uprisings would require a certain amount of preparation in a way that the role assigned to the courtiers involved in the conspiracy did not.

Of the conspirators, it was those who were courtiers who were probably kept in the greatest ignorance. Not only were they the most likely to betray information to the king but they were also not expected to do anything until the invasion when it was hoped they would desert to William's forces. For this reason they were not brought into the conspiracy until later. When the seven wrote to William on 30 June they stated that among the officers of the army 'some of their minds are known already'\(^{35}\), indicating that some contacts were already being made in the armed forces. However, had any senior courtiers fully committed themselves at this stage they would surely have been pressed to sign the invitation. It was not until 4 August that Churchill wrote to William to tell him, 'my honor I take leave to put into your Royalle hinesses hands, in which I think itt safe, if you think ther is anny thing else that I ought to doe, you have but to comand me, and I shall pay an intier obedience to itt'.\(^{36}\) Quite possibly it was only after this point that recruitment of courtiers got under way with Sidney, through whom this letter was sent to William, presumably having made contact with Churchill as the first step in that process. As major-general in the army, confidant of Princess Anne and First Gentleman of the Bedchamber, he was ideally placed to prepare the discontented anglicans at court for the possibility of intervention by William and there is no reason to dispute the traditional assumption that through him the senior army officers and the 'Cockpit circle' were brought into the conspiracy.\(^{37}\) The involvement of the latter, the group linked with Princess Anne, was partly because it was important for William that Princess Anne side with him and her sister against her father and these were the courtiers Churchill would have been able to contact most easily but it was mainly because they overlapped with the former that they were brought in. Little attempt appears to have been made to recruit anyone not with a military position and all the members of the royal household involved were army officers as well. Apart from Ormond and Percy Kirke (by now the Keeper of Whitehall), the royal servants

---


involved may have included, in view of their subsequent actions, Richard Leveson, Roger Pope and John Tidcombe, although in none of these cases can this be certain.

Whether the ‘Portsmouth captains’ were involved remains uncertain. The point is relevant here because the most senior of the six officers from Princess Anne’s Regiment of Foot court-martialled in September 1688 for refusing to admit the soldiers from Ireland was John Beaumont, the Equerry, who was lieutenant-colonel of the regiment, while the five captains included Thomas Orme, the Gentleman Pensioner, and Thomas Paston, Yarmouth’s younger brother.\(^{38}\) It is tempting to believe that the discontent of these six means that they must have been involved in the conspiracy, with their refusal being further evidence of resentment among the protestant officers at the infiltration of catholics into the English army. It may not have been as simple as that. The Irishmen in question were ordinary footsoldiers, not officers, so, whatever their religion, their appointments did not contravene the Test Acts and if anyone in the regiment was breaking these laws, it was Berwick, the colonel, at whose appointment his officers had raised no protest. At their trial they said nothing about the tests, instead producing a weak defence involving what they claimed had been errors in the orders.\(^{39}\)

It had been a version of this excuse which Beaumont had used when, acting as their spokesman, he had explained to Berwick the reasons for their obstructive behaviour. Beaumont had told him,

> we do not think it consistent with our Honours to have Forreigners imposed upon us, without being complained of that our Companies were Weak, or Orders to recruit them, not doubting but if such Orders had been given us, we that first in very ill Times raised them Hundreds; could easily now have made them according to the King’s Complement; we humbly Petition we may have leave to fill up our Companies with such Men of our Nation as we may judg most sutable for the King’s Service and to support our Honours...\(^{40}\)

In this there is more than a suggestion of professional hurt feelings (not to say sensitivity to the charge that they may have been guilty of undermanning the regiment\(^{41}\)) but the emphasis on the particular that the men were foreigners implies a more serious objection. To Englishmen few acts were more likely to induce a cold sweat than proposals to station Irish troops in England.\(^{42}\) The nightmarish effect this prospect could have on the English imagination would be vividly demonstrated by the


\(^{39}\) HMC Leyborne-Popham, p. 266, autobiography of George Clarke.


‘Irish fear’ three months later. It was one thing to look away from what Tyrconnel was doing in Ireland. It was something else if the Irish were to be allowed to interfere in England. At such a possibility even many of the most loyal officers would have baulked, whether or not they were involved in a conspiracy. The only source to suggest that any of the six was a conspirator is Dicconson, who names Beaumont as one, but his accuracy is anything but assured.43 Quite why they would have drawn attention to their discontent in this way if they knew William intended to invade has never been adequately explained. The king’s reaction to the incident was one of ‘dejection rather than anger’.44 Beaumont was reappointed to his position while Orme, who had been dismissed from the Gentlemen Pensioners following the verdict, apologised to James and was reinstated.45 Moreover there had been one royal servant who had not shared their qualms. It had been Henry Slingsby, the Groom of the Bedchamber, who, as the lieutenant-governor of Portsmouth, had attempted to implement the royal order assigning the Irish soldiers to them in the first place.46

Even if the ‘Portsmouth six’ are counted, those royal servants involved in the conspiracy, despite the inclusion of two peers and a regimental colonel, seem a rather meagre bunch. Doubtless this concentration on the army was meant to weaken James where it mattered most and, with the army officers still unconvinced that repeal of the tests would be in their interests, many in the higher ranks of the officer corp who were not also royal servants proved to be willing participants in the conspiracy.

But what exactly was it that the conspirators were plotting to achieve? Leaving aside what the intentions of William and the whig exiles who accompanied him were, it is now generally accepted that, at this stage, most of the conspirators did not want to do anything so crass as to overthrow James. Rather, their explicit objective was that conventionally claimed by aristocratic rebels: persuading the king that he was

43 Clarke, Life, II, p. 168. It is true that Beaumont later defected to William. (Childs, Army, p. 187). This, however, can only be circumstantial evidence for his involvement and it is always possible that he became involved in the conspiracy out of resentment at the way he had been treated. Dicconson’s claim that Beaumont was involved, which he probably based only on the fact that Beaumont did defect, was meant to discredit Churchill, for Dicconson made it in conjunction with the claim that Churchill argued for the death penalty to the court martial. The simple objection to this is that the court would not have had the authority to pass the death sentence and not even Macauley was prepared to believe this slur against Churchill. (J.R. Jones, Marlborough, (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 32-3; T.B. Macauley, The History of England, I, p. 539n). The author of Revolution Politicks, in what appears to be an equally garbled version of the same story, claims that the officers were tried and acquitted by a council of war before the court martial at Windsor. According to this version, only one (unnamed) member of the council of war, ‘who gladly would have had their Blood’, voted against them. (Revolution Politicks, (1733), book VI, p. 48). However, given the nature of this source, it cannot be certain that this version is independent of the Dicconson version and there appears to be no other evidence of a council of war having acquitted them.
44 HMC Leyborne-Popham, p. 267.
45 For Orme’s reinstatement, see Huntington Library, Hastings MSS, HA 12813, Thomas to Huntingdon, 13 Nov 1688; HA 6068, Huntingdon to Preston (draft), n.d.
46 [E. Bohun], The History of the Desertion, (1689), pp. 6-7.
misguided. Everything suggests that these rebels meant it. On absconding from James, Churchill would leave a letter explaining the reasons for his apparent treachery.

This, sir, could proceed from nothing but the inviolable dictates of my conscience, and a necessary concern for my religion (which no good man can oppose), and with which I am instructed nothing can come in competition. Heaven knows with what partiality my dutiful opinion of Your Majesty has hitherto represented those unhappy designs which inconsiderate and self-interested men have framed against Your Majesty’s true interest and the Protestant religion; but as I can no longer join with such to give a pretence by conquest to bring them to effect, so I will always with the hazard of my life and fortune (so much Your Majesty’s due) endeavour to preserve your royal person and lawful rights, with all the tender concerns and dutiful respect that becomes, sir, Your Majesty’s most dutiful and most obliged servant.47

Churchill himself recognised that ‘men are seldom suspected of sincerity, when they act contrary to their interests’.48 Since Reresby, who felt he was ‘ungratefull’, there have been many who have doubted the genuineness of Churchill’s motives in defecting and it is difficult not to regard such assurances of loyalty in such circumstances as blatantly hypocritical.49 Yet his position outlined in this letter is consistent with his later actions in the Convention. Moreover in May 1687 he had told William that he was ‘resolved, although I cannot live the life of a saint, if there be ever occasion for it, to show the resolution of a martyr’, in his letter of 4 August he had reiterated that he was ‘resolved to dye in that Religion, that it has pleased god to give you both the will and power to protect’, and ten days after joining William he would assure Clarendon that ‘he would never be ungrateful to the King; that he would venture his life in defence of his person; and that he had never left him, but that he saw our religion and country were in danger of being destroyed’.50 Many years later his wife would give a revealing description of his motives, recalling that

When he left King James, which was with the greatest Regret imaginable, but he saw it was plain that King James could not be prevented any other way from establishing Popery and arbitrary Power to the Ruin of England. And I really believe he then thought that the Army would force the Prince of Orange to go back to Holland, when they found some way to secure the Prince of Orange’s Interest, & to have the Laws of England continued, which King James had so solemnly promised to do when he came to the Crown.51

48 ibid, I, p. 299.
50 Dalrymple, Memoirs, II (b), p. 191, Churchill to William, 17 May 1687; W.S. Churchill, Marlborough, (1933-8), I, p. 272; Clarendon Correspondence, II, p. 214. There were rumours that Bishop Turner had advised Churchill that a rebellion to protect the Church of England would be justified. (Revolution Politicks, (1733), book VI, p. 56).
51 ‘Some Instructions to the Historians for beginning the Duke of Marlborough’s History’, printed in W.S. Churchill, Marlborough, (1933-8), I, p. 569. Although her account of the Churchills’ role in
Sincere concern about the future of the Church of England is the least complicated explanation for Churchill’s and the other defectors’ actions, which is not, however, to deny that their motives were less than straightforward. The letter left for James was not just an apologia. It was also a statement of Churchill’s opening negotiating position for it is clear that the defectors wanted their defections to be the beginning, not the end, of the process of seeking a negotiated settlement.

The precise context in which the leading defectors abandoned James between the evening of 23 November and the early hours of 25 November does not point to the decision to defect being a spontaneous one taken without much forethought. Instead their actions suggest that if they did not go over to William at the earliest possible opportunity, they did do so as soon as was sensible. With them unaware that the landing would be in Devon and with most of the courtiers in London at the time, a delay was unavoidable but during the third week of November the first defections of officers already in the field had duly got under way. Among them had been John Beaumont and the Gentleman Pensioner, John Tidcombe, with it being possible that Tidcombe did so in order to inform William that Bath was preparing to seize Plymouth. For the really important conspirators, however, had had to wait. James had not set out from London until 17 November, after some confusion in the days before as to when exactly he would depart, and he did not reach Salisbury until 19 November.

For the most senior members of the conspiracy, including Prince George, Churchill, Grafton and Ormond, who were part of the king’s considerable entourage, this was the first chance to get to the front. Nevertheless, they seem already to have decided before they left London to go over to William because on 18 November Princess Anne was able to write to William to tell him that Prince George would defect as soon as possible. That they did not immediately defect on reaching Salisbury need not be interpreted as vacillation. Although it would seem that it was not the state of the army which, by disillusioning them, prompted their defections, it was only commonsense

these events is otherwise conventional, Harris recognises the importance of these comments. (F. Harris, A Passion for Government, (Oxford, 1991), p. 53).

52 Huntington Library, Hastings MS HA 2394, Dunkin to Huntingdon, 15 Nov 1688; HA 6068, Huntingdon to Preston (draft), n.d.; HA 6069, Huntingdon to countess of Huntingdon, 18 Nov 1688; Childs, Army, p. 147. It was Tidcombe’s defection which, by creating a vacancy, enabled Huntingdon to reappoint Thomas Orme as a Gentleman Pensioner.

53 On 13 and 14 November the intention was that James would leave on 19 November. The next day the Board of Greencloth was told that the journey was to be postponed but the day after that the departure was brought forward to 17 November. (SP 44/97, p. 16, Middleton to Mews, 13 Nov 1688; LC 5/148, fol. 284, Mulgrave to Greencloth, 14 Nov 1688; fol. 296, Mulgrave to Greencloth, 15 Nov 1688 and Mulgrave to Greencloth, 16 Nov 1688).

54 SP 8/2, part 2, fols. 152-3, Anne to William, 18 Nov 1688, printed in Dalrymple, Memoirs, II (b), p. 334. In this letter she makes no mention of any intention on her part to defect. When she did so, she was already aware that Churchill had defected and probably assumed that her husband had also done so. Equally important would have been the news of the uprisings at Nottingham and York.
that Churchill and his main co-conspirators should have delayed their departures in order to assess the military preparedness of the army and to wait for the king to decide what he was going to do. With the king afflicted with severe nosebleeds, which started the day after they arrived in Salisbury, there was a complicating delay of four days before the council of war met to determine strategy. Bluffing his way through by advising against a withdrawal, Churchill was able to ascertain that James agreed with Feversham’s advice that the army retreat to London. Within hours he and Grafton had gone and the others followed within twenty-four hours. Kirke would probably have done so as well had he not been arrested, although Leveson, on being sent to Warminster to arrest him, seized the opportunity to defect himself.\textsuperscript{55}

The eighteen day delay notwithstanding, defection was these conspirators’ first move in response to the invasion and for those of them who were political players of consequence, it would have been viewed as a means of placing themselves into the best position from which to influence the crisis ensuing from William’s intervention. Their reasons for joining William were not so much to tilt the military balance in his favour (and was certainly not to further his interests at the expense of those of James) as to avoid the outbreak of civil war. To moderates, a ‘free parliament’ still seemed the best hope for a resolution and with this being the main demand being made by William, uniting around him appeared the least divisive course. It was clear that were the two armies to clash in a full-scale battle (and the king’s retreat did not rule this out) the situation would become irredeemably polarised and William’s claim that he had no warlike intentions was not without conviction for, no matter the outcome of it, any battle would have seriously dented his attempts to portray himself as the unifier of the nation.\textsuperscript{56} For the senior army officers especially, the responsibility for instigating a civil war was one they were determined not to accept and they would have been acutely aware that, if fighting began, they would be the ones charged with destroying an opponent whom they viewed as standing for moderation. Anxious to minimise divisions, they would have rejected the idea that it was all a question of choosing sides and regarded themselves as seeking the same objectives as those tories who remained aligned with the king. A ‘free parliament’ had been the request of the bishops, Ormond, Grafton, Dorset, Clarendon, Rochester, Newport and the other tory peers who had presented their petition to James on 17 November as he was leaving for Salisbury and

\textsuperscript{55} Clarke, \textit{Life}, II, p. 225, memoirs; SP 44/97, p. 24, [Middleton] to Preston, 25 Nov 1688. Oglethorpe was sent to find out what had happened to Leveson and it was initially assumed that Leveson had been killed or taken prisoner rather than had deserted. When exactly Roger Pope defected is not known but it must have been at about this time that Sir John Elwes, who did not have a military position and who had probably been the Gentleman of the Privy Chamber given the task of accompanying the king to Salisbury, travelled north to join Devonshire at Nottingham. (Henning, \textit{History of Parliament}, II, pp. 264-5, III, 262-3).

The defectors would have hoped to overcome the ominous intransigence indicated by the fact that, on receiving the petition, James had 'seemed not pleased, and gave a very short answer to them to this effect, that he would call a Parliament as soon as it was convenient, but it could not be whilst the invasion and rebellion lasted'. A 'free parliament' was again the main advice given to James when he consulted with the peers on his return. It is true that these demands were not entirely without partisan motives, with the tories hoping that they would benefit most from the elections, but, on this point at least, William was closer to agreeing with them than with the whigs.

The serious drawback in this evaluation of the situation was that the polarisation of opinion had begun with William's intervention because those who initially assumed that that intervention constituted a foreign invasion and a call to rebellion, that is, those who were not in on the conspiracy, naturally misunderstood defection to William to be treason against the king. It was because he had made this assumption that Clarendon was mortified when his son, Cornbury, defected, although, once James had conceded the demands for a 'free parliament', he too joined William, only to be disillusioned when he realised that, no matter what the tories wanted, the whigs around William did intend to remove James. Among the soldiers Cornbury took with him was the Surveyor of the Stables, Ambrose Norton, and he was one of those who returned as so D, as he was able to the king's army.

Ailesbury, who would have resigned as a lord lieutenant had Dartmouth, being aware that news that William was planning to invade was about to break, not warned him against doing so and who had been considered by his brother-in-law, Ormond, as a possible recruit to the conspiracy, had advised the king that Prince George, Churchill, Ormond, Grafton, Kirke and Trelawny be arrested when it was rumoured that they were conspiring against William. When they did defect, he 'could not imagine that persons that had such eminent employments, civil and military, could betray their benefactor and King and master'. Ailesbury's comments make it clear that had he been asked to join the conspiracy he would have refused, or, at any rate, in later life he liked to think that he would have done. Northumberland did do so when Churchill and Grafton informed him of their plans immediately before leaving and it was he who then

---

57 SP 31/4, fol. 196, petition to James II, 17 Nov 1688; To the King's Most Excellent Majesty, the Humble Petition of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, (1688); Macpherson, Original Papers, I, pp. 161-2; Campana de Cavelli, Les Derniers Stuarts, II, pp. 331-4, Hoffman to Leopold I, 19/29 Nov 1688; Clarendon Correspondence, II, p. 205.


60 Ailesbury, Memoirs, I, pp. 177-80, 184.
replaced Churchill as a Gentleman of the Bedchamber. Sir Stephen Fox had likewise refused to become involved when he was approached by Compton. According to his first biographer, he told him that

he was very sensible of the King his Royal Master’s Designs, thro’ the Insinuations of wicked and ill-disposed Counsellors; that he beheld his Majesty’s and the Nations deplorable Condition, with the utmost Concern and Grief; that he wish’d a happy Issue out of it to both, and that he should be just to his Word, which he had given him to keep this Proposal secret; but that he had imbib’d Loyalty from his Infancy, in such a manner, and was so instructed in his Duty to his Prince, by the Precepts of Religion and Justice, as never to have swerved from it thro’ the Course of a long Life, which had been spent in the Service of the late and present King; and therefore desired to be excused from having a Hand in any Design against a Monarch, whose, and his Brother’s Bread he had so plentifully eaten of, and to whom he ow’d the Opulence and Wealth which, by the Blessing of God, he was possess’d of.

As for Mulgrave, one of the conspirators (probably Sidney) had suggested to William that he should be contacted, only for Shrewsbury to advise against the idea. Six years later William would tell Mulgrave of this to which he would reply that, if contacted, he would have betrayed the conspiracy to the king. Beaufort, whatever his previous doubts about the king’s policies, also stayed loyal and was responsible for the attempted defence of Bristol. When he did surrender, he did so with permission from James. Similarly, Somerset had responded to the news of the invasion by immediately offering his assistance to James. Huntingdon would suffer imprisonment because he remained loyal, which worsened his already poor health, for when Bath had seized Plymouth (supposedly in the king’s name), he had had him placed under arrest. Like Rochester, Huntingdon’s involvement in the Ecclesiastical Commission meant that he was distrusted by many anglicans and it seemed likely that in what followed, those tories who had distanced themselves from James’s policies would be wary of working with those who had remained in court office.

