CORA Cork Open Research Archive
Cartlann Taighde Oscailte Chorcaí

Title	Archbishop William King (1650-1729) and the Constitution of Church and State
Authors	O'Regan, Philip
Publication date	1996
Original Citation	O'Regan, P. 1996. Archbishop William King (1650-1729) and the Constitution of Church and State. PhD Thesis, University College Cork.
Type of publication	Doctoral thesis
Link to publisher's version	http://library.ucc.ie/record=b1254669~S0
Rights	© 1996, Philip O'Regan - http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/
Download date	2024-04-24 07:56:19
Item downloaded from	https://hdl.handle.net/10468/1626

UCC
University College Cork, Ireland
Coláiste na hOllscoile Corcaigh

DP 1996 OREA
Vol 2.

Table of Contents

Page

Volume II

Chapter 6: 1708-1714: '..... parties wonderfully hinder business.....' 264

Chapter 7: 1715-1718: '..... this new scene of life.....' 329

Chapter 8: 1719-1720: '..... the worst we feared has befallen us.....' 403

Chapter 9: 1721-1729: '..... one foot in the grave.....' 462

Conclusion 536

Bibliography 540

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE
Library
CORK

CHAPTER 6

1708-1714: '..... *parties wonderfully hinder business.....*'[1]

King had entered parliament fifteen years previously confident of the benefits to be derived from the political process by both church and country. But by 1707 this optimism had evaporated in the light of the cumulative disappointments of recent sessions. The determination of the London parliament to press its legislative and judicial claims had thwarted any hopes he had harboured that the authority of the Irish Lords might be reasserted. His frustrations on this point had been compounded by the unwillingness of either parliament or government to support the various legislative and administrative initiatives which he believed necessary to encourage change within the church.

This disillusionment with the political process had been exacerbated by other developments. Ever since the Glorious Revolution politics in England had been characterised by the emergence of various political factions or 'parties'. This phenomenon had quickly spread to Ireland where the terms 'Whig' and 'Tory' had become commonplace. In England these parties reflected genuine divisions in the body politic. Whigs were generally seen as champions of a Revolution Settlement which had increased the power of parliament and diminished that of the crown. But they were portrayed by Tories as latitudinarians who were overly sympathetic to non-conformists. Tories, for their part, presented themselves as defenders of the Anglican Church and the monarchy. They were, in turn, vulnerable to Whig charges that they were

[1] King to Crow, 15/11/12, TCD Ms. 750/4/1/67.

crypto-Jacobites, opposed to the Protestant succession.[2]

The problem with the application of these terms in an Irish context was that they did not do justice to the political divisions which existed in the country. While Whigs and Tories in England disputed the importance of the revolution, all Protestants in Ireland were 'hearty for the revolution to which they owe their lives, liberty and all that is dear to them in this world'. A related, but even more unifying feature of the Irish political landscape was a dread of any return of the Stuarts. The result was that the terms Whig and Tory took on different connotations once they crossed the Irish sea. Thus, while Tories in England baulked at the anti-popery laws, and Whigs at the Test clause, the majority of the Anglo-Irish political nation wholeheartedly supported both.[3]

King understood this quite clearly: 'I think it impossible to set the two parties on the same foot in Ireland as in England', he wrote to Swift, who was increasingly inclining towards the Tory fold,

> 'for our division is founded on the right of our Estates which are all claimed by the forfeiters and nothing can restore them but the Pretender nor anything take them from us but bringing him in, whereas all your contests so far as I understand them have no other foundation, but who shall have the ministry and employments. The gaining these has no connection with the Pretender. You may have them without him or under him. But you see the case is widely different with us and here is the true source of the zeal and violence of the Protestants of Ireland. Remove the fear of the Pretender and you may lead him [sic] like a dog in a string.

Indeed, it was because he believed that parties which had emerged in response to conditions peculiar to Britain were introducing an unnatural dichotomy into Irish politics, that the gradual polarisation of Irish politics along these lines

---

[2] Jones, Country and Court; England 1658-1714, London, 1978.

[3] King to Robert Calder, 25/11/12, TCD Ms. 2532/72; Hayton, *Ireland and the English Ministers*, pp.120-149; idem, 'The beginnings of the 'Undertaker System'', in Bartlett and Hayton, ed., *Penal Era and Golden Age*, p.41.

caused King such concern: parties 'arise not among ourselves, but are brought from you,' he complained to the Archbishop of Canterbury,

> 'If a man go over to London in never so good a temper he commonly returns influenced one way or the other so that it is some time before he can be brought to cool ..... there can be no parties here but what are raised by government.'[4]

His own response to this situation was to attempt to remain aloof from any overt show of loyalty to one particular party or faction. Convinced that Ireland should not be 'much concerned in parties', and fearful also of the emergence of an Irish church party as had happened in England, he urged a similar course on others, particularly churchmen. 'It would cut me to the quick to see a parcel of little inconsidering fellows blowing up faction and sedition', he informed Southwell, alluding to those amongst the lower clergy who inclined towards the Tory party, 'when all wise men are doing their endeavours to extinguish it'. If churchmen felt an urge to align themselves with any party then he was 'sure we ought to stick to the crown and make that our only party', since in the 'long run' it would undoubtedly do both church and country 'more service than any party.'[5]

However, his various political and ecclesiastical responsibilities meant that he would not be able to remain entirely independent. While he might believe that 'as to oppressing Ireland a Whig and Tory parliament and ministry are much as one', it was imperative, particularly for the sake of the church, that he establish a *modus operandi* which acknowledged the influence these parties would wield for the foreseeable future. The result was that for the next few years it became his practice to bestow a guarded blessing on whichever party,

---

[4] King to Swift, 13/1/14, Swift Corr. ii, p.3; King to Wake, 27/8/13, TCD Ms. 2532/199-200.

[5] King to Crow, 19/6/08, TCD Ms. 750/3/2/215-6; King to Southwell, 16/2/09, TCD Ms. 2531/61-2; King to Cloyne, 15/11/12, TCD Ms. 2532/67-8.

group or administration came closest to promoting his own agenda. This had the effect of seeing him alternately clash with and support the several policies of successive ministries. It also saw him refuting strenuously any accusations of partiality. When the Bishop of Cloyne hinted that he was displaying 'Whiggish' tendencies he countered that he 'never was a friend, that I knew, of anything but Truth and Justice and I hope I never will'. He was delighted when Swift wrote to tell him that whenever anyone suggested to him that he might ever have acted out of party loyalty, he would

> 'not allow it ..... [for] I conceive you to follow the dictates of your Reason and Conscience, and whoever does that will, in public management, often differ as well as from one side as another.'[6]

Swift had, however, mastered the none too difficult task of flattering King. In fact, the historical record would suggest that King did incline, if not wholeheartedly, towards the Tories. Suspicious of the Erastian and latitudinarian tendencies of many of those who supported the Whigs, he viewed as critical the Tory espousal of the rights of the established church to the exclusion of non-conformists, as expressed in their support for the continuation of the Test clause. He was likewise sympathetic to Tory advocacy of a peaceful settlement with France. By 1713, willing to accept that they no longer intended to undermine the Protestant succession, he was happy to support their cause, canvassing openly for several Tory candidates in the election of that year. It was ironic, therefore, that in the wake of the Hanoverian accession he would come to be identified as a man who had done more than most to frustrate Tory attempts to consolidate their position in Ireland.

---

[6] King to Crow, 2/5/13, TCD Ms. 2532/150; Swift to King, 31/12/13, Swift Corr. i, p.426; King to Annesley, 6/5/18, TCD Ms. 2535/160-1.

I

Political developments in England in the aftermath of union with Scotland saw Godolphin, Harley and Marlborough increasingly dependent upon Somers, Sunderland and other members of the Whig ministry. One of the immediate consequences for Ireland was the removal of Ormonde as Lord Lieutenant. The ministry's nominee for the position was Thomas, Earl of Wharton. However, the queen, who considered Wharton too extreme, insisted on the more moderate Earl of Pembroke, who was duly appointed. Nevertheless, the Whig ministers were in a position to influence policy for the Irish parliament which was due to convene in July 1707. A central element of this was to be a determined bid to remove the Test clause.[7]

Annesley wrote in April to inform King of the ministry's intentions. King was not surprised. Having observed Whig opposition to the clause mounting since 1704, he had regarded it as merely a matter of time before a repeal was attempted. He was confident that the bishops, - 'Angels, not one warping in the least,' - would be resolute in opposing any such endeavour. But he was not so sure that the temporal peers or members of the Commons could withstand concerted government lobbying. While there might be some 'struggle between them' it was, he felt, more than likely that 'fear may conquer inclination' on their part. He began to lobby various individuals immediately,

[7] Dodington to Hopkins, 28/8/07, PRO. S.P. 63/366/340-1; Jones, *op. cit.*, pp.328-330; Victory, *Colonial Nationalism in Ireland*, pp.102-4.

citing reports of a growing 'insolence' on the part of various northern presbyteries as evidence of what would follow any repeal. He found this particularly useful in influencing several of those members from Ulster already concerned at Presbyterian influence on Corporations there. Nor was he reticent about exploiting tensions within the government. Aware of the need of the still precarious Godolphin ministry to avoid being distracted by a contentious Irish parliament, he let it be known to Southwell that unless it desisted on the matter of the Test clause, it might find other elements of its programme impeded.[8]

It soon became obvious that such considerations were playing upon the government in London, and hearing of this, King persuaded himself that Pembroke would be 'unwilling to embroil himself by insisting on anything that may be against the gentlemen'. Guaranteeing a two-year supply and a quiet session were likely to be far greater priorities. That this was indeed the case was confirmed by the Lord Lieutenant in his opening speech. Alluding merely to the need to cultivate 'a good understanding' amongst all Protestants, he made no mention of the Test clause. Members were asked merely to give an adequate supply and there was little in the way of contentious legislation.[9]

King was delighted at this and interpreted it as an important success for the church. But he was also conscious of the fact that a repeal might well have succeeded had it been pressed. He took the opportunity, therefore, to condemn what he believed was the basic lack of understanding of Irish political

---

[8] Annesley to King, April 1707, Lyons 1257; King to Annesley, 2/5/07, TCD Ms. 750/3/2/111-2; Cox to Southwell, 31/7/07, B.L. Add. Ms. 38155/87; King to Southwell, 1/7/07, TCD Ms. 750/3/2/134.

[9] LJI, ii, 7/7/07. King to Southwell, 1/7/07, TCD Ms. 750/3/2/134-5; Cox to Southwell, 29/4/07, B.L. Add. Ms. 38155/20; Levinge to Ormonde, 31/1/08, HMC Ormonde, viii, p.315; Joseph Kelly to Ormonde, 31/7/07, HMC Ormonde, viii, p.303; Dodington to Hopkins, 28/8/07, PRO. S.P. 63/366/340-1; Dodington to _____, 1/9/07, PRO. S.P. 63/366/238.

dynamics amongst British politicians which the episode had highlighted: 'it seems the ministry in England was of opinion that we were wonderfully fond of repealing that clause,' he wrote to Annesley,

> '.....and that we could not oblige her Majesty by anything more effectually than by complying in it. But upon trial it proved that nothing was more averse to the universal inclination of the parliament here. I believe some few might be for it but it was their interest to make things go smoothly in parliament and they found this was the way to obtain it.....'

The proof of this, he believed, was the willingness of the members to reciprocate by passing supply without any difficulty once the government had suggested a reasonable figure.[10]

In spite of his initial pessimism, King had further reason to feel pleased with this parliament. For almost the first time since beginning his parliamentary career he could point to the fact that several bills of value to the church had passed. One provided for the rebuilding of two Dublin churches. Another enabled the subdivision of several parishes. A third formalised the endowment of Archbishop Marsh's library. That these three measures were specific to King's own diocese did not prevent him from presenting them as of more widespread significance and, as such, an indication of how a Whig government might be prevailed upon to assist the church.[11]

---

[10] King to Annesley, 16/8/07, TCD Ms. 750/3/2/143-4; King to Southwell, 2/9/07, TCD Ms. 750/3/2/147; Cox to Southwell, 3/7/07, Ms.38155/71; Annesley to King, 28/10/07, Lyons 1276; Southwell to Dawson, 23/10/07, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/735; Pembroke to Lord Justices of Ireland, 3/5/07, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/643.

[11] LJI, i, 25/10/07, 29/10/07 and 30/10/07. The relevant pieces of legislation were: 'An Act for dividing the several Parishes.....', 'An Act for settling and preserving a public library forever.....' 'An Act for the raising Money for the finishing the parish church of St. Mark and also for rebuilding and finishing the parish church of St. Nicholas'. King to Vesey, 2/9/07, TCD Ms. 750/3/2/150; King to Southwell, 23/9/07, TCD Ms. 750/3/2/153; Same to Same, 8/11/07, TCD Ms. 750/3/2/160; There is no record of King making a contribution to the debate in the Lords on an anti-popery bill which passed parliament during this session. But a reply by Annesley to a letter which King had written some time previously would suggest that he continued to oppose this approach: Annesley to [King], 28/10/07, Lyons 1276.

But he was quickly disabused of the notion that this might presage a new approach on the part of the ministry as events in both Ireland and England conspired to persuade the Whigs to persist in their determination to repeal the Test clause. In Ireland the threat of a Jacobite invasion briefly occupied the attention of the country. King found Protestants 'frightened out of their wits with the fear of an invasion'.[12] But he was encouraged by the unity of Anglicans and Dissenters, Whigs and Tories, as well as by the apparent indifference of the Catholic population. By April 1708 he was delighted to report that the entire episode had merely given Protestants 'a fresh opportunity to show their hearty and unanimous zeal for the revolution', with both Whigs and Tories striving 'to outdo one another' in displays of loyalty. In England, however, the steadfastness displayed by the Dissenters was being used by Whigs to press the case for repeal of the Test.[13] Meanwhile, the incorporation of many Whig leaders into the Godolphin/Marlborough ministry was reflected in the nomination of Wharton to replace Pembroke. The appointment of such a radical Whig was welcomed by few in the Church party in Ireland. It left little doubt as to the determination of the ministry to proceed with a Whig agenda for Ireland. Specifically, it confirmed fears that a determined effort would be made to secure a repeal of the Test clause when parliament reconvened.[14]

---

[12] King to Southwell, 13/3/08, TCD Ms. 750/3/2/194; King to Swift, 28/2/08, Swift Corr. i, p.72-3; Same to Same, 7/4/08, Swift Corr. i, p.74-5; King to Thomas Knox, 27/3/08, TCD Ms. 750/3/2/199; Dodington to Dawson, 11/3/08, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/807; Same to Same, 13/3/08, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/808.

[13] King to Ashe, 23/3/08, TCD Ms. 750/3/2/196-7; Same to Same, 20/4/08, TCD Ms. 750/3/2/205-6; Southwell to Dawson, 29/3/08, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/817; Dodington to Lord Justices of Ireland, 20/3/08, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/812; Swift to Stearne, 15/4/08, Swift Corr. i, pp.76-7; Swift to King, 15/4/08, Swift Corr. i, p.79; Dodington to Dawson, 9/11/08, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/942.

[14] King to Swift, 20/11/08, Swift Corr. i, p.112; Swift to Charles Ford, 12/11/08, Swift Corr. i, p.109; Southwell to King, 19/11/08, Lyons 1306; William Trench to Robert King, 27/11/08, Lyons 1307; Swift to King, 30/11/08, Swift Corr. i, p.126; J.C. Beckett, 'Swift as an Ecclesiastical Statesman', in Cronne, Moody and Quinn, ed., *Essays in British History in honour of James Eadie Todd*, London, 1949, p.150-162; L.A. Dralle, 'Kingdom

Indeed, the intentions of the ministry on this point were soon made more explicit. Swift, who, under King's watchful eye, had been pursuing the return of the First Fruits and Twentieth Parts to the Irish church, alerted him to the emergence of 'a new difficulty' in their campaign: officials in London had left him in no doubt that a remit could only 'be purchased by a compliance' on the part of the bishops in the matter of the Test clause. This placed the bishops in a particularly delicate position. A remit would make available substantial sums of money which several of the bishops hoped to employ to repair dilapidated property and supplement the incomes of some curates. If this was to be sacrificed in order to retain the Test clause then it might seem to some too high a price to pay.[15]

King was now in somewhat of a dilemma. For one thing, the government was obviously becoming more obstreperous on this point. It was unlikely, therefore, that the church could achieve a return of the First Fruits without a concession on the Test clause. The church's position was further compromised by the fact that under Bolingbroke's tutelage, Swift was inclining more and more to the Tory cause, thereby reducing his effectiveness as a lobbyist. Shortly before Pembroke was removed, therefore, and without informing Swift, King decided upon a change in tactics. Approaching George Dodington, secretary to the Lord Lieutenant, whose 'good offices' he hoped might 'very much contribute to the success', he asked him to 'be so favourable' as to put Pembroke '..... in mind of that affair of the Twentieth Parts and First

---

in Reversion: The Irish Viceroyalty of the Earl of Wharton, 1708-1710', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 15, 1951-2, pp.393-431.

[15] Swift to King, 1/1/08, Swift Corr. i, p.62; Same to Same, 15/4/08, Swift Corr. i, p.80; Same to Same, 7/9/08, Swift Corr. i, p.97; King to Swift, 16/12/07, Swift Corr. i, p.61; King to Vesey, 28/2/08, TCD Ms. 750/3/2/189; S[outhwell] to Dawson, 1/1/09, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/993; Dralle, *op. cit.*, pp.410-1.

Fruits when it may be proper .....' Initially it appeared that Dodington had made some progress, and King wrote to record his thanks and encouragement. But the removal of Pembroke meant that this initiative, too, was to prove fruitless.[16]

Unaware that King had concluded that he was becoming dispensable, Swift, who was intent upon exploiting his commission to obtain promotion within the church, hoped to persuade him to adopt a more aggressive stance. Expressing surprise that a man of King's known 'vigilance' in the matter of the Test clause had not been more vociferous in presenting the church's case for its retention, he urged that he involve himself more forcefully. At a minimum, he suggested that he arrange an *Address* to her Majesty on the matter. For his part he contributed a strongly anti-Whig tract, *A Letter ..... Concerning the Sacramental Test,* to which Wharton took great exception.[17]

Reluctant to compromise the church's position, King was, at first, wary of provoking the government: 'if the repeated votes of parliament be not sufficient to show the sense of the people as to that point I can't tell how it shall be known.....', he replied. But Swift, who knew better than most how to goad

---

[16] King to Dodington, 7/8/08, TCD Ms. 750/3/2/231; Same to Same, 9/10/08, TCD Ms. 750/11/1/3.

[17] Swift to King, 15/4/08, Swift Corr. i, p.79. Carpenter, *Archbishop King and Dean Swift,* pp.316-332. [Swift], *A Letter from a Member of the House of Commons in Ireland to a Member of the House of Lords in England concerning the Sacramental Test,* London, 1708. Swift also used the pamphlet to ingratiate himself further with King, who he described as one who 'does not busy himself by entering deeply into any party, but rather spends his time in ..... the practice of all virtues that can become a public or private life'. This was the case to such an extent, he continued rather disingenuously, that even the Presbyterians of Derry 'had parted from him with tears in their eyes and universal acknowledgments of his wisdom and goodness' on his translation to Dublin. 'He may be justly reckoned among the greatest and most learned prelates of this age', he concluded, 'however his character may be defiled by such mean and dirty hands as those of the *Observator*.....' (The *Observator* was a Whig Newsletter.) During this period King had also managed to write a paper which Samuel Molyneux had read on his behalf before the Royal Society which was published as part of its Transactions for 1708-9: W. King, An Account of the manner of Manuring lands by Sea-Shells as practised in the Counties of Londonderry and Donegal in Ireland, London, 1710.

King into action, had correctly gauged the latter's mood. Despondent at the manner in which all initiatives to date had foundered on Whig intransigence, he was eventually persuaded. Within a short while he was canvassing both church and government dignitaries, belittling the contribution of Dissenters to the defence of the island during the recent scare as little more than perfunctory. Together with Archbishop Marsh he made a major issue of attempts by Presbyterians to set up a meeting house in Drogheda, portraying it as an example of the impertinence which could be expected in the event of the Test being repealed. He also made a point of objecting to a government proposal to introduce a community of Palatine refugees to the country, convinced that they would ally themselves with the non-conformists.[18] His pugnacity was only stimulated by threats from Dissenters that, if denied, they would pursue their case in the British parliament. 'Nothing will satisfy these people but the church constitution of North Britain', he wrote to Annesley, mindful of the terms of the recent union. Indeed, such was the intensity of his public pronouncements that, at one point, Swift felt obliged to inform him that his zeal was rapidly earning him an unenviable reputation with the ministry in London as the most obstreperous of the Irish prelates.[19]

---

[18] King to Swift, 12/6/08, Swift Corr. i, p.88; King to Edward Southwell, 16/2/09, TCD Ms. 2531/61; King to Annesley, 27/1/09, TCD Ms. 750/11/1/44-6; William Trench to Robert King, 23/11/08, Lyons 1307; Swift to Stearne, 15/4/08, Swift Corr. i, p.76-7; Swift to King, 15/4/08, Swift Corr. i, p.79; Dodington to Dawson, 9/11/08, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/942; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 28/2/09, Midleton Mss. 2/358. King's hostility to the Palatines continued for many years. In 1710 he wrote to Secretary Dawson complaining that 'their design 'tis but to eat and drink at her Majesty's cost, live idle and complain against those that maintain them': King to Dawson, n.d., [late 1710], TCD Ms. 2531/311. As late as 1715 he was still arguing that they were merely allies of the Dissenters: King to Addison, 31/5/15, TCD Ms. 750/4/2/47-8.

[19] King to Swift, 20/11/08, Swift Corr. i, p.111-2; King to John Evans, Bishop of Bangor, 8/2/09, TCD Ms. 750/11/1/49-50; King to Annesley, 27/1/09, TCD Ms. 750/11/1/44-5; King to Southwell, 16/2/09, TCD Ms. 750/11/1/61; Cox to Southwell, 8/2/09, 38156/51; King to Swift, 10/2/09, Swift Corr. i, p.123; King to Annesley, 27/1/09, TCD Ms. 750/11/1/44-6; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 16/8/08, Midleton Mss. 2/338; Swift to King, 30/11/08, Swift Corr. i, p.115.

Conscious of the dangers of antagonising the church and its supporters prematurely, Wharton was, for his part, anxious to appease those who might prove troublesome in parliament. He attempted, therefore, to persuade both the Tories and the bishops that he did not intend anything contrary to their wishes. It was his unequivocal intention, he assured King, to maintain 'the government of church and state on the same foot as they are.' King was not persuaded. He continued to voice his misgivings, encouraging the bishops to remain steadfast while, at the same time, seeking to bolster the nerve of some of the less steadfast members of the Commons.[20]

King felt vindicated in the stance he had taken, when, in his opening *Address* to parliament on May 5, 1709, the Lord Lieutenant announced the ministry's programme for parliament.[21] With a repeal of the Test clause in mind, Wharton proposed to the members that they investigate methods 'of cultivating and preserving a good understanding amongst all the Protestants of this Kingdom'. Accompanied by a promise to present bills disabling Catholics further, the intention and strategy of the government was obvious. Claiming to

---

[20] King to Southwell, 16/2/09, TCD Ms. 2531/61; Swift to King, 6/1/09, Swift Corr. i, p.118; King to Swift, 10/2/09, Swift Corr. i, p.123-4; King to Dr. John King, 12/2/09, TCD Ms. 2531/62; Addison to Sunderland, 5/5/09, *The Letters of Joseph Addison*, ed., Walter Graham, Oxford, 1941, p.134, [hereafter: *Addison Letters*]; Annesley to King, [March], 1709, Lyons 1361; King to Southwell, 16/2/09, TCD Ms. 750/11/1/61-2.

[21] To mark the opening of parliament King was invited to give a sermon in Christ Church on May 15 before the Lord Lieutenant and assembled Lords: J. D'Alton, *History of the Archbishops of Dublin*, Dublin, 1838, p.308. He used the occasion to speak for over three hours on the topic of predestination. Published shortly afterwards as *Divine Predestination consistent with the Freedom of man's will in a sermon Preached at Christ Church Dublin before his excellency Thomas, Earl of Wharton and the Honourable the House of Lords*, it ranked with *The Origin of Evil* as King's most important metaphysical work. It enjoyed wide popularity (there was a second edition published in London in 1710), and secured King's reputation as a philosopher of some note. This was evidenced by the fact that philosophers of the calibre of Collins, Bayle, and Leibnitz felt compelled to at least acknowledge, and, in some cases, refute, its central thesis. This aspect of King's life is discussed in more detail in David Berman, *A History of Atheism in Britain: From Hobbes to Russell, London, 1988*, (see especially pp. 82-92 for his comments on the reaction of Collins), and idem., Introduction to Archbishop King's Sermon on Predestination, in *Irish Writings from the age of Swift*, ed. Andrew Carpenter, vol. iv, Dublin 1976, pp. 9-20.

detect a marked enthusiasm for such a policy, and confident that the Lord Lieutenant had properly gauged the mood of both Houses, one official reported eagerly to London that the *Address* had been widely 'commended' by the members.[22]

King, however, was happy that the reaction, at least of the bishops, had been anything but commendatory. In fact, rather than wait for the government to introduce its bill, they had decided to take the initiative. They successfully lobbied to have King elected to head the committee responsible for preparing a response to Wharton's *Address*. He used his position to full effect, ensuring that the draft reply presented to the House made no mention of the Test clause. Alluding, rather disingenuously, to the wording of the *Address*, it promised merely to 'cultivate and improve' that 'good understanding amongst Protestants' which seemed to so concern the Lord Lieutenant. An attempt by some government supporters to effect a change was unsuccessful, the realities of Irish party loyalty coming home forcefully to those charged with securing the votes of supposed Whigs: although two-thirds of the members described themselves as such, Addison had to concede that 'not ..... half of them would go [to] such lengths as their friends in England.....' With relatively little opposition, therefore, the committee's version was adopted and promptly forwarded to the Castle.[23]

Wharton's response was dictated by the fact that political circumstances in England required that he ensure a quiet parliament in Ireland. Unwilling to risk the success of the entire session, and under pressure to placate the

---

[22] LJI, ii, 6/5/09; Dodington to Dawson, 14/5/09, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1069; Same to Same, 21/5/09, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1074; G. Tilson to Dawson, 14/5/09, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1070; Tilson to Dawson, 14/5/09, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1070.