62 *Memoirs of the Life of Sir Stephen Fox*, (1717), p. 83. These comments are, admittedly, reported in late source and there were other late stories that Fox had taken care to hedge his bets. *Revolution Politicks*, (1733), book VIII, p. 23). There would, however, have been little reason for a favourable biographer to have distorted Fox’s actions during late 1688 in this way by the time when this biography was published. The one contemporary letter by Fox commenting on events, which will be quoted below, tends to support this account.
64 SP 44/56, p. 456, Sunderland to Beaufort, 18 Oct 1688; SP 31/4, fol. 157, Beaufort to Sunderland, 20 Oct 1688; B.L. Add MS 10118, fol. 175; Huntington Library, Hasting MS HA 6072, Huntingdon to James II, 24 Nov 1688; HA 6073, Huntingdon to countess of Huntingdon, 25 Nov 1688; HA 6074, Huntingdon to countess of Huntingdon, 26 Nov 1688; SP 8/2, part 2, fol. s 58-9, Bath to William, 27 Nov 1688. Huntingdon’s wife died on Christmas Eve and, for this reason, he was released in early January 1689. (*Universal Intelligence*, no. 10; *English Currant*, no. 9).
For the moment, with the king's return to London and the decision by him to summon a parliament, there was an uneasy hiatus. Defections more or less ceased (Clarendon being one exception if, that is, he can be said to have defected) and, no doubt, like everyone else, relieved that civil war, at least, had seemingly been avoided, the royal servants waited to see what happened next. Much depended on what role William would be given or press for in the moves to work out some solution to what was to be done. As the terms presented at Hungerford show, his immediate aim was to obtain from James a tacit acknowledgement that both sides should step back from hostilities, although, by demanding the removal of all catholics from government office, he was also seeking the concession which many of the rebels would have seen as the essential component of the settlement to be reached in the new parliament.65 What he could not have realised was just how quickly these demands became irrelevant.

By his own account, it was these demands which made James decide to flee. If this was the honest truth (and comments attributed to him by Burnet suggest otherwise), it would indicate that he had badly misinterpreted the situation, for these demands were, in the circumstances, not immoderate.66 In any case it can be argued that, whatever his reasons for doing so, the fact that he fled, of itself, indicates that he had misinterpreted the situation. To flee only solved most of William's immediate problems whereas to stay would have compounded them. Had he stayed he would have been able to benefit from the doubts of some of the rebels who were not completely confident that what they were doing could be justified and with the rebels divided over exactly what they intended to do with him, there would, had he been prepared to give some ground, have been plenty of opportunities to exploit these differences. The example of his father should have told him that, even when a prisoner, a king remained a potent political force and, for the time being, it would have been in William's interest to have maintained the pretence that James was not, in any sense, a prisoner. It was, however, the example of his father which meant that James could never choose this approach. With the callow certainties of the teenager he had been in the 1640s, his father's death proved to him the perils of demeaning the office of king by stooping to negotiate with those who were only his subjects. Far better it seemed to withdraw into exile to await the summons from a contrite nation as his brother had done rather than to tarnish the royal honour in what could only be a futile attempt to reconcile any conception he had of what a monarchy should be with what he took the demands of the rebels to be. In particular, he would have realised that negotiating would, without

65 Foxcroft, Halifax, II, pp. 29-30, William to Halifax, Nottingham and Godolphin, 10 Dec 1688.
question, mean addressing the issue of the legitimacy of his son and, on this, everything pointed against him being accorded a fair hearing. What, however, in his bitterness, he overlooked (or could not forget) was that the leading rebels were his daughters and their husbands. Machiavellian William might have been but Mary and Anne would never have supported anything remotely like the solution to which the Rump had had to resort in the face of their grandfather’s principled stubbornness. To remain would have meant James having to lose face but there was never any question of him having to lose his head.

Why he failed to understand this was that the deeper truth about his flight was that he felt betrayed by all those whom he had felt he could trust most. It was not just his daughters and Churchill whose actions he found inexplicable either. He would later recall that Bath’s defection was ‘more wonder’d at by the King than any which had happen’d, his obligations to the Crown were so great, his family allways esteem’d so loyall, and himself till then looked upon as uncapable of being shaken or tempted to an ill action’. Both politically and emotionally he was now crippled by the fact there was no one whom, he thought, he could fully trust. Even Dartmouth seemed suspect. Doubts in his mind about this, his closest friend, had first emerged with his failure to intercept the Dutch invasion fleet. When Mulgrave had then spoken disparagingly of him at court, James had publicly expressed confidence in him and Preston wrote to him to reassure him that, no matter what other courtiers might say against him, he retained the king’s favour. Nevertheless, to his memoirs, James would confide that he thought this failure to stop the Dutch ‘a mistery’ and, with a note of sadness, added ‘the King who till then had a good opinion of him, would not censure him till he heard what he could say for his own justification, but never seeing him more, that could not be done’. James appeared to confirm that he was still prepared to trust him when on 1 December he recommended him to Cambridge University as a suitable successor to Albemarle as Chancellor but it was not long before the doubts reappeared. That same day Dartmouth and forty other naval officers wrote to James to inform him that, given ‘the Great Dangers your Majesties Sacred Person has been in, and the great Effusion of

---

70 SP 44/150, p. 3, James II to the Vice-Chancellor and Senate of Cambridge University, 1 Dec 1688. Earlier that year Albemarle had nominated him to act as his deputy during his absence. (HMC Dartmouth, I, p. 136, Croft to Dartmouth, 7 Jan 1688). On 12 December the university, ignoring the king’s recommendation, nominated Sancroft but he turned it down.
Christian Blood that threatened this your Majesties Kingdom', a parliament was 'the only means in our opinion, under the Almighty, left to quiet the Minds of your People' and the doubts were further increased when he refused to assist in the removal of the prince of Wales to France. Looking back on these events James would recall them in terms which were less than fair to Dartmouth. On the incident involving his son, he would, forgetting that he had had the election writs issued on 28 November, claim that he 'was hugely troubled when he heard it, tho[ugh] not surprized, considering the address which came from that Lord and the rest of the Marine Offices a little before, wherein they desir'd the King to call a Parliament, declaring their resolution of standing by the Protestant Religion but not one word of standing by the King'. In a separate autobiographical fragment he would be even more unjustifiably harsh for he would write that Dartmouth’s actions
doe but too manifestly shew, that whether it was Religion, faction, or intrest, that weighed most with him, tis certain his loyalty was worsted in that conflict; and that it was the Prince of Orange’s contempt of his service, rather than his want of good will to serve him, that hinder’d My Lord Dartmouth from falling in with the current as others did at the Revolution.

With even Dartmouth no longer thought by him to be reliable it was easy for James to overlook that the vast majority of his servants had remained loyal. More than anyone else, James misunderstood the actions of those around him.

III

James could, it is true, still rely on his co-religionists and it was mainly to them that he now turned. When he left Whitehall shortly after midnight on 11 December, leaving Northumberland, the (anglican) Gentleman of the Bedchamber who happened to be on duty that week behind, James rode with Hales and James de Labadie, the Page of the Bedchamber, in a coach which was probably driven by Richard Smith, one of the Grooms of the Stables. With De Labadie and the coachman remaining at Millbank, James and Hales crossed by ferry to Vauxhall or Lambeth where they were met by an

71 To the King’s Most Excellent Majesty, the humble address of George Lord Dartmouth...and the Commanders of Your Majesties’ Ships of War, [1688], single leaf.
72 Clarke, Life, II, pp. 233-4, memoirs.
73 ibid, II, p. 208, memoirs. These comments are explained by James’s belief that Dartmouth had made contact with William after preventing the prince of Wales from leaving. (Macpherson, Original Papers, I, p. 157). They would also have been influenced by Dartmouth’s decision that, because disbandment of the fleet was hardly practical, to cooperate with William in the weeks following James’s departure. The comments are especially harsh and ungrateful because by the time they were written Dartmouth had already died while imprisoned in the Tower as a Jacobite conspirator. There are differences in emphasis between these three passages from the memoirs because they would almost certainly have been written at different times.
unnamed guide and Edward Syng, the quartermaster of Hales's regiment. This party then set off on horseback through north Surrey and Kent. Six hours later, at the Woolpack Inn at Aylesford Bridge, they rendezvoused with Ralph Sheldon who was waiting there with fresh horses. Hales and Sheldon then went with James to Faversham and would have accompanied him to France had the plan not miscarried.74

By this time the most notorious of the catholic courtiers had already tried to flee. The biggest exodus had taken place on 9 December with the departures of Peterborough (who claimed that he was going abroad for the sake of his health) and Salisbury, as well as that of the queen and the prince of Wales. Like the king, Peterborough was stopped on 11 December in Kent, in his case at Ramsgate. Meanwhile, in London the peers' committee were ordering the sheriffs to investigate reports that armour was being loaded onto a boat at Salisbury's house in the City. Salisbury himself also seems to have been stopped somewhere in Kent round about this time as were most of the fleeing catholics courtiers. Salisbury then managed to escape, only to be recaptured. On 24 December permission would be granted to transfer both Peterborough and Salisbury from Canterbury to the Tower.75 Most of the last orders James had issued were for passes to those catholic courtiers who were still at Whitehall including Henry Hills (whose house and printing shop had become a particular target for the mob), John Abel and Bulkeley's wife, Lady Sophia.76

---

74 Clarke, Life, II, pp. 251-6, memoirs; Macpherson, Original Papers, I, pp. 165-6; Buckingham, Works, II, p. 73; Ailesbury, Memoirs, I, p. 194, 208; Bramston, Autobiography, p. 338; Dalton, Army Lists, II, p. 35, 144 and n.; B.L. Add MS 32095, fols. 302-11, accounts of James II's capture at Faversham, Dec 1688; F.C. Turner, James II, (1948), pp. 444-5. The evidence for Smith's involvement is the rumour anticipating the king's flight reported by Ailesbury. It would have been uncharacteristic of Ailesbury not to have revise this anecdote in the retelling so that the rumour conformed to what subsequently did happen. He also states that De Labadie was held along with Hales and Sheldon at Faversham. This matches contemporary speculation, repeated by Bohun and Dodd, that he was with James when stopped. (London Courant, no. 2; Universal Intelligence, no. 2; [E. Bohun], History of the Desertion, (1689), p. 105; [C. Dodd], The Church History of England, (Brussels, 1737-42), III, p. 434). These, however, are contradicted by James's explicit statement that he was left at Millbank. Bohun is known to have had copies of the news-sheets (see C.U.L. Sel. 3. 235) and Dodd's information may not be independent testimony, being possibly derived from Bohun. There was a false rumour that Peterborough was with James when he was stopped. (London Courant, no. 2; London Mercury, no. 1; English Currant, no. 2).

75 SP 44/338, p. 158; HMC 11th Report, appendix, part V, p. 228, Pepys to Dartmouth, 10 Dec 1688; p. 235, Beach to Dartmouth, 15 Dec 1688; HMC 12th Report, appendix, part VI, p. 12, no. 8, petition from Peterborough, 24 Jan 1689; Campana de Cavelli, Les Derniers Stuarts, II, p. 413, 419, 425, 373; Hatton Correspondence, II, p. 125, King to Hatton, 13 Dec 1688; London Courant, no. 2; London Mercury, no. 2; POAS, IV, p. 328, II. 28-45; Beddard, Kingdom without a King, p. 70, 91, 101, 158, 162. There had been rumours that Peterborough had secretly removed his belongings from St. James's Palace as early as mid-October. (Revolution Politics, (1733), book VII, p. 5). At about the time of his flight a mob ransacked his house at Drayton and discovered a large store of arms which had been thrown into a fishpond. (London Mercury, no. 4; Universal Intelligence, no. 5).

76 SP 44/338, pp. 159-62; SP 44/97, p. 15 Middleton to Lord Mayor, 13 Nov 1688; Ellis Correspondence, II, pp. 350-1, ----- to Ellis, 13 Dec 1688; CTB (1685-89), p. 2140. On 10 December one of the very last warrants issued by James before his flight had been a commission to James Fortrey, the Groom of the Bedchamber, to be guidon in Peterborough's Regiment of Royal Horse Guards. (SP 44/166, p. 10). Hills had made his will on 10 December. The flight probably killed him
Just how most of the royal servants reacted when Northumberland opened the doors of the Bedchamber to reveal that James had disappeared is not known. All that is known is that James Griffin set out for Abingdon to tell William whilst his fellow Groom of the Bedchamber, Henry Slingsby, was one of the ten regimental colonels in London who immediately wrote to William to promise to uphold public order in the capital until he arrived. Although there had been rumours that he was going to depart, the discovery that he had gone must have been disconcerting. What exactly they were expected to do now was unclear so the household officials, pending the locating of the king’s whereabouts, could do little except defer to the emergency committee of peers which, with little hesitation, set themselves up as the most appropriate substitute for the king. Yet it is possible that, at first, not all the senior courtiers were prepared to recognise this body because of them, only Mulgrave and Ailesbury attended the first session, but then, Feversham and Godolphin except Mulgrave was the only courtier of real consequence left in London who was eligible to attend it. He also allowed his secretary as Lord Chamberlain, Richard Cooling, to assist Francis Gwyn, the acting clerk to the peers. His attendance was therefore important in conferring some sort of legitimacy on its proceedings, as well as casting doubt on Ailesbury’s claim that he responded to the king’s disappearance by breaking his white staff. Both Mulgrave and Ailesbury, having almost certainly supported the original, explicitly loyalist, draft, signed the neutral declaration asking William to assist in ensuring the smooth assembling of the parliament, as already summoned by James, in order to protect the protestant religion.

Mulgrave’s lead in attending these meetings was followed by the

for within weeks he was dead. (R.L. Haig, ‘New light on the King’s Printing Office, 1680-1730’, Studies in Bibliography, VIII, (1956), p. 160. Additional evidence that he fled at this time is that His Majesties Reasons for withdrawing himself from Rochester, [1688] prompted the publication of a satirical commentary whose full title was The King’s Reasons (with some Reflections upon them) for withdrawing himself from Rochester, written with his own Hand, (or rather Copied from his own Speech after the Bawdy Affidavit) and ordered by him to be published, (By Henry Hills, but that he was out of the way), [1688].

HMC Hamilton Supplement, p. 113, Feversham to commanding officers of Lichfield's and Arran's regiments, 12 Dec 1688; SP 31/4, fol. 203, regimental colonels to William, 11 Dec 1688. Beddard misidentifies Griffin as being Lord Griffin. (Kingdom without a King, p. 35).

Beddard, Kingdom without a King, p. 67, 71-2; idem, ‘The loyalist opposition of the Interregnum’, BIHR, XL (1967), p. 106; idem, ‘The Guildhall declaration of 11 December 1688 and the counter-revolution of the loyalists’, HJ, XI (1968), pp. 403-20; Buckingham, Works, II, p. 74; Ailesbury, Memoirs, I, p. 202. Gwyn’s minutes, edited by Beddard, reveal that Ailesbury’s account of these events must be used with considerable caution, especially when he is discussing Mulgrave. His statement that Mulgrave did not attend any of the meetings of the peers is false. Mulgrave may have broken his white staff but in the days which followed he was one of James’s most prominent supporters and so the interpretation Ailesbury places on this action is unfair. Like all government departments the Chamber administration ground to a halt. Mulgrave had issued a number of routine warrants on 8 December. The only one he issued in the days which followed was an oddity. On 12 December he sent a request to Griffin to pay Richard la Bas, the Marshal of the Ceremonies, for introducing ambassadors at court during the previous two years. This was not entered up in the usual sequence and it is most unlikely that Griffin would have been responded. La Bas was not a catholic. Had Mulgrave already broken his staff this warrant would have been invalid. (LC 5/148, fol. 306, 367).
others. On the morning of 12 December the second session was attended by both Feversham and Godolphin. Feversham’s position in these circumstances was particularly fraught. Queen Catherine, fearful that Somerset House would be attacked, had turned to him, her Lord Chamberlain, for protection and that afternoon she refused to give him leave to attend the peers at Whitehall. He was, moreover, supposed to be the lieutenant-general of the army but that position he had effectively relinquished when, misinterpreting his letter from James of 10 December (which meant as well that he was aware that James did intend to leave the country) he had issued orders to disband the army before travelling from his headquarters at Uxbridge to London to join the queen dowager. When on 13 December he attempted to address some of the troops, before he was dissuaded by Halifax, he made clear where his sympathies lay by wearing mourning dress. Like Mulgrave, it was of some importance that he recognised the peers’ authority.19 Preston, now Secretary of State as well as Master of the Great Wardrobe, who had been questioned on 11 December as to where James had gone, was the next day admitted as a member of the committee along with all the other Privy Councillors who were not English peers. Lichfield came first that afternoon and Yarmouth, the afternoon after that. Given that Dartmouth was with the fleet, that Huntingdon was in prison, that Beaufort was still in the west (he would join William at Windsor on 14 December to make his peace with him) and that Waldegrave was out of the country on a diplomatic mission, only Northumberland and possibly Griffin showed any prolonged unwillingness to participate. Northumberland waited until 22 December, when James had left London for a second time, before attending any of the meetings and Griffin, whose whereabouts are unknown and who may have been conscious that his grant of a peerage dating only from the previous month would be called into question, attended none of the meetings.80

On meeting one of the peers’ priorities was to determine where the Great Seal was. To this end, once Jaffeys, after being arrested, had claimed that James took it with him, Chiffinch was questioned to obtain information about the final meeting of James with his Lord Chancellor but he was unable (or unwilling) to confirm that it had been left with the king. Only when Jaffeys was questioned again did it become clear


that James had, indeed, taken it with him. After the initial investigation Mulgrave, along with Kent and Montagu, sealed the royal closet.81 The other development which, amidst all the uncertainty, required action from the household officials was that the mobs, intent on destroying any symbols of popery, were singling out the catholic chapels royal and the ambassadorial residences. During the rioting of 11 December the Queen’s Chapel at St. James’s had come under attack and the next day extra military forces were stationed at the royal palaces. That same night a mob had also attacked Weld House where De Ronquillo, the Spanish ambassador, was staying. Sir Charles Cotterell was therefore instructed to convey the peers’ apologies and the Board of Greencloth was then ordered, via Godolphin, to provide him with food and accommodation, which they did until 29 December at a cost of £195. Further assistance to him was provided by an order that Sir Henry Firebrace, the Second Clerk of the Greencloth should, in return for payments of one-twentieth their value, receive any goods which had been stolen from him.82 In all, plate amounting to 1,896 ounces was returned to De Ronquillo. Firebrace would subsequently inform the Treasury that, in addition to the items stolen from De Ronquillo, ‘several pieces of the Kings Chappel Plate have been brought in, and large Sums demanded for reward, as also several sorts of Household & other Goods much broken & spoiled, with many Bookes & other things of little value, insomuch that they grow too bulky & troublesome’ and so asked, instead, that the Jewelhouse deal with these valuables belonging to the king.83 Further trouble was caused by a break-in at the lodgings of Father Warner at Whitehall which was reported by the Wardrobe staff.84

It was with the news that James was at Faversham that differences in attitudes towards the implications of the king’s disappearance began to emerge between the royal servants and the other peers. His servants seem not to have thought that James was anything other than still king and were much more willing to send help. In the confusion which followed the arrival on the morning of 13 December of the Canterbury joiner, Thomas Liniall, with something important to tell Sancroft, it was Mulgrave who, announcing that it was being rumoured that Liniall would tell them that the king

83 B.L. Add MS 51320, fol. 121, Gilbert and Brydall to Devonshire, 21 Dec 1689; fol. 123, inventory of plate in Firebrace’s hands, 1 Mar 1689; fol. 125, Firebrace to Treasury Commissioners, n.d.
84 Beddard, *Kingdom without a King*, p. 104. The servants who reported this incident were probably the employees of the Standing Wardrobe who would have had their offices in the vicinity of the Bedchamber, most likely on the ground floor below.
was at Faversham, got him admitted to confirm the momentous news. Before Halifax could adjourn the meeting, Mulgrave, along with Berkeley, had managed to move that a troop of horse be sent to protect him. That afternoon when the peers reassembled, Mulgrave, for reasons which are not known, was absent and this time it was Bishop Mews who led for those who wanted to send help to the king. Berkeley again supported this view and it was backed by Middleton, Montagu, Godolphin, Ailesbury and Preston. While Halifax was opposed to sending any help and Feversham warned that James would return only if invited, the real debate was over what help exactly should be sent. With Montagu suggesting that two Gentlemen of the Bedchamber be sent and Middleton pressing for the royal servants being allowed to go too, Carlisle (possibly in the hope that he would encourage the king to flee and go with him) nominated Dumbarton but, on this being rejected, Ailesbury volunteered and then James Grahme, Feversham, Yarmouth and Middleton agreed to go as well. This was just the beginning of what rapidly became a stream of royal servants making their way to Faversham. The same day permission was given to Thomas Heywood, the Page of the Bedchamber; Joseph Thomlinson, the Yeoman of the Robes; Thomas Frazier, the royal barber, and John Rumsey, the Page of the Backstairs to go with the peers and Edward Carleton, the Knight Harbinger, also went. In the days which followed those who went included, among numerous others, the Board of Greencloth, Oliver Nicholas, the Groom of the Bedchamber, Sir Charles Scarburgh, the Physician, Thomas Hobbs, the Surgeon, and John Chase, the Apothecary. George Bromwich, the Messenger, was sent with a letter to Feversham, Ailesbury, Yarmouth and Middleton asking them to find out from James what he had done with the Great Seal and the election writs. Sums amounting to £43 10s. for James's use were issued to the mayor of Faversham by Richard Kent from the customs receipts for although the Treasury had ceased to transact its business, Fox was prepared to authorise these payments. These arrangements meant that when on 14 December Feversham produced a letter from James, dated 12 December, asking him to ‘speak to some of my most necessary servants to come to me, and bring with them some linnen and cloaths; and if Frazier be in the way, let him be one’ and to send Grahme with money, all his requests had

85 Beddard, *Kingdom without a King*, pp. 90-5; Buckingham, *Works*, II, pp. 77-8; Ailesbury, *Memoirs*, I, pp. 200-2. The minutes tend to support Mulgrave’s version rather than Ailesbury’s which appears to be hopelessly inaccurate. Ailesbury seems to have conflated two separate meetings and to have played up his own role in them. In doing so he takes the credit for speaking up first for James which properly belonged to Mulgrave, whom he further denigrates by claiming that he was not even there.

already been seen to.87 The next day Mulgrave was ordered to prepare the royal
apartments for the king’s return.88

When Thomlinson and the other employees of the Robes got to Faversham and
met the king, they burst into tears.89 Within the week they were to be mightily
disappointed. On his return to London James did try to reassert his status as king. A
meeting of the Privy Council was held, the Treasury resumed business and authorised
payments to Kent, acting as a trustee for Fox, and to the Cofferer, Mass was said,
meals were served to the king as usual, Mulgrave issued warrants again as Lord
Chamberlain and the Board of Green Cloth, with money having become available with
the death of Thomas Marshal, a former Master Cook, who had had a royal pension,
was ordered to increase the salary of Thomas Vivien, the Second Clerk of the
Kitchen.90 Those who attended on him at Whitehall included Newport, Halifax and
Dorset.91 However, James’s fate was being decided elsewhere. At Windsor on 17
December William called together the peers attending on him to discuss what to do
about James’s return to London. He had already had Feversham placed under arrest
after he had brought James’s offer to meet in London to negotiate a settlement.92
Churchill and Grafton managed to block a proposal from Delamere, Macclesfield and
Stamford that he should be sent to the Tower but it was agreed that he should not be
allowed to stay in any of the royal palaces because they did not want to ‘do any thing
that might look like treating him as a King’ and William delegated Halifax, Shrewsbury
and Delamere to tell James to withdraw to Ham House.93

The next morning James set out for Rochester by royal barge. He had been
allowed to take any of his servants and with him were Ailesbury, Lichfield,
Dumbarton, Arran, James Grahme, Ambrose Norton and the Grooms of the
Bedchamber, James Fortrey, James Griffin and Richard Biddulph. Patrick Lamb, the

87 Beddard, Kingdom without a King, pp. 98-100. A copy of this letter made for Halifax is in B.L.
Althorp papers C8.
88 Beddard, Kingdom without a King, p. 116.
2101, warrant to Tyrconnel, 18 Dec 1688; H.B. Wheatley (ed.), Diary of John Evelyn, (1906), IV, pp.
427-8, Evelyn to Evelyn, 18 Dec 1688; Universal Intelligence, no. 4; Burnet, History, II, p. 47n; LC
5/148, fol. 307; [E. Bohun], History of the Desertion, (1689), pp. 102-3; LS 13/173, unfoliated. The
warrants issued by Mulgrave (on 17 December) were to prepare St James’s Palace for William’s arrival.
If Ailesbury is to be believed, Mulgrave had also had prepared a warrant granting himself a marquisate.
(Ailesbury, Memoirs, I, pp. 215-16). Although Ailesbury had taken a different view of his actions,
Mulgrave may have expected some reward from James for upholding his interests in his absence but
this story seems just another attempt by Ailesbury to discredit him. It would have been improper for
the Lord Chamberlain to have presented the king with such a warrant.
91 London Mercury, no. 2.
92 According to one source, Oglethorpe was arrested along with Feversham. (HMC Kenyon, p. 211,
[Kenyon] to Derby, 18 Dec 1688).
93 B.L. Althorp papers C8, minute by Halifax on meeting of peers at Windsor, [17 Dec 1688];
William to Halifax, Shrewsbury and Delamere, 17 Dec 1688; Clarendon Correspondence, II, pp. 228-9.
Master Cook, was also with them and laid on a meal on the way there. Middleton, Charles Frazier and Robert Brady, the royal physicians, and James de Labadie may also have been with them and, if not, went to join them later. Those of them with army commissions resigned them before departing or when they reached Rochester. As they left Whitehall they were watched by Sir Stephen Fox, who was standing with Sir Charles Cotterell and John Evelyn, and later that day Fox, writing to tell her that her husband had gone to Rochester with the king, told Dorothy Grahme that he ‘was by command left here’ and that he was ‘extremely troubled for the circumstances of my master’. Other servants responded in less sophisticated ways. When on the coach journey from Gravesend to Rochester he repeated exclaimed, ‘God damn Father Petre’ because ‘but for him we had not been here’, John Dixey, the senior Coachman of the Stables, was taking refuge in the crudest explanation available to loyal anglicans to help them come to terms with what was happening.

During the next few days it was Grahme who undertook the final pieces of business on behalf of the king. On the evening of 19 December he returned to London and told Clarendon that he would go back to Rochester on 21 December. Clarendon told him to tell James not to go. On getting back to Rochester he would have collected the final letters James wrote in England. Two of them were to Sir William Turner and Sir Benjamin Bathurst asking them to assist in the disposal of his Royal Africa Company stock, worth £3,000, and his East India stock, worth £10,000, which he would transfer into Grahme’s name. A third was to Chiffinch giving instructions as to which of his personal belongings he was to entrust to Grahme to be sent on to him. A fourth James would leave with Dumbarton to give to Middleton. This was addressed to his subjects and would be printed as His Majesties Reasons for withdrawing Himself from Rochester. Once he had completed these arrangements and said his farewells to

---

94 Clarke, Life, II, pp. 268-71, memoirs; Macpherson, Original Papers, I, p. 168, 295; [E. Bohun], History of the Desertion, (1689), p. 104; Universal Intelligence, no. 4; Ailesbury, Memoirs, I, pp. 218-24; J. Fitzjames, duke of Berwick, Memoirs of the Marshal Duke of Berwick, (1779), I, pp. 35-7. Both James and Berwick state that Biddulph was a Groom of the Bedchamber. There is no record of him being appointed to this position but this supports the assumption that he took over the duties after Richard Leveson had defected to William.

95 H.B. Wheatley (ed.), Diary of John Evelyn, (1906), IV, p. 429, Evelyn to Evelyn, 18 Dec 1688; HMC 10th Report, appendix, part IV, p. 329, Fox to Dorothy Grahme, 18 Dec 1688. Fox, apparently, began to lend money to William to pay his troops after this point but deliberately avoided visiting him until James reached France. (Memoirs of the Life of Sir Stephen Fox, (1717), p. 84).

96 Ailesbury, Memoirs, I, pp. 219-20.

his servants, James slipped away, accompanied only by Berwick, Biddulph and De Labadie.98

The other servants left Rochester the next day. On returning to London they would have found that the household departments were already having to adjust to William's presence. Since 13 December, when he had requisitioned Chiffinch's lodgings at Windsor for his own use, he had been staying in royal palaces and it would eventually be the Household which would pay for his domestic expenses from this point onwards.99 On reaching London he asserted control over them by instructing Richard Cooling to inform the officials of the Removing Wardrobe, the Standing Wardrobes and the Jewelhouse, as well as Chiffinch (as keeper of the royal paintings), that they were not to release any goods in their possession without permission.100 A number of servants began to prepare journeys to France to join James but most, waiting to see what happened next, stayed put. That they did so, and had done so after the first flight, would, for Edmund Bohun, acquire significance. To him, that James's 'Menial Servants' had had by the Guildhall declaration to recognise William's authority was the proof that, by fleeing, James had forfeited the throne.101 Whether the 'Menial Servants' themselves shared this view is not so clear. With no king, however, the royal

arising from Grahme's attempts to dispose of these shares were unsuccessful. Among the personal belongings of James which passed to Grahme, being given to him by William III so that they could be sent to James, were a set of family portraits which are now in the Suffolk Collection in the Ranger's House at Blackheath. (The Suffolk Collection, (GLC publ. no. 650), [1975], nos. 35-45; J. Bryant, London's Country House Collections, (English Heritage, 1993), pp. 14-15, 24-5). The catalogue assumes that the paintings in question are nos. 34-43. No. 34, the portrait of Charles I, however, had entered the collection by 1697 which was twelve years before Grahme's daughter married the fourth earl of Berkshire. Even although no. 45 is of Mary II, it may have been one of these paintings as it is possible that it was painted for her father before 1688. No. 42 has since been identified as the countess of Dorchester.

98 Clarke, Life, II, p. 275, memoirs; Macpherson, Original Papers, I, p. 169; Ailesbury, Memoirs, I, pp. 223-4; Berwick, Memoirs of the Marshal Duke of Berwick, (1779), p. 37; Campana de Cavelli, Les Derniers Stuarts, II, pp. 462-3, Zipoli to Gondi, 1/10 Jan 1689. For Biddulph, see Campana de Cavelli, ibid, II, pp. 401-3, account of the flight of James II. In the MS Biddulph's name is abbreviated to 'Bill'. Although he is described as 'premier valet de chambre' and as having been long linked with James, the information that 'il est des plus anciennes maisons d'Angleterre où ses ancêtres s'établissent, lorsque les Saxons vinrent pour envahir ce Royaume' rules out the possibility that De Labadie was meant. Bohun again appears to have got the names of James's companions wrong. He states that Ralph Sheldon was also among them. ([E. Bohun], History of the Desertion, (1689), p. 105). This error probably derives from Universal Intelligence, no. 5. As with his account of the first flight, Dodd's statement that James was accompanied by Sheldon may be based on Bohun. ([C. Dodd], The Church History of England, (Brussels, 1737-42), III, p. 435).

99 LS 8/26, fols. 39-51, 53-61; T 1/4, fols. 42; Clarendon Correspondence, II, p. 227; CTB, (1685-89), p. 2162, 2164. These accounts show that the servants' stay at Rochester cost £263 Os. 3d. while William's expenses in the month before he became king came to £874 16s. 3d.

100 LC 5/148, fol. 308, William to Cooling, 19 Dec 1688.

101 [E. Bohun], History of the Desertion, (1689), p. 157. The text of the declaration does not support Bohun's argument. It said nothing of the royal household and the recognition of William could be interpreted as being conditional on the king's absence. Several of the signatories would refuse to recognise William and Mary as king and queen. (Beddard, Kingdom without a King, pp. 71-2).
household had ceased to have any immediate purpose. At the end of the month all the royal servants were paid off.102

102 Luttrell, Brief Historical Relation, I, p. 493; CTB, (1685-89), p. 2141. See also London Mercury, no. 8; English Currant, no. 7. Apsley, in presenting his accounts to the Exchequer as Cofferer, would account up to 31 December, the date to which the Household servants had been paid. (E 351/1855; LS 1/31). The Chamber, the Stables and the Robes would account up to 25 December. (AO 1/406/133; E 351/1753; E 351/2838). The exception was the Great Wardrobe. Montagu, having been reappointed as Master, instead accounted from Michaelmas 1688. This was reflected in the departmental record-keeping and was possible because the receipts from the Exchequer charged on his first account included £4,000 by a warrant of 11 March 1685. Although during the interregnum the Treasury continued to address correspondence to Preston as the Master of the Great Wardrobe, Montagu may have wanted to reassert his claim that Preston had intruded on his rights to the Mastership. By the time he presented his accounts to the Exchequer the Court of Common Pleas had found for him in the case which he brought against Preston and had awarded him damages of £1,300. (E 351/3116; LC 9/123; LC 9/279; RA Great Wardrobe accounts, fols. 79,952-80,042; fols. 86,397-86,555; CTB, (1685-89), p. 2162, 2164; CP 40/3085, rot. 327r).
CHAPTER SEVEN: THE UNDOING OF THE WORKS OF JAMES II

I

William, as Gaspar Fagel put it, had no wish to be 'his wife's gentleman usher'. If it was the example of the Venetian doge William actually used, he was just as determined not to become another stadhouder.\(^1\) This determination did more than just secure victory in the key divisions in the Lords on 6 February. Even before the very heavy hints were made to the wavering peers to ensure that the Lords concurred with the Commons' resolutions, William's presence in England had severely restricted the likely outcomes of the Convention. Unless he did leave in pique of frustration, it was simply not realistic to suppose that he was not going to be confirmed as the man in control of government. Although he had little influence over, or even much interest in, the details (and these included the Declaration of Rights), there were plenty of indications that William was willing to, and when it became necessary did, dictate the main outlines of what was decided.

With too many lawyers using the occasion to show off their erudition on what were ultimately circular arguments about legal definitions, what was said in the Convention can be misleading.\(^2\) However much the speakers may have wanted to create the impression that they were discussing matters of the profoundest importance, the most significant feature of the speeches is how little of consequence was said about fundamental constitutional questions. This, if nothing else about them, was calculated to appeal to the silent majority who had to sit through them and who were probably only too glad if they could avoid having to pronounce on things they did not pretend fully to understand. Indeed, on what may be assumed to have been the central issue confronting the Convention, even the most voluble members preferred to restrict themselves to the usual generalities. It is clear that differences of opinion on the question of whether a king could ever be deposed still ran very deep and the debating positions adopted in the early 1680s remained, in most cases, intact. Whatever else it had done, the experience of James's rule had not led to many changes of heart on this point. There had been few who had been predisposed to accept that, in exceptional circumstances, deposition might be permissible, who had not therefore a decade earlier, concluded that James's catholicism was such a circumstance. They were now more convinced than ever that they were correct. On the other hand, for tories the inviolability of the succession was necessarily not something which was capable of


\(^2\) The major sources for events in the Convention are printed in D.L. Jones (ed.), *A Parliamentary History of the Glorious Revolution*, (HMSO, 1988). Although the conclusions differ from those argued here, the most detailed discussion on the Convention remains L.G. Schwoerer, *The Declaration of Rights, 1689*, (Baltimore, 1981).
disproof. Even if they thought that his actions might justify it, there was nothing James had done, or could do, which would empower them to depose him as king de jure. Both sides seem to have realised that, given the persistence of such disagreements, there was little use in merely rerunning all the old arguments. They remained useful only as a way of abusing opponents.

In any case, what really had changed were the circumstances. James’s flight meant that it no longer mattered that much whether a king could ever be deposed. The issue was now whether James could be said to have deposed himself. The whigs were careful to confine themselves to arguing that James had already ceased to be king and it was whether he had ‘abdicated’ and the throne ‘vacant’ which produced the confrontation between the Lords and the Commons. Had James simply remained in England the character of the debates would have been entirely different. Adding further heat to the arguments was the concomitant question of what William’s exact role was to be. The tories’ stress on the succession cannot be divorced from their wariness towards him and the proposals for a regency can equally be interpreted not as an attempt to limit James’s power but as an attempt to give power to William in a way which would not be irreversible. In the event, that William could not be ignored, together with the fact that from the outset a clear majority in the Commons were supportive of any settlement which confirmed his control of the kingdom, counted against the tories dictating the outcome by parliamentary manoeuvring alone. They had probably known this from the start.

The unwillingness to tackle any constitutional questions other than those they could not reasonably avoid was reflected in the eventual settlement.3 The whigs’ gain of a promise of good behaviour which could be thought vaguely to resemble an original contract had some symbolic importance but was mainly significant for legislating against particular abuses. Crucially, the Declaration of Rights lacked enforcement provisions so that, except by implication, it had nothing to say about what should be done if the sovereign did disregard it and interpretations of those implications were, and remain, famously ambiguous. In fact, nothing the Declaration actually said altered the principle that resistance to the Crown was illegal under any circumstances. This principle still applies. What claims the settlement had to real significance rested mainly on the way in which (once the practicalities of removing James from power had been dealt with by the Dutch invasion) the Convention had shown how easy it was to produce an almost credible legal justification to enable them to endorse William’s accession. Even this was hardly an innovation. James II was not the first but the last English king (unless Edward VIII is counted) to be forcibly removed from office and

all previous usurpers had found it no less easy to come up with justifications for doing so.

Despite the impression they may give, these comments are not meant to trivialize the Convention. It had, at the very least, sanctioned the transfer of the Crown. That this was possible had been due to the extent to which most of those who had voted for the transfer had been in agreement with those who had voted against it. Leaving aside legal purism, the strongest argument in favour of James continuing as king was that the security of the Crown could never be assured unless the principle of hereditary succession was strictly adhered to. It was with some reason that the loyalists made much of the theory that the succession had, by William’s appointment, become elective. Arguments that changing monarchs would produce political volatility were ones that had to be taken seriously for they played on deep anxieties shared by all right thinking persons. Instability was not something to be risked carelessly. Yet these fears were also ones which worked to William’s advantage. Once it became clear that William commanded greater support than James within the Convention, there emerged a strong case that he should be supported, if only so that the decision be seen to unite rather than divide. For the Convention to disagree openly about what should be done exposed it to the risk of being viewed as a failure, in the same way as contested elections still were. There was thus a powerful desire for the Convention to come to a united decision. It hardly needs to be said that this motive was particularly obvious in the actions of those peers who changed their stances between 4 and 6 February and in the immediacy with which the Lords, once they had consented to the Commons’ resolutions, then proceeded without a division to approve the motion that William and Mary should be offered the Crown. Less easy to establish figures for, but probably just as important, were those MPs who had voted for the resolutions on 28 January for these same reasons. What seemed to be a hopeless predicament when the Convention assembled, that the deep divisions would be at odds with the general desire for unity, resolved itself quickly because there proved to be enough of a minority prepared to compromise to achieve a majority which, if it did not represent unanimity, was nevertheless sufficient.

Not least of the reasons which made the Convention important was that this process of compromise to achieve unity and to avoid conflict reflected a similar process at work throughout the kingdom. Most Englishmen, probably by a significant margin, were prepared to recognize William as their new king. It is not quite true that they did so because the alternative was a civil war. The grant of the Crown to William did not in any way diminish the likelihood that James would challenge him in battle in the immediate future, as indeed he did do. What would have persuaded some that they should acknowledge the new king was that, on balance, he seemed more likely to
provide the strong kingship required in such circumstances. It was therefore especially
necessary that, at this time, the Convention should fulfil parliament's ancient function
as the representative of the people, in the medieval and more potent sense of that term.
Divisive though they actually were, the events of early 1689 represented, for most of
those who concurred with what was done, a whole-hearted endorsement by the nation
of the idea of personal monarchy. In this way, the full authority of the Crown was able
to pass to William with remarkable smoothness.