[23] LJI, ii, 6/5/09; Southwell to Dawson, 26/7/09, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1106; Addison to Sunderland, 13/6/09, *Addison Letters*, p.149.

Commons over an increasingly contentious Money Bill, he felt constrained to drop this attempt at repeal.[24] Hoping that this would placate both Houses he informed the parliamentary managers of his decision. He was immediately reminded, however, that it had originally been agreed to tack the repeal of the Test clause onto a Popery Bill and that this bill was still expected in the Commons. Persuaded that this would now have to be proceeded with, Wharton reluctantly acquiesced. A bill 'to prevent the further growth of popery', which required all registered priests to take the oath of abjuration, was duly presented to and passed by the Commons. However, when it reached the Lords on August 18 it encountered stiff opposition. Consistent with his previous expressions of antipathy to such measures, King, who was now perceived by government officials as 'most acceptable to the papists', dissented: 'I was violently against the Popery Bill here,' he wrote of this episode some years later, 'and used many arguments against it and experience has justified the force of every one of them.'[25] He was still of the opinion that, rather than abetting further punishment of Catholics, the church should be undertaking their evangelization. This, he wrote to the Rev. Philip Whittingham, who was attempting to start such a missionary work, was 'a matter that requires a tender and prudent management', rather than a legal code which 'seemed to upbraid rather than compassionate' them. He was joined in this protest by a large

---

[24] Thomas Southwell to Coningsby, 11/8/09, De Ros Ms.30/24; J. Pulteney to Dawson, 9/8/09, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1114; Same to Same, 3/9/09, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1129; Dodington to Dawson, 7/9/09, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1132; Samuel Dopping to Dawson, 25/7/09. Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1100.

[25] King to Annesley, 3/7/14, TCD Ms. 750/4/1/310-1; LJI, ii, 24/8/09; Addison to Somers, 14/6/09, *Addison Letters*, p.151; Addison to Godolphin, 26/8/09, *Addison Letters*, p.215; Pearson to [Harley], 24/6/11, HMC Portland v, p.20; Southwell to Dawson, 2/6/11 and 18/6/11, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1538; D'Alton, *op. cit.*, p.308; Connolly, *Religion*, pp.275-8. Simms argues that another reason for King's opposition to the bill was that he believed the oath which Catholics would have to take would so reduce their numbers as voters that those who supported Dissenters would be advantaged at the expense of the church party: Simms, 'Irish Catholics and the Franchise, 1692-1728, *IHS*, 12, 1960, p. 230.

number of peers, both spiritual and temporal. In the end the measure was only passed by 21 votes to 14, with a majority of the bishops opposing it. Indeed, seven of the bishops, headed by King, felt so strongly on the point that they insisted on being allowed to register their dissent in the journals of the House.[26]

This was the second time in this session that King had dissented from the government and he was now alienated even further from Wharton. Not that he had ever enjoyed a close relationship with either the Lord Lieutenant or the Whig administration. Indeed, despite the fact that he was both Archbishop of Dublin and a prominent member of the Privy Council, he had been almost completely ignored by the administration in the preparations for parliament. It was ironic, therefore, that a combination of circumstances suddenly produced a situation in which both he and Wharton found themselves in unlikely alliance, leading one observer to comment with astonishment at the emergence of '[t]he A[rch]b[ishop] of Dublin's and my L[or]d Lieut[enant]'s party' which resulted. Even more remarkable was the fact that this unity of purpose stemmed from events at Convocation which was again in session at the same time as parliament.[27]

With an intense aversion to the High Church interest, Wharton could be depended upon to be antagonistic towards any assembly which permitted the expression of such views, particularly in the light of events in Convocation in England where Atterbury and the 'Highfliers' were again causing acute

---

[26] King to Browne, 20/6/09, TCD Ms. 750/11/1/83; King to Rev. Philip Whittingham, 31/1/10, TCD Ms. 2531/137; Addison to Godolphin, 21/8/09, *Addison Letters*, p.183; Same to Same, 26/8/09, *Addison Letters*, p.215; *List of Lords voting against bill*, B.L. Add. MS. 34777/68; LJI, ii, 24/8/09; Pulteney to Dawson, 3/9/09, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1129; Addison to Sunderland, 20/6/09, PRO. S.P. 63/366/286; F.G. James, 'The Church of Ireland in the early eighteenth century', pp.446-8.

[27] Hayton, *Ireland and the English Ministers*, pp. 154-6. Perceval to Charlett, Bodleian Ms Ballard, 36, fo. 57v-58, quoted in I. Ehrenpreis, *Swift: the man, his works and the age*, ii, London, 1962, p.363; King to Browne, 20/6/09, TCD Ms. 2531/83; Dralle, *op. cit.*, pp.412-416; Winnett, *op. cit.*, pp.40-7.

embarrassment to the government. King on the other hand, notwithstanding his disappointment at the poor progress towards reform made during previous sessions, remained a vigorous defender of Convocation. He viewed its convening as confirmation of the church's right to legislate for itself in matters of discipline and doctrine. As such he had been tenacious in his demands to see it convened regularly. Indeed, much to Primate Marsh's annoyance, it was he who had initiated the process which had led to the government allowing Convocation to convene on this occasion.[28]

Initially King had congratulated himself on the smooth conduct of affairs in both the Upper and Lower Houses. He was especially encouraged to hear that the Lower House was considering remedies for the problems of non-residence and pluralities as well as exploring methods by which the native Irish might be effectively evangelised. But this was before a 'very foolish circumstance' had 'disturbed and inflamed all.' This 'circumstance' revolved, once again, around the dispute over the respective privileges of Convocation and parliament. What involved Wharton so deeply was the fact that his chaplain, Rev. Ralph Lambert, had become a central figure in the affair.[29]

The seeds of this controversy had been sown in the events of an earlier session. After the Irish Convocation of 1705 had adjourned, two leaders of the Lower House, William Perceval and Francis Higgins, had been invited by Atterbury to speak to the Houses of the English Convocation. Their topic was the Irish practice in relation to intermediate sessions, that is meetings of the

---

[28] King to Edward Southwell, 11/9/09, TCD Ms. 2531/101-104; Wharton to Dartmouth, 11/7/09, PRO. S.P. 63/366/49; Addison to Godolphin, 7/5/09, *Addison Letters*, p.137; King had taken the initiative in lobbying the government for a recall of Convocation. But this had been highly resented by Archbishop Marsh who interpreted it as an attempt to usurp the prerogative of the primate. Marsh expressed his antipathy to King's action in such strong terms, however, that he was eventually forced to seek the Queen's pardon.

[29] King to Southwell, 11/9/09, TCD Ms. 2531/101-4.

Lower House when the Upper House was not in session. This had been, and continued to be, an extremely contentious issue between the English Houses themselves. Their contribution had delighted Atterbury who printed it in his tract *Some Proceedings in the Convocation AD. 1705*, which he had dedicated to the members of the Irish Convocation. King, who was in London at the time, had been disgusted at this 'rash and presumptuous' step by some inexperienced and junior ministers: '[w]ithout the privity of the [Irish] houses' or the bishops, they had embroiled the Irish Convocation 'in the dispute between the Houses in England'. This, he protested, had 'done us a world of mischief both in England and Ireland', and was likely to have 'mischievous consequences' for the church as a whole.[30]

Lambert, sitting in Convocation as proctor for the Chapter of Down, had involved himself in the controversy right from the start. Determined to refute Tory demands for greater autonomy for the Lower House, he had accused Higgins and Perceval of breaching the privilege of Convocation by their actions. This had been rejected by the predominantly Tory lower clergy who saw it as an attack upon their independence. There the matter had rested until Wharton's appointment. Having endured the activities of Atterbury and his allies in England, the new Lord Lieutenant was determined not to allow a similar situation to develop in Ireland. Impressed by Lambert's hostility to these Irish 'Highfliers', he had appointed him as his chaplain and encouraged him to pursue his case. When an English divine, Archdeacon Charles Trimnell, sought a contribution to a pamphlet intended to refute Tory demands,

---

[30] King to Vesey, 4/7/05, TCD Ms. 750/3/1/196; Same to Same, 17/4/05, TCD Ms. 750/3/1/144; King to Southwell, 11/9/09, TCD Ms. 2531/101-4; *Notes of Mr. [Francis] Higgin's Conference with Archbishop of Canterbury*, 1707, in HMC Second Report, Appendix 9, p.244; *A Dialogue between the Archbishop of Canterbury and Mr. Higgins*, London, 1707; King to Vigors, 10/9/09, TCD Ms. 750/11/1/98; Victory, *Colonial Nationalism in Ireland*, pp.105-6; Winnett, *op. cit.*, pp.40-7.

therefore, Lambert willingly obliged. Following publication in London in 1708, his submission was circulated separately in Dublin.[31] Perceval responded with a pamphlet of his own, and, undaunted by Wharton's endorsement of his chaplain, when Convocation reconvened in Dublin in 1709 he persuaded the members of the Lower House to charge Lambert with breach of privilege.[32]

It was at this point that the interests of King and the Lord Lieutenant converged. Determined to curtail the members of the Lower House, Wharton let it be known that it would be to the church's advantage if the prosecution of his chaplain was not proceeded with. King had a similar interest in seeing the Lower House of Convocation quietened, if for totally different reasons. For one thing he was fearful lest the activities of a radical Tory faction again deflect the members from the various bills before them. But, more importantly, he was acutely aware of the delicate state of discussions on the remit of the First Fruits. Indeed, according to Perceval, King had extracted a promise from the Lord Lieutenant that 'he would do nothing in relation to the church without consulting' him and would 'use his interest with the queen to get a remittal of the First Fruits' if King could persuade Convocation to 'let fall this affair about his chaplain'. As far as King was concerned, therefore, a resumption of this dispute was something which the members 'ought to avoid with the greatest care' as it would 'sink' both Convocation and the campaign to obtain the remit of these levies.[33]

---

[31] King to Southwell, 29/7/07, TCD Ms. 750/3/2/141; Swift to Stearne, 30/11/08, Swift Corr. i, p.113; Charles Trimnell, *Partiality Detected*, London, 1708; Ralph Lambert, *A Letter printed in a pamphlet, Partiality Detected, relating to the Convocation of Ireland*, Dublin, 1708; _____ to _____, 25/6/04, B.L. Add. Ms. 21137/69-70.

[32] William Perceval, *Remarks upon a Letter printed in a pamphlet entitled Partiality Detected, relating to the Convocation of Ireland*, Dublin, 1709; Addison to Somers, 26/5/09, *Addison Letters*, p.143; Addison to Sunderland, 20/6/09, PRO. S.P. 63/366/286; Same to Same, 25/6/09, PRO. S.P. 63/366/288; Same to Same, 28/6/09, PRO. S.P. 63/366/290; Dralle, *op. cit.*, pp.411-4.

[33] King to Southwell, 11/9/09, TCD Ms. 2531/102; Perceval to Charlett, Bodleian

King moved quickly in an attempt to broker a solution. With a view to demonstrating that the bishops would in no way countenance the attempts of the Tory clergy to embarrass the government he reminded Wharton that the Upper House had already declared Higgins' and Perceval's earlier venture in London 'scandalous and seditious.' He then turned his attention to the Lower House, summoning a number of clerics to meetings with him at St. Sepulchre's. There, by 'terrifying some and soothing others', he managed to coax several into adopting more 'peaceful measures'. At the same time he succeeded in persuading various leading members of the House of Commons not to involve themselves, for which the government was particularly grateful: 'The Archbishop of Dublin, at my Lord Lieutenant's desire, undertook the matter,' secretary Addison recorded,

> '[T]his affair would have passed from the Convocation into both Houses of parliament and have drawn some others after it which have raised great heats amongst the Protestant parties over all the kingdom, had it not been prevented in time.'

At Wharton's request King then arranged a meeting at St. Sepulchre's with Peter Browne, Provost of Trinity College and Chairman of the committee set up by the Lower House to investigate Lambert's pamphlet. There he explained to him the larger issues at stake and the importance of Convocation desisting from taking any further action against the Lord Lieutenant's chaplain. Furthermore, if the members chose to ignore this advice, then Browne was left in little doubt as to the determination of the government to see them punished.[34]

Ms Ballard, 36, fo. 57v-58, quoted in I. Ehrenpreis, *Swift: the man, his works and the age*, ii, London, 1962, p.363; Carpenter, *Archbishop King and Dean Swift*, p.318; W. Perceval, *A Letter to Dr. Synge in Answer to his Letter entitled 'Dr. Synge's Defense of himself against unjust aspersions thrown upon him in a late pamphlet entitled 'a reply to a vindication of the Letter published in a pamphlet called Partiality Detected'*, Dublin, 1711, p.37.

[34] King to Browne 20/6/09, TCD Ms. 2531/83; Winnett, *op. cit.*, pp. 40-47; Addison to Godolphin, 26/5/09, *Addison Letters*, p.144; Addison to Somers, 26/5/09, *Addison*

When they became aware of the influence being exerted on Browne by both Wharton and King, the members of the Lower House were incensed. Even some of the bishops threatened to raise the matter in the Upper House. It was obvious that King had miscalculated.[35] A series of motions in the Lower House denounced him as one of the 'creatures' of Wharton's party and as his 'agent..... against the Convocation'. At one point Wharton even had to send to Kilkenny, where King had gone on provincial visitation, to urge him to return to defend himself against a motion aimed at 'passing a censure' on his actions. A counter-proposal that the 'thanks of their body' should be given to King for his care for the church was 'warmly opposed' by the Tory faction.[36] The charges against Lambert were brought forward once more. When Browne, who was about to flee to England, 'not being able to stand these storms,' succeeded in stalling discussion on the matter a number of clergy insisted on registering their protest. Infuriated, Wharton reacted by threatening to prorogue Convocation and to censure any cleric who persisted in such a course, a threat dismissed by Perceval: 'My Lord Lieutenant is now sensible of the difficulties that his Grace of Dublin has drawn him into', he wrote to a relative, failing to understand that Wharton and King were of one mind on this matter,

---

Letters, p. 143; Addison to Sunderland, 28/6/09, PRO. S.P. 63/366/290; Dodington to Dawson, 7/9/09, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1132; Robert Johnson to Ormonde, 29/7/07, HMC Ormonde, viii, p.302; LJI, ii, 29/7/07.

[35] Addison to Somers, 26/5/09, *Addison Letters*, p.143; Addison to Sunderland, 28/6/09, PRO. S.P. 63/366/290; Same to Same, 13/6/09, *Addison Letters*, p.148-9; Stearne to King, 30/7/09, Lyons 1324; Addison to Godolphin, 13/6/09, *Addison Letters*, p.147.

[36] Edward Pearson to [Oxford], 24/6/11, HMC Portland, v, p.20; Stearne to King, 2/8/09, Lyons 1325; Addison to Godolphin, 2/8/09, *Addison Letters*, pp.169-70; King to Addison, 4/8/09, TCD Ms. 2531/93; Addison to Sunderland, 9/8/09, PRO. S.P. 63/366/292.

> 'and how to get out of them he cannot tell. If he should proceed against us as he threatens, I am of opinion that he will plunge himself deeper than ever.'

When Perceval succeeded in persuading several of the bishops to register their own displeasure at Wharton's threat, the Lord Lieutenant decided he had had enough, and in early August he adjourned the session.[37]

On a personal level the most disturbing aspect of the whole episode for King was that he now found himself alienated from a large element within his own church. It is also likely, though he would never admit it, that he had been extremely hurt by some of the criticism aimed at him. He took some consolation from the fact that a few churchmen did appreciate the dilemma in which he had found himself. Edward Synge congratulated him on his actions, particularly in attempting to ensure that the Lord Lieutenant was not further antagonised by the impulsive actions of some minor clerics. In this and in his understanding of the dangers which the affair posed, King had acted, Synge believed, as 'a wise and tender Father of the Church.' Government officials were also quick to commend him: 'the Archbishop of Dublin is looked upon as the oracle of the Church party in this kingdom', Addison informed Godolphin,

> 'and is a great speaker both in the House of Lords and at the Council table. He seems to have joined a good knowledge of the world to a great deal of learning and bears a very high figure among the laity as well as the clergy for his hospitable way of living and exact care of his diocese.'[38]

---

[37] Nicolson to Wake, 5/1/10, Gilbert Ms. 27, pp.40-1; Southwell to Dawson, 26/7/09, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1101; Wharton to Dartmouth, 5/7/09, PRO. S.P. 63/366/53; Same to Same, 11/7/09, PRO. S.P. 63/366/49; Addison to Godolphin, 2/8/09, *Addison Letters*, pp.169-70; King to Southwell, 11/9/09, TCD Ms. 750/11/1/101; Perceval to Sir John Perceval, 14/9/09, HMC Egmont, ii, p.237; Same to Same, 4/8/09, HMC Egmont, ii, p.238. Three months later Browne was elevated to the bishopric of Cork.

[38] E Synge, *Defense of himself against unjust aspersions thrown upon him in a late pamphlet entitled 'a Reply to a vindication of the letter published in a pamphlet called Partiality Detected'*, Dublin, 1710, p.32; King to Addison, 4/8/09, TCD Ms. 2531/93; King to Annesley, 11/9/09, TCD Ms. 750/11/1/101; Addison to Godolphin, 26/5/09, *Addison Letters*, p.144.

King was more than happy to accept these accolades. It was not, however, the personal consequences of recent events which most concerned him. His main worry was the 'world of mischief' which he was sure had been done to the campaign to recapture the remit of the First Fruits. He was convinced that there was now little possibility of seeing these monies returned to the church in the immediate future. Even before parliament and Convocation had been prorogued, therefore, he had decided that he should travel to England in an attempt to retrieve the situation.[39]

With the Whig ministry showing signs of disintegrating under the combined weight of foreign policy disaster, war-weariness and Tory resurgence, King found that his arrival in England coincided with a period of intense political turmoil. In these circumstances he was not surprised to have his fears about the First Fruits confirmed:

> 'I find that the carriage of the Convocation towards my Lord Lieutenant is not approved here by any that I have discoursed upon it and I am afraid it has given us a blow that will not easily be avoided or the damage retrieved. I pray God forgive them that did us that great mischief: it has wonderfully exposed our nakedness and given me many melancholy thoughts when I consider how eager we are to do ourselves mischief and how short-sighted and lazy in what might do us good'.[40]

The ministry's unwillingness to give its attention to the finances of the Church of Ireland did mean, however, that King was free to devote some time to his ongoing dispute with the Chapter of Christ Church. Notwithstanding a succession of judgements in his favour since 1705, the Chapter had managed to drag out the affair by a series of appeals. Yet another appeal was about to be

---

[39] King to Vigors, 10/9/09, TCD Ms. 750/11/1/98; King to Southwell, 11/9/09, TCD Ms. 750/11/1/101-4; King to Smith, 20/10/09, TCD Ms. 750/11/1/108-9.

[40] King to Stearne, 31/1/10, TCD Ms. 2531/138; Same to Same, 7/2/10, TCD Ms. 750/11/1/143; Jones, *op. cit.*, pp.334-6.

heard by the English Courts and King was determined to co-ordinate his own defence. At the last moment, however, he found that his case had been postponed in order to allow a trial involving the Rev. Henry Sacheverell, a crypto-Jacobite who had preached a sermon which was little more than a thinly veiled attack on the Hanoverian succession.[41] Indignant that his own hearing should have been shelved in order to facilitate this hearing, King decided, nevertheless, to remain on in London to see how matters developed. Ironically, his own case had been displaced by one which would eventually lead to the demise of this Whig ministry and, ultimately, to the restitution of the First Fruits.[42]

From the start the trial went badly for the government and it soon began to act as a catalyst which galvanised its opponents. Around Sacheverell's cause rallied not only supporters of the Pretender, but many in the Church of England who sensed an opportunity to exploit Whig difficulties. When the government failed to secure the conviction of Sacheverell a Tory and High Church revival ensued, which enabled Harley to construct alliances with moderate Tories which threatened Godolphin's tenuous hold on power. The consequence for Ireland was that when Wharton returned in May 1710 to reconvene parliament he did so as the representative of a disintegrating administration which had lost the confidence of the Queen.[43]

---

[41] King to Stearne, 21/2/10, TCD Ms. 750/11/1/147; Same to Same, [7]/3/10, TCD Ms. 750/11/1/152-3; King to Ashe, 5/12/10, TCD Ms. 750/11/1/125; King to Annesley, 3/4/10, TCD Ms. 750/11/1/170; Henry Sacheverell, *The Perils of False Brethren both in Church and State, a sermon preached at St. Paul's Cathedral on November 5, 1709*, London, 1709.

[42] B[rinley] B[utler] to Dawson, 15/12/09, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1182; Same to Same, 21/2/10, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1249; Pulteney to Dawson, 10/1/10, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1201.

[43] William Lloyd, Bishop of Worcester, to King, 30/6/10, Lyons 1373; Nicolson to Wake, 11/5/10, Gilbert Ms. 27, p.53; Jones, *op. cit.*, pp.335-8; Stearne to King, 9/5/10, Lyons 1370; Swift to Addison, 22/8/10, Swift Corr. i, p.170; Addison to Dawson, 11/10/09, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1147; Southwell to Addison, 10/4/10, Cal. Dept. Corr.,

The session of the Irish parliament which began on May 19 was not overshadowed by conflict over the Test clause. Conscious that his patrons in London were under increasing pressure, Wharton was in no position to pursue a belligerent course. In fact, such was the non-contentious nature of the government's programme that Dean Stearne had written to King telling him that he need not rush back from England to attend. Once supply was secured the parliament had effectively served its purpose.[44] By the time of its prorogation on August 28 the news that Godolphin's ministry had fallen and that Harley and Shrewsbury had been requested by Anne to form a new Tory ministry had already reached Dublin.[45]

King, who had taken Stearne's advice and remained on in London and then Bath while the Irish parliament was in progress, was not unduly perturbed by the demise of the Whig administration. He was convinced that the Whig agenda for Ireland had never taken sufficient account of the sensibilities of the Anglo-Irish population. This was particularly the case in relation to the church

---

52/142/1280; Swift, *Journal to Stella*, ed., H. Willaims, Oxford, 1948, 9/9/07, p.7.

[44] Stearne to King, 9/5/10, Lyons 1370; R. Warre to Dawson, 4/7/10, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1312; Pulteney to Dawson, 6/7/10, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1313; Wharton to Dartmouth, 12/8/10, PRO. S.P. 63/366/23; Same to Same, 14/8/10, PRO. S.P. 63/366/12; King chose to heed Stearne's advice, remaining in England to take the waters and only returning to Dublin in late summer: King to Crow, 12/8/10, TCD Ms. 750/11/2/192.

[45] D. Hayton, 'The Crisis in Ireland and the disintegration of Queen Anne's last ministry', *IHS*, 22, 1981, pp.193-215, [hereafter: 'Crisis']; Pulteney to Dawson, 15/8/10, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1333; Addison to [Dawson], 23/9/10, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1359; Lawrence Clayton to Thomas Brodrick, 12/9/10, Midleton Mss. 3/17; Dralle, *op. cit.*, pp.418-22.

which had struggled in vain to secure the right to the First Fruits while simultaneously attempting to thwart government efforts to foist a repeal of the Test clause on the country. Nor was he upset at Wharton's departure. He had found the Lord Lieutenant a difficult man to deal with, yet another in that long line of English governors who had attempted to impose an English agenda on Ireland: 'I reckon that every Chief Governor who is sent here comes with a design to serve first those who sent him', he complained,

> '..... our good only must be so far considered as it is subservient to the main design. The only difference between Governors, as to us, is to have a good natured man that has some interest in our prosperity and will not oppress us unnecessarily.....'