That the royal household had supposedly been dissolved did little to prevent
William taking over for himself the outward forms of monarchy. Even before the
Convention officially confirmed him as king, he was interpreting his powers to control
the government to extend to include the ceremonial functions of the royal office. As
early as 20 December he had dined in public with his leading supporters. He made the
traditional Epiphany visit to the gambling organised by the Groom Porter, gaining good
publicity from his decision to donate his winnings to charity. More open to question
was his interference in the Chapel Royal. Prayers for James were omitted from the
services held at Whitehall, the Queen's Chapel at St.James was handed over to the
French Huguenots and there was published the list of Lent preachers (who included,
interestingly, the bishops of Norwich, Bath and Wells, Chichester, Gloucester and Ely,
and, for Palm Sunday, one of the archbishops). It blurred the issue that William was
already of royal status and therefore entitled to much of the honoured treatment he
received. His regal demeanour was, nevertheless, useful in projecting the image of him
as a plausible claimant to the throne and nothing he did in the early weeks of 1689
could be considered unbecoming of a king. Whether they were so becoming of a
usurper was another matter. In his haste to appear as royal as James had been, he
perhaps displayed impatience at needing to have him new position formalised but, if so,
there would have been little about the ceremony on 13 February to irritate him.

This is not to ignore that many aspects of the 13 February ceremony were
questionably innovatory. They had to be. An Accession Council was out of the
question because, while the existing Privy Council could have seriously claimed to
have greater legal validity than the Convention could, there would have been no
guarantee that it would have come to the required decision and, in any case, it clearly
made sense to acknowledge the role of the Convention in preparing the constitutional

4 Orange Gazette, no. 4; London Intelligence, no. 7; English Currant, nos. 4, 7; London Gazette, no.
2419.
5 One of the clearest examples of William's awareness of the importance of ceremonial symbolism was
his decision to delay his first appearance before parliament until 18 February so the robes of state
would be available and then, when he did eventually appear before them, to break with tradition and
Feb 1689; Bodl. MS Carte 109, fol. 77, newsletter, 16 Feb 1689; LJ, XIV, p. 128; London Gazette,
no. 2429).
settlement. Making that acknowledgement was all the more important because the reading of the Declaration of Rights was the centre-piece of the ritual. Whether this prominence within the ceremony made the Declaration anything so simple as a statement of conditions by which the Crown was offered to William and Mary remains debatable. That many willingly interpreted it as that must not obscure that its main function within the ceremony was as an explanation of why it was that James was no longer king. As such, it did set out the constitutional framework within which the Convention wished its recognition of the new monarchs to be interpreted but William and Mary were not asked to give their approval to the principles it stated nor did William in his reply do more than imply that they did accept them. Indeed, instead of laying down preconditions to them becoming king and queen, the operative word within the document was that which declared William and Mary to ‘be’ king and queen and it is not clear whether what followed should be interpreted as an offer of the Crown to them. This meant that what happened was the reverse of the usual practice at an Accession Council. Rather than those present recognising and approving a new monarch who had already become so by the laws of succession, it was William who was called upon to recognise and approve a decision to alter the laws of succession which had already been agreed on by those present.

There were other aspects of the ceremony which might have been thought at odds with any desire to imply a contractual process. Thus, the choice of the Banqueting House as the setting was hardly a neutral one. It meant that the members of the Convention were seen to wait on William and Mary, which was rather different than to have had them summoned to the ceremony, as would have been done had the Lords’ Chamber been used. Equally, it could be taken to mean that William had already taken possession of the royal palace. The obvious neutral setting, Westminster Hall, would have been too reminiscent of the ceremonies in 1399 and 1653. As it was, the members of both Houses made their way in procession to the Banqueting House and there awaited the arrival of William and Mary. The Yeoman of the Guard, as was usual when the king appeared there in public, lined both sides of the hall. On entering, the royal couple took up positions on the steps to the chairs-of-state at the southern end. Black Rod (acting as the First Gentleman Usher rather than as the officer attendant on the Lords) then led in the two delegations, who bowed three times as they approached the dais. The Declaration was read and William made his reply. Whatever else it was meant to be, the form of the ceremony was that used when Lords and Commons came to present joint addresses to the king. Given that the Convention was formally requesting that William and Mary acknowledge themselves to be king and queen, this was

---

7 What Halifax said to them after the Clerk of the Parliaments had completed the reading of the Declaration was considered sufficiently irrelevant for it to be ignored in all the official records of the ceremony. (*LJ*, XIV, pp. 127-8; *CJ*, X, p. 29; *London Gazette*, no. 2427).
appropriate. Once the ceremony had been completed, the accession was proclaimed by the Heralds in the usual manner.

The former employees of the royal household would have been precisely the sort of persons to whom this stress on royal continuity was intended to appeal. William could not needlessly afford to alienate such an important section of the governing class, especially as he would shortly have to reconstruct the household for his own service, and, unless he could (literally) assume the mantle of kingship with conviction, they might well doubt his regal pretensions. In the event they were, despite William’s best efforts, decidedly unimpressed. In the Lords it had been they who had formed the nucleus of the opposition. Beaufort, Northumberland, Ailesbury, Lichfield, Feversham, Dartmouth and the newly-elevated Griffin were among the twenty-six diehards from the temporal peerage who had entered their dissents in the Journal after the vote on 6 February. Yarmouth, who until then had voted with them, may (if he did not leave before the vote) have also refused to agree with the motion. More certain is that he, like Lichfield and Griffin, would refuse to take the oaths. Joining these seven in their expression of dissent to the 6 February vote were their former colleagues, Somerset, Ormond and Maynard, who were not prepared to go so far in their opposition to James, even at this stage, as to depose him. In fact, with Churchill initially just as reluctant to agree to a change of monarch, Newport was something of an exception, being the only peer who had resigned or been dismissed from James’s household who adhered to the Williamite line in the Convention with any consistency. He made his reasons for this clear when he argued that the letter from James to Preston should not be read because ‘he from whome it came is no more King here’. The only other former royal servants among the peers prepared to support William and Mary were, of all people, the former Ecclesiastical Commissioners. Clearly anxious to be seen to be penitent about their actions, Mulgrave brazenly followed the whig line throughout while Huntingdon was one of those key individuals who deftly changed their positions between 4 and 6 February. Once he reached London, Bishop Crewe had the sense to seek atonement in a similar way. In Mulgrave’s case, the desired rehabilitation was achieved. Combined with his apologetic Letter to Doctor Tillotson and the useful assistance of ‘some friends neer the King to make him civeill’, these actions would help obtain William’s support when he came to make his successful attempt to avoid being excluded from the general pardon. Huntingdon and Crewe would be less fortunate, becoming, as a direct result of their service on the


Ecclesiastical Commission, almost the only Anglicans excluded from the pardon by name.¹⁰

Among James's former servants who were sitting in the Commons, the pattern of positions adopted was probably much the same. That only seven of them (eight if Arthur Herbert is counted) had been returned might, for one thing, be evidence that electorates were disinclined to give their support to anyone who had been closely associated with the court and some, rightly or wrongly anticipating such a mood, might have judged it prudent not to attempt to stand. Some may even have refused to put themselves forward on a point of principle, believing that the writs were invalid. As it was, Jeremiah Bubb, Sir Robert Dashwood, Bernard Granville, Philip Bickerstaffe and Henry Slingsby all on 5 February voted against the motion that the throne was vacant. This leaves Herbert, Thomas Howard and Percy Kirke (another who may have been anxious to rehabilitate himself) as those who were not included by Charles Beecher in his list, compiled for Ailesbury, of those who had voted against.¹¹ There is no reason to suppose that these three could not have voted for the motion. Howard and Kirke were certainly willing to be reappointed as Lieutenant of the Yeoman of the Guard and as Keeper of Whitehall. That Bubb was once again appointed one of the Gentlemen Ushers, Daily Waiters, as well as becoming lieutenant-governor of Carlisle, suggests either that he accepted the change of king once it had been agreed by the Convention or that he was one of those who felt that really Mary alone should be queen. For Granville, on the other hand, not to be continued as a Groom of the Bedchamber is not, in itself, especially revealing as to his views at this time and he did retain the Mastership of the Swans. His refusal later in the reign to sign the Association, nevertheless, suggests that he was less willing than his brother, Bath, to agree to what the Convention did. Slingsby was, without doubt, unwilling to do so, remaining firmly loyal to James and Dashwood was someone else who would refuse to sign the Association. What Bickerstaffe meant by his vote on 5 February cannot be known but, like Slingsby and Dashwood, he never held court office again. In that, he was not alone.

The appointments to the household offices began to be made in the weeks following William and Mary's confirmation as joint-monarchs. Dorset received the white stave of the Lord Chamberlain the very next day and a week later he started to

¹⁰ Buckingham, Works, II, pp. 89-92; Ailesbury, Memoirs, I, p. 230; B.L. Add MS 4292, fols. 261-2, Mulgrave to Tillotson, 27 Mar 1689; Foxcroft, Halifax, II, p. 212, 219; Grey, Debates, IX, pp. 385-6; CJ, X, p. 203; Statutes of the Realm, VI, p. 178 (2 Gul. & Mar., c. 10). The only other one of James's servant excluded from the general pardon was Lord Thomas Howard, presumably because of his embassy to Rome in 1688 rather than his appointment as Master of the Robes. Later that year lack of evidence meant that Howard was dropped from the rebels (attainder) bill. (HMC 12th Report, appendix, part VI, p. 230; HMC 13th Report, appendix, part V, pp. 237-8)
issue the warrants of appointment to places in the Chamber. Although it had been widely anticipated, Devonshire’s formal appointment as Lord Steward was delayed until the day before the first meeting of the new Board of Greencloth on 22 February. When it met, the four other members of the Board whose appointments had already been decided on, Newport, once more the Treasurer of the Household, Thomas Wharton, the new Comptroller and James Forbes and Peter Isaacs, the two Clerk Comptrollers, were sworn in and work began on a new Household establishment. After the meeting the process of authorising appointments belowstairs commenced. The new establishment was ready by 1 April, on which date it came into effect, thereby marking the official start of the new royal household.12

With this process of reconstruction under way it became clear that the number of James’s servants who had failed to resume their careers at court was on a huge scale.13 This was, to an extent, only understandable. It was predictable that William would seek to have trusted supporters in his own Bedchamber so that Ormond and Churchill (soon to become Marlborough) were the only Gentlemen of the Bedchamber reappointed is not remarkable. The clearout among the Grooms and Pages was even more thorough with not one being continued. Moreover, that none of the four members of staff of the Robes were reappointed may be of as little statistical interest, in view of the small numbers involved, as that eight of the ten Sergeants-at-Arms and all six officials of the Jewelhouse were reappointed. Rather, what are noteworthy are the figures for some of the larger departments. Even among the Watermen, who were comparatively unaffected, with thirty-four out of forty-nine retained, the effects cannot be said to have been negligible. With the Messengers (seventeen out of thirty-two retained), almost half the employees had been lost and in the Guard Chamber, the Presence Chamber and the Privy Chamber (thirty-seven retained out of a total of sixty-nine), the size of the change was similar. In the other departments not even a majority of the former employees had been returned to their places. Belowstairs in the Household, out of the 113 servants in office at the end of James’s reign, only fifty reappeared to serve William and Mary, while in the Band of Gentlemen Pensioners just twelve of the forty men and none of the officers remained. Most striking of all was the extent of the alterations in the Stables. With a mere thirteen of the eighty-seven doing so, fewer than one in six of the former members of the staff were kept on into the new reign.

12 LC 3/32, rough establishment, 1689-95; LC 5/149, Lord Chamberlain, warrant books, general, 1689; LS 13/10, cheque roll, 1685-1702; LS 13/114, fol. 25, Greencloth minutes, 22 Feb 1689; LS 13/256, entrybook of warrants of appointment (Steward’s), 1689-1702; LS 13/257, entrybook of warrants of appointment (royal), 1689-1702; LS 13/39, Household establishment, 1689; LS 1/32, accounts of the Cofferer of the Household, 1689. In the second week of April 1689, after Sir Stephen Fox and Sir Henry Firebrace had confirmed that they did not want to be reappointed and Sir William Forrester had been appointed First Clerk, Forbes and Isaac were both moved up one place in the Greencloth hierarchy.
13 Evelyn, Diary, IV, p. 627.
It cannot simply be assumed that these figures are to be explained entirely in terms of the withdrawal of servants unwilling to serve William and Mary. There were other important reasons why those newly appointed to the major court offices might have wanted to make changes in the personnel of the departments under their control. Most would have been only too willing to use the opportunities their appointments provided for the exploitation of the patronage now in their disposal, in the same way senior courtiers had always done. Recognising this, there was no shortage of applicants. When Matthew Prior wrote his letter of application in verse to Fleetwood Sheppard, Dorset's steward who had just become one of the Gentlemen Ushers, Daily Waiters, he explained how

When Crowding Folks, with strange ill Faces,
    Were making Legs, and begging Places;
And some with Patents, some with Merit,
Tired out my good Lord D____t's Spirit:
Sneaking, I stood, among the Crew,
Desiring much to Speak with You.
I waited, while the Clock struck Thrice,
And Footmen brought out fifty Lies;
Till Patience vext, and Legs grown weary,
I thought it was in vain to tarry...\(^{14}\)

Naturally, as Prior implied, the demand for office exceeded the available supply but, rather than be limited to distributing only those places whose former occupants had ceased to want them, it was always possible for an enterprising courtier to create more vacancies by ignoring the claims of priority by those who had hitherto held the position and who felt that normally they should have had a reasonable expectation of being continued. When, for reasons which are not known, Devonshire passed over John Clements, the existing First Clerk of the Kitchen, and instead appointed the Second Clerk, Thomas Vivien, to his place, Clements complained to the Treasury that 'he had hoped no innovations would be made among the protestant servants of the household'. In this case, the Treasury Commission took sympathy on Clements and, after failing to persuade Devonshire to reinstate him, awarded him a pension on the royal bounty.\(^{15}\)

It was widely rumoured that abovestairs Dorset's main interest was in obtaining as much money as he could in exchange for places. One anonymous poem, supposedly pinned up on his door, advised

\[\text{If Papist, Jew or Infidel}\]
\[\text{Would buy a place at Court:}\]
\[\text{Here Dorset lives, the Chamberlain,}\]

\(^{15}\) CSPD, (1689-90), p. 39; CTB, (1689-92), p. 18, 1455. The information on Vivien in the History of Parliament (Henning, III, pp. 645-6) is inaccurate. He had been appointed Second Clerk of the Kitchen in November 1688 on the retirement of John Manley, having previously been the Queen's Clerk of the Kitchen between 1662 and 1685.
To whom you may resort.
Then come away, make no delay,
Bring coin to plead your cases;
He’ll turn the King’s friends out of doors,
And put you in their places.\textsuperscript{16}

Another satire, possibly by the same wit, singled out Sheppard, Cooling and the new Knight Harbinger, Simon Smith, as Dorset’s agents in this business.\textsuperscript{17} Similar allegations came out that summer when the Commons prepared legislation against abuses arising from the sale of offices. On that occasion, there came forward one disgruntled ex-servant, John Barcroft, who claimed that he had in the 1660s been hounded out of his job as a Sergeant-at-Arms by catholics after arresting several priests. Believing that he should have been treated sympathetically, he attributed the failure of his attempt to regain his old job earlier that year to the fact that in the royal household ‘they openly sold the Places to those that would give most for them’. He too identified Sheppard, Cooling and Smith as the culprits, adding that they had received ‘many Thousand Guineas’.\textsuperscript{18}

Money was perhaps not the only consideration, given that it could not be assumed that all those sympathetic to James would, of their volition, remove themselves from court. For many their place there was a livelihood and, whatever their attitude towards William, they may have felt that they had no choice but to seek reemployment under the new regime. There was, however, always the danger that any attempt to weed out suspected Jacobites would, because of the disposable vacancies thereby created, be undertaken with excessive zeal. This may have been the case with the changes made by Lovelace among the Gentlemen Pensioners in what is the clearest instance from 1689 of a purge of this kind. Lovelace, one of the most extreme of the whigs who had been rewarded with court office, had, as has been mentioned, kept on only twelve of the forty Gentlemen Pensioners. On 8 April 1689 ten of those who had been dismissed, together with the ex-Clerk of the Cheque, William Thomas, complained to the Privy Council, arguing that Lovelace as Captain did not have the authority to dismiss them. They also asserted that they had ‘neither acted nor spoke, in compliance to the late times, any thing which might weaken the Protestant interest, or injure our Laws; but, on the contrary, constantly expressed their dissatisfaction to the measures then taken to the prejudice of both’.\textsuperscript{19} Their dismissal had raised an issue which was far from straightforward. Back in 1676 Roscommon had tried to dismiss Thomas from the Clerkship of the Cheque. In April 1677, after lengthy arguments, Charles II had issued an order confirming, among other things, that the Captain could

\textsuperscript{16} \textit{POAS}, V, p. 102, ll. 1-8.
\textsuperscript{17} \textit{ibid}, V, pp. 104-6 - cp. V, pp. 107-12.
dispose of any vacancies arising through death and that the men could, if they were ill, nominate a deputy from among their fellow members of the Band. The dispute had ended with Thomas being reinstated.\textsuperscript{20} The 1677 order had been confirmed in 1682 when Huntingdon had become Captain and in 1683 when a further dispute had arisen over the right to appoint deputies.\textsuperscript{21} Then, in 1685, new orders for the Band had confirmed the Captain's rights regarding vacancies but had also confirmed an older rule, dating back at least to the order which had implemented the 1670 reforms, which laid down that if the Captain removed anyone who had paid for their place, then they should continue to receive half their salary with the replacement getting the other half.\textsuperscript{22} Somewhat oddly, the eleven petitioners in 1689, who seem to have paid for their places, do not appear to have tried to use this against Lovelace. With more reason, Lovelace also ignored the previous history of the dispute and the issue turned on a related but new aspect of the subject. It was not until 25 July 1689, after the submission of two further petitions and three attempts by the Privy Council to obtain a response, that Lovelace came up with a reply.\textsuperscript{23} When he eventually did do so, his central contention was, in essence, that a new reign meant that appointments made in the previous reign were no longer valid and that he was therefore free to appoint whomever he wished. Unfortunately for the petitioners, this was a legitimate argument because, for all their discussions about vacancies, the 1670, 1677, 1682, 1683 and 1685 orders had made no mention of what was to happen at an accession and Lovelace's argument was one which was true of other court offices. As well as adding that it was inappropriate that 'the Guard and Defence of your Majesty's Person (which is the greatest Trust that can be in this World) should be bought and sold for Money', Lovelace noted that the petitioners, 'having been the Guard to the late King James does not seem to recommend them', thus confirming that the changes had been politically motivated.\textsuperscript{24} The Privy Council, while stressing that all appointments of Gentlemen Pensioners had to have the king's approval, found in Lovelace's favour.\textsuperscript{25}

Running in parallel with this dispute was a similar one concerning dismissals from the Yeomen of the Guard. Less is known about the circumstances and it cannot even be ascertained precisely how many dismissals were involved. What is known is that on 24 June 1689 John Smith, Richard Dewell, John Brafield and John Smallwood


\textsuperscript{21} Huntington Library, Hastings MS HA 1370, Charles II to Huntingdon, 26 June 1682; PC 2/70, fol. 89, 14 Dec 1683; \textit{HMC Hastings}, II, p. 849, orders in Council, 14 Dec 1683.