Swift, whose efforts had been singularly frustrated by Wharton, went further, expressing his sentiments in print. His *Short Character* of the former Lord Lieutenant portrayed him in a particularly uncomplimentary fashion, denouncing him as 'a Presbyterian in Politics and an Atheist in Religion'. Although he judged it libellous and an 'appeal to the mob', King could not help concurring that Wharton might 'perhaps ..... deserve the usage.'[46]

[46] King to Swift, 7/9/08, Swift Corr. i, p.97; Same to Same, 16/9/10, Swift Corr. i, p.176; Same to Same, 16/11/10, TCD Ms. 750/11/1/222; Same to Same, 9/1/11, Swift Corr. i, p.207; Same to Same, 13/1/11, Swift Corr. i, p.208; Same to Same, 27/10/11, Swift Corr. i, p.265; King to Annesley, 3/4/10, TCD Ms. 750/11/1/170; [Swift], *A Short Character of his Ex[cellency], T[he] E[arl] of W[harton]*, Dublin, 1710, p.179.

II

A committed churchman above all else, King might have instinctively inclined towards a Tory party which styled itself 'the Church party'. Not only did he support the efforts of the English Tories to obtain a peaceful settlement with France, but he was satisfied that a toleration for the Dissenters would never be countenanced by them. It was also a party to which many of his closest confidantes, such as Southwell and Annesley had aligned themselves.

That he did not wholeheartedly embrace the new regime could be traced to the fact that the change left him uncharacteristically unsure of his position. There was no doubt that he had strongly resented the refusal of the Whigs to grant the First Fruits to the church while simultaneously continuing to pay the *regium donum* to the Presbyterians. He had, however, formed a working relationship with the ministry. But crucially, while he knew what to expect from the Whigs, the new ministry, and, in particular, Harley's attitude to the Protestant succession, was an unknown quantity.[47]

King was not alone in being wary of an English Tory ministry. He understood that, above everything else, 'the great thing that frightens all the gentlemen of Ireland' was 'fear of the Pretender.' This, coupled with the fact that English Toryism had its roots in a crypto-Jacobitism which had never been entirely eradicated, had too often made Irish politicians seem to be 'friends to

---

[47] King to Ashe, 17/2/11, TCD Ms. 750/11/1/315; King to Annesley, 16/10/10, TCD Ms. 750/11/1/203; Same to Same, 30/1/11, TCD Ms. 750/11/1/309; King maintained that he had for many years admired Harley and even defended him in 1706 during the 'Gregg affair' when Harley's secretary had been discovered to be a French spy: King to Swift, 19/4/11, Swift Corr. i, p.223-4.

the Whiggish interest', since Whigs were unequivocally in favour of the Protestant succession. King, for one, understood that this 'Whiggism' on the part of Anglo-Irish politicians was 'only so far as to keep out the Pretender', but, nevertheless, it did mean that there were no natural allies for a Tory government amongst the Irish political nation. Only if they could convince the Anglo-Irish that they intended to support the Protestant succession, did he think that they had a chance of generating support. But with 'many villainous papers' circulating and 'so much pains taken' to persuade Irish gentlemen that it was the definite intention of the new ministry to bring the Pretender in, it was, he opined, 'no wonder they are afraid of them.'[48]

Nor was he reassured by the appointment of the Duke of Ormonde as Lord Lieutenant in spite of the fact that Ormonde attempted to accommodate him by appointing him, along with the Earl of Shannon and Thomas Keighley, to hold the Great Seal pending the nomination of a new Lord Chancellor.[49] It was not long, in fact, before Ormonde had begun to confirm King's suspicion that he was would prove incapable of either fathoming or managing the intricacies of party politics. The Lord Lieutenant seemed not only unwilling to involve himself in government, he remarked shortly after Ormonde had arrived, but was 'governed by fools', whose advice he too readily accepted. Even more alarming was the fact that he was doing little to allay suspicions that he was

---

[48] King to Dr. Jenkins, 17/2/11, TCD Ms. 2531/316; King to Annesley, 23/2/12, TCD Ms. 750/4/1/13; Laurence Clayton to Thomas Brodrick, 12/9/10, Midleton Mss. 3/17; King to Swift, 15/5/11, Swift Corr. i, p.234.

[49] King to Swift, 27/10/11, Swift Corr. i, p.264; Same to Same, 2/11/10, Swift Corr. i, p.188; Swift to King, 4/11/10, Swift Corr. i, p.190; Same to Same, 28/11/10, Swift Corr. i, p.196; A[ddison] to [Dawson], 1/9/10, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1344; Sir W. Robinson to Dawson, 19/10/10, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1377; Ormonde to Dartmouth, 21/11/10, PRO. S.P. 63/366/284; Annesley to King, 28/11/10, Lyons 1392. That King, for his part, stood 'very well with the Duke' was confirmed by Swift: Swift to King, 8/1/12, Swift Corr. i, p.286.

personally sympathetic to the Stuart cause.[50]

This impression was reinforced by the appointment of Sir Constantine Phipps, an extreme Tory, to the position of Lord Chancellor in January, 1711.[51] Phipps, who had come to prominence as counsel for Dr. Sacheverell, was intent on purging the old administration in Dublin and installing high Tories wherever possible. Amongst others, Brodrick and Conolly, the two principal parliamentary managers in the country, were removed from government positions. They were replaced by Tories such as Sir Richard Levinge, Sir Richard Cox, Francis Bernard and Robert Blennerhassett. This further alienated political opinion. It also ensured that there would be a substantial opposition whenever parliament reconvened.[52]

These considerations cast a shadow over the early months of the new ministry in Ireland. They also displeased King whose support would have been readily forthcoming had he been assured on the matter of Tory loyalty to the Protestant succession. He was particularly unhappy at attempts by Phipps and his supporters to brand the gentlemen of Ireland as 'a pack of desperate Whigs ready to rise up in arms for the old Ministry.' But he was also conscious of the fact that he would need to arrive at some form of working accommodation with the new ministry. He decided, therefore, to wait and see how the Tories conducted themselves in the British parliament due to commence in December

---

[50] King to Swift, 10/11/11, Swift Corr. i, p. 272; Ormonde to Oxford, 28/7/11, HMC Portland, v, p.65; King to General Hamilton 12/3/15, TCD Ms. 2536/207.

[51] Southwell to Dawson, 30/11/10, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1409; Same to Same, 7/12/10, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52 142/1416; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 23/1/11, Midleton Mss. 3/37; Swift, *Journal to Stella*, 23/11/10, p.102; Hayton, 'Crisis', pp.195-7.

[52] Southwell to [Dawson], 5/2/11, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1455; Same to Same, 2/6/11, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1526; Same to Same, 18/6/11, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1526; Ormonde to Dartmouth, 31/5/11, PRO S.P. 63/367/114. Same to Same, 14/7/11, PRO.S.P. 63/367/42; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 19/5/11, Midleton Mss. 3/49; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 23/1/11, Midleton Mss. 3/37; Hayton, 'Undertaker System', p.52.

1710.[53]

In the event King was pleasantly surprised by what transpired at Westminster. He was particularly pleased with Harley's attempts to include moderate Whigs such as Marlborough and Walpole in his administration, to encourage peace with France and to sponsor several church bills. As he explained to Annesley:

> 'The Queens speech, the addresses and votes give great quiet of mind to all honest men here who were, at least many of them, in a mortal terror lest the Pretender should come in at which you will not wonder ..... the generality of gentle[men] here you know are under an attainder by King James' parliament for lives and estates and any idea of the Pretender's returning puts them out of their senses ..... besides you are sensible that the party that is going down is very industrious to spirit people with an ill opinion of those that come into their places. But most of all the ill blood that has been raised is quieted by this first step the parliament has made and if they go on as they begin..... they will confound Whiggism forever.....'[54]

Phipps' appointment policy apart, the conduct and public utterances of the administration in Dublin gave equal cause for optimism. Indeed, by early 1711 King had begun to revise his earlier assessment of the Tories: 'if the ministry proceed as they have begun', he told one government supporter, then 'the people of Ireland will generally make as good Tories as they did Whigs.....' 'In a little while', given a non-partisan approach by Ormonde and Phipps, the Anglo-Irish would, he had persuaded himself, be as 'hearty' to this ministry as they ever had been to any 'especially when it is considered how much they were

---

[53] King to Edward Southwell, 13/3/11, TCD Ms. 2531/322-3; Same to Same, 4/12/10, TCD Ms. 2532/232-3; King to Swift, 16/12/10, Swift Corr. i, p.199; Same to Same, 9/1/11, Swift Corr. i, p.206; King to Bishop of Lincoln, 2/8/15, TCD Ms. 2533/42-3.

[54] King to Annesley, 16/12/10, TCD Ms. 2531/238; King to Southwell, 13/3/11, TCD Ms. 2531/322-3; Jones, *op. cit.*, pp.341-4. One bill of which King heartily approved allocated funds for the construction of 50 churches in London. He hoped that the government could be persuaded to introduce similar legislation in Ireland: King to Annesley, [9/6]/10, TCD Ms. 750/11/1/341.

disgusted with the last'. 'Things have taken a new turn here,' he informed Swift, who was then in London, '.....by the time you come back, few will profess themselves Whigs.' 'God be thanked', he wrote some time later,

> 'this Ministry and parliament has pretty well allayed that fear [of the Pretender] by their steady and prudent management. And if his Grace the Duke of Ormonde prosecutes the same measures the Ministry doth in Britain, (as I believe he will), I persuade myself that the generality here will be as zealous for this as any ministry we ever had.'[55]

In fact, once he began to ponder the possibilities offered by a Tory government unlikely to interfere with the Protestant succession, King became uncharacteristically enthusiastic. He was soon conjuring up images of a long a fruitful alliance between the church, the 'gentlemen of Ireland', the Tory ministry and the queen: '[t]he party that are for the restitution in church and state are much more numerous than they themselves imagined', he remarked confidently, 'and if it please God to give her Majesty success they will increase every day which I and all good men heartily pray for.' 'We have rowed long against the stream', he told another friend, 'and I think have lost no ground, and if the clergy can be prevailed on to act with temper and prudence I am sure we shall gain ground every day.' '[T]hough the clergy and church need the ministry's encouragement', he informed another, he had now come to the conclusion that in the present state of affairs, 'they have more need for our support, and if we gain our people as we set them up, so we will be able to keep them in power'. [56]

This metamorphosis on King's part was not unrelated to a determined

---

[55] King to Anthony Dopping Jr., 20/1/11, TCD Ms. 2531/301; King to Southwell, 13/3/11, TCD Ms. 2531/322; Same to Same, 17/5/11, TCD Ms. 2531/340; King to Swift, 16/12/10, Swift Corr. i, p.199; Same to Same, 15/5/11, Swift Corr. i, p.234.

[56] King to Annesley, 19/6/11, TCD Ms. 2531/345; King to Jenkins, 17/2/11, TCD Ms. 750/11/1/316; King to Swift, 30/11/10, Swift Corr. i, p.197.

effort by the ministry to cultivate the church interest. First of all, there had been promises that there would there be legislation on a range of matters of importance to the church including funding for rebuilding churches. Licence had also been granted to Convocation to produce Canons which could be instituted with the Queen's approval. But, most importantly, after years of Whig opposition and procrastination, steps were finally being taken to remit the First Fruits and Twentieth-parts to the church.[57]

Whether King and the Tories would work closely together was not, however, for King alone to decide. While he had moved to a position of tacit support for the new ministry, this was not entirely reciprocated. Several members of the Dublin administration remained sceptical of his *bona-fides*. Edward Pearson, one of the more extreme members of Phipps' entourage, singled him out for special mention when he wrote to inform Harley of 'the disaffected party ..... who pretend to comply with the ministry'. Despite appearances, King remained 'most intimate with the creatures of the late ministry', he reported. Furthermore, he had been Wharton's agent in both the House of Lords and Convocation and he could still be depended upon to frustrate government business at the Privy Council.[58] Some unwise comments he was reported to have made on hearing of the assassination attempt on Harley were forwarded as evidence of his true loyalties.[59]

---

[57] LJI, ii, p.366; Swift to King, 10/10/10, Swift Corr. i, p. 183-6; Same to Same, 4/11/10, Swift Corr. i, p.190; King to Swift, 6/11/10, Swift Corr. i, p.191; Same to Same, 30/11/10, Swift Corr. i, p.197; Hayton, *Ireland and the English Ministers*, pp.235-7. King to Annesley, 22/9/11, TCD Ms. 2531/352. Canons were regulations passed by onvocation relating to church discipline and liturgy which could be given force of law by royal assent.

[58] Pearson to [Oxford], 24/6/11, HMC Portland, v, p.20; Southwell to Dawson, 2/6/11, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1526; Same to Same, 18/6/11, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1538.

[59] Swift to King, 8/3/11, Swift Corr. i, p.213-5; Same to Same, 10/4/11, Swift Corr. i, p.219-20; King to Swift, 17/3/11, Swift Corr. i, p.216; Same to Same, 19/4/11, Swift Corr. i, p.223-4; Phipps to Oxford, 18/3/11, HMC Portland iv, p.668; Wogan to Southwell, 26/4/11, B.L. Add. Ms. 37763/109; Swift, *Journal to Stella*, 28/4/11, p.253; King was accused of having implied that Harley was secretly dealing with the French court: Carpenter,

Sentiments such as this were, however, incompatible with government requirements. With the continuing decline of Primate Marsh, and the prospect of difficult sessions of parliament and Convocation ahead, officials realised that a working relationship with King, the churchman with whom they would have to deal on most church related matters, would have to be worked out. Gradually, therefore, King found himself consulted on a variety of government proposals for parliament and Convocation, and although he continued to receive intelligence about government intrigues aimed at discrediting him, as parliament approached it was noticeable that such attacks diminished.[60]

King had high hopes for the parliament which gathered in July 1711, encouraged by the inclusion of several church bills in the legislative programme.[61] Ormonde's opening speech, by omitting any reference to the Test clause and confirming the ministry's determination to 'secure the Protestant succession in the House of Hanover', seemed to vindicate such optimism. King was a member of the House of Lords committee which framed *Addresses of Thanks* to both the Queen and the Lord Lieutenant.[62] He was

---

Archbishop King and Dean Swift, pp.371-6.

[60] William Courtenay to _____, 18/9/11, Lyons 1408; Courtenay to _____, 18/9/11, Lyons 1409.

[61] King to Annesley, 19/6/11, TCD Ms. 750/11/1/345; R. Powys to Dawson, 17/7/11, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1551. In particular King hoped to secure the passage of a 'Bill for the real Union and Division of Parishes.'

[62] LJI, ii, 17/7/11; King to Swift, 25/7/11, Swift Corr. i, p.240-1; Same to Same, 28/7/11, Swift Corr. i, p.243; *Address of House of Commons to the Queen*, PRO. S.P. 63/367/31; There was some acrimony over these *Addresses* which many considered implicitly critical of Wharton. In fact, it was 'so intended', King informed Swift, 'but it was ill expressed to bear that sense; and besides what did it signify for us to show our resentment,

also one of those who introduced to the Lords heads of a government 'bill for the more easy Recovery of Tithes'. When, in early August the ministry announced that the Twentieth-parts were being remitted entirely and the First-Fruits applied to church building projects, King took it as confirmation of the benefits which the church could expect from a Tory ministry. *Addresses* by the House of Lords and Convocation thanking her Majesty for her 'tender regard and care of us' reflected the satisfaction of most churchmen. The successful passage through the Commons of a two year Supply Bill concluded a very calm session and parliament adjourned on August 11, the first session having been conducted with a minimum of rancour.[63]

Convinced that the church had at last found a ministry sympathetic to his own views on religious policy, King, in a ploy which would reveal both the depth of his antipathy towards Dissenters and the vindictiveness to which he could often stoop, now began to make plans to pursue a long held ambition of his own. Ever since 1692 he had resented the seeming indifference of successive governments to the 'presumptuousness' of Presbyterians as they had extended their spiritual and economic influence. Having successfully countered Wharton's attempts to impose a repeal of the Test on the parliaments of 1709 and 1710, he now hoped to employ the partisanship of the ministry in a bid to penalise Dissenters further.[64] The encroachment of Dissenters into southern towns had aroused the indignation of the entire church. Capitalising on this,

---

when it could only provoke a great man to revenge and could not reach him?': King to Swift, 27/10/11, Swift Corr. i, p.264; Same to Same, 1/9/11, Swift Corr. i, p.250.

[63] LJI, ii, 6/8/11, 11/8/11; King to Swift, 28/7/11, Swift Corr. i, p.243; King to Ashe, 7/8/11, TCD Ms. 750/11/1/350.

[64] Phipps to Oxford, 26/12/12, HMC Portland, v, p.254-5; D. Hayton, 'An Irish Parliamentary Diary from the reign of Queen Anne', *Analecta Hibernica*, 30, 1982, [hereafter: 'Parliamentary Diary'], pp 99-110.

King intended to propose in the Lords that a 'collection' be made 'of all our grievances, and particularly of the insolences used by the Dissenters to propagate their schism', with a view to getting the new government to 'provide against it'. The fact that Convocation were proceeding along similar lines and compiling a *Representation* which listed specific grievances, (eliciting several Presbyterian retorts in the process), gave him further encouragement.[65] It was one of the factors which persuaded him that it might be an opportune moment for church leaders to make representations protesting at the continued payment of the *Regium Donum* to Dissenters. In meetings throughout the early autumn he found that the majority of bishops and many government officials concurred in his opinion that 'all this mischief [was] due to the pension'. As members of both parliament and Convocation reconvened in October, therefore, King was confident that proposals to have it discontinued would be well received.[66]

In both England and Ireland, however, political developments were militating against him. During the adjournment Lord Chancellor Phipps had continued with a policy of filling important positions with his own placemen. This had aroused the antagonism of the Brodrick and Conolly factions, with the result that many of the more moderate members of both Houses of parliament had been galvanised into a sizeable opposition by Brodrick. By the time the members had resumed, therefore, Tory dominance in the Commons was being

---

[65] King to Annesley, 30/1/10, TCD Ms. 750/11/1/309; P[ulteney] to [_____], 15/4/10, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1284; Dodington to Dawson, 9/11/08, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/942; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 13/1/9, Midleton Mss. 2/350. Dralle, op. cit., pp.424-6; *A Representation of the present State of Religion*, Dublin, 1712; *Humble Address..... of the Presbyterian ministers .....on behalf of Themselves and the rest of their Persuasion in the North of Ireland*, [June] 1711, PRO. S.P. 63/367/135; Hayton, *Ireland and the English Ministers*, pp.265-8.

[66] King to Ashe, 17/2/11, TCD Ms. 750/11/1/315; Same to Same, 30/1/11, TCD Ms. 750/11/1/309; King to Annesley, 22/9/11, TCD Ms. 750/11/1/352. See William Hair to Wodrow, 4/12/12, National Library, Scotland, Wodrow Coll., 20, p.100, for confirmation of continued Anglican harrassment of Dissenters on the question of 'illegal' marriages.

successfully undermined. A parliament which had three months previously voted supply for two years was now rejecting a government sponsored Corn Bill, hearing numerous inflammatory speeches and witnessing a significant breach over privilege between a Tory House of Lords and an increasingly whiggish House of Commons. The threat which this posed to King's ambitions in relation to the Dissenters was compounded by the fact that in London parliamentary arithmetic dictated that Harley pursue his policy of accommodating moderate Whigs even more assiduously that heretofore.[67]

In these circumstances, King stood little chance of succeeding. Nevertheless, with the assistance of several bishops, he decided to press the matter. With their support he was elected as the senior ranking member of a Lords committee delegated the task of drawing up a *Representation* to the Queen 'relating to the Dissenting Ministers'. Within twenty four hours the committee had submitted a draft *Address* to the House. After listing the provocations and effronteries of the Presbyterians it concluded that it was the duty of the House to,

> 'acquaint your Majesty with the danger we apprehend from these great advances which Presbytery and Fanaticism have made, which if not checked we doubt not, will, in time end in the destruction of the Constitution both in Church and State. We therefore humbly submit it to your Majesty, whether your Majesty will not think it in your great wisdom proper to put a stop to these growing evils by withdrawing from them your bounty of £1200 a year.'

In this course they were fully supported by the Tory administration in Dublin. But, constrained by his need for Whig support and unwilling to allow the Irish ministry a completely free hand, Harley, (now the Earl of Oxford), refused to

---

[67] Southwell to Dawson, 2/6/11, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1526; LJI, ii, 15/10/11; King to Swift, 27/10/11, Swift Corr. i, p.263-4; Jones, *op. cit.*, pp.342-349.

recommend a change of policy to Anne.[68]

This was not the only setback to King's hopes as Convocation proved similarly unprofitable. Encouraged by Phipps, the predominantly Tory lower clergy felt confident enough to re-engage the Upper House over their respective rights and privileges. The bishops were no less determined to check this insubordination. No amount of episcopal displeasure could dissuade the Lower House, however, and the matter of Lambert's breach of privilege was resurrected.[69] Just as disconcerting was the fact that the dispute had now been taken up by other bodies, making it more difficult to reduce tensions in Convocation. The Dublin Grand Jury published its own version of events, branding one of Lambert's main opponents, Rev. Francis Higgins as 'a sower of sedition'. The House of Commons reacted by producing *A Good Character of Higgins* which described him as both 'a good Christian and a loyal subject.' To the exasperation of the 'Highfliers', however, some of the bishops eventually managed to divert the attentions of the members onto more mundane matters. King was once again the butt of some stinging invective: according to Perceval both he and Peter Browne, now Bishop of Cork, had

> 'hung upon the wheels and did what they could to obstruct business and did at last openly declare against having any done at all..... and some dependants upon these two prelates in our House were not less industrious to clog business and give us as much trouble in the expediting of it as possibly they could."[70]

---

[68] LJI, ii, 6/11/11; King to Swift, 10/11/11, Swift Corr. i, p.270; Phipps to Oxford, 26/12/12, HMC Portland, v, p.255-6; Jones, *op. cit.*, pp.343-6.

[69] King to Swift, 1/9/11, Swift Corr. i, pp.252-3; Same to Same, 25/7/11, Swift Corr. i, p.240-1; Same to Same, 27/10/11, Swift Corr. i, p.264-5; *Heads of Articles to be considered in Convocation*, 1711, PRO. S.P. 63/367/45; Southwell to Dartmouth, 12/12/11, PRO. S.P. 63/367/298; *The Answer of Francis Higgins*, 1711, PRO. S.P. 63/367/15.

[70] King to J. Sharp, 19/6/11, TCD Ms. 750/11/1/344; Southwell to Dartmouth, 12/12/11, PRO. S.P. 63/367/298; *Verdict of the Grand Jury of the County of Dublin*, 5/10/11, PRO. S.P. 63/367/17; *A Good Character of Higgins*, 9/10/11, PRO. S.P. 63/367/18; King to Swift, 27/10/11, Swift Corr. i, p.264-5; [Perceval] to Gastrell, 17/11/11, HMC Portland, v, p.112. (King was distracted during this time by the death of his nephew and

A *Message of Thanks* to Phipps from the Lower House echoed these sentiments and denounced the interference of King and Browne in a more public manner. As a consequence Convocation spent little time on purely ecclesiastical matters. Some discussion did take place with regard to 'methods to convert the natives' but all that resulted was a *Representation of the State of Religion as to Infidelity, Heresy, Impiety and Popery*, which King dismissed as futile. 'I do not find that it is desired by all that they should be converted', he lamented, disgusted at what he considered merely the latest example of ecclesiastical apathy.[71]

By the time both parliament and Convocation were prorogued King had resigned himself once again to a failure to obtain legislation of advantage to the church. He was especially annoyed at the loss of two church bills simply because of the conflicts induced by party politics in the Commons. He was also disappointed not to have secured some statutory impediment to the spread of Presbyterianism. The fact that Convocation had not managed to produce any canons of benefit to the church, setting aside some proposals he had made with

---

lawyer, Robert King.)

[71] *Message of Thanks from the Lower House of Convocation*, 9/11/11, PRO. S.P. 63/367/194; King to Swift, 27/10/11. Swift Corr. i, p.266; King to Swift, 28/7/11, Swift Corr. i, p.244; Same to Same, 10/11/11, Swift Corr. i, p.271; *Heads of Articles to be considered in Convocation*, 1711, PRO. S.P. 63/367/45; Southwell to Dawson, 30/3/11, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1489; Swift, *Journal to Stella*, 2/4/11, p.229; Jane Bonnell to King, 23/3/12, Lyons 1422. Although King's commitment to evangelism should not be overstated, he was annoyed at Convocation's refusal to deal more comprehensively with the evangelisation of the native Irish. This reflected his frustration at what he believed was the failure of the church to fulfil its divinely appointed responsibility in this regard. He himself was involved in a number of schemes to reach Catholics through the medium of Irish and, having witnessed the success of this approach at first hand in Derry, had, for a number of years, been a supporter of the Rev. John Richardson who was championing the large-scale evangelisation of the native Irish using Gaelic translations of the Bible, the Book of Common Prayer and Catechism. When, during one meeting, Richardson's proposals were rejected by a committee of several bishops King stormed out of the room in protest, castigating his peers in the process: see T.C. Barnard, 'Protestants and the Irish Language, *c.*1675-1725', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 44, 1993, pp.254-260.

regard to discipline and non-residence in the process, merely exacerbated his sense of frustration. What made the lack of success especially galling, however, was the fact that the preliminaries, particularly the remit of the First Fruits and Twentieth Parts, had augured so well: 'With tolerable good management,' he lamented, 'this would have been as quiet a session as has been in Ireland.' He even implied that events might have been orchestrated by enemies of the kingdom: '[b]oth the parliament and Convocation have been so ordered,' he informed Swift,

> 'as to make us appear the worst people in the World, disloyal to her Majesty, and enemies to the church; and I suspect with a design to make us appear unworthy to have any countenance or preferment in our native country.'

'There are some,' he remarked bitterly, alluding to various members of the hierarchy and government, 'that..... obstruct whatever is attempted though of the greatest advantage to the church and state.'[72]

One of those whom King had in mind was Phipps who personified all that he detested in English Toryism. The Lord Chancellor's strategy of entrenching Toryism in Ireland by appointing large numbers of extreme Tories to Irish offices was anathema to him. It not only sustained what King believed to be an artificial division in Irish politics, but reflected the subordination of the Irish political agenda to that of interest groups in England. Nor was King alone in regarding Phipps with such distaste, widespread antipathy to the Lord Chancellor having been evident in parliament, particularly in the Commons.

---

[72] King to Swift, 1/9/11, Swift Corr. i, p.253; Same to Same, 27/10/11, Swift Corr. i, p.266; Same to Same, 10/11/11, Swift Corr. i, p.271; Phipps to _____, 10/7/11, PRO. S.P. 63/367/74-5; Southwell to Dartmouth, 12/12/11, PRO. S.P. 63/367/298. Advice which he proffered to Bishop Ashe regarding a communicant who had been caught in adultery gives some insight into the type of disciplinary measures which King may have sought to have approved by Convocation: 'the offender', he wrote, should be made to 'stand in a white sheet, bare footed and bare legged, in every church in the diocese Sunday after Sunday for a year, and if this do not mend him enlarge it into two or three [or] as many as you please 'till he mend': King to Ashe, 7/8/11, TCD Ms. 2531/350.

But with the session prorogued a crucial mechanism by which the Lord Chancellor might be constrained was removed.[73]

It was for this reason that a dispute between Phipps and the Corporation of Dublin, which had dragged on since the spring, assumed a particular importance. The origins of this conflict, which would come to be known as the 'city affair', could be traced to an attempt by the government to impose a Tory Lord Mayor upon the predominantly Whig Corporation.[74] Phipps had first become involved in the controversy when one Alderman Robert Constantine, a Tory, had claimed the right to be nominated as mayor on the basis that he was the most senior member of the Corporation. Since 1672 the procedure had been that the aldermen would forward a list of three nominees to the Privy Council from which the Council would then choose the next mayor. When Constantine's name was not one of the three forwarded to the Council in 1711 Phipps refused to sanction any candidate. The Corporation then proceeded to install Alderman Barlow, a Whig, as mayor for the forthcoming year. Phipps countered that this procedure was illegal and secured the opinions of several judges in his favour. Removing Barlow, he imposed Alderman Constantine. But the aldermen refused to submit and confirmed Barlow as their choice. The result was stalemate.[75]

In the weeks leading up to the 1711 parliament Phipps and Ormonde had continued to exert pressure on the Corporation. Several attempts at

---

[73] King to Swift, 15/5/11, Swift Corr. i, p.232-3; Same to Same, 10/11/11, Swift Corr. i, p.271; Phipps to _____, 10/7/11, PRO. S.P. 63/367/74-5.

[74] Ormonde to Dartmouth, 20/7/11, PRO. S.P. 63/367/100; King to Swift, 15/5/11, Swift Corr. i, p.232-3. The question of Constantine's right, or otherwise, to the mayoralty had first arisen during Wharton's Lord Lieutenancy. However, he had refused to allow the Privy Council to decide on the matter.

[75] *The Statutes at Large passed in the parliaments held in Ireland, Dublin, 1765-1801*, iii, pp.205-12, 217-34; King to Southwell, 17/5/11, TCD Ms. 750/11/1/338-40; King to Swift, 1/9/11, Swift Corr. i, p.251.

compromise had foundered on Phipps determination to have Constantine accepted. A petition by the Whig aldermen to the Queen was successfully countered by the Lord Lieutenant.[76] At his request Secretary Dartmouth had written immediately to Dublin confirming royal endorsement of his strategy. As a result critics were met with letters indicating the Queen's absolute support for government policy. These were accompanied by thinly veiled threats that opposition would be construed in London as disloyalty.[77] A compromise whereby a government supporter, Ralph Gore, was elected as mayor and two Whig nominees appointed as Sheriffs, briefly reduced tensions. It was indicative of the growing confidence of the majority of the members of the Corporation, however, that they did not view this as a defeat - in confirming the mayoralty to be 'elective and not successive' they were of the opinion that they had 'carried their point'.[78]

With parliament prorogued, the city affair began to assume a greater importance, since it offered one of the few outlets for opposition to the Tory government. Within a short time both the government and its opponents were bombarding Harley with their respective accounts of the situation.[79] From the

---

[76] King to Swift, 15/5/11, Swift Corr. i, p.232-3; Pulteney to Dawson, 30/10/11, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1580; Ormonde to Dartmouth, 29/7/11, PRO. S.P. 63/367/318; Ormonde to Dartmouth, 20/7/11, PRO. S.P. 63/367/100; Hayton, *'Crisis'*, pp.193-215; Southwell to Dawson, -/5/11, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1515; *Humble Petition of the Lord Mayor and Aldermen of the City of Dublin*, September 1711, PRO. S.P. 63/367/368.

[77] Ormonde to Dartmouth, 3/10/11, PRO. S.P. 63/367/308-9; Southwell to Dartmouth, 4/10/11, PRO. S.P. 63/367/300; Same to Same, 24/10/11, PRO. S.P. 63/367/224; Southwell to Dawson, 6/4/12, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1664; Southwell to Lords Justices of Ireland, 21/5/12, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1703; Southwell to Dawson, 26/7/12, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1740; Same to Same, 1/11/12, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1786; Wogan to Dawson, 30/9/12, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1771.

[78] Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 9/10/11, Midleton Mss. 3/57; Pulteney to Dawson, 30/10/11, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1580; Southwell to Dartmouth, 24/10/11, PRO. S.P. 63/367/224; Same to Same, 31/10/11, PRO. S.P. 63/367/237.

[79] Earl of Dunbarton to [Oxford], 15/8/12, HMC Portland, v, p.211; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 23/7/12, Midleton Mss. 3/80.

start King had favoured the Corporation, citing his support for the Whig principle of independent corporations in the process, the sincerity of which, given his earlier dealings with the Corporation of Londonderry, was somewhat questionable. In a situation where the rights of a body corporate were being threatened by the state, however, he had persuaded himself that it was his duty, especially as Archbishop of Dublin, to 'be for the city'. At issue, he believed, was whether the Corporation had the power to nominate the mayoral candidates or whether the senior alderman had a prescriptive right to the office.[80] In his opinion, law and precedent supported the Corporation, and Phipps and the predominantly Tory Privy Council, had, he believed, 'dealt hardly and imprudently' with the aldermen. At numerous Privy Council meetings, therefore, he opposed various attempts by Phipps to impose his candidate. Phipps reacted to this by reviving the memory of King's indiscreet comments in the wake of the assassination attempt on Harley some years previously, circulating them in official circles as evidence of his treacherous intent. As a consequence, Swift wrote from London, he was 'so rail'd at by all who come from Ireland,' that even he could 'defend him no longer.' But tactics such as these merely had the effect of confirming King in his opposition. Having undertaken to thwart the Chancellor, and, as a Privy Councillor, one of the few people in a position to pursue the issue, he soon became Phipps most implacable opponent.[81]

---

[80] King to Major Fox, 8/5/11, TCD Ms. 2531/333-4; Swift, *Journal to Stella*, -/5/11, p.277, and 29/5/11, p.282; King to Southwell, 17/5/11, TCD Ms. 2532/339; King to Swift, 15/5/11, Swift Corr. i, p.233; Victory, *Colonial Nationalism in Ireland*, p.113. King had taken a dislike to not only Constantine but his wife, a woman of 'illfame', with whom, he claimed, even the wives of other aldermen refused to associate: King to Southwell, 17/5/11, TCD Ms. 750/11/1/338.

[81] Swift, *Journal to Stella*, 14/2/12, p.488; Swift to King, 31/12/13, Swift Corr. i, p.426; King to John Spranger, 18/3/19, TCD Ms. 750/5/124-8. King had one formidable ally at Council in Robert (later Viscount) Molesworth: Edward Pearson to Oxford, 24/6/11, Portland v, p.20; Molesworth to King, 7/10/13, Lyons 1470.

Throughout 1712 the dispute dragged on. In April the aldermen once again offered a list of candidates which they knew to be unacceptable to the Tories. Rather than call a full Privy Council meeting, Phipps summoned six of his most partisan supporters to a private meeting in the Castle.[82] There he instructed them to write to London entreating her Majesty to use her authority to impose the wishes of the executive.[83] Inundated by these petitions from the principal office holders in Ireland, Southwell urged that they be supported. Dartmouth replied immediately to Phipps re-affirming the unequivocal support of the queen and promising to pursue the question as a matter of urgency. Acquainted of this the aldermen still refused to capitulate. Phipps, for his part, buoyed by supporters who lauded his 'prudence [and] wisdom' in 'driving these diabolical [Whig] principles out of the country', would not confirm the candidates the Corporation proposed. For a large part of the year, therefore, Dublin was without effective administration.[84]

In all of this King was able to play only a minor role, and, in general, 1712 was a year of virtual inactivity on his part. An attack of gout early in the year persisted through the summer and was exacerbated first by a trying visitation and then by a riding accident.[85] It was, he reckoned, the most serious

---

[82] Cox to Southwell, 8/5/12, PRO. S.P. 63/367/280; Dawson to Southwell, 8/5/12, PRO. S.P. 63/367/290. The six individuals were: the Lord Justice Richard Ingoldsby, Bishop Smyth of Down and Connor, Bishop Lindsay of Killaloe, Lord Chancellor Cox, Lord Chief Baron Rochford and Chief Baron of the Exchequer Savage.

[83] Rochford to Southwell, 8/5/12, PRO. S.P. 63/367/278; Cox to Southwell, 8/5/12, PRO. S.P. 63/367/280; Savage to Southwell, 8/5/12, PRO. S.P. 63/367/282; Lindsay to Southwell, 8/5/12, PRO. S.P. 63/367/284; Bishop Smyth of Down and Connor to Southwell, 8/5/12, PRO. S.P. 63/367/286; Lords Justices of Ireland to Southwell, 8/5/12, PRO. S.P. 63/367/288. (Whether the monarch had the authority to impose a solution was itself hotly contended by Whigs who tended to view Corporations as independent bodies.)

[84] King to Swift, 10/11/11, Swift Corr. i, p.272; Lords Justices of Ireland to Dartmouth, 27/5/12, PRO. S.P. 63/367/268; Dunbarton to [Oxford], 15/8/12, HMC Portland, v, p.211; Southwell to Dartmouth, 16/5/12, PRO. S.P. 63/367/272; Hayton, 'Parliamentary Diary', p.122.

[85] King to Swift, 29/7/12, Swift Corr. i, p.302-3; Same to Same, 23/7/12, Swift Corr.

recurrence of his illness since 1696: 'I consider my life as near spent,' he told Annesley morbidly at one point,

> 'and though I wish well to mankind and posterity, yet I can't reckon it wisdom for a man to trouble himself much with what he is to have little or no part in.'

Even rumours of Jacobite activity failed to rouse him, King dismissing such 'expectations and fears' as the result of Tory scaremongering which 'serves them to good purposes.'[86]

But by early 1713, with the Jacobite threat receding and the deterioration in his health halted, King was once more in a position to focus his attentions on matters political. Little had changed since he had last been directly involved. The hostility engendered by the city affair, rumours that Ormonde would soon be replaced, and the 'ill temper' in which the parliament had concluded in 1711, continued to dictate the political temper of the country.[87] When, therefore, it was announced in April that the parliament called for November would be preceded by an election, King was sure that it

---

i, p.302; King to Annesley, 7/6/12, TCD Ms. 750/4/1/34-5; Swift to King, 3/1/13, Swift Corr. i, p.328.

[86] King to Swift, 16/2/12, Swift Corr. i, p.290; Wogan to Dawson, 30/9/12, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1771; Southwell to Dawson, 3/10/12, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1775; King to Annesley, 23/2/12, TCD Ms. 2532/13; Levinge to Southwell, 26/2/12, *Jottings of the Levinge Family*, ed., R. G. Levinge, Dublin, 1977, [hereafter: *Levinge Jottings*], p.41; Levinge to Southwell, 26/2/12, *Levinge Jottings*, p.41.

[87] King to Swift, 10/11/11, Swift Corr. i, p.272; Swift to King, 8/1/12, Swift Corr. i, p.285-6; King to Swift, 22/1/13, Swift Corr. i, p.331-4; R. Powys to Dawson, 20/3/12, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1648; Pulteney to Dawson, 3/4/12, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1661; Southwell to Dawson, 3/10/12, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1775.

portended a particularly volatile few months.[88]

The prospect of an election did not appeal to King. Complaining that 'parties wonderfully hinder business' as it was, he dreaded the intense political activity which electioneering would bring with it. Furthermore, with the country in such a 'high ferment', the prospect of many of the clergy embroiling themselves in the campaign compounded his sense of gloom:

> 'As to the factions that are very high and some of the clergy themselves deeper in it in my opinion than either the duty or interest of their function requires, I wish we have not all reason to repent their violence. There are a parcel of young men that make politics much the subject of their sermons.....'[89]

Nevertheless, his instinctive reaction was to lobby the church's interest without delay and he was soon formulating a series of proposals which he hoped to press on the authorities. But, once again, his deteriorating health caused him to change his plans. Forced to travel to Bath in the spring and to remain there until August, he found himself removed from the fray at the very moment when he knew the programme for parliament was being decided.[90]

As soon as he disembarked at Ringsend on his return from England it

---

[88] Ormonde to Lords Justices of Ireland, 30/4/13, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1900; Dartmouth to Ormonde, 28/4/13, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1898; Southwell to Dawson, 24/2/13, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1865; Same to Same, 13/6/13, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1945; Bolingbroke to Lords Justices of Ireland, 14/9/13, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/2016.

[89] King to Crow, 15/11/12, TCD Ms. 750/4/1/67; King to Annesley, 14/11/13, TCD Ms. 2532/223; King to Jenkins, 20/2/13, TCD Ms. 2532/119; King to Bishop of Ferns, 13/10/13, TCD Ms. 2532/213; King to Swift, 16/5/13, Swift Corr. i, p.349; Same to Same, 5/8/13, Swift Corr. i, p.382.

[90] Parnell to King, 28/4/13, Lyons 1450; King to Annesley, 14/8/13, TCD Ms. 750/4/1/197; King to Crow, 29/8/13, TCD Ms. 750/4/1/203-4; Lady Beresford to [King], 12/5/13, Lyons 1452; Bishop Smith to King, 10/6/13, Lyons 1455. King did not travel to London where an appeal in his dispute with Christ Church was being heard, but he was made aware that his opposition to Phipps was being used to prejudice several English nobles against his cause: Parnell to King, 21/7/13, Lyons 1466; King to Annesley, 27/7/13, TCD Ms. 750/4/1/192; Same to Same, 14/8/13, TCD Ms. 750/4/1/197. While in Bath he was kept fully informed of any developments in Ireland by Stearne: Stearne to King, 25/7/13, Lyons 1467.

became clear that his hopes that tensions between the two parties might have abated during his absence had been misplaced. Phipps' decision to seek clemency for Edward Lloyd, who had reprinted copies of the Jacobite pamphlet *Memoirs of the Chevalier de St. George*, had generated particularly heated debate. The frenetic and partisan electioneering merely testified to the enduring belligerence of both factions. 'They are all mad on Elections, hurrying from place to place', he noted, after a brusque encounter with one candidate in the street,

> 'so that I can hardly get one to speak to and when I begin to talk to any of business their answer is "How goes such an election?", "I must be so tomorrow, at the Naas the next day, at Wicklow next"..... then he hears somebody is come to town and away he flies.'

'For six weeks', he complained to Swift, the city had witnessed 'nothing but tumults, contentions, quarrels, calumnies and drinking about elections'.[91]

Accusations by King of over zealousness on the part of certain candidates were, however, somewhat disingenuous. This was because, for the first and only time in his career, he had allowed himself to become actively identified with the campaigns of several individuals who were seeking election to the House of Commons. For a man who had consistently claimed to be above such involvement, this in itself was a noteworthy development. The real significance, however, lay in the fact that he made a point of supporting only those candidates who had proven Tory credentials. A Major Burnet, 'a friend of mine', was one of those to receive his backing, not only on the grounds that he was 'well effected to the Constitution of Church and State', but that he had

---

[91] King to Mrs. Marion King, 31/10/13, TCD Ms. 2532/218; King to Annesley, 13/10/13, TCD Ms. 2532/216; Hayton, 'Parliamentary Diary', p.196; Phipps to Swift, 10/10/13, Swift Corr. i, p.390; Wogan to Dawson, 5/9/13, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/2010; King to Swift, 15/12/13, Swift Corr. i, p.415; Alan Brodrick to Martha Courthorpe, 7/11/13, Midleton Mss. 3/129; Cox to Southwell, 30/6/13, B.L. Add. Ms. 38157/7.

'approved himself so' by giving not 'one vote to the Whigs' in the last parliament. The Tory, Chambre Brabazon, future Earl of Meath, was another whose campaign he supported, while Colonel William Berry, a Tory candidate from Duleek in Co. Meath, received his endorsement on the basis that he could be expected to be 'a hearty friend to the Constitution both of Church and State' if elected.[92]

While King had occasionally supported the campaigns of friends and associates who had sought election to various positions, this was the occasion on which he publicly aligned himself with a particular party. This was mainly because, re-assured by Oxford's moderate approach and satisfied that the Tories no longer intended to challenge the Protestant succession, he saw in them the natural allies of the church. The only thing that caused him concern was Phipps' presence in the executive. If only he and his crypto-Jacobite supporters could be purged, the way would be open for an alliance between the Tories and the bulk of the Irish body politic.

It was for this reason that he was pleased to hear that a change of Lord Lieutenant was being mooted. Ormonde, though personally affable, had, he believed, alienated many in the political body by his support for the Lord Chancellor and his refusal to discount rumours of loyalty to the Stuarts. King's hope was that a more moderate, but assertive, Governor would allay the fears of the Anglo-Irish by removing the increasingly imperious Phipps.[93]

The man appointed was the Duke of Shrewsbury. A veteran politician,

---

[92] King to Swift, 22/1/13, Swift Corr. i, p.331; King to Crow, 2/5/13, TCD Ms. 750/4/1/150-2; King to Mr. Billon, 26/10/13, TCD Ms. 2532/218; King to Mr. Huson, 19/9/13, TCD Ms. 2532/207; King to Swift, 15/12/13, Swift Corr. i, 415.

[93] King to Swift, 27/10/11, Swift Corr. i, p.265; King to Annesley, 13/3/14, TCD Ms. 2532/262; Butler to Dawson, 4/8/13, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1986; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 7/11/13, Midleton Mss. 3/131; Swift, *Journal to Stella*, 22/3/13, p.643-4; King to Swift, 28/7/11, Swift Corr. i, p.243.

his appointment had been rumoured as early as January 1712. At that time, however, chastened by the cumulative effect of several disappointing Lord Lieutenants, King had not been overly enthused: 'I need not tell you', he remarked to Southwell,

> 'that the Duke of Shrewsbury will be acceptable here for most are pre-possessed with the opinion of his probity and understanding and particularly that he is no enemy to this Kingdom. [But] I do not reckon any Governor can do us much good. All that we expect is that they may do us as little mischief as they can.'[94]

English political considerations had dictated that Shrewsbury was not appointed at that time. But with Ormonde's ineptitude more clearly exposed in the meantime, King was now more amenable. However, he felt that the task of leading an executive in the tense circumstances induced by Phipps' partisanship might be beyond even the Duke: 'very few Chief Governors have come into Ireland under more difficult circumstances', he explained to Annesley

> '..... The Kingdom in a high ferment, higher than I ever saw it except when in actual war; the Council, and the City embroiled; the two Houses of parliament not yet cooled of the heat contracted at parting. His Grace the Lord Lieutenant an absolute stranger to person and things, not knowing whom to trust or on whom to depend, a parliament called in his absence and his Grace coming here in the midst of elections when all was in a hurry and heat.'[95]

In addition to this Shrewsbury was expected to 'begin the session with a money bill such as was never offered before at the opening of parliament.' Even

---

[94] Swift to King, 8/1/12, Swift Corr. i, p.285-6; King to Southwell, 26/3/12, TCD Ms. 2532/22; Watson to Dawson, 17/1/12, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1606; Powys to Dawson, 20/3/12, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1648; [Southwell] to [Dawson], 4/3/12, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1641; Swift, *Journal to Stella*, 20/3/12, p.518; King to Swift, 27/3/12, Swift Corr. i, p.291.

[95] Swift to King, 20/5/12, Swift Corr. i, p.295-6; King to Swift, 29/5/12, Swift Corr. i, p.298; King to Shrewsbury, 3/10/13, TCD Ms. 2532/211-2; Southwell to Dawson, 13/5/13, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1907; King to Annesley, 14/11/13, TCD Ms. 2532/223-4; Alan Brodrick to Martha Courthorpe, 7/11/13, Midleton Mss. 3/129.

Bolingbroke, who was delighted at Shrewsbury's removal from England, did not envy him his task: 'the sweetness of his temper [and] strength of his understanding', might not be sufficient, he told an associate,

> '..... to calm the minds of that distracted nation, who from knowing no distinction but Protestant and Papist are come to be more madly divided about Whig and Tory, High Church and Low, than even this society of lunatics to which you and I belong.'[96]

But the most difficult challenge facing the new Lord Lieutenant would be that posed by Phipps who could be expected to resent the closer involvement in government affairs which Shrewsbury was likely to initiate. Shrewsbury would have 'a hard task' in dealing with some of his own executive, King predicted, 'the same that embroiled his Grace the Duke of Ormonde seem combined to embarrass him and by the same methods and, some think, on the same design.' 'Some of his own party had rather have his room than his company,' he elaborated, 'and will endeavour to embarrass him as much as they can'. In these circumstances he wondered 'how it could be expected that he should be able to manage such exasperated minds and bring them immediately to a temper'.[97]

That there would be tension between the Lord Lieutenant and Lord Chancellor was confirmed by reports from England which suggested that, as a precondition to accepting the post, Shrewsbury had insisted upon having both Phipps and Chief Justice Nutley removed from their posts. Although this was stymied by Bolingbroke whose influence ensured that both men were retained,

---

96 King to Annesley, 14/11/13, TCD Ms. 2532/223-4; Bolingbroke to Lords Justices of Ireland, 14/9/13, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/2015; Same to Same, 14/9/13, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/2016; Hayton, 'Crisis', pp.199-201; Bolingbroke to Prior, -/9/13, quoted by J.G. Simms in 'The Irish Parliament of 1713', in G.A. Hayes McCoy ed., *Historical Studies*, iv, London, 1963, p.84.

97 Phipps to William Bromley, 5/12/13, HMC Portland v, p.370-1; Phipps to Swift, 24/10/13, Swift Corr. i, p.398; King to Annesley, 14/11/13, TCD Ms. 2532/223-4.

the fact that Shrewsbury had indicated his displeasure at Phipps' continuation in office seemed to King to augur well. He wrote immediately to Shrewsbury, wishing him well in his new position and offering his 'best endeavours' in anything the Duke might attempt.[98]

The 'scuffles' about the mayoralty had continued throughout 1713 and had taken on an even more partisan character as parliament had approached.[99] In particular, Bolingbroke's support for Phipps had meant that, in spite of Shrewsbury's attempts to introduce a more moderate regime, the Lord Chancellor remained in a powerful position. He was still being exhorted to give the Whigs 'a lesson' by securing a Tory nominee as mayor. Southwell, for example, informed him that he could continue to count on backing from London in his efforts to stem any 'invasion of the Privy Council's rights' by Whigs attempting to undermine its authority.[100]

As the elections approached the dispute became even more bitter, inflamed by the fears induced by Anne's decline and worries over the

---

[98] King to Shrewsbury, 3/10/13, TCD Ms. 2532/211-2; Butler to Dawson, 4/8/13, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1986; B[utler] to [Dawson], 8/9/13, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/2011; Southwell to Lords Justices of Ireland, 14/9/13, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/2018.

[99] Cox to Southwell, 12/5/13, B.L. Add. Ms. 38157/1; Same to Same, 5/9/13, B.L. Add. Ms. 38157/10; Phipps to Swift, 10/10/13, Swift Corr. i, p.390; *Remarks upon the Replication of the Seventeen Aldermen of Dublin lately made to the Answer of Sir Samuel Cooke, Knight, Lord Mayor of that city,* Dublin, 1713; Southwell to Dawson, 19/5/13, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1914; Southwell to Lords Justices of Ireland, 28/5/13, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1927; Southwell to Dawson, 28/5/13, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1928; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 7/11/13, Midleton Mss. 3/131.