\textsuperscript{22} H. Kearsley, \textit{His Majesty's Bodyguard}, (1937), p. 87, 93-4.

\textsuperscript{23} PC 2/73, fol. 108, 9 May 1689; fol. 157, 27 June 1689; fol. 192, 18 July 1689; S. Pegge, \textit{Curialia}, (1791), pp. 82-4.

\textsuperscript{24} S. Pegge, \textit{Curialia}, (1791), pp. 85-6.

\textsuperscript{25} ibid, pp. 86-7; PC 2/73, fol. 202, 25 July 1689.
complained to the Privy Council. A month later the new Captain, Manchester, outlined his reasons. This time, although the four had felt it appropriate to mention that they were 'all known and professed Protestants, and were filled with Joy at your Arrival in England', Manchester differed from Lovelace in producing justifications which said nothing about politics. Instead he argued that those dismissed were too old, too small or lived away from court and used deputies to perform their duties. Smith, Dewell and Brafield were among those who lived in the country and he considered Smallwood to be 'of a low Stature'. How the Privy Council ruled on this is not recorded in the registers nor can it be discovered whether the four were ever reappointed. It is, however, evidence that the changes among the Yeomen of the Guard were a less politically charged process than those among the Gentlemen Pensioners that Grandison, on being replaced by Manchester, had been granted a pension of £1000 p.a.

Manchester's action can be defended as the appropriate response of an active courtier on reviewing the effectiveness of a department newly placed under his charge. In contrast, the controversy about the dismissals from the Gentlemen Pensioners would rumble on for years. In December 1690 the House of Lords would seize a copy of a pamphlet on the subject which it considered might be libellous towards Lovelace. The pamphlet, which investigations suggested was probably by Samuel Alstone, one of the 1689 petitioners, claimed that Lovelace had dismissed them 'to make way for friends of his own' and observed that 'all men condemn such stewards to private masters, who misrepresent old servants to bring in new ones for money, or otherwise to prefer relations, which servants, so retained, are more the Steward's than the Master's servants'. Then, in 1693, on succeeding Lovelace, St.Albans would attempt to reinstate some of those dismissed, only to be blocked by the Privy Council. Finally, in May 1703, Anne would order that Thomas and Alstone were to be reappointed.

With appointments in 1689 being determined by such various factors, establishing whether a given individual did or did not continue in their court office in 1689 cannot be used unhesitatingly to establish their views on the change of king. Serving William or refusing to do so could be an easily comprehensible political statement but it should not be supposed that every royal servant chose to make it so. The figures for those not reappointed can only be a maximum for the numbers of those

26 PC 2/73, fol. 156, 27 June 1689; fol. 192, 18 July 1689; S. Pegge, Curialia, (1791), pp. 70-5.
27 PC 2/73, fol. 76, 18 April 1689.
29 PC 2/75, fol. 295, 7 Dec 1693; fol. 316, 18 Jan 1694; Luttrell, Brief Historical Relation, III, p. 250, 260; S. Pegge, Curialia, (1791), pp. 87–8n. See also The Case of several of the Band of Gentlemen Pensioners, and Band of Yeomen of the Guard, Servants to King Charles the Second, humbly offer'd to the Honourable House of Commons which survives in one copy in the library of Lincoln's Inn. It is undated but is assigned to 1694 by Wing. (STC Wing C986). It takes the form of a brief petition to the Commons complaining about the arrears still owed and about the dismissals in 1689 but there is no record in the journals of it ever having been presented.
who may have put their consciences before their careers. An alternative approach is to attempt to establish a minimum by concentrating instead on those who are known to have remained loyal to James. To do so, however, is to confront immediately the fundamental problems of definition and evidence which any study on the extent of Jacobitism must come up against. The evidence for treasonable conspiracies is rarely adequate and the activities of the Jacobites are no exception. Regrettable though it may be, both for those who had been his servants and for the wider population, it is the number of those who remained loyal but also silent and inactive which would be the really illuminating piece of information. Even recognising that only those whose activities are recorded can be studied does not resolve all the difficulties. That those most willing to commit treason were those whose Jacobitism can usually be most readily established is useful but there is the complication that there were some who, without being perverse, may have wanted to be treasonable in appearance only. What however makes an analysis of Jacobitism among his former servants to some extent more manageable is that there was one form of support for James which they were especially likely to undertake.

II

Service at the court in exile at Saint-Germain-en-Laye was the most overt means of indicating continued loyalty to James. That many employed by him after his overthrow were from among his existing servants is not, in itself, unexpected. To those of his servants convinced that no earthly power could deprive James of his kingship, there would have been a strong impulse to believe that the only appropriate response to his seeking of refuge in France was to follow him dutifully to where he now needed them. His household there was, logically enough, regarded by its members as the same institution which had served him in England and, as such, was important as giving some substance to the claim that James's court represented the legitimate but displaced government. The rather awkward fact that he had become, in effect, a guest (temporary or otherwise) of Louis XIV made it all the more important that those serving James should be seen to be his own servants. Saint-Germain may have been conveniently close to Versailles and the royal cousins were regular visitors to each other but the court maintained by James was purposely kept separate. Even if it was Louis who was especially indebted to Dr. Edward Corp for sharing with me his knowledge of the court at Saint-Germain. His most recent publications, 'La Maison du roi à Saint-Germain-en-Laye, 1689-1718', Revue de la Bibliothèque Nationale, no. 46 (Hiver, 1992), pp. 5-13 and, with J. Sansom, La Cour des Stuart à Saint-Germain-en-Laye au temps de Louis XIV, (Paris, 1992) are now the best works on the subject. His assistance means that the attempts below to identify those of James's servants who went into exile with him are probably as complete as the available evidence allows.
providing the accommodation and ultimately paying his bills, their official relationship was one of friendship and not of dependence.

From as early as 1 February 1689 New Style James was able to rely mainly on his own servants rather than those Louis had made available to him on his arrival at Saint-Germain twenty-five days before. A significant number of his servants had, the Tuscan ambassador reported, already made the journey to France.\(^{31}\) Disruption occurred within weeks when James left to try to regain the throne and it was only on his return from Ireland in 1690 that his household, as opposed to that of his wife, was able to settle down.\(^{32}\) By 1696 he was employing about 100 servants. Of these, twenty-three were working in the Household, forty in the Chamber and Bedchamber, and twenty-five in the Stables. It will be recalled that in 1685 he had had a total of 600 servants and, roughly speaking, he was having to make do with a Household and Stables which had both been reduced by about three-quarters and a Chamber which was only a tenth of its former size. He was, beyond this, providing pensions to forty-six people and, in all, about 300 individuals were receiving payments on the combined establishment of the various royal households.\(^{33}\) It was therefore with some, possibly pardonable, exaggeration that Dicconson would claim that James maintained his household with ‘that prudence and frugality, as not only to keep up the forme of a Court by mentaining the greatest part of those Officers that usually attended upon his person in England, but relieved an infinite number of distressed people, antient and wonded Officers, widdows and Children of such as had lost their lives in his service’.\(^{34}\) What can be believed, because it sounds familiar, is his stress on James’s thrift. To ensure this proper management of his domestic affairs, he went back to using a commission comprising his senior servants.\(^{35}\) Not the least advantage of this was that it sidestepped any tensions which could have arisen in a situation in which a number of departments, including the Stables, the Bedchamber and the Great Wardrobe, had been headed by senior courtiers who were still in England but who were of undoubted loyalty. Equally, it would have been deliberate that the office of Lord Chamberlain, which was given to Powis, was the one great office James did choose to fill. That it was the Comptroller of the Household who emerged as the day-to-day administrator may have owed less to any continuation of the practices of the Board of Greencloth

\(^{31}\) Campana de Cavelli, *Les Derniers Stuarts*, II, p. 501, Zipoli to Gondi, 7 Feb 1689 NS.
\(^{33}\)Sizergh Castle, Strickland MS R4, establishment, 1696. I have relied on Dr. Corp for the information contained in this MS. Few other official papers of the household at Saint-Germain survive. The other major sources are in the Stuart MSS at Windsor, namely RA SP 1/79, establishment of the household of Mary Beatrice, 1693, and RA SP misc. 18, entrybook, temp. James II. The contents of the latter are available in *HMC Stuart*, I, passim and *The Jacobite Peercage*, pp. 216-18. See also the 1692 lodgings list printed in E. and M.S. Grew, *The English Court in Exile*, (1911), pp. 267-8.
\(^{34}\) Clarke, *Life*, II, p. 472.
\(^{35}\) Corp, *La Maison du roi*, p. 6, 8-9. Corp’s argument that those with household positions did not face hardship in the way that other exiles did, seems plausible.
than to Waldegrave's presence at Saint-Germain until his death there in June 1690. One way of describing the court in exile would be to say that, in terms of size and organisation, James had reverted to the type of household he had had as duke of York.

It would seem that at least forty-five people who had been his servants when king in England continued as his servants when in exile.\textsuperscript{36} A further seven are known to have spent time at Saint-Germain without formally holding office while two others may possibly have been there.\textsuperscript{37} Two features of this group of fifty-four individuals are worth commenting on. The first is that nineteen of them had been James's servants before his accession.\textsuperscript{38} This is partly attributable to the decision by six of his eight Grooms of the Bedchamber and three of his six Pages of the Bedchamber to join him because they accounted for seven of these nineteen. Their loyalty confirmed his wisdom in having in 1685 relied mainly on his existing servants to staff the Bedchamber. Ten of those who had been with him as duke of York were, or possibly were, catholics, giving them an extra reason to go into exile and it is the number of catholics which is the other feature of note. Out of the fifty-five, thirty-three were catholics or were possibly so.\textsuperscript{39} Sir Charles Carteret converted once he was there. That

\textsuperscript{36} John Abel, Musician; Dudley Bagenal, Esquire of the Body; Francis Beaulieu, Surgeon; Michael Bedingfield, Barber; George Benyon, Comptroller of the Great Wardrobe; Richard Biddulph, Groom of the Bedchamber; Thomas Bray, Footman of the Stables; Denis Carney, Gentleman Usher of the Presence Chamber; Sir Charles Carteret, Gentleman Usher, Daily Waiter; William Chanvoys, Brusher of the Robes; John Darnell, Messenger; Jean Delatre, Gentleman Armorer; Gerald Devereux, Purveyor of the Stables; John Dixey, Coachman; Dumbarton, Gentleman of the Bedchamber; Innocenzo Fede, Musician; Heneage Finch, Groom of the Bedchamber; Thomas Fox, Groom of the Bedchamber; James Griffin, Groom of the Bedchamber; Henry Griffith, Yeoman Sadler of the Stables; Thomas Heywood, Page of the Bedchamber; Lord Thomas Howard, Master of the Robes; James de Labadie, Page of the Bedchamber; Philip Lesserture, Master Cook; John Lewin, Riding Purveyor of the Stables; David Lloyd, Groom of the Bedchamber; Nicholas Miller, Footman of the Stables; Francis Miner, Child of the Kitchen; Oliver Nicholas, Groom of the Bedchamber; Michael Noble, Yeoman of the Confectionary; Edward Nosworthy, Gentleman of the Privy Chamber; Eppentus Pawlett, Messenger; Nicholas le Point, Yeoman of the Cellar; James Porter, Vice-Chamberlain; Humphrey Prescott, Yeoman of the Bakehouse; Joseph Rondile, Gentleman Usher, Presence Chamber; Ralph Sheldon, Equerry; Henry Slingsby, Groom of the Bedchamber; Sir John Sparrow, Clerk Comptroller of the Greencloth; Thomas Symn, Yeoman of the Guard; John Thomas, Sewer, Presence Chamber; Richard Thomas, Master Cook; Waldegrave, Comptroller of the Household; Thomas Woolhouse, Page of the Presence Chamber; Thomas Wyvil, Gentleman Usher, Quarter Waiter. Most of them held the same or similar jobs in exile.

\textsuperscript{37} Those known to have been at Saint-Germain were Henry Bulkeley, Master of the Household; Griffin, Treasurer of the Household; Sir William Jenning, Bagnioman; Alexander Prieur, Page of the Bedchamber; Sir Theophilus Ogletorpe, Equerry; and James and Lawrence du Puy, Keepers of the Pall Mall. It is perhaps somewhat surprising that there is no record of Elizabeth du Puy having been there. Sir James Butler may have been there in 1701. It is true that he was reappointed as Steward of the Marshalsea by William III but he would vacate this office in 1700. John Lambert, one of the Yeomen of the Guard, may have been the innkeeper of that name at Saint-Germain. Henry Hills got as far as Saint-Omer but probably died before reaching Saint-Germain. His son became a servant there. (A.F. Johnson, 'The King's Printers, 1660-1742', \textit{Library}, fifth series, III, (1948), p. 34; R.L. Haig, 'New light on the King's Printing Office, 1680-1730', \textit{Studies in Bibliography}, VIII, (1956), p. 160).

\textsuperscript{38} Bedingfield, Carteret, Delatre, Finch, Griffin, James Griffin, Heywood, De Labadie, Lesserture, Lloyd, Nicholas, Noble, Le Point, James and Lawrence du Puy, Rondile, Sparrow, Thomas.

\textsuperscript{39} In interpreting this figure it should be borne in mind that the usefulness of the local parish registers (printed in C.E. Lart (ed.), \textit{Jacobite Extracts from the Parish Registers of St.Germain-en-Laye}, (1910-
so many of them may have been catholics brings to mind the long-held assertion that
the presence of the protestants at the exiled court was discouraged. The main source for
this claim has always been John Macky’s 1696 pamphlet, *A View of the Court of
St.Germain*, which explicitly stated that

Mr. Fergus Graham was the only protestant gentleman in King James’s family, but as soon as they saw that my Lord Preston, and Col.[James] Graham, his brothers, who ventured so much for that prince, could do them no more service in England: he was discharged for no other reason, but that they thought a protestant a blemish in their household.40

It was possibly with these claims in mind that Dicconson felt it necessary to argue that
the protestants had been made welcome.41 Macky’s statement, if true, would mean the
twenty-one other servants for whom there would otherwise be no evidence that they
were anything but protestant would have to be reclassified as catholics. As it is, some
were without doubt protestant and it is now clear that Macky was exaggerating. Despite
the influence of the non-compounders, James was sufficiently aware of the political
advantages of toleration and valued their loyalty too much to discriminate against his
existing protestant servants.42 Whether he was just as unbiased when making new
appointments is more debatable. It is also difficult not to believe that at least some of the
protestants found their position trying. This was to be the experience of the comparable
cases of those protestant servants of Queen Catherine who went with her to Portugal in
1692 and who are known to have quickly decided to return to England.43 It would,
moreover, have been understandable if many of James’s servants had decided that even
serving him was not a sufficient reason to justify uprooting themselves to go to live in a
foreign country and any hearsay that the household there would be unwelcoming would
have been an added discouragement.

It should also be appreciated that there is evidence of servants attempting to go to
Saint-Germain but being prevented from doing so. Shortly after arriving at Saint-
Germain, James sent Ralph Sheldon back to England with a letter for Dartmouth,
asking for his horses and coaches to be dispatched to him. He reasoned that
‘howsoever the P[rince] of Orange uses me in other things, sure he will not refuse me

12), 2 vols, passim) means that the presence at Saint-Germain of the catholic servants is more likely to
be known than that of the protestants.
40 W. Oldys and T. Parks (eds.), *Harleian Miscellany*, (1808-13), VI, p. 394.
263-4. Szechi has recently argued that the catholic advisers at Saint-Germain may have been less
influential than has sometimes been supposed. (D. Szechi, ‘The Jacobite Revolution settlement, 1689-
43 See the letters written to Halifax (who was her Chancellor) by members of her household in 1692
and 1693, presently in B.L. Althorp papers C6. Lack of evidence (particularly the fact that warrants of
appointment were issued only to new servants, on the grounds that the appointments of existing
servants were still valid) means that it is perfectly possible that in the early years of the exile some
protestant servants could have returned to England without their presence there having been recorded.
the common Civility of letting all my coaches and Horses come over to me; tis but what I did to P[rince] George when he went from me'.44 The result of this was that between 17 and 25 February over one hundred passes were issued by the government in London to persons wishing to travel to France. Significantly, the largest group which can be discerned among them, thirty-four in all, had been employed in the Stables. Furthermore, an unknown number of royal huntsmen were also issued with passes, as were twelve others who had been servants to James above and belowstairs.45 Forty-two of those issued with passes (all of them issued on either 23 or 25 February) also appear on an undated list of sixty-four royal servants who planned to go to Saint-Germain and which is now to be found among the papers of Sir Stephen Fox. Again, the staff of the Stables predominate, making up forty-two of the total. Eleven were servants from other departments, with the rest being servants to the queen and the prince of Wales, or, in one case, the husband of one of those servants. Also mentioned but not listed were the staff of the Queen’s Stables and the thirty-two servants the members of the King’s Stables planned to take with them. Before leaving each was paid up to 31 December and they took with them from the Stables six coaches, six sets of harnesses, two sedan chairs, two wagons, six pad saddles, thirteen hunting saddles, six cases of pistols and sixty-five horses.46 Taken together, these sources can provide a list of at least fifty-eight of James’s servants who set out in February 1689 for Saint-Germain.47 Most of them, however, probably never got there. On 27 February one of the Messengers was sent to Dover to recall the passes. Five days after this, Shrewsbury gave permission for Mary Beatrice’s possessions to be shipped to France on the Penelope and this was confirmed by a warrant issued on 7 March. In giving this

44 Campana de Cavelli, Les Derniers Stuarts, II, p. 472, James to Dartmouth, 19 Jan 1689 - cp. HMC Dartmouth, I, p. 252. This letter would appear to have been dated according to the New Style because on 19 January Old Style Preston was able to tell Clarendon that Sheldon had arrived the day before with this letter and another for the Privy Council. One newspaper report stated that Sheldon had arrived on 17 January. (Clarendon Correspondence, II, pp. 251-2; Orange Gazette, no. 6).
46 B.L. Add MS 51320, fols. 107-14.
47 The forty-three of them connected with the Stables were :- Ralph Sheldon and Charles Turner, Equerries; Thomas Wyndham and Richard Grahme, Pages of Honour; Robert Gargrave, Sergeant of the Carriages; William Bankes, Surveyor of the Stables; John Calvert, Yeoman Rider; Gerald Devereux and John Lewin, Purveyors; Jean Delatre, Gentleman Armorer; John Fraser, Surgeon; Andrew Snape sen, Sergeant Farrier; John Rose, Thomas Rose and Edward Commons, Farriers; Henry Griffith, Yeoman Sadler; Nicholas Miller, Thomas Bray, Henry Higgins, Richard Tildesley, James Henderson and John Miller jr, Footmen; John Dixey, Thomas Welsh and John Adams, Coachmen; Richard Hulke, Leon Wyatt, Thomas Woodcock, Aaron Wall, Robert Richardson, Gervas Houlston, Henry Robinson, Robert Peake, Thomas Shepherd, Thomas Mann, Benjamin Marret, Michael Burton, Thomas Farrayan, John Ullock, Richard Smith, Richard Adamson and Josias Doughty, Grooms; and John Peach, Bottlegroom. The other fifteen were Thomas Alsop, Turnbroach of the Kitchen; Richard Annis, Huntsman with the Foxhounds; Robert Blandford, Scourer; Innocenzo Fede, Musician; Claud Fournmont, Master Cook; Thomas Heywood, Page of the Backstairs; George and John Holder, Dogkeepers; Thomas Jones, Sergeant of the Foxhounds; Francis Miner, Child of the Kitchen; Eppentus Pawlett, Messenger; Nicholas le Point, Yeoman of the Cellar; Humphrey Prescott, Yeoman of the Bakehouse; Luke Smith, First Groom of the Larder; and John West, Gentleman Pensioner.
permission, Shrewsbury made clear that James's possessions were not to be removed from the country and clearance to the Penelope to sail was conditional on it being searched first by Customs officials. It seems likely that Sheldon, who had been issued with a second pass on 4 March, would have had to go back to France without most of the others. Later that month James's coaches were disposed of at a sale held in Hyde Park.48

If the intention of the government in London was to prevent these persons continuing as James's servants, they seem largely to have succeeded. Of the fifty-eight, only thirteen are known to have served in his household in the years which followed.49 Perhaps even more telling is that eight of the others felt able to become servants to William III.50 The rest seem simply to have disappeared. It is at least a possibility that some of this group may not have meant to take up permanent residence at Saint-Germain, instead viewing the operation as one final duty to their master. That James had specifically asked for his coaches and horses is the obvious explanation why so many of them were Stables servants and could be taken to support the view that their objective was to deliver the items requested rather than join the court in exile. Yet it will be recalled that the scale of the changes among the Stables employees in 1685 had been greater than in most other departments, which could explain why they might have been more willing to remain loyal to James. Also worth considering is the further possibility that many of them may have been catholics. This, were it to be shown, would neatly explain any willingness to remain loyal. Such an hypothesis is, however, unlikely. For one thing, seven of the Stables servants were among the eight who accepted places under the new king. Moreover, with twenty-seven of the other thirty-six members of this group who had been servants of the Stables having been employed from the beginning of the reign, this explanation would as likely as not mean that James would had to have appointed far more catholics in 1685 than anyone has thought possible. This would also mean that the extent to which Dartmouth is regarded as having actively cooperated with James's policy of catholicization would need to be entirely rethought. More to the point and slightly less circular in its reasoning is the consideration that the five for whom there is evidence that they were catholics were among the six of them who did end up at Saint-Germain. This matches the findings outlined above for the rest of the servants who are known to have made it to Saint-Germain and it might be

48 CSPD, (1689-90), p. 9, 11-13, 15; Luttrell, Brief Historical Relation, I, p. 512. The sale of the coaches may have been organised by Dartmouth so it is possible that the money raised was paid to James. (Orange Gazette, no. 17).
49 Bray, Delatret, Devereux, Dixey, Fede, Griffith, Lewin, Miller, Miner, Pawlett, Le Point, Prescott and Sheldon.
50 Adamson, Blandford, Peake, Robinson, Shepherd, Smith, Snape, Ullock. There were two Robert Blandfords, a father and son, both of whom were issued with passes, and it is not certain that it was the one formerly employed by James who served William III.
thought that, had some of them been catholics, those who did not make it might have made more effort to get there as well.