[100] Stearne to King, 16/6/13, Lyons 1456; Same to Same, 25/7/13, Lyons 1467; Southwell to Dawson, 23/1/13, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1845; Victory, *Colonial Nationalism in Ireland,* p.114; Southwell to Lords Justices of Ireland, 16/5/13, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1913; Southwell to Dawson, 19/5/13, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1914; Hayton, 'Parliamentary Diary', pp.207-211.

succession.[101] In September Bolingbroke ordered Phipps to instruct the incumbent mayor to nominate three Tory members from whom the aldermen might choose a successor. In favour of this injunction Phipps had gathered the opinions of various judges.[102] Undaunted, the aldermen replied that the right to propose candidates was theirs alone and refused to acquiesce. Government supporters responded that there were 'many more instances' of Corporations being forced to comply in this manner. Those who supported the Corporation challenged this and called for evidence of these 'instances' to be produced. King was particularly strong on this point. At several protracted Council meetings both he and Molesworth argued the aldermen's case, denouncing Phipps in the process. In spite of the fact that he 'ventured [his] life' by spending over twenty hours at two such meetings, it was obvious that King remained as truculent as ever and as determined as before to oppose the Lord Chancellor.[103]

Phipps' response was to instigate an increasingly vindictive vilification of King. At one meeting King found himself accused of sedition in siding with the Corporation against the express wishes of the Queen.[104] At another he had

---

[101] Butler to [Dawson], 30/6/13, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1960; Southwell to Dartmouth, 17/5/13, PRO. S.P. 63/369/181; Lords Justices of Ireland to Ormonde, 9/5/13, PRO. S.P. 63/369/187-8; Southwell to Dawson, 30/6/13, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1961; Hayton, *Ireland and the English Ministers*, p.245.

[102] Bolingbroke to Lords Justices of Ireland, 21/9/13, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/2025; Southwell to Dawson, 24/9/13, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/2030; Same to Same, 26/9/13, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/2031; Bolingbroke to Oxford, 21/9/13, HMC Portland v, p.339; Lords Justices of Ireland to Bolingbroke, 28/9/13, PRO. S.P. 63/369/156-8; Cox to Southwell, 5/9/13, B.L. Add. Ms. 38157/10.

[103] Southwell to Dawson, 17/10/13, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/2044; King to Dromore, 12/9/13, TCD Ms. 2532/205.

[104] Phipps to Swift, 10/10/13, Swift Corr. i, p.390; Cox to Southwell, 12/5/13, B.L. Add. Ms. 38157/1; Same to Same, 5/9/13, B.L. Add. Ms. 38157/10; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 7/11/13, Midleton Mss. 3/131; *Remarks upon the Replication of the Seventeen Aldermen of Dublin lately made to the Answer of Sir Samuel Cooke, Knight, Lord Mayor of that city*, Dublin, 1713.

to defend himself against charges that he had assisted in the production of traitorous tracts. Protesting that he 'never wrote to any person or procured any person to write about it or meddled any farther in it than to give my opinion and reasons at the Council Board', King accused Phipps, in turn, of concocting stories intended to discredit him. The Lord Chancellor reacted with even more serious charges of treasonable intent on King's part. Such was the animosity directed at him that King finally felt compelled to withdraw and to go 'to the country for a fortnight in the heat of the business to be out of the way'. Phipps took the opportunity afforded by his absence to have the Council draw up a *Representation* which put 'the worst face of which the thing was capable' on King's actions and comments. This was then sent to England where it was hoped it would lead to him being removed from the Council. Not to be outdone, King reacted by writing to the English Attorney-General setting out his version of events and questioning the legality of what Phipps was attempting to force upon the aldermen.[105]

It was at this point that, for one of the few times in his life, political developments in England began to work in King's favour. Oxford, striving to maintain his policy of comprehension, was becoming increasingly impatient with Phipps' divisive tactics and was acutely aware that this 'obstinacy' in Ireland came at a 'very unseasonable' time, since it threatened to disrupt the government's carefully constructed parliamentary programme. This was particularly the case since Bolingbroke was exploiting the tensions induced by the affair to undermine the ministry in London. The consequence of this was a reply to King's letter to the Attorney-General in which 'every point in which I

[105] King to Annesley, 14/11/13, TCD Ms. 2532/222; King to Southwell, 14/11/13, TCD Ms. 2532/225; King to Bishop of Dromore, 12/9/13, TCD Ms. 2532/205; Swift to Archdeacon Walls, 13/10/13, Swift Corr. i, p.391; *Petition of the Privy Council to Her Majesty*, 1713, PRO. S.P. 63/369/140.

differed from the major part of the Council [was] determined for me and against them.' In effect, the legality of Phipps' endeavours to contrive the election of a Tory candidate was rejected: '..... though the men of the law were generally against me here', King pointed out gleefully, he had now been 'fully justified' while Phipps had been humiliated by his political masters.[106]

This unexpected development exacerbated the already intense enmity between the two men. Although thwarted on this occasion, Phipps refused to be deflected. King now became the focus of even more intense opposition and at yet another Privy Council meeting was accused of being a 'private informer' and a spy for opponents of the government. Once again King felt compelled to retire to his country residence as tensions in the Council and in the elections began to be reflected in sporadic rioting in the city.[107]

These disputes at Council presaged the squabbles which would plague the new parliament which convened on November 25. The first problem confronting Shrewsbury was the election to the key position of Speaker of the House of Commons. Normally this would be filled by a government nominee. That there was some uncertainty over whether the government candidate would be successful was due to the fact that a substantial opposition had emerged in the

---

[106] King to Annesley, 14/11/13, TCD Ms. 2532/222-3; Southwell to Dawson, 17/10/13, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/2044; Victory, *Colonial Nationalism in Ireland*, p.116; Shrewsbury to Bolingbroke, 3/11/13, PRO. S.P. 63/369/132; Same to Same, 10/11/13, PRO. S.P. 63/369/126; Stanley to Bolingbroke, 17/11/13, PRO. S.P. 63/369/110-1; *Minutes of Privy Council Meeting*, PRO. S.P. 63/369/123; Jones, *op. cit.*, p.351; King to Southwell, 14/11/13, TCD Ms. 2532/224; Hayton, 'Parliamentary Diary', pp.207-11.

[107] King to Annesley, 14/11/13, TCD Ms. 2532/222-3; Phipps to William Bromley, 5/12/13, HMC Portland, v, p.370-1; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 7/11/13, Midleton Mss. 3/131; Alan Brodrick to Martha Counthorpe, 7/11/13, Midleton Mss. 3/129; Stanley to_____, 17/11/13, PRO. S.P. 63/368/110-1.

aftermath of the election. It was also a recognition of the calibre of the opposition candidate, Alan Brodrick. Brodrick had served as Speaker of the Commons from 1703 to 1709 and not only had a considerable personal following but, because of his treatment by Phipps, had become a champion of opponents of the government. By the time the government announced its own candidate, the Attorney-General, Sir Richard Levinge, Brodrick had already garnered considerable support.[108]

Government supporters remained confident of victory, however, in spite of the fact that their success in the elections had been less comprehensive than that of their counterparts in Britain. Indeed, Shrewsbury was sure that merely announcing that Levinge had the full support of the Queen would be sufficient to secure his election. Phipps was equally sanguine. While 'parties here run very high', he and his supporters were sure that once parliament sat 'the Whigs will not be able to maintain their ground'.[109]

More mindful of the fickleness of the Irish politician, King suspected that the contest might be closer than the government or its managers were willing to allow. Even if defeated, he was fearful lest a good showing encouraged Brodrick and his supporters to mount a vigorous opposition in the Commons. Although sympathetic to Brodrick and his supporters, the fact that this might endanger several church bills persuaded him to act. Inviting 'some of the principal members [and] the principal managers' to meet him at St.

---

[108] Cox to Southwell, 17/11/13, B.L. Add. Ms. 38157/23; Simms, 'The Irish Parliament of 1713', pp.82-92; Southwell to Dawson, 27/11/13, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/2060; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 26/11/13, Midleton Mss. 3/135; Same to Same, 10/11/13, Midleton Mss. 3/133; Swift to King, 30/10/10, Swift Corr. i, p.202; Same to Same, 19/12/13, Midleton Mss. 3/142. Brodrick had been removed from his position as Lord Justice of the Queen's Bench in one of Phipps' first acts as Lord Chancellor.

[109] Justice Nutley to Swift, 21/11/13, Swift Corr. i, p.408; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 19/12/13, Midleton Mss. 3/142; Stanley to _____, -/11/13, PRO. S.P. 63/368/106-8; Phipps to Swift, 24/10/13, Swift Corr. i, p.398.

Sepulchre's, he proposed that, in the interests of a harmonious session, Levinge be allowed to go forward unopposed. But the Brodrick faction was not in a conciliatory mood. Only if King would 'engage to have their grievances redressed by removing the Great Minister [Phipps] and settling the City of Dublin' would they consider withdrawing Brodrick's name. In no position to give them 'any assurance' on those matters, King pleaded with them to reconsider. They refused to be moved. An election, King now accepted, was unavoidable.[110]

King's only concern had been to avoid a divisive contest because he had been warned repeatedly by Swift that any disquiet in parliament would be manipulated to extreme Tory advantage by Bolingbroke. But privately he remained confident that the Tories would be successful. As a result of Phipps' patronage 'the Government, Privy Council, benches, Custom House, army pensioners, officers of all sorts, dependants and expectants were all for them.' Furthermore, he was well aware that the ministry had already engaged in 'the giving of money' to assist Levinge's election. In any case he regarded the queen's endorsement of the Tory candidate as decisive: 'His Grace the Lord Lieutenant by her Majesty's order has recommended Sir Richard Levinge for Speaker,' he reported to Annesley,

> 'Others were engaged beforehand to Mr. Brodrick but I reckon the former will carry it if it comes to a dispute to which I hope it will not come at all. Most men of sense and sobriety that I converse with of either party believing it the common interest to comply with her Majesty in this particular, though the person proposed were not liked.'[111]

---

[110] King to Annesley, 15/12/13, TCD Ms. 2532/234; King to Southwell, 15/12/13, TCD Ms. 2532/237; Same to Same, 5/1/14, TCD Ms. 2532/239; Nutley to Swift, 21/11/13, Swift Corr. i, p.408.

[111] King to Swift, 15/12/13, Swift Corr. i, p.416-7; Same to Same, 13/1/14, Swift Corr. ii, p.4; Molesworth to King, 7/10/13, Lyons 1470; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 10/11/13, Midleton Mss. 3/133; Swift to King, 20/10/13, Swift Corr. i, p.397; Nutley to Swift, 21/11/13, Swift Corr. i, p.408; King to Annesley, 14/11/13, TCD Ms. 2532/222-3;

Brodrick's victory came, therefore, as an unpleasant surprise to both King and the government. It filled King with dread at the 'misery to the kingdom' which this 'contending with the government' portended. In particular, the extensive Whig support which it evidenced augured badly for the various government sponsored church bills due to come before the Commons.[112] "Tis never good to be too confident', he wrote to Annesley in the aftermath of Levinge's defeat, unsure as yet of where this result left matters:

> 'those that appeared against the City were so assured of a majority in the House of Commons and declared it so publicly that they had no apprehension but all that was done would be justified there. They, it seems, were mistaken and what the consequences may be God only knows. I was against putting it to that issue and I fancy they are now of my opinion. The Parties are so near an equality in the House that I hope no very absurd thing will be attempted. They give out that by their zeal and unanimity to do everything that may be for her Majesty's service and ease of the Government here they will demonstrate to the world that they are not the persons they have been represented to be. I pray God they may say and hold.'[113]

Such prayers were not to be answered. Rumours soon began to circulate that an attempt would be made by Brodrick's supporters to have Phipps reprimanded. Hearing it 'whispered' that several in the Commons intended to 'complain of some things they call "hardships" and leave it to her Majesty's goodness to do as she shall think fit', King once again moved to

---

Same to Same, 15/12/13, TCD Ms. 2532/233-4.

[112] King to Southwell, 5/1/14, TCD Ms. 2532/239-40; King to Swift, 13/1/14, Swift Corr. ii, p.3; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 26/11/13, Midleton Mss. 3/135; Hayton, 'Crisis', p.204; Nutley to Swift, 21/11/13, Swift Corr. i, p.408; King to Swift, 13/1/14, Swift Corr. ii, p.4; Wogan to Dawson, 29/11/13, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/2064.

[113] King to Annesley, 15/12/13, TCD Ms. 2532/233-4; King to Southwell, 15/12/13, TCD Ms. 2532/237; Nutley to Swift, 21/11/13, Swift Corr. i, p.408; King to Swift, 15/12/13, Swift Corr. i, p.415.

defuse matters. In the hope that these 'embryo designs [might] be shifted in the birth', he approached several of the more prominent members with a view to dissuading them. His pleas went unheeded. Brodrick and his supporters were determined to have the Lord Chancellor censured.[114]

As King had feared this set the tone for the entire session and came to prejudice even the most innocuous items of business. Several church bills were deferred to allow debate on the conduct of the government. Amid accusations that he was attempting to 'bring in Popery' a committee was set up in the Commons to investigate a series of complaints against Phipps.[115] Following condemnation of his activities by sizeable majorities an *Address* to the queen petitioning his dismissal was approved. This was accompanied by a refusal to pass a money bill granting any more than three months supply.[116]

In the House of Lords, where a Tory majority predominated, it was decided to counter the Commons' *Address.* This show of support for an increasingly beleaguered government was orchestrated by Lord Anglesea who had galvanised his supporters into initiating an *Address* which would give Phipps 'a very good character.' Protesting at the 'pains..... taken to vindicate' his adversary, Brodrick urged King to take a stand. Having been one of the

---

[114] King to Southwell, 15/12/13, TCD Ms. 2532/237; King to Swift, 15/12/13, Swift Corr. i, p.415; King to Annesley, 15/12/13, TCD Ms. 2532/233-4; Victory, *Colonial Nationalism in Ireland*, pp.117-9; Nutley to Swift, 21/11/13, Swift Corr. i, p.408.

[115] King to Southwell, 15/12/13, TCD Ms. 2532/237; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 1/12/13, Midleton Mss. 3/136-7; Sir John Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 21/12/13, Midleton Mss. 3/140-1; Stanley to _____, 19/12/13, PRO. S.P. 63/369/47-9; Cox to Southwell, 24/12/13, B.L. Add. Ms. 38157/42. This committee's remit covered both the city affair and Phipps' role in the dropping of charges against Edward Lloyd who republished the *Memoirs of the Chevalier de St. George.*

[116] Lindsay to Swift, 26/12/13, Swift Corr. i, p.423; Swift to King, 31/12/13, Swift Corr. i, p.424; Shrewsbury to _____, 22/12/13, PRO. S.P. 63/369/43-4; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 1/12/13, Midleton Mss. 3/136-7; Hayton, 'Parliamentary Diary', p.132-8; King to Swift, 13/1/14, Swift Corr. ii, p.6; Simms, 'The Irish Parliament of 1713', pp.204-7.

few to have persistently harried Phipps over the previous three years, and resigned to the fact that cultivating the ministry in favour of the church was unlikely to yield anything on this occasion, King needed little persuasion. He soon found himself at the head of a small group including Molesworth and Ashe which was determined to frustrate Anglesea. Anglesea moved quickly, however, and a resolution to have the Books and Records relating to the elections for mayor brought to the Lords was approved on December 17, in spite of an objection by King and four other peers. On the following day witnesses were called and the House formed into a committee to discuss the issue with Phipps in attendance throughout as Speaker. One Richard Nuttall was ordered to be prosecuted for having spoken 'scandalous, malicious and seditious' words when he accused Phipps of being 'a canary bird, a villain that had set this Kingdom together by the ears and ought to be hanged'.[117] By a large majority the House then approved a motion to send an *Address* to the queen commending Phipps and 'beseeching' her Majesty 'not [to] suffer any evil report against him', a reference to the contrary *Address* forwarded by the Commons. Only King, the Bishop of Clogher and 5 temporal peers registered their dissent.[118] Phipps could not have obtained a more 'vigorous resolution' in his favour if he had dictated it himself, one delighted supporter proclaimed. On December 24 the Lords approved an additional *Address* to the queen specifically in relation to the city affair. The Lord Chancellor, it declared, had

---

[117] King to Swift, 13/1/14, Swift Corr. ii, p.6; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 24/12/13, Midleton Mss. 3/146; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 19/12/13, Midleton Mss. 3/142; Shrewsbury to _____, 22/12/13, PRO. S.P. 63/369/43-4; Mountrath to King, 4/1/14, Lyons 1479; Stanley to _____, 19/12/13, PRO. S.P. 63/369/47-9.

[118] LJI, ii, 17/12/13, 18/12/13; *Address of the Irish House of Lords to Her Majesty*, PRO. S.P. 63/369/62; Levinge to Southwell, 19/12/13, *Levinge Jottings*, p.47-9; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 24/12/13, Midleton Mss. 3/146; Sir John Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 21/12/13, Midleton Mss. 3/140-1; Cox to Southwell, 19/11/13, B.L. Add. Ms. 38157/36; Same to Same, 19/12/13, 38157/38.

given 'no other directions to them [aldermen] than what he received from your Majesty or was instructed to give them by the Privy Council.' Once again King spoke against it, but to no avail. When it was eventually approved, however, he and seven others refused to sign their names.[119]

Preoccupied by the debates regarding Phipps, the members managed to address only a fraction of the legislative programme before becoming so embroiled in controversy that parliament had to be prorogued.[120] King was again dismayed at the lack of business done, bemoaning 'the sudden prorogation [which] broke all our measures about our church', and contrasting the paucity of official support with the £14,000 which he estimated he himself had allocated to church building since 1703.[121] He was, according to Cox, 'a sad soul', totally frustrated by the church's failure to obtain anything of real benefit yet again. Furthermore, by his opposition to Phipps he had shown himself to be 'a fierce enemy' of the government and could no longer pretend to any interest in it. This was widely advertised by his opponents, particularly those determined to see that he did not succeed the ailing Primate Marsh. Swift, then in London, felt obliged to inform him that amongst government supporters there he was now viewed as 'altogether of the other party' and must

---

[119] LJI, ii, 24/12/13; Lewis to Dawson, 2/1/14, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/2075; King to Swift, 13/1/14, Swift Corr. ii, p.5; Mountrath to King, 4/1/14, Lyons 1479; Swift to King, 31/12/13, Swift Corr. i, p.424; King to Swift, 13/1/14, Swift Corr. ii, p.5; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 24/12/13, Midleton Mss. 3/148.

[120] LJI ii, 24/12/13; Southwell to Dawson, 2/1/14, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/2077; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 7/1/14, Midleton Mss. 3/153; Lindsay to Swift, 5/1/14, Swift Corr. ii, p.2; *A Long History of a Short Session of Parliament in a certain Kingdom*, [Dublin], 1714.

[121] King to Earl of Meath, 17/4/14, TCD Ms. 750/4/1/264; King to Wentworth, 13/10/13, TCD Ms. 750/4/1/213. Convocation had also been overshadowed by the dispute between Tories and Whigs. As a result little of any importance had been achieved. King, preoccupied with his challenge to Phipps in the Lords, was unable to give it much attention and it is little mentioned in his correspondence. It was prorogued at the same time as parliament and was never recalled during King's lifetime.

expect to suffer the consequences.[122]

Characteristically, King was none too concerned by these reports. While the executive and its supporters might feign confidence, he believed that this belied a deepening crisis of confidence amongst many of their number. The defeat of Levinge and the denunciation of the Lord Chancellor by the Commons had unnerved many of its supporters. In Brodrick's opinion several of them, 'especially the most knowing and considerable', were now 'very chagrin' at their prospects. Promises from London of 'open declaration from hence' in Phipps favour, if it would 'turn the balance', merely emphasised the increasing alienation of the Tory leaders. Apart from betraying a lack of awareness of the dynamics of Irish politics, such endorsements were unlikely to have any practical effect. Furthermore, with Oxford and Bolingbroke engaged in a bitter struggle for supremacy in London, promises that the Commons would 'not..... find their demands satisfied' could not be made with any degree of certainty.[123]

But the development from which King had taken most encouragement had been the Lord Lieutenant's attempt to broker a compromise between the Council and the Corporation. Shrewsbury had arrived in Ireland with instructions from Oxford to defuse the situation as soon as possible. But it was not until early December at a Privy Council meeting called to discuss yet another set of legal opinions which Phipps had gathered in his favour, that he had decided to act. Sensing that many of the members were unhappy at what

---

[122] Cox to Southwell, 8/12/13, B.L. Add. Ms. 38157/31; (Cox indicates King under the code letter 'L' in his correspondence.) Same to Same, 24/12/13, B.L. Add. Ms. 38157/42; Swift to King, 31/12/13, Swift Corr. i, p.426.

[123] Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 12/1/14, Midleton Mss. 3/155; Southwell to Dawson, 29/12/13, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/2073; Same to Same, 2/1/14, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/2077; Lewis to Dawson, 2/1/14, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/2075; Lewis to Dawson, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/2075.

the Lord Chancellor was proposing, he 'join[ed] with the Whigs in this debate'. With, according to Phipps, 'the usual civility he pays to men that are not of his opinion', King had moved immediately to capitalise on this unexpected development, proceeding to question the validity of the judicial opinions which the Lord Chancellor had gathered. Several others then joined in: 'I must not omit to tell you', Phipps told Bromley,

> 'that the ill-usage we received from the Archbishop of Dublin and Mr. Molesworth was such as I believe has not been known, and we were very much concerned that his Grace [Shrewsbury] did not show any resentment nor give them the least check for it. One part of the Archbishop's civility was to hint to us that if we did not behave ourselves as we ought, the Queen would turn us out of the Council, and I must own I think we are not fit to sit in the same Council with him and Molesworth.'

The result was that Phipps was unable to get the support of Council for his strategy, Shrewsbury's stance being 'construed .....to be a public declaration..... in favour of the Whigs.' The only satisfaction he could glean was that, with 'the mask now taken off', Shrewsbury could be portrayed as siding with those who opposed the regime in Ireland. He hoped that this information might be of some assistance to Bolingbroke in his attempts to undermine Oxford.[124]

Oxford's policy of comprehension had been under pressure from both extreme Tories and extreme Whigs for several months. Bolingbroke, in particular, had been agitating for a return to a more overtly Tory programme. Capitalising on the victories of the Whigs in the Irish Commons, he had been able to galvanise his supporters into pressing for a less conciliatory policy for Ireland and Oxford had been forced to concede on this point. The result was that, in spite of the difficulties they had encountered in the Irish parliament and Privy Council, the position of the extreme Tory faction in Ireland was

---

[124] Bolingbroke to Oxford, 21/9/13, HMC Portland, v, p.339; Phipps to Bromley, 5/12/13, HMC Portland, v, p.370; King to Swift, 15/12/13, Swift Corr. i, 415.

strengthened. When news of this reached Ireland in the new year, the advantage returned to Phipps and his supporters. 'It is hardly to be expressed how great a change in affairs the last packets made,' Levinge wrote to London on hearing the news,

> 'one side are fallen from the pinnacle of Glory to abysm of darkness and the other raised from the dead to a new life. In the meantime a calm is evident at the Head.'

A reply from the queen to the Lords' *Address*, indicating continued support for the Lord Chancellor further consolidated his position at the expense of Shrewsbury.[125]

King's disappointment at these developments was eagerly noted by his adversaries: he was, Cox wrote to London, 'extremely dejected', having found the queen's reply to the Lords 'very mortifying'.[126] In particular, he was disturbed by the eclipse of the more moderate Shrewsbury, whose only 'crime' had been that 'he would not run into all the violent measures that some would have had him'. This removed a vital constraint upon Phipps and meant, in effect, that, with the assistance of the predominantly Tory Privy Council, he was free to resume his policy of entrenching extreme Tories in office.[127]

---

[125] Southwell to Dawson, 29/12/13, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/2073; Lewis to Dawson, 2/1/14, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/2075; Wogan to Dawson, 2/1/14, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/2076; Hayton, 'Crisis', pp.193-4, 210-2; Levinge to Southwell, 4/1/14, *Levinge Jottings*, p.49; Same to Same, 19/1/14, *Levinge Jottings*, p.52.

[126] Cox to Southwell, 2/1/14, B.L. Add. Ms. 38157/43-4; Same to Same, 5/1/14, B.L. Add. Ms. 38157/45; Same to Same, 19/2/14, B.L. Add. Ms. 38157/69

[127] King to Molyneux, 8/6/14, TCD Ms. 2532/296-7; Shrewsbury to Bolingbroke, 25/5/14, PRO. S.P. 63/370/70; King to Ashe, 13/5/14, TCD Ms. 2532/268-9; Southwell to Dawson, 25/1/14, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/2083; Same to Same, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/2088. However, Shrewsbury was instructed by Oxford to take the unusual step of remaining in Ireland for some time after the end of parliament with a view to operating some restraint on Phipps: Swift to Earl of Peterborough, 18/5/14, Swift Corr. ii, p.22; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 5/6/14, Midleton Mss. 3/181.