It could, admittedly, be argued that waiting on him at Saint-Germain, while necessary if his regal status was to be maintained, was not the most useful way in which his ex-courtiers could be of service to James. It was, after all, most unlikely that it would be the residue of his household still with him who would bring about his restoration. Honourable though it was for his servants to stay with him during exile, honour would equally have been due to any of them who had been able to assist in bringing that exile to an end. It was some of those servants who remained in England who, in the first instance, took the lead in the efforts to try to make his return possible. The reasons for this are not difficult to discover. The only ones of his senior household courtiers who had gone into exile were Waldegrave, Dumbarton, Lord Thomas Howard and James Porter; that is, those catholics who had owed their political prominence to him. The rest had remained in England and, as has been described, had mostly opposed the constitutional settlement. Those of them committed to James’s restoration, had they gone to be with him, would, in truth, have contributed little to that cause and have been not much more than a drain on his resources. By instead staying where they were, they formed precisely the sort of network which would be needed if any conspiracy was to stand any chance of success. During 1689 and 1690 the leading part was played by Preston and, with his associates including his brother, James Grahme, Griffin, Dartmouth, Sir Theophilus Oglethorpe and John Ashton, as well as Clarendon, the countess of Dorchester, Sir John Fenwick and William Penn, the group he created was clearly heavily dependant on connections which had had their origins within James’s household. Preston’s arrest broke this group but, within the more fragmentary organisation which succeeded it, former servants of James continued to play a leading role. Griffin and the Oglethorpes remained active while Ailesbury and Lichfield were what could be considered the heads of two of the rival factions. Henry Bulkeley was the leading agent in London and, in time, it would be James St.Amand who would succeed him in this capacity. Edward Nosworthy fulfilled much the same role in Devon and Cornwall. Another of the agents, Peter Cook, may have previously been the Gentleman Pensioner of that name. Others known to have been involved included Huntingdon, Peterborough, Yarmouth and Arran. Moreover, if the statements made in 1691 by William Fuller, who had been a Page to Mary Beatrice at Saint-Germain) are to be believed, Feversham, Beaufort, Northumberland and Mulgrave were also linked with the Jacobite plots and it cannot be said that any of these four were

---

52 Dalrymple, Memoirs, II (c), p. 237, Cook’s confession, [1696]; HMC Buccleuch (Montagu House), II, p. 320, notes on Jacobite plots, Mar-June 1696.
implausible suspects. Feversham’s involvement is made all the more plausible by the reputation the Queen Dowager’s household at Somerset House had as a hotbed of Jacobitism. Mulgrave (by then marquis of Normanby) is known to have made approaches to James’s agents in 1694 and his 1705 marriage to Catherine Darnley, daughter of James and the countess of Dorchester, may represent corroboration as to where his true sympathies lay. This placed him among those of James’s courtiers who served William but who, for whatever reason, were prepared later to have some dealings with their former master. Most famously, Marlborough did so but, with so few of the senior servants accepting places under William, he could only be something of an exception. The only other case of a household servant for which there is any evidence would seem to have been Percy Kirke. Of course, Ormond would eventually declare for the exiled dynasty and would provide them with more than secret verbal assurances.

There is no reason to think that most of those who felt that James was still the only true king would have approved of any armed insurrection to restore him and it cannot even be assumed that all those involved in the various conspiracies would have done so. This need not be thought to have precluded a successful restoration (the precedent of 1660 may have made it seem that a peaceful recall would be the most likely outcome) but it did mean the despondent strand was built into Jacobitism from the very beginning. With obedience to the king a godly duty, and conversely, disobedience a sin, most would have expected to be answerable to God for their attitude towards His anointed representative and the ideal of Christian forbearance was readily available as a prototype for those who chose to be the true believers. It is not accidental that some of the best evidence for Jacobitism among former courtiers is to be found on epitaphs. That of James Fortrey, one of the two Grooms of the Bedchamber who did not go to Saint-Germain (Chiffinch was the other), would in 1719 record that he ‘would have followed his unhappy master’s fortune in exile, but was forbidden by his commands, on account of his ill-state of health; fidelity and gratitude forbade him to engage in the service of his successor. Having lived a favorite of princes, he rather chose obscurity...’ Similar proud sentiments, dating from 1691, are to be found on Sir Henry Firebrace’s tomb. His resignation as Second Clerk of the Green Cloth in 1689 was, it explained, because ‘for his integrity and most pure morals he was ever dear to

56 Dalrymple, Memoirs, II (c), p. 235, Fenwick’s confession, 1696. The strongest case for Marlborough’s involvement having been serious is that made by Hopkins, ‘Jacobite conspiracy’, pp. 265-9, 274-5, 277-9, 312-15). His most recent biographer is more sceptical. (J.R. Jones, Marlborough, (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 49-52)
the august brothers Charles and James, of whom the one yielding to nature and the other to fortune, he then at last forsook the Court that he might keep his fealty'. In their tone these reveal something of why in the following decades Jacobitism would become associated with 'country' values. The tendency to look back on the period before 1689 as a golden age would naturally have been especially strong among those who had spent it at court. The examples given above of royal servants who became Jacobites are hardly typical. Even among those who had been James's servants they are only a tiny handful. The argument that there were probably many more, among the ex-royal servants and the rest of the population, whose support cannot be recovered is entirely valid but it cannot dispel the doubts which must accompany any attempt to extrapolate from the few examples. It has to be said that the suspicion one is left with is that ex-royal servants played an inordinately large role among the first generation of Jacobites. Consequently, it was their feeling of loss, not just for their king but also for their careers, which did much to influence what carping disapproval there was of the courts of James's successors.

III

In view of the upheavals created by James's overthrow, it might seem that there was some justification in concerns that the number of changes in personnel had damaged the ethos of the royal household. It could not be expected that all the new servants would be able to take the proper care of the court traditions and inexperience of administration might encourage mismanagement. Things were not however as simple as that. A measure of continuity was achieved by the retention of a number of key individuals, whose willingness to be reappointed may, in part, have been motivated by the value they placed on that continuity and their desire to ensure that traditions were handed on. In the Chamber, at least, there were officials who knew what they were doing in enough of the Chamber positions which mattered to keep improvisation in the public ritual of the court to a minimum. In particular, it helped that Sir Thomas Duppa remained on as First Gentleman Usher, Daily Waiter and Black Rod. Moreover, there was one experienced Gentleman Usher of the Privy Chamber in the form of Sir Edward Sutton, while Jeremiah Bubb and Nathaniel Hammond were promoted from Gentlemen Ushers, Quarter Waiters to become, respectively, one of the three other Gentlemen Ushers, Daily Waiters and the Assistant Gentleman Usher, Daily Waiter. Robert Jegon,

59 For the development of Jacobitism as a 'country' viewpoint, see P. Monod, 'Jacobitism and country principles in the reign of William III', HJ, XXX (1987), pp. 289-310.
Jeremy Chaplain and James Meyrick were reappointed among the eight Gentlemen Ushers, Quarter Waiters. Sir Charles Cotterell continued as Master of the Ceremonies.

Maintaining tradition was one thing. To do so, experienced officials had to be employed. Where the issue was more one of competent management, there was a noticeably greater willingness to employ outsiders and, in this respect, it cannot be argued that the results were without blemishes. When the new Treasurer of the Chamber, Sir Rowland Gwynne, was dismissed in 1692 (after, of all things, accusing Sydney of selling jobs in Ireland), an investigation by the Comptroller of the Chamber uncovered evidence that he had embezzled £4,000 from unclaimed salaries.61 Also less than satisfactory were the financial affairs of the Stables. Ouwerkerk’s first accounts as Master of the Horse proved to be full of errors, some trivial, some of substance, and, although the problems arose principally from his military activities, for it was through the Stables that horses were purchased for use in the army, this practice caused its own accounting problems for the Board of Greencloth when the Stables accompanied the king on campaign.62 No matter how much this is attributed to the pressures inherent in organising military logistics in a time of war, the impression that Ouwerkerk was ignorant about the financial practices of Exchequer cannot be explained away and, in this case, was perhaps only to be expected. Ignorance of this sort was as much a danger belowstairs in the Household where experienced staff were in shorter supply than was the case in the Chamber. It was because of this that Newport was not only reinstated as Treasurer of the Household but was appointed Cofferer as well.63 His expertise gained on the Board of Greencloth in the fifteen years before 1687 was especially useful because none of the Clerks of the Greencloth accepted reappointment under the new king. Sir Stephen Fox would have done so (and initially acted as First Clerk) had he not objected to Newport’s combined appointment which he considered improper. Three of the replacement Clerks, William Forrester and James Forbes as the two Clerks and Peter Isaac as the First Clerk Comptroller, had no experience of

61 T 1/18, fols. 208-10, Richards to Treasury Commission, 3 [June] 1692. Gwynne never got round to presenting his accounts to the Exchequer. For the circumstances surrounding his dismissal as Treasurer of the Chamber, see Luttrell, Brief Historical Relation, II, p. 412, 414, 418, 436, III, 40, 59; HMC Finch, IV, p. 44, 55, 63-4; E 351/550.
62 B.L. Add MS 51320, fol. 143, memorandum on Stables accounts, 1688-9; fol. 159, account of money issued to Ouwerkerk, 1688-93; B.L. Harl MS 6837, fol. 173, minutes of Commission of Public Accounts, 18 July 1691; E 351/1754-1755, 1757-1760. When the king was on campaign the Board of Greencloth had to suspend its oversight of the Stables expenditure. (LS 13/106, fol. 10, Rowe to Greencloth, 25 July 1691; LS 13/257, fol. 98, William III to Greencloth, 2 Mar 1692; LS 1/33-36). Thomas Wharton also acted as a middleman in the buying of horses for the army. In 1691 the Commission of Public Accounts suspected him of attempting to defraud the Exchequer but investigations cleared up the confusions and revealed that the suspicions were largely unfounded. (E 351/1756; B.L. Harl MS 6837, fols. 152-3, 173, 201-2, 204).
63 The intention may originally have been for Herbert of Cherbury to become Cofferer. Instead of salaries of £1,200 and £500 being paid to the Treasurer and the Cofferer, Newport received £200, with the other £1,500 going as a pension to Herbert. After Herbert’s death in 1691, £400 p.a. was paid to Newport and £1,110 was paid to Maynard. (LS 13/257, fol. 18, 21, 71-2, 74, 89).
working in the Household and their appointments did much to bring about the final
collapse of the ancient system of clerical promotion belowstairs. The new Second Clerk
Comptroller, John Fox, was the nephew of Sir Stephen and could, in contrast, claim
some familiarity with how the Board of Greencloth worked. Since 1685 he had been
Clerk of the Spicery and in 1688 had become Supernumerary Clerk Comptroller of the
Greencloth, as well as Clerk Comptroller to the prince of Wales. He had clearly been
considered his uncle’s designated successor and his appointment enabled Sir Stephen to
retain some influence in the running of affairs downstairs. There were some initial
problems. The Master Cook had to pay the tradesmen providing supplies for the
coronation banquet himself because ‘his Maj[es]t[y]s Family was then unsettled, &
very few serv[an]ts Sworn’.64 Yet it is only fair to say that there is no real evidence that
the members of the Board of Greencloth of the early 1690s were especially more
incompetent than their predecessors. Even the scandals involving Gwynne and
Ouwerkerk were hardly unprecedented and, although, as will be seen, it would
certainly not be the case with regards to general issues, the newcomers may even have
brought a freshness of approach to their handling of the details.

John Fox did not in fact remain on the Board of Greencloth for long. In January
1690 he would be dismissed from the Household, accused of proposing a Jacobite toast.65
It is thus not impossible that he was one of those in the mind of the indignant
whig who, on Christmas Day 1689, wrote to William warning him against the
influence of the Tory courtiers. This possibility would be especially tantalising if the
letter was, as seems likely, by the Comptroller, Thomas Wharton. The contents of the
letter were blunt. The retention of those senior courtiers who had served James was
condemned, and it was contended that ‘

almost all their imps are as bad as they, and many in your own family, of the
same stamp. Some of those who daily serve, wish every bit you eat and drop you
drink, may poison you. Though it seems strange, that any man should have the
impudence to recommend such persons to Your Majesty, yet we cease to wonder,
when we see the corruption of your court and ministers.66

This sounds suspiciously like paranoia and that is probably how William, who
disregarded its insubordinate advice, viewed it. Nevertheless, these anxieties are
revealing. After all, the attitude Lovelace had expressed in the dispute with the

64 LS 13/174, fol. 13.
65 B.L. Add MS 11043, fol. 140, newsletter, 18 Jan 1690; LS 13/174, fols. 17, 26; LS 13/257, fol.
65, Mary II to Greencloth, 6 Mar 1690; Clay, Public Finance and Private Wealth, p. 247.
drop this way. In November 1692 he would warn the Commons that ‘your chief men that manage
matters are such as submit to this King upon wrong principles - because he has the governing power -
but will be as ready to join another when he prevails. They are such as came not into your government
 till it was late, and I think it no policy to make men into a government because they are violent
against it’. He then proposed that an address be presented to the king calling for their removal. Sir John
Lowther, in replying, argued that the king knew best who to employ. (H. Horwitz (ed.), The
Gentlemen Pensioners had been similar and doubtless many other whigs thought much the same. To object that these fears did not exactly correspond with a situation in which the clear-out of those who had supported James had actually been rather thorough would have been besides the point. The events leading up to William’s acquisition of the throne had given the more doctrinaire whigs a test by which to determine whether an individual was, so to speak, one of them. This desire to mark out who was for them and who was against (a desire they shared with the extremists on the other side) was, in its imposition of a polarity onto political debate, a major reason why whigs and tories remained sharply divided. The whigs’ conviction that James’s deposition had been an historic development which vindicated their values made it, moreover, a duty for them to demonize those who thought otherwise. It must be remembered that at court there were always groups whom their opponents wanted to be removed from office. Usually this was just a matter of pure factionalism but, as the Test Acts demonstrate, it was not unknown for purges to be sought on ideological grounds. What does have some claim to be new was the onset of ‘the rage of party’. The events of the previous decade, together with more regular parliaments and the growth in print as a medium for reporting and debate, probably can be said to have made the competing groups less fluid. The king’s ability to appoint ministers of his own choosing was not yet diminished but there were already changes in the way appointments were interpreted by observers. The game of who was in and who was out was now undoubtedly a subject of wider interest.

What made the 1689 appointments of interest was that many of those who were ‘in’ had previously been those most suspicious of the court. Wharton and Lovelace are the most obvious examples, as are Gwynne and the earl of Monmouth, who became a Gentleman of the Bedchamber. They were believers in some of the more radical whig ideas and there were others like them. Furthermore, among the more moderate whigs, there were those, including Devonshire, who had a strong ‘country’ dash to their views, while someone like Sir John Lowther, the new Vice-Chamberlain, was more ‘country’ than he was tory. Were they therefore all selling out? Some probably were but, when they are understood in relation to what was said about reaction to the reforms between 1662 and 1685, the actions of the others need not be thought mystifying. Here, after all, was a chance to ensure that the moral and administrative standards required for the court to be the honour and asset to the nation they wanted it to be were upheld. It must be admitted that, given some of the examples described above, it is extremely doubtful whether the standards were in practice that much different but then the unchanging everyday problems may well have made hopes of actual improvements unrealistic. Self-deceptive or otherwise, the hope that improvements were possible, the enduring ‘country’ message, now meant that those who took control of the royal
household in 1689 would have thought themselves those best able to continue its true traditions. But had their predecessors not believed the same? That they had indeed done so is not the paradox it seems. For the anglican-royalists, the conviction that they alone could properly serve the king had rested on the belief that the king was both sovereign and master. As an explanation and justification of the way things were, this conflation of these two roles at least had the advantage of simplicity. At the heart of their opponents’ critique, however, was the objection that a patriarchal theory by itself was too simple. The argument that the sovereign should be obeyed in the same way as any master reduced political debate to the most uncomplicated level possible, but to those who did not respond to such clarity, this was to brush aside all the irksome details of politics in the real world. To most of the mainstream whigs (who, in their own way, were also anglican-royalists), it was not that the theory was wrong so much that it was not enough. Other principles were needed as well to produce the sort of approach to constitutional dilemmas with which they felt comfortable. To them, the blind devotion of their predecessors in government had been evidence of either corruption or credulity. The incoming courtiers were sure that they were more sophisticated in these matters. Some of them may even have remembered how, during the previous two reigns, the royal servants had dutifully stifled their hostility towards change when successive retrenchments had been pushed through, apparently with the aim of strengthening the king in his dealings with parliament. This surely was an example of encroachment by royal absolutism, made possible by the complicity of the tories, of the sort they were pledged to reverse.

When the new Household establishment came into effect on 1 April 1689, it did just that. In particular, boardwages were reintroduced. In the Household and the Chamber this was done by cutting the wages back to their 1679 level, with the boardwages being restored at higher levels to ensure that the total payment was at least as great as the salaries had been under the 1685 establishment. This meant that the official income in most offices remained unchanged. The salaries of the Secretaries of State, the Scottish Secretary, the Clerks of the Signet and of the Privy Seal, and the Dean of the Chapel Royal were converted directly into boardwages. Belowstairs the salaries of the Grooms, which had hitherto ranged from £20 to £40, became a wage of £2 13s. 4d. and a board wage of £37 6s. 8d. The situation with regards the Yeomen was more complicated but most received £5 wages and £45 boardwages. Things were different in the Stables where, with all the salaries remaining unaltered, the Master of the Horse, the Avenor and the Equerries did not regain their separate boardwages. The

67 LS 13/39, Household establishment, 1689. This can be found printed in A Collection of Ordinances and Regulations for the Government of the Royal Household, (Society of Antiquaries, 1790), pp. 380-422. Although it was taken from a copy (B.L. Harl MS 5010, fols. 20-42), this printed text is accurate.
fact that the Gentlemen Ushers, Daily Waiters now got £20 plus £105, rather than £150, was made up for by the restoration to them of their diet and this helped increase the total number of dishes served each day from forty-eight to sixty-one. As a direct result of the changes, the Household Kitchen came into being once more, the accounts of the Cofferer reverted to their pre-1685 form and the Board of Greencloth resumed the practice of requiring all new Chamber servants to present their certificates of admission, so that they knew to whom to pay the boardwages.68 Added to this, more servants were taken on. The number in the Household increased from 113 to 178 and those in the Stables from eighty-seven to 104. In the Chamber numbers rose from about 500 to about 600. The effect was to increase expenditure. The cost of the Household establishment in 1685 had been fixed at £64,850, although later additions (particularly for the catholic chapel) had caused it to drift up to £75,149. This meant that the 1689 establishment, which totalled £76,953, actually represented only a modest increase, but additions would force up the cost to £80,415 by April 1691.69 Within years actual total expenditure by the Cofferer was exceeding £110,000, whereas James had regularly kept it below £80,000. Expenditure in the Great Wardrobe and by the Treasurer of the Chamber also showed increases. This set the pattern for the reign, during which the cost of the court as a whole would average almost half as much again as it had done under James.70 To complete the rejection of James’s innovations, the new Bedchamber ordinances ignored the 1685 ordinances, instead consisting largely of a reissue of the 1661 and 1673 ones.71

These changes were so thorough, so precise and, it would seem, so unnecessary, that the main reason must have been a desire to erase all evidence of a policy associated with James. Yet it must also be taken to indicate that some of those in power in 1689 must have looked back with affection on the old system. As such an indulgence, it would be an expensive one but, despite the image problems which dogged the

---

69 For the additions, see the abstracts in T 1/10, fol. 42-44, Greencloth to Jephson, 29 Sept 1690; B.L. Harl MS 7495. The latter document, from which the figure of £80,415 comes, belonged originally to Sir William Forrester. See also the undated abstract inserted into LS 13/39.
70 R.O. Bucholz, ‘The court in the reign of Queen Anne’, (unpublished D.Phil thesis, Oxford, 1987), p. 328, table 1.2. Average annual expenditure on the court (including the Works) would be £318,164. This compared to only £222,429 for James II. The figures for Anne and George I would be £259,576 and £272,454; that is, lower than for William III but not as low as for James II.
71 Bodl. MS Rawl A 142, Bedchamber ordinances, 1689. For copies, see B.L. Stowe MS 563; B.L. Add MS 61419 A and B. The only major changes fully retained were clauses 7, 8 and 10, which became clauses 7, 8 and 15. These regulated who was allowed to have the keys to the Bedchamber and who the Pages of the Bedchamber were always to allow to enter. Even on many minor points the earlier versions were preferred but, overall, the changes made no more practical difference than the 1685 changes had done. Regarding the Chamber ordinances, Carte claims they ceased to be used after 1689. (Ormonde, I, p. 356). It is true that no more ordinances were issued but all other evidence indicates that the State Apartments continued to operate as before. Carte may have meant to refer to the practice at Kensington House under William but it should also be borne in mind that he would have had ulterior motives for blaming William for ending a system he attributed to Charles I.
government throughout William’s reign, the decision seems to have attracted almost no adverse criticism. In this, Ailesbury was an exception, for he did disapprove of the increase in the cost of the court, but, of course, he was a Jacobite and a disgruntled ex-royal servant. Most telling was the silence of the Commission of Public Accounts on the subject. Although the 1691 Commission (unlike its predecessor body in 1667, which had been restricted to military expenditure) did have powers to investigate the household finances, it used them only to search for evidence of outright corruption. In any case, the Commissioners were far more interested in the army and the navy, with domestic expenditure being treated very much as a side issue. This bears out the fact that contemporary concerns about government expenditure were predominantly to do with the military budget and, although the point is often misunderstood, it should be remembered that the introduction of the Civil List in 1698 was an attempt to control these military costs by ring-fencing the allocations for other items. As had been the case under Charles II, ‘country’ politicians under William, and later under Anne, were worried about issues other than the extravagances of the royal household. Indeed, instead of being worried, Sir John Lowther complained

So far have kings been from being able to build cities, as private men among the Romans, and as great princes have sometimes done, for the good of their country, and perpetuating their memory, that ours can scarce repair their palaces. King James could but get one room built; king Charles the first, nothing; king Charles the second, with all the violent passion he had for building, got the alterations at Windsor finished, and yet most, if not all, the money came from Ireland. King James the second made some alterations in Whitehall; and king William and queen Mary repented they ever undertook Hampton-Court, and at last were forced to leave it in a miserable condition, not half finished.

In his 1697 poem, On the Last Treasury Day at Kensington, the earl of Monmouth also implied that William was too thrifty. Describing how the Treasury Commissioners reported to the king on the poor state of the finances, it told how ‘Sir Stephen next, in tears, laments our fate. And then declares the pinchgut kitchen’s state.’ The reference to ‘pinchgut’ was to the money paid to sailors when food supplies ran out, indicating that Monmouth, as was only appropriate for the man who had been First Lord of the Treasury in 1689, knew exactly what he was talking about.

72 Ailesbury, Memoirs, I, p. 304.
76 Lonsdale, Memoirs, p. xiv.
77 POAS, V, p. 502, ll. 15-16.
It was presumably deliberate that Monmouth should have represented Fox as the one who outlined the situation in the Household for Fox had become obsessive about the subject. His departure from the Board of Green Cloth in 1689 had been acrimonious. By his own account (for, unfortunately, only his version of the events is available), the Whigs had conspired to prevent him becoming, at long last, the Cofferer, the post he considered to be his due and the only fitting climax to his career in royal service. That Newport was appointed instead enraged him. His argument that Newport could not be both Treasurer and Cofferer, because the former was meant to be a check on the other, was valid, but should not be thought entirely impartial. To him, the mounting expense of the Household proved the point, although he himself may have been nearer the mark when he told William that a lifestyle which involved infrequent use of Whitehall and regular absences abroad was the main problem. Running throughout his complaints was the issue of the diets. As someone who still understood how the old system was supposed to work, he was especially scandalised that Devonshire, Newport and Wharton could not be bothered to use their board wages to keep open tables. This failure to foresee that the great officers would find this duty as tiresome as the other aristocrats who had preceded them reveals Fox to have been too much of a pedant to realise that, for others, it was the paying of lip service to tradition which really mattered. One, however, who is known to have agreed with him was the king.

William's attitude was simple. It was, if Fox is to be believed, that 'he lived better when prince of Orange then now he was King of England'.

William exaggerated. The old view of him as a dour, sober Calvinist with little affinity with the ways of a monarchy no longer convinces. Rather, there is now general agreement that he pursued the traditional activities of a prince with enthusiasm and discernment. As the head of the house of Orange, he needed no lessons in how to insist on the maintenance of his royal image once he became king. He hunted regularly, he set fashions in interior design, he took a close interest in the royal art collections and he created gardens which were among the finest in Europe. At Hampton Court he built for himself a range of apartments which, as can only now be fully appreciated again, almost bear comparison with those of Louis XIV at Versailles, while to consider that Kensington House was too modest for a royal palace is to forget that it was a whim.

---

78 B.L. Add MS 51324, fols. 43-5, 48-57, 61-2; B.L. Add MS 51319, fols. 177-8. It has to be stressed that in these notes Fox does not even imply that the great officers had opposed the contents of the 1689 establishment in the form they were implemented. Fox's grudge would have been added to by the fact that the 1689 Household ordinances reaffirmed that a vacancy in the Cofferership should be filled by the First Clerk of the Green Cloth. (Ordinances and Regulations, pp. 420-1). William's view would have been based on the fact that dining at the Dutch court was still communal. (N.A. Robb, William of Orange, (1962-66), II, p. 122, 129-30.

79 There is even less reason to see him as the stereotypical Dutch Calvinist now that Schama's The Embarrassment of Riches, (1987), means that Dutch Calvinists can not now be thought of as either dour or sober
built as a substitute for Huis ten Bosch. When Mary died, he gave her what may have been the most lavish royal funeral ever staged in England and then pressed ahead with the Royal Hospital at Greenwich, the grandest English secular building of its age, to serve as her monument.80

William would, no doubt, have said that he was doing no more than was expected of him and the thought that he was perhaps too anxious to show that he was the king may be unfair. On the other hand, it is presumably significant that, of the later Stuarts, it should have been James II, the one most certain of his right to the throne, who attempted to bring about a more considered approach to royal grandeur. To tamper with such things confidence was required, partly because the risks would have seemed less when undertaken from what was thought a position of strength but also because his subjects were, on this as on everything else, profoundly suspicious of innovation. Charles II had lacked that confidence and had only ever muddled through. What he had found was that even short-termism was no protection against ingrained preconceptions held by many about long-term conspiracies, with his inability to keep up the customary style of the monarchy seeming to support the suspicion that his rule had gone wrong. These preconceptions had again been confirmed when James set out to avoid his brother’s weaknesses by stating, in terms which he was innocent enough to think would not be misinterpreted, exactly what he planned to do. To compound this, his hope that the way of life of the court would find a focus in his piety, with the rituals of kingship heightening the humility he showed towards his faith, jarred with those who, when it came to religion, preferred their king to be answerable to God, or possibly to parliament, and not to the pope. Just as James looked forward to the conversion of his servants and his subjects, so they looked forward to when he would see the errors of his ways and return to the religion which was properly his. When William forced his way into the affairs of the kingdom in 1688, he did so to cleanse the court of the comparatively small number of catholics whom everyone assumed were to blame for the king’s delusions. This was a policy to be taken seriously by all anglicans, for they

would have wanted it as a sign that James had repented and, except by those who were convinced that such a miracle could never happen, the repentant sinner would gladly have been forgiven. James’s desire for humility did not extend this far and he had spoilt everything for those who looked to him to reunite the nation when he left them to sort things out without him. Appointing William in his place ensured that the catholics were permanently purged and, to those who regarded them as little better, the consequent removal of many who had served the monarchy with unthinking devotion was hardly less welcome. The revival of boardwages was a similar attempt to reform the court into something it was thought to have been in the past. This can accurately be called nostalgia for the reign of Charles II because, although the blemishes in his reputation had not yet been forgotten, there were many prepared to agree that he had, if nothing else, been better than his brother. The equation between the kingdom and the court remained unquestioned, so it was at court that there started the attempt to reassert what those who gained power in 1689 took to be the true values of the kingdom. In this sense, William could claim to have fulfilled the promise made by his motto: ‘Je maintiendrai’.
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PAMPHLETS AND PERIODICALS

An Account of the Late Horrid Conspiracy to Depose their Present Majesties K. William and Q. Mary, to bring in the French and the Late King James, and ruine the City of London with a Relation of the Miraculous Discovery thereof - Also some brief Reflections on the Trials of the Lord Preston, Major Ashton, and Mr. Elliot, who were chiefly concern'd therein, and found Guilty. 1691. [attributed to Daniel Defoe].

An Act of Common-Council of the City of London, (made in the first and second years of the Reign of Philip & Mary) for Retrenching of the Expences of the Lord Mayor & Sheriffs, &c. Published with Additional Reasons for putting the said Act in present Execution and now offered to the Consideration of all good Citizens, by some Well-wishers of the present and future Prosperity of the said City. 1680.

The Address of the Nonconformist Ministers (in and about the City of London) to His Highness the Prince of Orange. 1689.

An Answer to the Bishop of Rochester's First Letter to the Earl of Dorset etc. concerning the Late Ecclesiastical Commission. 1689.

An Answer to a Pamphlet called, The True Protestants Appeal to the City and Country being a Vindication of the Dissenting Protestants in General; and Mr. Sheriff Bethell in Particular. by a Truer Protestant. 1681.
The Arguments of the Lord Keeper, the Two Lords Chief Justices and Mr. Baron Powell when They Gave Judgment for the Earl of Bath. 1693.

Baldwin, R. (ed.), Fourteen Papers... 1689.

[Beaumont, J.], A Letter to the Honourable Major Slingsby, Lieutenant-Governor of Portsmouth. [1688].

[Bethel, S.], The Vindication of Slingsby Bethel Esq.; one of the Sheriffs of London and Middlesex: Against the several Slanders Cast upon him Upon the occasion of his being proposed, for one of the Burgesses to Serve in the late Parliament for the Burrough of Southwark. 1681.

[Bohun, E.], The History of the Desertion, or an Account of all the Publick Affairs in England, from the Beginning of September 1688 to the Twelfth of February following with an Answer to a Piece call’d The Desertion Discussed: in a letter to a Country Gentleman by a Person of Quality. 1689.

[Burnet, T.], A Relation of the Proceedings at Charter-House, upon Occasion of King James the II His presenting a Papist to be admitted into that Hospital in vertue of His Letters Dispensatory. 1689.

The Case of the Dutchess of Albemarle and Christopher Monke, Esquire, Appellants, Against the Earl of Bath, and Others, Respondents. [1693].

The Case of several of the Band of Gentleman Pensioners, and Band of Yeomen of the Guard, Servants to King Charles the Second, humbly offer’d to the Honourable House of Commons. n.d.

The Ceremonies Us’d in the Time of King Henry VIII for the Healing of them that be Diseas’d with the King’s Evil. 1686.

A Compleat and True Narrative of the Manner of the Discovery of the Popish Plot to His Majesty by Mr. Christopher Kirkby with a Full Answer to a Late Pamphlet entitled ‘Reflections upon the Earl of Danby’ relating to the Murther of Sir Edmundbury Godfrey in a Letter to a Friend. 1679.

The Converts. 1687.

[Cooper, A.A., first earl of Shaftesbury], A Letter from a Person of Quality to His Friend in the Country. 1675.

A Dialogue of the Dead; between the very Eminent Signor Glibertini and Count Thomaso, in the Vales of Acheron. 1715.

Douglas, J., earl of Arran, A Speech made by the Righe [sic] Honourable the Earl of Arran, to the Scotch Nobility and Gentry, Met together at the Council Chamber in White-Hall, on the Eighth of January 1688, about an Address to His Highness the Prince of Orange, to take upon him the Government of the Kingdom of Scotland. 1689.
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[Dunton, J.], The Hazard of a Death-Bed-Repentance, Fairly Argued, From the Late Remorse of W____ late D____ of D____ [Devonshire] with Serious Reflections on His Adulterous Life On His Living so Long in A Known Sin On that Latin Epitaph He Order’d to be Set on the Tomb-stone of Miss Campion And Upon His Seeming Penitence in his last Sickness... 1708.
The Hazard of a Death-Bed-Repentance, Further Argued, From the Late Remorse of W____ late D____ of D____ with Serious Reflections on his Adulterous Life. Being A Second Answer to Dr. K____'s [Kennett's] Sermon Preach’d at the D____'s Funeral... 1708.

The English Currant, (1688-9).

Fiddes, R., A Letter in Answer to one from a Free-Thinker: occasion'd by the Late Duke of Buckinghamshire's Epitaph wherein certain passages in it that have been thought exceptionable, are vindicated; and the Doctrine of the Soul's Immortality asserted to which is prefix'd, a version of the Epitaph, agreeable to the explication given of it in the Answer. with an Introduction, containing extracts of Two Letters relating to the Conduct of that Noble Lord. 1721.
The Doctrine of a Future State, and that of the Soul's Immortality, asserted and distinctly proved; in a second letter to a free-thinker occasion'd by the Late D. of Buckinghamshire's Epitaph. 1721.

[Fowler, E.], An Answer to the Paper delivered by Mr. Ashton at his Execution to Sir Francis Child: Sheriff of London, &c. together with the Paper it self. (1690).

A Full and True Account of the Barbarous Rebellion and Rising of the Lord Dunbarton’s Regiment at Ipswich in Suffolk with their Pretences of Declaring for the Late King James. 1689.

A Full and True Account of the Tryal, Conviction, & Condemnation of the Scotch Rebels, Officers in the L. Dunbarton’s Regiment; at Bury St.Edmunds in Suffolk (on Wednesday, July 31st, 1689) for High-Treason. 1689.

A Full Answer to the Depositions; and to all other Pretences and Arguments Whatever, Concerning the Birth of the Prince of Wales, the Intreague thereof detected, the whole design being set forth, with the way and manner of doing it. Whereunto is annexed, A Map or Survey Engraven of St.James’s Palace, and the Convent there; describing the Place wherein it is supposed the true Mother was delivered: with the Particular Doors and Passages through which the child was convey’d to the Queen’s Bedchamber. 1689.

A Funeral Oration upon the Late King James composed from Memoirs furnished by Mr. Porter, his Great Chamberlain, printed by the Consent of the Late Queen, dedicated to the French King, and Published by his Authority wherein it is own’d, that the late King reconciled his Brother King Charles II to the Church of
Rome; That He Himself design'd to destroy the Protestant Religion, and to reduce these Kingdoms to the Obedience of the See of Rome, according to the Example of Louis le Grand, who, they hope, will effect it, and punish these Rebellious Nations, as they are pleased to call them with Remarks upon the Whole. 1702. [unauthorised English edition]

The Gracious Answer of the most Illustrious Lady of Pleasure, the Countess of Castlem____ to the Poor-Whores Petition. [1668].

Griffith, J., A Sermon occasioned by the Death of the Late Duke of Devonshire, who Departed this Life, August the 18th, 1707, at Devonshire House London. 1707.

[Harris, W.], A Farewel to Popery in a Letter to Dr. Nicholas, Vice-Chancellor of Oxford, and Warden of New-College, from W.H.M.D. lately Fellow of the same College shewing the true Motives that with-drew him to the Romish Religion, and the reasons of his Return to the Church of England: concluding with some short Reflections concerning the Great Duty of Charity. 1679.

Herbert, A., Admiral Herbert's Letter to all Commanders of Ships and Sea-men in His Majesties Fleet. [1688].

The Earl of Torrington's Speech to the House of Commons in November 1690 occasion'd by the Ingagement at Sea on the 30th of June that Year, between the Confederate and French Fleets. 1710.

Hildeyard, J., A Sermon Preached at the Funeral of the Right Honourable Robert Earl and Viscount Yarmouth, Baron of Paston, and Lord Lieutenant of the County of Norfolk. 1683.

Hudleston, R., A Short and Plain Way to the Faith and Church composed Many Years since by that eminent Divine Mr. Richard Hudleston of the English Congregation of the Order of St.Benedict and Now published for the common Good by his Nephew Mr. Jo. Hudleston of the same Congregation to which is Annexed his Late Majesty King Charles the Second his Papers found in his Closet after his Decease. As also a Brief Account of what occurred on his Death-Bed in Regard to Religion. Dublin, 1688. [Irish edition of pamphlet originally published in London].

The Hue and Cry after Father Peters, by the Deserted Roman Catholicks. 1688.

An Impartial Account of Some Remarkable Passages in the Life of Arthur, Earl of Torrington: together with some modest remarks on his Tryal and Acquitment. 1691.

An Intimation of the Deputies of the States General in a Late Discourse with Mr. Sidney Extraordinary Envoy from his Majesty of Great Britain. [1680].