The physical decline of the queen meant that political manoeuvring became even more intense during the first half of 1714. For King the main issue was the security, or otherwise, of the Protestant succession. He was dismayed by rumours of Tory contacts with the Pretender, which suggested that the Tory ministry, in which Bolingbroke was playing an increasingly prominent role, might yet attempt to reinstate the Stuarts. While he knew that such a scenario was attractive to the many churchmen who had never fully reconciled themselves to the implications of the Revolution, he was aghast at the prospect. By virtue of its absolutist tendencies, the House of Stuart had, he believed, abandoned all claims to the loyalty of its erstwhile subjects and, as if to remind people, he arranged for an abstract from *The State of the Protestants of Ireland* to published. He himself was unequivocal in his support for the House of Hanover as settled by the Act of Succession and he was confident that the majority of Anglo-Irishmen were of the same opinion, regardless of party loyalty: 'You know the gentlemen of Ireland are entirely in the interest of that illustrious House and most firm for the support of the succession,' he told Samuel Molyneux, who was then travelling to Hanover where he would eventually became secretary to Elector George's son,

> 'Not only our religion and liberties, but properties are depending on it. I wish we were represented truly there and that we knew how to manage ourselves so that our conduct might meet approbation of being prudent and safe for those we heartily desire to serve and for the happiness of these Kingdoms.'

He repeated these sentiments in another letter to Hanover some weeks later:

> 'I am glad that the court of Hanover is sensible of the good affection of the Protestants of Ireland whatever the matter is they think themselves not much favoured here on that account at present but both [sic] their interest, inclinations and principles will always make them true to the succession.'

It was this loyalty to the Protestant succession which had 'obliged us to struggle with so much vigour' against Phipps and his supporters, he insisted, and would 'ever tie us inviolably' to the Hanoverian cause.[128]

Bolingbroke's manipulation of the High Church party, the anger raised by the Schism Bill, the withdrawal of the *Regium Donum*, reports of Jacobite activity in the north, as well as the elevation of the Tory Bishop Lindsay to the primacy, added to the 'utmost confusion' which reigned in Ireland during these months.[129] 'The whole country is in as great [a] ferment', Cox reported, 'as if the Pretender were to land'. Matters 'look cloudily', an increasingly pessimistic King, angry at being overlooked for the primacy, agreed, 'God only knows when they will clear up; men's hearts melt for fear and many are at their wits end what course to take.' Nor was he placated by a vote in the English parliament pronouncing that the succession was 'in no danger'. He likened it to a similar declaration several years ago in relation to the church, 'and', he reminded Stearne, sarcastically, 'you may call to mind the success of those votes'. In order to pre-empt any attempt by Tories in England to frustrate the accession of the Hanoverians, he advised that George be requested to travel to London before Anne died. Without the actual presence of some prince of that

---

[128] Jones, *op. cit.*, pp.350-5; J.H. and M. Shennan, 'The Protestant Succession in English Politics, April 1713 - September 1715', in R. Hatton and J.S. Bromley, eds., *William III and Louis XIV - Essays 1680-1720*, pp.252-270; King to Molyneux, 10/4/14, TCD Ms. 2532/259-60. Same to Same, 8/6/14, TCD Ms. 2532/296-7; W. King, *An Answer to All that has ever been Said, or Insinuated in favour of a Popish Pretender, exhibited in an Abstract of The State of the Protestants of Ireland under King James the Second's Government*, London, 1713. The full text of *The State of the Protestants of Ireland* was also re-issued in a volume which included Temple's *The Irish Rebellion.*

[129] King to Samuel Molyneux, 3/8/14, TCD Ms. 2536/3-5; King to Nicolson, 19/5/14, TCD Ms. 2536/285; King to Story, 13/4/14, TCD Ms. 2532/260; King to Annesley, 3/7/14, TCD Ms. 750/4/1/310; Walters to King, 25/6/14, Lyons 1493; J.H. and M. Shennan, *op. cit.*, pp.259-263. Some efforts to have King, who they described as 'the Chief Ornament' of the church, considered for the primacy, were made by several of his friends. King, however, was well aware that his opposition to Phipps removed any chance he may have had of succeeding: Thomas Wentworth to King, 3/6/14, Lyons 1488.

House in England, he believed, 'many friends to the succession will be discouraged and some induced to believe that they are deserted'.[130]

It was while preoccupied on this point that he began to hear reports from London of how the city affair was being exploited by Bolingbroke in his own attempts to oust Oxford. In particular, he was using it to entice into his party the powerful Earl of Anglesea, who was ideally placed, both as leader of a faction in the British parliament and an Irish peer with an important influence in Irish politics.[131] With his patron's position strengthened, Phipps, for his part, was becoming even more imperious in his dealings with the Corporation. Complaining of the 'utmost confusion.....for want of a mayor and Sheriffs' which prevailed in Dublin as a result of the 'obstinate and perverse' aldermen, he made yet another attempt to impose his candidate. With the backing of Bolingbroke and the opinions of several judges he threatened the aldermen with dire consequences if they persisted in their 'rebellion'. Initially, the Whig members refused to accede.[132] But, when Phipps persisted they eventually

---

[130] Cox to Southwell, 5/3/14, B.L. Add. Ms. 38157/73; Same to Same, 16/1/14, B.L. Add.. Ms. 38157/55; King to Molyneux, 17/6/14, TCD Ms. 2532/305; Maxwell to King, 12/7/14, Lyons 1495; King to Crow, 1/5/14, TCD Ms. 2532/272-3; Sir John Stanley to King, 5/8/14, Lyons 1501; Ford to Swift, 14/8/14, Swift Corr. ii, p.124.

[131] [Forster] to King, (enclosing report on British Privy Council decisions on the city affair), 15/7/15, Lyons 1496; Charles Ford to Swift, 20/7/14, Swift Corr. ii, p.73; Shaw to Dawson, 24/6/14, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/143/2136; Same to Same, 9/7/13, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/1968; Bolingbroke to Shrewsbury, 27/4/14, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/143/2112; King's antipathy to Anglesea's politics had been sharpened by the fact that Anglesea had recently helped to sponsor the passage of the Schism Act through the British Parliament This Act, ostensibly an attempt to penalise Dissenters, was objected to by King on the grounds that it both strengthened the position of Bolingbroke's mainly High Church Tory faction which he suspected of favouring the return of the Pretender, and contained a provision which extended its application to Ireland: King to Story, 13/4/14, TCD Ms. 2532/260; King to Annesley, 3/7/14, TCD Ms. 2532/310-1; Swift to King, 31/12//13, Swift Corr. i, p.425-6; Ford to Swift, 24/7/14, Swift Corr. ii, p.79; King to Annesley, 2/3/14, TCD Ms. 2532/255, (Anglesea is the 'great man' referred to in this letter). The importance of the City affair in the unfolding struggle between Oxford and Bolingbroke is discussed by Hayton in 'Crisis', pp.207-13, and idem., *Ireland and the English Ministers*, pp. 241-256.

[132] Southwell to Dawson, 27/2/14, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/2093; Bolingbroke to [Dawson], 9/3/14, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/2096; Bolingbroke to Shrewsbury, 27/4/14, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/2112; Bolingbroke to Lord Chancellor of Great Britain, 11/2/14, PRO.

offered to nominate Alderman Constantine 'since the Council was so positive for him' on condition that they might 'have a free choice for the next year.' Sensing victory the Lord Chancellor refused this compromise.[133] The matter was immediately brought back to the Council, and King was soon complaining of a resumption of those interminable meetings devoted to it. One such session involved 'a long argument for three or four days', but again to no avail. Indignant at these tactics, he refused to sign a petition to Bolingbroke seeking authorisation for the Privy Council to impose its preferred candidate. 'I can't see,' he grumbled, 'that those in power here abate anything in the prosecution of their measures.'[134]

Matters continued in this manner throughout the first half of 1714, and by early summer the positions of the protagonists had hardened even more: the aldermen might 'elect and elect', King wrote, summing up the essence of the whole dispute, 'but because the person the council would have is not elected they, (having the power of confirmation), will confirm none.' In the end it was only the death of Queen Anne in early August which brought about a resolution to the whole affair.[135]

S.P. 63/370/201; Hayton, *Ireland and the English Ministers*, pp.284-6.

[133] King to Nicolson, 8/5/14, TCD Ms. 2532/284-5; Phipps to Swift, 15/1/14, Swift Corr. ii, p.8; Phipps to Swift, 15/1/14, Swift Corr. ii, p.8; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 19/12/13, Midleton Mss. 3/142; Shrewsbury to Bolingbroke, 19/3/14, PRO. S.P. 63/370/155.

[134] *Petition of Privy Council of Ireland* [to Bolingbroke], 18/5/14, PRO. S.P. 63/370/78-9; *Proclamation of Lord Lieutenant and Council of Ireland*, 28/5/14, PRO. S.P. 63/370/242; King to Ashe, 20/4/14, TCD Ms. 2532/266. The affair dominated Privy Council business for the first six months of 1714: PRO. S.P. 63/370, *passim.*

[135] King to Nicolson, 8/5/14, TCD Ms. 2532/284-5.

CHAPTER 7.

1715-18: *'..... this new scene of life.....'*[1]

King was genuinely saddened by the death of a monarch who he believed had always acted in the best interests of the church. He was also very apprehensive about the succession: 'The great loss of our late gracious Queen, and the accession of his present Majesty to the throne being matter of such moment,' he told one correspondent, 'they employ not only my thought but also my time.' 'I know not what will be the effects of the loss of our most gracious Queen', he admitted to Roger Foley, 'I hope his present Majesty [George I] will be received by all without opposition.' He did, however, take solace from what he saw as the providential timing of her death:

> 'It has pleased God, since we were to lose her Majesty, to order it in such a juncture of circumstances that seem providentially favourable to the succession. What was done in the parliament of Great Britain and Ireland had awakened most people to say that there was real danger and given them a notion of a necessity of declaring themselves and likewise courage to do it to the great mortification of the ill affected, and has frightened them from attempting any opposition'.[2]

It was 'plain' that those who supported the Stuart cause had 'expected something else', he surmised, 'but her Majesty's demise was ill timed for them.'

---

[1] King to Fitzwilliam, 10/9/14, TCD Ms. 2536/54-5.

[2] King to Foley, 10/8/14, TCD Ms. 2536/10-11; King to Annesley, 10/8/14, TCD Ms. 2536/12; King to Molyneux, 3/8/14, TCD Ms. 2536/5; King to Lord Fitzwilliam, 10/8/14, TCD Ms. 2536/9-10; Sir John Stanley to King, 5/8/14, Lyons 1501; Wogan to Dawson, 3/8/14, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/143/2158; Bolingbroke to Lords Justices of Ireland, 3/8/14, PRO. S.P. 63/371/21.

As a consequence, he believed, there had been little opportunity for opposition to manifest in England. And it was the same in Ireland where he found 'all ..... quiet' and 'the Papists infinitely dejected'.[3]

Nevertheless, he was anxious that a declaration of loyalty to George be secured immediately. When orders were despatched to Ireland instructing the Privy Council to take the oaths to the new monarch he was instrumental in ensuring that the proclamation was read at the meeting despite Tory attempts to procrastinate.[4] Once this had been secured he felt more optimistic. Reports from various parts of the country recounting the peaceful proclamation of George relieved him of any lingering doubts. Within a few days he felt confident enough to write to Henry Maxwell predicting that the succession would 'meet with no opposition.'[5]

King's ambitions for the monarchy had not changed: 'I hope his present Majesty ..... may prove a nursing father to the church', he told one cleric,

> 'and a wise and gracious pastor to his people and that God may give him the wisdom and goodness to preserve our Constitution in church and state.'

He took it 'for granted' that a king 'that sets himself against the established church' would never 'sit easy in his throne.' And so he 'beseech[ed] God to give

---

[3] King to Story, 10/8/14, TCD Ms. 2536/12; Cox to Southwell, 14/8/14, B.L. Add. Ms. 38157(ii)/108; King to Story, 10/8/14, TCD Ms. 2536/12; Wogan to Dawson, 3/8/14, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/143/2158; Stanley to Dawson, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/143/2169.

[4] King to Hartstonge, 10/8/14, TCD Ms. 2536/8; Stanley to King, 5/8/14, Lyons 1501; King to Molyneux, 17/6/14, TCD Ms. 2532/305; Bolingbroke to Lords Justices of Ireland, 3/8/14, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/143/2166; Dawson to Delafaye, 9/8/14, Lords Justices of Ireland to Bolingbroke, 14/8/14, PRO. S.P. 63/371/85; *Newsletter*, 12/8/14, HMC Portland, v, p.486; King to Lord Mountjoy, 7/8/14, TCD Ms. 2536/6; *The Whole Works of Sir James Ware concerning Ireland*, ii, pp.367-8.

[5] King to Crow, 3/9/14, TCD Ms. 2536/45; Rev. Richard Boyle to King, 7/10/14, Lyons 1529; Lords Justices of Ireland to Bolingbroke, 14/8/14, PRO. S.P. 63/371/86; King to Henry Maxwell, 10/8/14, TCD Ms. 2536/12; Cox to Southwell, 17/8/14. B.L. Add. Ms. 38157(ii)/110; Same to Same, 1/10/14, B.L. Add. Ms. 38157(ii)/129.

us such a solid settlement of our Constitution in Church and State that we may no more be distracted with fears.....'[6]

In the light of these aspirations it is noteworthy that the years 1714 to 1718 represented probably the only period in his life when King felt that the 'Constitution of Church and State' for which he had so long struggled came close to being realised. The smooth inauguration of George I secured the place of the constitutional monarchy, with King more than happy to accept the Protestant credentials of the Lutheran Hanovers. With Dissenters still excluded by virtue of the Test clause, and Catholics unable to mount any challenge, the exclusive hold of Anglicans on positions of power remained undiluted. Finally, with the British parliament preoccupied with war, the Irish parliament was able to function without excessive interference from Westminster.

The years 1714 to 1718 were also important for King in one other respect. As one of the few people to oppose Phipps and the extreme Tories over the previous years, he was to be entrusted with state office by the new ministry, and on three occasions during these years he would be appointed as a Lord Justice. It was a position of singular influence and to it King brought, not only an administrative competence, but a very personal approach which depended as much on direct correspondence with his superiors in England as on his relations with officials in Dublin.

---

[6] King to Foley, 10/8/14, TCD Ms. 2536/10-11; King to Annesley, 10/8/14, TCD Ms. 2536/13; Same to Same, 26/8/14, TCD Ms. 2536/40-1; King to Maxwell, 10/8/14, TCD Ms. 2536/12.

I

King was surprised to hear that Shrewsbury had been appointed as Treasurer by Anne shortly before her death. The former Lord Lieutenant was considered a moderate and King feared that this might offer the Tories an opportunity to reach an accommodation with the new regime.[7] In spite of these misgivings, however, he wrote immediately to Shrewsbury congratulating him on his elevation, expressing the hope that he would use his position to ensure that Ireland was not placed at any disadvantage during the transition. In the event he need not have worried about a Tory resurgence. George had never forgiven them for arranging the Peace of Utrecht or for their discussions with the Pretender and was opposed to their inclusion in the government. As a result, Shrewsbury's appointment proved short lived. Despite King's naïve hope that 'the turn affairs have taken may put an end to our parties', it was apparent with the appointment of Townshend and Stanhope as Secretaries of State that a Whig ministry had assumed control.[8]

Preoccupied by affairs in England, the new ministry was not in a position to give their full attention to Ireland. For the time being, therefore,

---

[7] King to Dr. Thomas Goodwin, 14/8/14, TCD Ms. 2536/17-8; Stanley to King, 5/8/14, Lyons 1501; Southwell to Dawson, 30/7/14, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/143/2154; Cox to Southwell, 17/8/14, B.L. Add. Ms. 38157(ii)/110; John Barber to Swift, 3/8/14, Swift Corr., ii, p.100; Bolingbroke to Swift, 3/8/14, Swift Corr., ii, p.101-2.

[8] King to Duke of Shrewsbury, 17/8/14, TCD Ms. 2536/23; J.H. and M. Shennan, *op. cit.*, p.263; Wogan to [Dawson], 19/8/14, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/143/2172; Same to Same, 21/8/14, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/143/2176; King to Stearne, 26/8/14, TCD Ms. 2536/39; Lewis to Swift, 10/8/14, Swift Corr., ii, p.117.

Phipps and his colleagues remained in office. In spite of the bravado of some of his more virulent supporters, however, the Lord Chancellor was well aware that his position was untenable. King was delighted to note as much: Phipps 'expressed himself as if he did not expect to continue long in his present station', he persuaded himself, after a rather brusque and ill-tempered encounter with him at Dublin Castle.[9]

With the change of ministry King was hopeful that there would at last be 'a good issue' in the dispute between the Council and the Corporation.[10] However, in direct contravention of orders from the regency in London, Phipps refused to install the Corporation's nominee.[11] Indeed, at successive Council meetings, he denied ever having received any such instructions. To the amazement of his opponents he then made one final attempt to secure the election of Sir Samuel Cooke as Lord Mayor. When the proposal came before Council King was one of those to object, refusing to sign an Order directing that Cooke be installed.[12]

It was obvious to King that, with little left to lose, Phipps was 'resolved to keep that sore open'. Moreover, he found that he himself was now even

---

[9] Molesworth to King, 2/9/14, Lyons 1510; Cox to Southwell, 17/8/14, B.L. Add. Ms. 38157(ii)/110; Shrewsbury to Lords Justices of Ireland, 12/8/14, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/143/2168; King to Lord Mountjoy, 24/8/14, TCD Ms. 2536/74-7; Stanley to Dawson, 14/8/14, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/143/2169; Lords Justices of Ireland to Bolingbroke, 14/8/14, PRO. S.P. 63/371/85.

[10] Ford to Swift, 12/8/14, Swift Corr., ii, p.119; Bolingbroke to Lords Justices of Ireland, 7/8/14, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/143/2162; Dawson to Delafaye, 9/8/14, PRO. S.P. 63/371/23; Lords Justices of Ireland to Bolingbroke, 14/8/14, PRO. S.P. 63/371/85; Same to Same, 17/8/14, PRO. S.P. 63/371/87.

[11] King to Stearne, 10/8/14, TCD Ms. 2536/14-5; Lewis to Swift, 10/8/14, Swift Corr., ii, p.117; King to Ashe, 19/8/14, TCD Ms. 2536/28-9; Lords Justices of Ireland to Bolingbroke, 14/8/14, PRO. S.P. 63/371/85; Same to Same, 17/8/14, PRO. S.P. 63/371/87.

[12] King to Mountjoy, 24/8/19, TCD Ms. 2536/34-7; Lords Justices of Ireland to Bolingbroke, 17/8/14, PRO. S.P. 63/371/87; _____ to King, 2/9/14, Lyons 1509; P. Mc Nally, 'The Hanoverian Accession and the Tory Party in Ireland', *Parliamentary History*, 14, 1995, pp.263-283. [hereafter: 'The Hanoverian Accession'].

more the focus of Tory anger, 'being unmercifully bated at Council'. Such was the ferocity of the abuse he encountered at one particular meeting, that he again found it necessary to retire to his country residence for 'shelter'. He made a point of keeping Shrewsbury informed of what was happening: 'Your Grace will observe that the Council is of the same humour, acts on the same principles and proceeds the same way that they did when your Grace was here', he reported to him. The only way to resolve matters, he advised, was to have a complete change in the make-up of the Privy Council with Phipps and all of his supporters removed.[13]

This obstructionism on the Lord Chancellor's part was only possible while the new Whig ministry remained preoccupied with establishing its own position. But by late August Townshend, Stanhope and Walpole had secured themselves sufficiently to be able to turn their attentions to Ireland. However, rather than remove all Tories from office in one fell swoop, which was King's favoured approach, they decided that they would only dismiss Phipps and Lindsay as Lords Justices. This left the question of who to install in their places. Having been one of Phipps most outspoken opponents over the previous three years, King was an obvious candidate for one of the vacancies and it was soon resolved that his elevation to the executive would be an appropriate reward. Shrewsbury, for one, had indicated that King would be 'most agreeable', while Conolly and Brodrick had also given their support. In early September, therefore, instructions to this effect were dispatched from Whitehall: King was to be included in the commission of new Lords Justices for Ireland along with Robert Fitzgerald, Viscount Shannon, (who was created Earl of Kildare), while the aged John Vesey, Archbishop of Tuam was to be

[13] King to John Forster, 18/8/14, TCD Ms. 2536/30; Swift to Ford, 24/8/14, Swift Corr., ii, p.127; King to Duke of Shrewsbury, 27/8/14, TCD Ms. 2536/43; King to Goodwin, 14/8/14, TCD Ms. 2536/17-8.

retained. For his part, Brodrick was rewarded with a peerage and appointed Lord Chancellor, while Conolly became Commissioner of the Revenue.[14]

Word of this reached King at his country residence to which he had retreated in the hope of finalising some revisions to his *Inventions of Men*.[15] His supporters were delighted. 'I can't conceal the satisfaction I take at the good news I have read this day of your Grace's being sworn one of the Lords Justices', one wrote eagerly,

> '[It is] a post due to your Grace's merit, who appeared so steady for the true interest of both Church and State, and that in the most dangerous and worst of times. I pray God that you may live long and be always a happy instrument for the preservation of our constitution in Church and State and the discouragement of party and faction.'

Molyneux also communicated his pleasure at the prospect of having a person of such 'distinguished worth and zeal employed in the public service'. His friend, Robert Molesworth, who was close to many in the new ministry, was another who wrote from London to relay his approval:

> This day our country is delivered from the domination of two tyrants and in their stead we have two worthy honourable patriots set over us..... The villainy and obstinacy of our adversaries was so insufferable that we could not have wished a greater triumph. And now, my lord, give me leave to congratulate your Grace upon that particular share which you have in it, as you have in a great measure borne the brunt, so it was but just you should receive the honour and recompense of your courage, patience and perseverance. Your Grace and my Lord Kildare had the unanimous voice of all the gentlemen of Ireland.'

---

[14] Stanley to Dawson, 4/9/14, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/143/2186; Addison to Dawson, 2/9/14, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/143/2182; Swift to King, 31/12/13, Swift Corr., i, p.426; Hamilton to King, 1/3/15, Lyons 1589; _____ to King, 2/9/14, Lyons 1509; Brodrick was created Baron (and later Viscount) Midleton.

[15] King to Stearne, 10/9/14, TCD Ms. 2536/56; King to John Stanley, 10/9/14, TCD Ms. 2536/51-3; Cox to Southwell, -/9/14, B.L. Add. Ms. 38157(ii)/121-2; Addison to Dawson, 2/9/14, *Addison Letters*, pp.293-4; King to Dr. Charlett, 20/11/14, TCD Ms. 2536/124-5; King to Mountjoy, 14/2/15, TCD Ms. 2536/187.

Nor could he 'forbear pleasing myself with the fancy how Sir Con[stantine Phipps] will digest carrying the purse before your Excellencies, a man of his rude obstinacy and unruliness.' He did predict, however, that the Tories would not surrender their power easily. The Privy Council would 'be as troublesome ..... as they can be and endeavour to die hard like their masters,' he warned. But he encouraged King to take 'such vigorous measures ..... as to break those who will not bow to truth and justice'.[16]

Supporters of the old executive protested their dismay at the removal of their 'two honest gentlemen [Phipps and Lindsay]' with equal fervour. Cox wrote to the Secretary of State to register his disapproval. Likewise, Secretary Wogan declared himself 'confounded at the sudden blow'. Phipps would, nevertheless, 'still shine out with the greater lustre' than any of his successors because of his great service to Ireland, he predicted. Swift, who viewed King's elevation and the removal of the Tories as a double blow to his own hopes for preferment, was particularly despondent: 'having despatched all our friends in England,' he wrote to Bolingbroke, 'off flies a splinter and knocks two Governors of Ireland dead.'[17]

For his part, King, while delighted at the removal of Phipps, claimed to be less than enamoured at being placed in 'this new scene of life'. For one thing there was the fact that he was now sixty-four years of age, and regularly debilitated by the effects of his gout. Nor was he attracted by the prospect of

---

[16] Molesworth to King, 2/9/17, Lyons 1510; Same to Same, 28/9/14, Lyons, 1524; Isaac Manley to King, 8/9/14, Lyons 1513; Maxwell to King, 11/9/14, Lyons 1514; Levinge to King, 12/9/14, Lyons 1516; Maxwell to King, 7/9/14, Lyons 1512; Manley to King, 8/9/14, Lyons 1513. Molesworth would become an important ally of King over the course of the next decade. For an assessment of his political beliefs see M.A. Stewart, 'John Smith and the Molesworth Circle', *Eighteenth Century Ireland*, 2, 1987, pp.89-102.

[17] *Newsletter*, 4/9/14, HMC Portland, v, p.493; Cox to Southwell, 10/9/14, B.L. Add. Ms. 38157(ii)/119; Wogan to Dawson, 4/9/14, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/143/2184; Wogan to Southwell, 14/9/14, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/143/2191; Swift to Bolingbroke, 14/9/14, Swift Corr., ii, p.129; Swift to Knightley Chetwode, 6/10/14, Swift Corr., ii, p.135.

the ceremonial aspects of his new office: 'all since has been ceremony, drums, trumpets, salutations, etc.', he complained after his inauguration, 'there would not be much more trouble in a marriage', he added, in what to him was a particularly damning indictment. But, there were more substantial reasons why he was 'not fond' of his new employment:

> 'firstly, I am afraid it may obstruct my proper business as a bishop, which I could never answer; secondly, it puts more on me than I am afraid my age and infirmities will admit me to despatch with that care that I think necessary; thirdly, I dread anything being put on me that my judgement will not allow me to do, which, if it should happen, I would be disgusted; fourthly, considering how our commission is limited, we can't do the good that we would or prevent the evil yet must bear the blame if anything be amiss.....'

He would, he knew, 'have a hard task to serve the church as my inclinations and principles lead me.' In addition he was afraid that, having fought so hard over the previous six years to maintain a semblance of political independence, he would be embroiled in 'the violent measures of parties,' since he was now, plainly, a Whig appointee.[18]

But, while these may have been his private sentiments he gave no public hint of such misgivings. In fact, he turned to his new responsibilities with a relish which tended to discredit any protestations of unhappiness at his new station. Indeed, convinced that one of the main reasons he found himself in this position was 'nothing but the obstinacy of the late Justices in not complying with the Regency's orders relating to the City of Dublin which was highly resented', he turned his energies at once to resolving the city affair. On foot of an order from England he immediately summoned a meeting of the Privy

---

[18] King to Fitzwilliam, 10/9/14, TCD Ms. 2536/54-5; King to Stearne, 16/9/14, TCD Ms. 2536/59-60; King to Tollet, 14/1/15, TCD Ms. 2536/173-4. King's activities were hampered by the fact that he was suffering from another fit of gout at this time: King to Dr. Charlett, 20/11/14, TCD Ms. 2536/124-6; King to Col. Edgworth, 30/11/14, TCD Ms. 2536/132.

Council. To his surprise the Tories still refused to yield. 'We had another order from the Lords Justice of Great Britain,' he informed one confidante,

> 'declaring that the Council here had not a judicial power as to elections and that the claiming such a power was derogatory to the loyal prerogative..... We put the question to them whether they would obey it. They stiffly stood on the judicial power and for answer returned they were not required to answer the question till an election came before them.'

Sir Richard Cox, a supporter of Phipps, viewed developments a little differently:

> 'Yesterday the Archbishop of Dublin, Archbishop of Tuam and Earl of Kildare were sworn Lord Justices and this day they directed the Lord Mayor to go to an election..... If they proceed regularly and return it legally all will be well. But if (as I fear) they proceed without the Lord Mayor, then the Council can never come into it..... this attempt will have bad influence..... but I have some sanguine thoughts that the friends of the Church and Monarchy will not be ill used.'[19]

This was a major embarrassment for King. With the new monarch about to be enthroned, he was anxious to 'prevent the ill-impression that the noise of this disturbance' might make amongst politicians in London. He complained bitterly of the influence which Phipps and his allies still enjoyed: 'I have always thought it the interest of Ireland to be quiet and not concern themselves in the factions of Great Britain', he confided to Southwell,

> 'and 'tis easy for us to do so if our Governors would let us. But either [sic] by their ignorance they have generally made it their business to lead us against our wills into the depth of faction and they have used their utmost endeavour to throw them into the fire whom they could not draw into the pit of confusion with themselves. He must be turned out who would not swear and bawl and mob and coffee house and preach and inform against his honest quiet neighbour. By these means the whole Kingdom

[19] King to Stearne, 10/9/14, TCD Ms. 2536/56-7; Lords Justices of Great Britain to Lords Justices of Ireland, 15/9/14, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/143/2193; Cox to Southwell, 10/9/14, B.L. Add. Ms. 38157(ii)/119; King to Forster, 28/9/14, TCD Ms. 2536/79-80; Stanley to King, 17/9/14, Lyons 1520.

is put in a ferment.'

The Tories, it seemed to him, were resolved 'to keep their sting in it till pulled out by force.'[20]

This was a situation which the ministry in London could not allow to continue.[21] In his first letter to him, Sunderland, the new Lord Lieutenant, informed King of the ministry's decision to dissolve the old Privy Council and to constitute a new one 'in which all the persons that have acted irregularly in the great affair of the City of Dublin are left out and several others of the greatest note and fortune in the Kingdom put in'.[22] King was pleased with this for two reasons; firstly it was in line with the advice he had given some time previously, but secondly, and more importantly, it held out the prospect of the city affair being resolved by an Irish Privy Council rather than by edict from London. Believing this to be an important constitutional consideration, he wasted no time in arranging for the removal of those Tories named, including Phipps.[23] With this accomplished, he then convened the new Council. At its first meeting the Corporation's nominee for the mayoralty, the Whig, James

---

[20] King to Shrewsbury, 10/9/14, TCD Ms. 2536/49-51; King to Coningsby, 18/9/14, TCD Ms. 2536/64-6; King to Southwell, 18/9/14, TCD Ms. 2536/66-7.

[21] King to Col. Toby Purcell, 1/10/14, TCD Ms. 2536/88-9; [_____] to King, 2/9/14, Lyons, 1509; Stanley to Dawson, 30/9/14, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/143/2197.

[22] Sunderland to King, 1/10/14, Lyons 1526; Stanley to King, 17/9/14, Lyons 1520; Cox to Southwell, 9/10/14, B.L. Add. Ms. 38157(ii)/133; Stanley to Dawson, 30/9/14, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/143/2197; Lords Justices of Ireland to Stanhope, 12/10/14, PRO. S.P. 63/371/99; King to Stearne, 5/10/14, TCD Ms. 2536/89-90; Molyneux to King, 23/9/14, Lyons 1522.

[23] King was disturbed at hearing of the tumultuous reception which Phipps received on his return to England, fearing that he might yet become 'the Sacheverell of the law': King to Lord Mountjoy, 2/11/14, TCD Ms. 2536/105-6. Cox was replaced as Chief Justice of the King's Bench by King's friend William Whitshed; Levinge was replaced as Attorney-General by George Gore, another close friend of King's at whose house he often holidayed; Francis Bernard was replaced as Solicitor-General by John Rogerson; and Morely Saunders was replaced as Prime Sergeant by William Caulfield: McNally, 'The Hanoverian Accession', pp.268-275.

Barlow, (now Sir James Barlow) was unanimously approved. 'We beg leave to acquaint you,' King wrote eagerly to his superiors in London later that night, that

> '.....pursuant to his Majesty's command the new Privy Council here was sworn and at the same time a certificate of the election of a Lord Mayor and Sheriffs was laid before the Board and approved..... and it is a great satisfaction to us to find that what we have done therein is agreeable to his Majesty's pleasure.'[24]

King was delighted at having been so instrumental in resolving a dispute which had consumed so much of his energies over the previous three years. And, despite protestations to the contrary, King, who revelled in official approval, was delighted when he was singled out by Sunderland as the man who had done more than anyone else to see Phipps frustrated in his ambitions to establish extreme Toryism in Ireland. Satisfied that the matter was at last 'ended to the satisfaction of all who wish well to the quiet of the Kingdom', the Lord Lieutenant wrote to acknowledge,

> 'the part your Grace has had in the whole affair, as it has his Majesty's entire approbation, so [it] ought to be acknowledged by all those that wish well to his and the Kingdom's services.'

His secretary wrote separately to commend King's 'unblemished integrity' and the fact that he had 'acted for the good of [the] country' throughout the entire affair. For its part, the Corporation ordered, 'on petition of certain of the Commons', that he 'be presented with his Freedom in a gold box.....' in recognition of his role in opposing Phipps so courageously.[25]

---

[24] Sunderland to King, 1/10/14, Lyons 1526; Same to Same, 16/10/14, Lyons 1536; Cox to Southwell, 9/10/14, B.L. Add. Ms. 38157(ii)/133; Swift to Ford, 27/9/14, Swift Corr., ii, p.131; Lords Justices of Ireland to Stanhope, 12/10/14, PRO. S.P. 63/371/99.

[25] Sunderland to King, 16/10/14, Lyons 1536; Addison to King, 8/10/14, *Addison Letters*, p.300.

While flattered to have had his role in this episode so publicly advertised, King had hoped that the successful resolution of the city affair might encourage the authorities to summon a parliament for Ireland immediately. This was because he considered it imperative that the 'gentlemen' of the country be given an early opportunity to declare their loyalty to the House of Hanover. His insistence that an Irish parliament would show a 'zeal for the loyal Constitution both in Church and State', if given the opportunity, had been reinforced by the ease with which the transfer of power to the new regime had been achieved.[26] The conduct of the previous parliament, when the members 'showed no ill precedent though under so many disadvantages', convinced him that an entirely loyal parliament was assured. On that occasion, in spite of the opposition of the government and its supporters who, by their 'artifices of all sort, by threats, persuasions, force and riots' had done their best to intimidate them, the gentlemen of Ireland had stood their ground 'and ventured all rather than comply with measures that had an ill aspect on the succession.....' If nothing else this indicated the 'temper of the nation,' and justified the country's claim to an early election. With the Tories now on the defensive he was convinced that if his Majesty should 'please to call a parliament' then he was guaranteed 'one to his mind'. In these circumstances 'the distinction of Whig and Tory will sink,' he predicted optimistically, 'and it will come to plain Jacobite and Georgian.' The only practical problem which a parliament might face was determining where the money for supply could be raised.[27]

---

[26] King to Mountjoy, 7/10/14, TCD Ms. 2536/95-6; King to Molyneux, 8/6/14, TCD Ms. 2532/296-7; King to Bishop of Lincoln, 9/12/14, TCD Ms. 2536/142-3; King to Sunderland, 25/11/14, TCD Ms. 2536/127; King to Nicolson, 9/12/14, TCD Ms. 2536/142-3.

[27] King to Bishop of Lincoln, 9/12/14, TCD Ms. 2536/142-3; King to Southwell,

While it was primarily with a view to obtaining a declaration of loyalty to George that he most desired a parliament, King had other reasons for pressing the case for its early convening. In particular, unwilling to forgive Phipps, who he blamed for the turmoil of the previous few years, he hoped to see the former Lord Chancellor censured by the members. Indeed, only his position as Lord Justice prevented him from writing to the king to inform him of the 'grievances suffered' by the kingdom under Phipps. He was confident, however, that a new parliament would give full vent to such sentiments. He was delighted to hear that several gentlemen had already undertaken to introduce a charge against Phipps and his supporters of their being 'guilty of a *praemunire* in usurping an illegal authority and judicial power'. He was also fully aware that an early election was feared by those he wished to humiliate for that very reason:

> 'Those engaged in the late ministry are afraid of an after reckoning which they do not fear immediately from His Majesty but from a parliament. They think themselves secure from a Tory parliament but dread the inquisition of a Whiggish one and therefore [it was] no wonder that they stick at nothing to get in their friends. 'Tis for their necks they struggle and such a motive will make the most lazy industrious.'

Since 'Sir Constantine's party give up their hopes as to a majority', and all they could expect was 'to give disturbance', his Majesty could not possibly hope for more favourable circumstances in which to summon his loyal Irish subjects to meet.[28]

Such sentiments carried little weight with a ministry more concerned

---

25/11/14, TCD Ms. 2536/127; King to Nicolson, 24/3/15, TCD Ms. 2536/222-3; Cox to Southwell, 1/10/14, B.L. Add. Ms. 38157(ii)/129; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 14/12/14, Midleton Mss. 3/205.

[28] King to Molesworth, 12/3/15, TCD Ms. 2536/205-6; King to Samuel Molyneux, 25/1/15, TCD Ms. 2536/178-9; King to Lord Merrion, 24/11/14, TCD Ms. 2536/120-1.

with securing its own position in England and it was soon confirmed that while a parliament was to be called in England, there would be none as yet for Ireland. It seemed to King a missed opportunity: if only Ireland could 'have had a parliament to sit before yours in Great Britain we should have given a good specimen of his Majesty's government.'[29]

The transformation in King's fortunes over the previous few weeks had been remarkable. Having only one month previously been vilified at Council meetings, he now found himself the chief representative of the government in Ireland. With both the Earl of Kildare and Archbishop Vesey either ill or unwilling to share the administrative burden, it marked the commencement of a Lord Justiceship of an uniquely personal nature. Appreciating that King's ability allowed him to concentrate on the political situation in England, Sunderland was, in turn, quite happy to allow him a relatively free hand. As a result, King found that, unusually for a native Lord Justice, he had a measure of executive independence. This he guarded jealously. Within a short while official communication between the executive in Dublin and the ministry in London had become an almost personal correspondence between King and Sunderland from which Kildare, Vesey and government secretaries were excluded.[30]

---

[29] Southwell to King, 1/2/15, Lyons 1577; King to Story, 25/1/15, TCD Ms. 2536/177; Molesworth to King, 28/9/14, Lyons 1524.

[30] Stanley to Dawson, 23/9/14, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/143/2195; Hayton, *Ireland and the English Ministers*, pp.201-4. Between September 1714 and September 1715 King wrote at least 27 personal letters to Sunderland, quite apart from the official correspondence which he signed as Lord Justice. These letters dealt almost exclusively with matters of state and church appointments. See also Addison to King, 2/7/15, Lyons 1669.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE Library CORK

King did not assume these responsibilities lightly. An experienced politician, he was well aware of the dangers inherent in a system which did not easily distinguish between public and private roles. As the chief representative of the ministry he now attracted the attention of many of those who had designs on advancement. In the first six months alone he was approached by at least 250 individuals seeking preferment. Apart altogether from the fact that the ultimate right to dispose of offices resided in the Lord Lieutenant, he was aware that he was now 'in a new world' in which he admitted to being,

> 'hard put to it to take proper measures that I may justify myself, that I act the honest and safe part. I believe the less I meddle it is the better. Perhaps time will give me more confidence when I come to know those with whom I have to do better.'[31]

In any case, Sunderland had already set out the credentials required for advancement: 'All the persons that had acted irregularly in the great affair of the City of Dublin are left out,' he had informed King bluntly, 'and several others of the greatest note and fortune in the Kingdom are put in.'[32]

But while King was reluctant to involve himself too forcefully in matters of public patronage, he showed no reticence with regard to church appointments. He was now 'in a better capacity' to influence such decisions and he intended to exploit it to the full. Acting on Molesworth's intimation that church positions would be filled only with 'such worthy men as the Archbishop of Canterbury's recommendation and your Grace's approbation shall determine upon', he wrote to Sunderland proposing various changes which he thought

---

[31] King to Crow, 23/2/15, TCD Ms. 2536/193-4; King to Southwell, 25/11/14, TCD Ms. 2536/127; King to Mr. Jemmett, 7/12/14, TCD Ms. 2536/138-9; King to Charles Trimmer, Bishop of Norwich, 11/12/14, TCD Ms. 2536/152-3.

[32] Sunderland to King, 1/10/14, Lyons 1526; Sir John Stanley to [King], 17/9/14, Lyons 1520; King to Alan Brodrick, 3/5/15, TCD Ms. 2536/262; Lords Justices of Ireland to Stanhope, 15/10/14, PRO. S.P. 63/371/101. Amongst those re-instated were: Alan Brodrick (Lord Chancellor), and John Forster, (Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas): McNally, 'The Hanoverian Accession', pp.268-275.

would benefit the church. To his surprise, the Earl responded by thanking him for his advice, acquiescing in several of his suggestions and requesting that he send a further list of vacant benefices together with his 'thoughts' on any preferred candidates. King was delighted and looked forward to a period of considerable influence: 'By the character my Lord has of probity, sense, sincerity and honour,' he declared cheerfully, he was confident there could be 'no difference in our principles or designs.'[33]

As ever, one of his priorities was to ensure that the church and its ministers were fully reconciled to the new regime. Indeed, the huge political changes of recent months, coupled with the fact that the Dissenters had been unequivocal in their support of both the new ministry and the Hanoverians, made such an accommodation more compelling, he felt, than at any time since the Revolution. The fact that a delegation of Presbyterians headed by Boyse was already in London persuaded him that the church should not be 'behind hand' in giving the requisite 'assurance' of loyalty. But he took solace from his belief that neither George's 'inclination nor interest will lead him to favour our opposites'. He was 'well assured' that 'if the church be hearty' in the king's interest, 'he will prove so in ours.' 'If we consider that his Majesty is a wise king,' he told one churchman,

> 'and the interest he has in the church, and what a jewel the supremacy is in his crown, 'twill be his interest as well as inclination to support it, and to me 'tis not only ridiculous but wicked to suspect, much more suggest any thing to the contrary. I am sure we can't lose so much ground as we have these last four years and have gained none.'[34]

---

[33] King to Stearne, 10/9/14, TCD Ms. 2536/56-7; Molesworth to King, 28/9/14, Lyons 1524; King to Sunderland, 9/10/14, TCD Ms. 750/4/2/7; Same to Same, 29/10/14, TCD Ms. 750/4/2/10; Sunderland to King, 16/10/14, Lyons 1536; Molesworth to King, 28/9/14, Lyons 1524; Addison to King, 12/3/15, Lyons 1595; Swift to Walls, 5/5/15, Swift Corr., ii, p.169; King to Col. Edgworth, 30/11/14, TCD Ms. 2536/132; Addison to King, 8/10/14, *Addison Letters*, p.300.

[34] King to Crow, 14/8/14, TCD Ms. 2536/18; Same to Same, 30/10/14, TCD Ms.

But, while he might express the hope that churchmen would not 'provoke him [George] to look at' the Dissenters, King was well aware that the political doctrines of pre-Revolutionary Anglicanism had not been entirely discarded and that tensions within the church on the question of the succession could easily be exploited. His main fear was that the church, headed by bishops, 'most' of whom had been 'very zealous for the late [Tory] ministry', might be manoeuvred into a compromising political position, as had been the case in England where the cry of 'the Church in Danger' had been seized upon by the Tory faction as a means of rallying its members. While those who might incline towards such a position were all 'against the Pretender', he explained, anxiously, to Lord Mountjoy,

> 'they pretend the danger of the church is so great that they must stand in her defence whatever it cost them and make such a party that being the majority the King may be obliged to turn out the Whigs and take them again into the Ministry and employments.'[35]

He was especially worried lest a lower clergy which had historically supported the Tories - their 'common cause' being that 'the Tories loved clergymen but the Whigs hated them..... [and] were lo[o]se in their religion, were Deists or as bad.....' - allowed themselves to be manipulated in this fashion. If this happened, then he feared a repetition of the situation under Phipps where the gentry had been 'much irritated and soured' by clerics who had

> 'set themselves against the gentlemen, traversed them in their elections, endeavoured to turn them out of their own boroughs,

---

2536/99-100; King to Bishop of Lincoln, 26/3/15, TCD Ms. 2536/226; King to Foley, 10/8/14, TCD Ms. 2536/10-11; King to Stanhope, 5/11/15, PRO. S.P. 63/373/209.

[35] King to Crow, 30/10/14, TCD Ms. 2536/99; Swift to Bolingbroke, 7/8/14, Swift Corr., ii, pp.111-2; Samuel Molyneux to King, 23/9/14, Lyons 1522; King to Jenkins, 17/8/14, TCD Ms. 2536/26; King to Mountjoy, 24/11/14, TCD Ms. 2536/121-3; Cox to Southwell, 10/9/14, B.L. Add. Ms. 38157(ii)/119; King to Stanhope, 5/11/15, PRO. S.P. 63/373/209-11.

and in their Convocation opposed the votes of the H[ouse] of Commons by contrary votes'.

For this reason he knew that, in reassuring the new regime of the loyalty of the church, '[m]uch will depend on the clergy's behaviour' towards the new king. He could only pray that they would 'prove hearty and cordial in their allegiance to him and not provoke him as some of them did King William which proved of ill consequence to the church.'[36]

It was soon obvious, however, that 'with all possible industry and artifice' on the part of the Tories, many clergymen had been 'riveted in a persuasion that there was a design to overthrow the Constitution of our church'. They were being told, he was informed, that the king intended to 'set up presbytery'. When political leaders such as Brodrick began to complain of church sermons critical of the king's religion and 'Pulpits [that] run very high', he moved immediately to defuse the situation. A Rev. Kearns, who had 'preached against Lutheranism..... and endeavoured to make it as bad if not worse than Popery,' was warned not to meddle in political matters again. So too were two clergymen from another diocese that he felt 'forced to admonish' for similar reasons. Summoning several of his own clergy to St. Sepulchre's, he 'gave them my advice in as mild and friendly a way as I could'. They had adopted 'a strange policy,' he told them, and it was 'a very awkward way of gaining the king'. 'Suppose they got him out [of] his throne', he enquired, '[t]hen the Pretender must come in, and there's an end of our laws and liberty and the public profession of our religion.....' To those who justified their

[36] King to Bishop of Lincoln, 26/3/15, TCD Ms. 2536/226; King to Crow, 14/8/14, TCD Ms. 2536/18; Same to Same, 30/10/14, TCD Ms. 2536/99-100; King to Foley, 10/8/14, TCD Ms. 2536/10-11; King to Stanhope, 5/11/15, PRO. S.P. 63/373/209; P. McNally, 'The Hanoverian Accession', pp.296-7; idem., "Irish and English Interests': national conflict within the Church of Ireland episcopate in the reign of George I', [hereafter: 'Irish and English Interests', *IHS*, 29, 1995, pp.295-331; King to Charlett, 20/4/15, TCD Ms. 2536/243-5.

actions as intended to secure the church establishment from the threat posed by a Lutheran monarch, he countered that if 'anything endangered it, it would be their unreasonable and imprudent behaviour'. 'I wish ..... the clergy would consider whose work they have been adoing these last years', he wrote wearily to Dean Mossom, having heard of several more sermons espousing the doctrine of Passive Obedience,

> 'and come into such measures as to convince the world that they are hearty in their affection to the king, which can never be done whilst they shelter, cover and herd with the enemies of his person, government and title.'[37]

[37] King to Nicolson, 16/9/15, TCD Ms. 2533/84-5; King to Mossom, 10/9/15, TCD Ms. 2533/79-80; King to Stearne, 26/8/14, TCD Ms. 2536/39-40; Same to Same, 5/10/15, TCD Ms. 2533/97; King to Bishop of Lincoln, 26/3/15, TCD Ms. 2536/226; King to Rev. Robert Howard, 12/7/15, TCD Ms. 2533/9-10; Swift to Chetwode, 3/1/15, Swift Corr., ii, p.155; King to Crow, 20/11/14, TCD Ms. 2536/114-5; Hamilton to King, 21/7/15, Lyons 1678; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 24/2/15, Midleton Mss. 3/217-8.

The opportunity for not only Anglican clergymen, but the entire political nation, to prove themselves 'hearty in their affection to the king' soon arose, although not in the form in which King had hoped. Reports of Jacobite activity in France and Scotland earlier in the year had been a reminder that the Protestant succession had not been irrevocably secured. Pleading with the English to show a little more sensitivity to Anglo-Irish concerns on this point, King had explained to the bishop of Carlisle why his countrymen appeared a little 'too zealous against' the Pretender:

> '..... we are nearer of the Pretender than you in Great Britain and have much more [to fear] from Popery than you ever did and so may be allowed to be sooner, and more, apprehensive. We have four Papists, I believe, for one Protestant in the kingdom. They are exasperated against us, not only on account of their religion, but for our estates which we hold by their forfeitures and they still claim them. You may lose your liberties and religion, but we must lose our estates also if he come in. Methinks, therefore, people should judge charitably of us.....'[38]

Imbued with such fears, the possibility of an invasion had occupied the minds of most Protestants in Ireland since the early months of 1714. Many expected that the Pretender would move before the Hanoverians had an opportunity to consolidate their position. However, Anne's sudden demise had been 'ill-timed' as far as Jacobites were concerned.[39]

---

[38] Maxwell to King, 12/7/14, Lyons 1495; J.H. and M Shennan. *op. cit.*, pp.269-70; King to Nicolson 20/4/14, TCD Ms. 2532/268-9.

[39] Cox to Southwell, 2/2/14, B.L. Add. Ms. 38157(ii)/63; King to Molyneux, 17/6/14, TCD Ms. 750/4/1/303-5; Kilmore to Wake, 12/1/15, Wake Mss. Epistolatory, 12, Bodleian Library, Oxford, [hereafter: Wake Mss. 12]; Bolingbroke to Lords Justices of Ireland, 15/6/14, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/2130; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 15/6/14, Midleton Mss. 3/185; King to Story, 10/8/14, TCD Ms. 2536/12; Cox to Southwell, 14/8/14, B.L. Add. Ms. 38157(ii)/108.