James II, His Majesties Reasons for Withdrawing Himself from Rochester. [1688].
Jenison, R., *A Narrative of the Depositions of Robert Jenison Esq.; with other Material Evidences, plainly proving that Mr. William Ireland, lately executed for High Treason was in London the Nineteenth of August, 1678 notwithstanding his Confident Denial thereof both at His Tryal and Execution.* (ed.) Chetwind, C., 1679.

The Narrative of Robert Jenison, of Grays-Inn, Esquire. 1679

The Informations of Robert Jenison of Grayes Inn, Esquire relating to the Horrid Popish Plott, as They were given in writing upon Oath to the Honorable House of Commons on Tuesday the 9th day of November, 1680. 1680.

Kennett, W., *A Sermon Preach'd at the Funeral of the Right Noble William Duke of Devonshire, in the Church of All-Hallows in Derby, on Fryday Septemb. 5th MDCCVII.* 1707.

To the King's Most Excellent Majesty, the Humble Address of George Lord Dartmouth, Admiral of Your Fleet for the present Expedition, and the Commanders of Your Majesties Ships of War now actually at the Spithead in your Majesties Service under his Lordships Command. [1688].

To the King's most Excellent Majesty, the Humble Petition of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal; whose Names are Subscribed. 1688.

The King's Reasons (with some Reflections upon them) for withdrawing himself from Rochester, written with his own Hand, (or rather copied from his own Speech after the Bawdy Affidavit) and ordered by him to be published, (by Henry Hills, but that he was out of the Way). [1688].

The Last Speeches and Confession of Oliver Plunket, Titular Primate of Ireland, with His Behavior in Newgate; and also of Edward Fitz-Harris, at their Execution at Tyburn, upon Friday July 1 1681 for High Treason, in Conspiring the Death of the King, &c. 1681.

A Letter from a Person of Quality to His Friend concerning His Majesties Late Declaration touching the Reasons which moved him to dissolve the Two Last Parliaments at Westminster and Oxford. [1681].


A List of one unanimous Club of Voters in his Majesties Long Parliament, dissolved in 78. Very fit to be thought on at the next New Choice. [1679].

London Courant, (1688).
London Gazette, (1688-9).
London Intelligence, (1688-9).
The London Mercury, or, Moderate Intelligencer, (1688-9).
His Majesties Declaration Defended: In a Letter to a Friend. Being an Answer to a Seditious Pamphlet, called A Letter from a Person of Quality to His Friend Concerning the Kings Late Declaration touching the Reasons which Moved Him to Dissolve the Two Last Parliaments at Westminster and Oxford. 1681.
His Majesties Declaration to all His Loving Subjects, Touching the Causes & Reasons that moved him to Dissolve the Two Last Parliaments. 1681.

[Marvell, A.], A Seasonable Argument to perswade All the Grand Juries in England, to Petition for a New Parliament, or a List of the Principal Labourers in the Great Design of Popery and Arbitrary Power: Who have Betrayed their Country to the Conspirators, and Bargain'd with them to Maintain a Standing Army in England, under the Command of the Bigotted Popish D. who by the Assistance of the L.L.'s Scotch Army, the Forces in Ireland, and those in France, hopes to bring all Back to Rome. 'Amsterdam', 1677.
Memoirs of the Life of the most noble Thomas late Marquess of Wharton with his Speeches in Parliament, both in England and Ireland. to which is added His Lordship's Character by Sir Richard Steel. 1715.
The Moderate Parliament Considered in this time of Danger: being An Answer to a Letter sent a Person of Quality About Electing a Member to sit in the ensuing Parliament. [1679].
Oates, T., A True Narrative of the Horrid Plot and Conspiracy of the Popish Party against the Life of His Sacred Majesty, the Government, and the Protestant Religion: with a List of such Noblemen, Gentlemen, and others, as were the Conspiratore: and the Head-Officers both Civil and Military, that were to Effect it. 1679.
The Orange Gazette, (1688-9).
The Popish Champion: or, a compleat History of the Life and Military Actions of Richard, Earl of Tyrconnel, Generalissimo of all the Irish Forces now in Arms...to this Treatise is added the Life and Memorable Actions of Father Petre, &c. 1689.
Publick Occurrences Truly Stated, (1688).
Reasons for His Majesties Passing the Bill of Exclusion in a Letter to a Friend. 1681. [attributed to Lord Cavendish, later first duke of Devonshire].

[Rowe, A.], A Letter to a Friend, upon the Dissolving of the Late Parliament, and the Calling of a New One. together with a List of Those that were against Making the Prince and Princess of Orange, King and Queen. 1690.

A Satyr upon King William being the Secret History of his Life and Reign written by a Gentleman that was near his Person for many years. 2nd edn., 1703.

Savile, H., A True Relation of the Engagement of his Majesties Fleet under the Command of his Royal Highness with the Dutch Fleet, May 28 1672, in a letter from Hen: Savile Esq. on board his Royal Highness, to the Earl of Arlington, Principal Secretary of State. 1672.

A Seasonable Answer to a Late Pamphlet, Entituled, The Vindication of Slingsby Bethel, Esq.; One of the Sheriffs of London and Middlesex by one who is a Citizen of London, and an Inhabitant of the Borough of Southwark. 1681.


Shaftoe, F., Narrative containing An Account of her Being in Sir Theophilus Oglethorpe's Family; where hearing many treasonable Things, and among others, that the Pretended Prince of Wales was Sir Theophilus's son, she was trick'd into France by Sir Theophilus's Daughter, and barbarously us'd to make her turn Papist and Nun, in order to prevent a Discovery; but at last made her Escape to Suisserland, and from thence arriv'd in England, in December 1706. 1707.

[Sprat, T.], A Letter from the Bishop of Rochester to the Right Honourable the Earl of Dorset and Middlesex, Lord-Chamberlain of His Majesties Household, Concerning His Sitting in the Late Ecclesiastical Commission. [1689].


Taxes no Charge: in a Letter from a Gentleman, to a Person of Quality shewing the nature, use, and benefit of taxes in this Kingdom; and compared with the impositions of Foreign States. together with their improvement of Trade in Time of War. 1690.

Taylour, C. [pseud.], A True and Perfect Narrative of the Strange and Unexpected Finding the Crucifix & Gold-Chain of that Pious Prince, St.Edward the King and Confessor, which was found after 620 years Interment: and Presented to His Most Sacred Majesty, King James the Second. 1688.
The True Copy of a Paper delivered by the Lord De _______ [Devonshire] to the Mayor of Darby, where He Quarter'd the One and Twentieth of November, 1688. 1688.

Two Letters from Mr. Montagu to the Ld Treasurer; one of the 11th, the other of the 18th of Jan. 1677/8 which were read in the House of Commons together with the Lord Treasurer's Speech in the House of Peers, upon an Impeachment of High Treason, &c. brought up against his Lordship by the House of Commons, Decem. 23. 1678. 1679.

W.W., Animadversions on the late Vindication of Slingsby Bethel Esq.; Wherein the Ancient and Laudable Customs of the City of London are asserted against the scandalous Reflections he has made upon them in a Letter to the Lord Mayor and Court of Aldermen, by a Loyal Citizen, 'Hamborough', 1681.

The Universal Intelligence, (1688-9).

The Vindication of the Dead: or, six Hours Reflections upon the Six Weeks Labour in Answering Mr. Ashton's Speech Published by Authority. [1691].

Welwood, J., A Vindication of the present Great Revolution in England; in Five Letters Pass'd betwixt James Welwood, M.D. and Mr. John March, Vicar of Newcastle upon Tyne, occasion'd by a Sermon preach'd by him on January 30 1688/9 before the Mayor and Aldermen for Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance. 1689.

An Answer to the Late King James's Declaration to all his Pretended Subjects in the Kingdom of England dated at Dublin-Castle, May 8 1689, ordered by a Vote of the Right Honourable the House of Commons, to be burnt by the Common Hangman. 1689.

OTHER WORKS PUBLISHED BEFORE 1751


Bateman, C., Bibliotheca Scarburghiana; or a Catalogue of the Incomparable Library of Sir Charles Scarburgh, Knt, M.D. containing (almost) a Complete Collection of Greek Books in all Faculties; with a large collection of Mathematicks and Physicks, all of the best editions, and curiously bound. 1695.


Brown, J., *Adenochoiradelogia: or, an Anatomick-Chirurgical Treatise of Glandules & Strumae*, or Kings-Evil-Swellings, together with the Royal gift of Healing, or Cure thereof by Contract or Imposition of Hands, performed for above 640 years by our Kings of England, continued with their admirable effects, and Miraculous Events; and concluded with many Wonderful Examples of Cures by their Sacred Touch. 1684.

Brown, W., *The Entring Clerk's Vade Mecum being an exact Collection of Precedents for Declarations and Pleadings in most actions; especially such as are brought for or against Heirs, Executors, or Administrators, Executrices, Administratrices, and their husbands in Personal Actions with variety of actions upon bills of exchange, Pollicies of Assurance, &c. and such Process and Parts of Pleading as relate thereunto*. 1678.


Carte, T., *An History of the Life of James Duke of Ormonde, from his Birth in 1610, to his Death in 1688 wherein is contained An Account of the most remarkable Affairs of his Time, and particularly of Ireland, under his Government in Two Volumes to which is added, for the Satisfaction of the Curious, in another Volume, a very valuable Collection of Letters, written either by his Grace, or by the King, the Secretaries of State, and other Great Men in his Time, and Serving to verify the most material Facts in the said History*. 3 vols., 1735-6.


Churchill, W., *Divi Britannici: being a Remark upon the Lives of all the Kings of this Isle, from the year of the world 2855 unto the year of grace 1660*. 1675.

Crawfurd, G., *The Lives and Characters of the Officers of the Crown, and of the State in Scotland, from the Begining of the Reign of King David I to the Union of the Two Kingdoms. collected from Original Charters, Chartularies, Authentick Records, and the most Approved Histories. to which is added, an Appendix, containing several Original Papers relating to the Lives, and referring to them*. Edinburgh. 1726.

Dodd, C., *The Church History of England, from the Year 1500, to the Year 1688, Chiefly with regard to Catholicks.* 3 vols., Brussels, 1737-42.

Dryden, J., et al. (trans.), *Plutarch's Lives translated from the Greek by Several Hands to which is Prefixed the Life of Plutarch.* 2nd edn., 1688.


[Gardiner, R.], *The Compleat Constable Directing all Constables, Headboroughs, Tithingmen, Churchwardens, Overseers of the Poor, Surveyors of the Highways, and Scavengers, in the Duty of their several Offices according to the Power allowed them by the Laws and Statutes: continued to this present time, 1692. Also Directions for the London Constables. to which is added, A Treatise of Warrants and Commitments, proper for the Knowledge of all Constables.* 1692.

Harris, W., *A Description of the King's Royal Palace and Gardens at Loo together with a Short Account of Holland in which there are some Observations relating to their Diseases.* 1699.


Kennett, W., *A Complete History of England: with the Lives of all the Kings and Queens thereof; from the Earliest Account of Time, to the Death of His Late Majesty King William III containing a Faithful Relation of all Affairs of State Ecclesiastical and Civil. The Whole Illustrated with Large and Useful Notes, taken from divers Manuscripts, and other good Authors: and the Effigies of the Kings and Queens from the Originals, engraven by the best Masters.* 3 vols., 1706.

*Memoirs of the Family of Cavendish,* 1708.

Lamb, P., *Royal Cookery: or, the Compleat Court-Cook - containing the Choicest Receipts in all the Several Branches of Cookery, viz. for Making of Soops, Bisques, Olio's, Terrines, Surtouts, Puptons, Ragoos, Forc'd Meats, Sauces, Patties, Pies, Tarts, Tansies, Cakes, Puddings, Jellies, etc. As likewise Forty Plates, curiously engraven on Copper, of the Magnificent Entertainments at Coronations and Installments: of Balls, Weddings, etc at Court: as likewise of City-Feasts. to which are added Bills of Fare for every Month in the Year.* 3rd edn., 1726.

*The Life of James, late Duke of Ormonde.* 1747.


Mackenzie, G., *The Works of that Eminent and Learned Lawyer, Sir George Mackenzie of Rosehaugh, Advocate to King Charles II and King James VII with

May, R., The Accomplisht Cook, or the Art & Mystery of Cookery. 5th edn., 1685.

Memoirs of the Life, Family, and Character of Charles Seymour, Duke of Somerset, Lately Deceased interspersed with several curious anecdotes and occasional Remarks. [1748].

Memoirs of the Life of Sir Stephen Fox, Kt. from His First Entrance upon the Stage of Action, under the Lord Piercy, till his Decease. 2nd edn. 1717.

[North, D., fourth Lord North], Observations and Advices Oeconomical. 1669.

[Nye, S.], The Life of Mr. Thomas Firmin, Late Citizen of London written by one of his most intimate Acquaintance with a Sermon on Luke X 36, 37 Preach'd on the Occasion of his Death with an Account of his religion, and the present State of the Unitarian Controversy. 1698.


Philipps, F., Tenenda non Tollenda, or the Necessity of Preserving Tenure in Capite and by Knight-Service, which according to their first Institution were, and are yet, a great part of the Salus Populi, and the Safety and Defence of the King, as well as of his People, together with a Prospect of the very many Mischiefs and Inconveniences, which by the taking away or altering of those Tenures, will inevitably happen to the King and his Kingdomes. 1660.

Ligeancia Lugens, or Loyaltie Lamenting the many great Mischiefs and Inconveniencies which will fatally and inevitably follow the taking away of the Royal Pourveyances, and Tenures in Capite and by Knight-Service, whic being ancient and long before the Conquest, were not then, or are now any Slavery, Publick or General Grievance: with some Expedients humbly offered for the prevention thereof. 1661.

Restauranda: or the Necessity of Publick Repairs, by setting of a certain and Royal yearly Revenue for the King or the way to a well-being for the King and His People, proposed by the Establishing of a fitting Revenue for him, and enacting some Necessary and Wholsome Laws for the People. 1662.

The Antiquity, Legality, Reason, Duty and Necessity of Prae-emption and Pourveyance, for the King: or, Compositions for his Pourveyance: as they were used and taken for the Provisions of the King's Houshold, the small charge and
burthen thereof to the People, and the many great Mischiefs and Inconveniencies which will inevitably follow the taking of them away. 1663.

The Mistaken Recompence; or the great Damage and very many Mischiefs and Inconveniencies which will inevitably happen to the King and his People by the taking away of the King's Prae-emption and Pourveyance, or Compositions for them. 1664.

Regale Necessarium: or the Legality, Reason and Necessity of the Rights and Privileges Justly Claimed by the King's Servants, and which ought to be allowed unto them. 1671.

Investigatio Jurium Antiquorum, et Rationalium Regni sive Monarchiae Angliae, in Magnis suis Conciliis seu Parliamentis: et Regimis, cum iisdem in suis Principiis, optimi or a Vindication of the Government of the Kingdom of England under our Kings and Monarchs, appointed by God, from the Opinion and Claim of those, that without any Warrant or Ground of Law or Right Reason, the Laws of God and Man, Nature and Nations, the Records, Annals and Histories of the Kingdom, would have it to be originally derived from the People, or the King to be Co-ordinate with his Houses of Peers and Commons in Parliament. 1686.

[Plunkett, O.], Jus Primatiale: or the Ancient Right and Preheminency of the See of Armagh, above all other Archbishopricks in the Kingdom of Ireland. 1672.


Revolution Politicks: being a Compleat Collection of all the Reports, Lyes, and Stories, which were the Fore-runners of the Great Revolution in 1688; commencing from the Death of King Charles II and from thence regularly continued to the Settlement of the Prince and Princess of Orange upon the Throne wherein the several Views and Designs of all Parties are exposed; and divers Jesuitical and Fanatical Intrigues are detected, and set in a true Light. 1733.

Rose, G., A Perfect School of Instructions for the Officers of the Mouth: shewing the Whole Art of a Master of the Housshold, a Master Carver, a Master Butler, a Master Confectioner, a Master Cook, a Master Pastryman being a Work of singular Use for Ladies and Gentlewomen, and all Persons whatsoever that are desirous to be acquainted with the most Excellent Arts of Carving, Cookery, Pastry, Preserving, and Laying a Cloth for Grand Entertainments. te Like never before extant in any Language. 1682.

Sandford, F., A History of the Coronation of the Most High, Most Mighty, and Most Excellent Monarch, James II, By the Grace of God, King of England, Scotland, France and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, &c. And of His Royal Consort Queen
Mary: Solemnized in the Collegiate Church of St. Peter in the City of Westminster, on Thursday the 23 of April, being the Festival of St. George, in the Year of Our Lord 1685. With an Exact Account of the several Preparations in Order thereunto, Their Majesties most Splendid Processions, and Their Royal and Magnificent Feast in Westminster-Hall. The Whole Work Illustrated with Sculptures. 1687.

A Select Collection of Catholick Sermons Preach'd before their Majesties King James II, Mary Queen-Consort, Catherine Queen-Dowager, &c. 2 vols., 1741.

Slezer, J., Theatrum Scotiae containing the Prospects of their Majesties Castles and Palaces: together with those of the most considerable Towns and Colleges; the Ruins of many Ancient Abbeys, Churches, Monasteries and Convents, within the Said Kingdom. 1693.

Snape, A., The Anatomy of An Horse, containing an Exact and Full Description of the Frame, Situation and Connexion of all his Parts (with their Actions and Uses) exprest in forty-nine Copper-plates. to which is Added An Appendix, Containing two Discourses: the one, of the Motion of the Chyle, and the Circulation of the Bloud. 1683, 2nd edn. 1687.

Some Account of the Family of the Butlers, but more Particularly of the Late Duke of Ormond, the Earl of Ossory his Father, and James Duke of Ormond his Grandfather. 1716.

[Strachey, J.], An Index to the Records with Directions to the Several Places where they are to be found and Short Explanations of the different Kinds of Rolls, Writs, &c. to which is added, a List of the Latin Sir-Names, and Names of Places, as they are written in the old Records, explained by the Modern Names Also A Chronological Table, shewing at one View the Year of our Lord, answering to the particular Year of each King's Reign; the several Parliaments, and the different Titles by which our Kings are styled in the Records. 1739.

Talbot, P., Primatus Dubliensis: the Primacy of the See of Dublin or a Compendium of the Arguments on which the see of Dublin relies, for the Enjoyment and Prosecution in its Own Right of the Primacy of Ireland. (trans.) Kenny, W.E., [1st edn. Lille, 1674], Dublin, 1947.

Vickers, W., An Easie and Safe Method for Curing the King's Evil with several Observations of Great Use and Service to People afflicted with that Distemper: to which is added, a Specimen of Success, in a faithful Relation of sundry Cures on Men, Women and Children. in a Letter to a Friend. 4th edn, 1710.

Wiseman, R., Severall Chirurgical Treatises. 1676.

The Works of the Most Celebrated Minor Poets, namely, Wentworth, Earl of Roscommon; Charles, Earl of Dorset; Charles, Earl of Halifax; Sir Samuel Garth;
George Stepney, Esq.; William Walsh, Esq.; Thomas Tickell, Esq. - never before collected and published together. 2 vols., 1749

A Supplement to the Works of the Most Celebrated Minor Poets - Namely E. of Roscommon, Dorset, Hallifax, Godolphin, Lord Somers, Dr. Sprat, Bishop of Rochester, Sir Samuel Garth, George Stepney, Esq.; William Walsh, Esq.; Thomas Tickell, Esq. and Ambrose Phillips, Esq. - to which are Added, Pieces Omitted in the Works of Sir John Suckling, Mr. Otway, Matthew Prior, Esq., Dr. King, and Dean Swift. 1750.
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