King's relief that the Protestant succession had been secured was tempered by a conviction that an attempt would be made at some stage by the Pretender to land in Ireland. This sense of impending crisis was heightened by lingering doubts as to the true loyalties of those amongst the establishment who, he believed, still harboured Tory sympathies. In the wake of his experiences with Phipps and his supporters, he remained deeply suspicious of Tory protestations that they were 'all here against the pretender.' This sense of unease was intensified by the numerical superiority of the Catholics: 'We have 6 Papists at least for one Protestant and are divided amongst ourselves', he pointed out to Dr. Charlett, explaining the real basis of Protestant unease. The fact that at present the Catholics were so 'poor, dispirited and unarmed' that they posed little immediate danger, gave no excuse for complacency. Nevertheless, King was at pains to point out, the kingdom remained peaceful:

> 'I find on diligent search in Dublin that there was no riots in it at all..... none that were for the Pretender, no encouragers of Papists, no disparagers of King William, none that represented the House of Hanover as Presbyterians, no preachers of hereditary right, no friends to France..... in short nothing of what such querulous, jealous people as you and I used to complain of. Those were all Whiggish lies.'[40]

Whiggish lies or not, such sanguine reports could not disguise the fact that recruitment for the Pretender's cause was more widespread than King was informing his masters in London. During December the government had been forced to issue orders for the arrest and trial of anyone suspected of treasonable activity and executions of Jacobite agents had begun. 'Seditious pamphlets' in support of the Pretender also circulated openly in Dublin, while

---

[40] King to Mountjoy, 24/11/14, TCD Ms. 2536/121-3; King to Charlett, 18/12/14, TCD Ms. 2536/155-6; King to Mountjoy, 24/11/14, TCD Ms. 2536/121-3; King to Nicolson 6/7/15, TCD Ms. 2533/3-4; Same to Same, 16/9/15, TCD Ms. 2533/84-5; King to Ashe, 14/12/14, TCD Ms. 2536/149-151; King to Purcell, 14/1/15, TCD Ms. 2536/171-2; King to Sunderland, 7/12/14, PRO. S.P. 63/371/121.

news from London that Bolingbroke had fled to France to escape impeachment led to a marked increase in tensions: 'Things are come to such a crisis,' King was eventually forced to admit, 'that such as are real Jacobites must now speak out or forever hold their peace.....' Nevertheless, he was confident that, if only for pragmatic reasons, those who ultimately expressed support for the Stuarts would be few:

> 'I can't see that many of our Tories here are in their hearts for the Pretender, Our case is different from yours..... not only our Religion and liberty, but estates depend on the Revolution ..... This obliged us to struggle with so much vigour against the late ministry and will ever tie us inviolably to his Majesty's interest. Several were seduced by fair pretences to join with our late managers but few of estates and yet fewer with any prospect to the Pretender and therefore they were forced to make use of new converts and persons that were always suspected as corrupt in their hearts.'[41]

This assessment was soon shown to be rather naïve, the fact that some of the earliest public displays of Jacobite sympathies occurred at Trinity College proving particularly embarrassing. In an obvious show of contempt for the Hanoverians, some students there celebrated with great gusto the birthday of their former Chancellor, the Duke of Ormonde, who had by now joined Bolingbroke in France. Coupled with the various clerical outbursts of previous months, demonstrations such as these were seized upon by enemies of the church as further evidence of disloyalty within its ranks.[42] When reports of

---

[41] King to Purcell, 14/1/15, TCD Ms. 2536/171-2; King to Sunderland, 7/12/14, PRO. S.P. 63/371/121; King to Annesley, 14/4/15, TCD Ms. 2536/240-1; Lords Justices to Stanhope, 10/5/15, PRO. S.P. 63/372/41; Hamilton to King, 26/2/15, Lyons 1588; King to Wake, 2/8/15, TCD Ms. 2533/42-3.

[42] King to Nicolson, 6/7/15, TCD Ms. 2533/3-4; Swift to Chetwode, 28/6/15, Swift Corr., ii, p.174-5; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 17/1/15, Midleton Mss. 3/211; King to Fitzwilliam, 6/7/15, TCD Ms. 2533/4-5; Stearne to King, 23/5/15, Lyons 1644; Same to Same, 25/6/15, Lyons 1666; King to Howard, 7/5/15, TCD Ms. 2536/270; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 24/5/15, Midleton Mss. 3/246; Same to Same, 30/5/15, Midleton Mss. 3/248.

other students condemning King William and Queen Anne as 'usurpers' were followed by a request from the Lord Lieutenant for a full account of events, King was quick to appreciate the potential for damage. He moved quickly to address the situation. Writing to the Rev. Robert Howard, a fellow of the College, he complained of the 'spirit of Jacobitism' that had 'got in amongst several of them', lamenting the fact that 'the discipline of the College has been mightily relaxed'. Convinced that 'the corruption is from the head', he ordered the Provost, on pain of removal, to bring the fellows and students to order. Preoccupied by his duties as Lord Justice, however, he was unable to give this the attention it needed, delegating the task to John Stearne, Bishop of Dromore. In the meantime he was left to bemoan the effect which that 'nest of Jacobites' crawling with its 'pestilent members' was having on the morale of the kingdom at so critical a moment.[43]

While he remained alert to the possibility of a Jacobite landing in Ireland, however, King does not appear to have been entirely convinced that the danger was immediate. During April and May, for example, he had sufficient time to supervise the construction of an observatory in the grounds of St. Sepulchre's and to spend several nights observing an eclipse, recording various astronomical measurements in the process which he then circulated to some of his associates. However, the announcement in July that an invasion was definitely intended forced him to turn his attention to the security of the island with some urgency.[44] But, the organisation of the defences was

---

[43] Delafaye to King, 21/5/15, Lyons 1643; Same to Same, 9/6/15, Lyons 1659; Stearne to King, 23/5/15, Lyons 1644; Same to Same, 25/6/15, Lyons 1666; King to Howard, 27/5/15, TCD Ms. 2536/299-300; Same to Same, 12/7/15, TCD Ms. 2533/9-10; Budgell to Addison, 30/5/15, PRO. S.P. 63/372/109; See also King to Nicolson, 6/7/15, TCD Ms. 2533/3-4, where King was quick to point out that similar disturbances were evident at Oxford.

[44] King to Ashe, 7/5/15, TCD Ms. 2536/269-70; King to Molyneux, 21/5/15, TCD Ms. 2536/289; Wake to King, 28/7/15, Lyons 1687; King to Lord Chief Justice Whitshed, 28/7/15, TCD Ms. 2533/33; King to Annesley, 27/4/14, TCD Ms. 750/4/1/270-1; Alan

complicated by the reluctance of the Lord Lieutenant to either travel to Ireland or to forward specific orders as to how matters should proceed. In the end, with little other than occasional indications from Sunderland that he approved his 'proceeding briskly and with vigour in these matters,' King was left to initiate and co-ordinate many of the arrangements himself.[45]

In the absence of detailed instructions he attempted to ensure that adequate precautions were taken to protect against both internal and external threats.[46] He was soon issuing orders to sheriffs in various parts of the country to ensure that civic and coastal defences were strengthened. Nor did he show any reticence about applying the terms of some of the anti-popery laws, signing a proclamation 'to disarm Papists and seize their serviceable horses according to law', or, (despite the memories of his own imprisonment under James which these events revived), in signing warrants for the arrest of suspected Jacobites. He also ordered that a full inventory of arms and ammunition throughout the kingdom be made. Meanwhile, to ensure that soldiers stationed in Dublin would not be transferred to England or Scotland, the Privy Council dispersed several regiments to different parts of country. All in all, the whole process kept King 'busily employed' for most of the summer of 1715: 'We are putting things here in as good a posture to defend ourselves as we can,' he told Molyneux:

'I hope the heartiness and zeal that appears everywhere even

Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 31/7/15, Midleton Mss. 3/252;

[45] Lords Justices of Ireland to Sunderland, 30/7/15, PRO. S.P. 63/373/21; Lords Justices of Ireland to Stanhope, 22/7/15, PRO. S.P. 63/373/19; Delafaye to King, 15/6/15, Lyons 1663; Same to Same, 9/6/15, Lyons 1659; Barber to Swift, 3/5/15, Swift Corr., ii, p.169.

[46] King to Fitzwilliam, 6/7/15, TCD Ms. 2533/4-5; King to Nicolson, 6/7/15, TCD Ms. 2533/3-4. The reference to his aversion to jailing people because of his own experiences in 1690 is in King to Annesley, 24/3/16, TCD Ms. 2533/158-9.

> amongst the generality of those called Tories will disappoint our enemies and dishearten them from going on with their prospect."[47]

The priority remained the arraying of the militia which King regarded as the 'best security' available,

> 'for we can't depend on the standing forces because we are sure if there be either a civil war in Great Britain or it be engaged in a foreign one most of these will be drawn away and we will be left naked.'

In July orders to array the militia were finally received. Anticipating such instructions, arrangements had already been made by the Privy Council. Lists of those gentlemen in the various counties who should be commissioned had been drawn up. A small irritation was the absence in Cork of Lord Chancellor Brodrick, who was required to seal the commissions. More disconcerting, however, was the insistence of some that Dissenters be commissioned whether they qualified under the Test clause or not.[48] King resolutely refused to countenance any relaxation of the law on this point. 'Though there are several that grumble, they will join unanimously to oppose [the Pretender]', he wrote confidently to England, while allowing them to be included in the commission would create a dangerous precedent.[49] Although by late August it appeared

---

[47] King to Addison, 30/7/15, TCD Ms. 750/4/2/60-1; King to Delafaye, 29/7/15, TCD Ms. 750/4/2/59-60; Lords Justices of Ireland to Sunderland, 30/7/15, PRO. S.P. 63/373/21; Same to Same, 30/7/15, PRO. S.P. 63/373/56; Alan Brodrick jnr. to Thomas Brodrick, 22/2/15, Midleton Mss. 3/215; King to Nicolson 30/7/15, TCD Ms. 2533/40-2; Southwell to Lords [Justices of Ireland], 31/1/15, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/142/2206; King to Samuel Molyneux, 30/9/15, TCD Ms. 2533/37-8.

[48] King to Samuel Molyneux, 30/9/15, TCD Ms. 2533/37-8; Delafaye to King, 21/7/15, Lyons 1680; Same to Same, 30/7/15, Lyons 1690; King to Flower, 6/8/15, TCD Ms. 2533/44; King to Synge, 6/8/15, TCD Ms. 2533/46; King to Addison, 30/7/15, TCD Ms. 750/4/2/60-1; Stearne to King, 12/9/15, Lyons 1713; Conolly to _____, 9/8/15, PRO. S.P. 63/373/70; Arthur Maxwell, Edward Price and John Harvey to Conolly, 6/8/15, PRO. S.P. 63/373/72; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 5/8/15, Midleton Mss. 3/254; J. Griffin, *Parliamentary Politics in Ireland during the reign of George I*, [hereafter: *Parliamentary Politics*], unpublished M.A., NUI, 1977.

[49] King to Charlett, 20/4/15, TCD Ms. 2536/243; Hamilton to King, 9/8/15, Lyons 1700; King to Bishop of Lincoln, 16/9/15, TCD Ms. 2533/87; King to Molyneux, 8/6/14,

that the immediate threat of invasion had receded, King was determined to ensure that 'the present establishment of the militia ..... continue[d] for some time'. Ireland, in his opinion, had 'great reason to be ready always for our enemy is at our door'.[50]

The Jacobite uprising in Scotland in September brought renewed dread to Ireland. Reports of enemy ships off Achill were taken seriously and interpreted by some as proof that invasion was imminent. With the collapse of the rebellion in Scotland, however, tensions subsided. But King counselled continued diligence. Although he was confident that no immediate danger existed, he remained of the opinion that an invasion would occur at some stage: 'I believe and am persuaded', he told the Bishop of Carlisle, that:

> 'whenever the Pretender makes his attempt 'twill be to the confusion of him and his adherents. But that such an attempt he will make, I make no manner of doubt in my own mind. Nor are we like to have any quiet till he do it for the minds of parties are so exasperated that till they try their strength neither will submit.'[51]

In the meantime, conscious of the suspicions which the city affair and events in Trinity College had aroused, King was intent on publicising the relative 'quietness' which had been evident in Ireland during the recent scare. All in all he was cheered by 'the heartiness and zeal that appears everywhere' amongst all Protestants. He was particularly encouraged by the fact that few

---

TCD Ms. 2532/296-7; King to Nicolson, 16/9/15, TCD Ms. 2533/84-5; Stearne to King, 12/9/15, Lyons 1723; Lords Justices of Ireland to Sunderland, 25/8/15, PRO. S.P. 63/373/62; King to Nicolson 16/9/15, TCD Ms. 2533/84; Thomas Dawson to King, 17/9/15, Lyons 1725.

[50] King to Thomas Knox, 18/8/15, TCD Ms. 2533/57-8; Lords Justices of Ireland to Stanhope, 5/10/15, PRO. S.P. 63/373/144; King to Ashe, 18/8/15, TCD Ms. 2533/58-9; Stearne to King, 27/8/15, Lyons 1713.

[51] King to Nicolson 16/9/15, TCD Ms. 2533/84-5; King to Bishop of Lincoln, 16/9/15, TCD Ms. 2533/85-7; Lords Justice of Ireland to Stanhope, 13/9/15, PRO. S.P. 63/373/96; King to Colonel Chidleigh Coote, 1/9/15, TCD Ms. 2533/74; Vigors to King, 3/9/15, Lyons 1718.

Tories had appeared 'in their hearts for the Pretender.' If nothing else the emergency had forced crypto-Jacobites to declare themselves. And those few that had declared for the Pretender seemed inspired only by greed: 'the King's turning them out of the ministry and places has turned their heart and nature has rebelled against principle', he explained,

> '.....they are resolved to be ministers and be employed and if the king at present think it not safe to trust them, they will try whether the Pretender will. And thus all their passive obedience and non-resistance is come to this..... that it is due to them whilst in power and to the king whilst when [sic] he employs them and acts by their measures, but not to [sic] from them to anybody, no not to the king.'[52]

There was also the fact, as King took great pleasure in pointing out, that while several distinguished peers had fled to France from England, Irish Protestants, 'though divided', had proven themselves uniformly 'hearty against the Pretender.' In several letters to England he was unable to resist contrasting the continued calm in Ireland with the defections and ensuing turmoil in Scotland and parts of England.[53]

While the immediate threat of an invasion had been averted, the cost of securing the kingdom had placed a considerable strain on the treasury. The need to renew supply meant that parliament would have to be convened. In the

---

[52] King to Molyneux, 30/7/15, TCD Ms. 2533/37-8; King to Purcell, 14/1/15, TCD Ms. 2536/172; King to Dean Mossom, 10/9/15, TCD Ms. 2533/79-80; Same to Same, 1/9/15, TCD Ms. 2533/22-3; King to Nicolson, 2/8/15, TCD Ms. 2533/42-3; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 17/3/14, Midleton Mss. 3/221.

[53] King to Bishop of Lincoln, 16/9/15, TCD Ms. 2533/85-7; Same to Same, 2/8/15, TCD Ms. 2533/42-3; King to Nicolson, 16/9/15, TCD Ms. 2533/84; Swift to Chetwode, 2/8/15, Swift Corr., ii, p.183; Lords Justices of Ireland to Stanhope, 13/9/15, PRO. S.P. 63/373/96.

autumn of 1715, therefore, it was decided that one would be summoned to meet later that year, to be preceded by elections. Anticipating such a development, King had attempted to take full advantage of his position by making some tentative suggestions as to the legislative programme, informing Sunderland as early as May that bills were available 'to open the parliament here when it shall please his Majesty to call one.' With the Jacobite threat in mind, and hoping to pre-empt any potentially contentious legislation, he had argued that members should be allowed a quiet, non-contentious programme. In such an event the loyalty of the country to the king could be clearly articulated, and the animosity between Whig and Tory purged. For this reason he attempted to contrive a situation in which matters likely to cause tension would not form part of the government's agenda. In particular, in spite of the fact that the ministry had shown its partiality by renewing the *Regium Donum,* he hoped to dissuade Sunderland from pursuing a repeal of the Test clause. Thus, while the Council intended to forward several bills to London for approval, King was ensuring that 'for good reason they are of little importance'. In spite of anticipated government pressure, he remained 'persuaded,' he told Lord Fitzwilliam, that,

> 'the parliament here will not think fit to innovate anything in the act of uniformity, nor can I think it for his Majesty's or any Lord Lieutenant's service that anything of that nature should be moved."[54]

Once a parliament had been called King knew that his tenure as Lord Justice would end as the ministry in London would require that the session be presided over by an English governor. Rumour had been rife for some time

---

[54] King to Delafaye, 19/5/15, TCD Ms. 2536/287-8; King to Stearne, 3/5/15, TCD Ms. 2536/263-4; King to Fitzwilliam, 6/7/15, TCD Ms. 2533/4-5; Same to Same, 12/2/15, TCD Ms. 2536/184; Lords Justices of Ireland to Stanhope, 7/10/15, PRO. S.P. 63/373/148-9; Beckett, *Dissent*, pp.65-71.

that Sunderland would not come over to Ireland. King was disappointed at this. He had developed a good working relationship with the Lord Lieutenant and believed that 'nothing could be more cross to the humour of the kingdom or his Majesty's affairs' than having him replaced. In fact, considering the many appointments which Sunderland had made, he reckoned it 'impossible a stranger or strangers coming in should be able to manage a parliament'. Nevertheless, it was soon confirmed that the Lord Lieutenant could not be persuaded to leave London.[55] In the uncertainty which followed various possibilities presented themselves. There were even suggestions that King might be retained in the commission and joined by two Lord Deputies from England. This option was not pursued, however, and in the last week of August Addison wrote to inform him that his Majesty had been 'pleased..... to declare the Duke of Grafton and Lord Galway, Lords Justices of Ireland.' They were not expected to arrive in Ireland, however, until just prior to the opening of parliament. In the meantime, King and his fellow Lords Justice were expected to proceed with the necessary preparations.[56]

Despite a keenly-developed appetite for power, King claimed to be neither surprised nor resentful at his removal from the executive. 'It was never designed that I should continue in the government', he informed Stearne,

> 'nor am I desirous of it..... nor will I ever desire to be in it again and am pretty sure I shall not on the terms on which I have

---

[55] King to Samuel Molyneux, 12/2/15, TCD Ms. 2536/186-7; Addison to King, 19/2/15, Lyons 1584; Same to Same, 12/3/15, Lyons 1595; Same to Same, 29/3/15, Lyons 1606; Same to Same, 2/7/15, Lyons 1659; King to Fitzwilliam, 6/7/15, TCD Ms. 2533/4-5; Delafaye to King, 5/4/15, Lyons 1613; Hamilton to King, 21/7/15, Lyons 1678; Hume to King, 26/7/15, Lyons 1686.

[56] Hamilton to King, 25/8/15, Lyons 1709; Same to Same, 27/8/15, Lyons 1712; Addison to King, 13/8/15, Lyons 1702; Same to Same, 25/8/15, Lyons 1708; Southwell to King, 27/8/15, Lyons 1711; Delafaye to King, 6/9/15, Lyons 1719; Budgell to _____, 13/9/15, PRO. S.P. 63/373/140; Lords Justices of Ireland to Stanhope, 7/10/15, PRO. S.P. 63/373/148-9; Galway to Stanhope, 21/10/15, PRO. S.P. 63/373/189;

> been. Nor did anything induce me to accept it then, but the necessity of the Kingdom. Nor I believe had I been thought of but because there was no one else besides the Earl of Kildare and I am on the place to accept it.'

He wrote to Molyneux of his relief at the ending of his governorship and of being 'eased of..... an employment that, in the circumstances in which we were, was very uneasy to me.....'[57]

Whatever about any unease he may have felt, he was at pains to stress that his term as Lord Justice had proven remarkably successful, with the city affair successfully resolved and, in spite of the lack of an additional supply during the year, the debts of the kingdom 'not much greater' than they had been at 'our coming to the government.' Preparations for the forthcoming parliament were also well advanced. But perhaps most importantly for King, the kingdom had been delivered 'in peace'. Indeed, it was a measure of his success that even Brodrick felt obliged to compliment his stewardship: 'You ought to be commended for your loyalty,' he told him in an unsolicited expression of approval that would not survive King's performance in the forthcoming parliament.[58] Sunderland's former secretary Joseph Addison, with whom King had had considerable dealings, concurred:

> 'I cannot dispense myself from repeating my humble thanks to Your Grace for the many favours you have been pleased to show me during the short continuance of my secretaryship. I ..... cannot forbear taking all opportunities of expressing my sentiments here of the obligations His Majesty has to your Grace for the services you rendered him before and since His accession to the throne.'

---

[57] King to Molyneux, 9/7/16, TCD Ms. 2533/266; Same to Same, 3/11/15, TCD Ms. 2533/115-7; King to Stanhope, 1/11/15, TCD Ms. 2533/110-1; King to Stearne, 5/10/15, TCD Ms. 2533/97-8.

[58] King to Molyneux, 3/11/15, TCD Ms. 2533/115-7; King to Stanhope, 1/11/15, PRO. S.P. 63/373/203; King to Stearne, 5/10/15, TCD Ms. 2533/97-8. Because the parliament of 1713 had granted only limited additional duties, a deficit of over £136,000 had accumulated.

Even more pleasing to King was the fact that several others wrote to indicate that both the Lord Lieutenant and the king himself had remarked favourably upon the 'zeal' with which he had managed the kingdom over the previous year and that he was now held in high regard at St. James' Court.[59]

Only the Dublin official, Eustace Budgell, gave any hint that King may have been less than enamoured at his removal from office. The hapless secretary, charged with the much of the preparatory work for the parliament, had his task complicated by King's stubborn refusal to accept a series of instructions from Galway and Grafton on the rather spurious grounds that their commissions as Lords Justices had been incorrectly drawn up. Although this was quickly sorted out, Budgell was convinced that it derived from King's bitterness at his treatment. Indeed, King's behaviour over the following weeks seemed to confirm Budgell's view. Indignant at having to shoulder the responsibility of preparing for parliament while Galway and Grafton remained in England, he could not resist venting his annoyance at the lack of instructions from London regarding the election. As so often over previous months it was Stanhope who bore the brunt of his considerable anger: 'We are much at a loss', King informed him,

> 'having no particular directions whether we should issue the writs immediately or wait the coming of the new Justices who we supposed were fully instructed in the particulars relating to the parliament.'

In the event, the Council took it upon themselves to issue the writs, thinking it fit not to delay any longer.[60]

---

[59] Addison to King, 4/10/15, Lyons 1732; Delafaye to King, 9/6/15, Lyons 1659; Same to Same, 13/8/15, Lyons 1701; Hamilton to King, 27/8/15, Lyons 1712; Howard to King, 30/8/15, Lyons 1716.

[60] Budgell to _____, 13/9/15, PRO. S.P. 63/373/140; Galway to Stanhope, 21/10/15, PRO. S.P. 63/373/189.

Having been accused of Tory sympathies in the wake of the elections of 1713, King was careful not to be identified too closely with either faction on this occasion. Throughout the autumn of 1715, therefore, while canvassing was in progress, he confined himself to urging 'all Protestants that designed to preserve their religion', to be 'unanimous more particularly at this time when so violent a storm threatens us'. 'Whatever parties men have been engaged in formerly', he pleaded, "tis now time to lay aside all distinctions and join together for our common defence.' As results from various constituencies reached him he was delighted to report that the elections appeared to have 'gone on very easily.' The Dublin government was just as pleased: 'The elections are about two-thirds over', Delafaye wrote to London at one point, 'and go even better than expected, the Tories in most places giving up very tamely'. 'If the king's best friends had been to name the men', King concluded, having viewed the final returns,

> 'they could not have chosen persons more cordial or sincere in his interests and this from the free notion of the people themselves without any act or indirect means to influence them. This gives us a prospect of a happy and quiet session.'

In a final entreaty before leaving office, he urged the new Lords Justices to exercise discretion and moderation. This parliament would 'zealously serve his Majesty and the kingdom's true interest', he advised them, 'if not chained by imprudent or unreasonable management.' Only ineptitude on the part of the incoming governors could jeopardise 'this temper'. As for himself, he promised that 'whatever my endeavours can contribute to it shall not be wanting'. In the meantime, after the exertions of the previous fifteen months, he intended to do nothing more than 'mind my own business'.[61]

---

[61] King to General Pierce, 18/10/15, TCD Ms. 2533/108; King to Flower, 18/10/15, TCD Ms. 2533/107; Delafaye to [Pringle], 3/11/15, PRO. S.P. 63/373/207; Delafaye to Stanhope, 3/11/15, PRO. S.P. 63/373/207; King to Bishop of Lincoln, 2/11/15, TCD Ms. 2533/111-3; King to Stanhope, 1/11/15, TCD Ms. 2533/110-1; Same to Same, 5/11/15,

In fact, far from minding his own business, King had begun to involve himself deeply in the political manoeuvring which preceded parliament. Although protesting at the invidious position in which he had been placed by the appointment of Galway and Grafton, he was determined to use the interval prior to their arrival to influence the parliamentary agenda. In particular, he hoped to ensure that a repeal of the Test was not attempted. This involved advising the government in London on the bills and tactics which should be employed. He was alarmed to see that, of the three bills which had been forwarded to England for approval some time previously, only two, the Money Bill and that for the Recognition of his Majesty's title, had been returned.[62] With little over one month to go before parliament assembled, King wrote to advise Stanhope that this was likely to cause 'great uneasiness' in parliament. Each House would have to be given one bill for discussion, he explained, but it was unlikely that the Commons would accept being presented with the Money Bill as their first item of business. In addition, the Bill envisaged supply being passed before November 21. He considered it highly unlikely that both Houses could deal with the matter in the seven working days allocated. 'To prevent, therefore, all occasion of disobliging,' he arranged for the Money Bill to be returned to England, changing the date of commencement to December 1 'which will be no great loss to his Majesty but will secure the Bill and make everybody easy.' To solve the procedural difficulties the Council was also 'sending over some more bills..... against which we conceive there can be no exception'. 'All that is requested,' King added caustically, 'is that they be sent back in time.' Grateful for this advice, Galway and Grafton wrote to Stanhope

---

TCD Ms. 2533/118-120.

[62] King to Stanhope, 7/10/15, PRO. S.P. 63/373/148-9; Delafaye to King, 17/9/15, Lyons 1726; Hamilton to King, 6/8/15, Lyons 1694.

recommending that King's counsel be heeded and that the amended bill be returned to Dublin 'with all imaginable speed.'[63]

With the arrival of the new Lords Justices in November, King was relieved of his official duties. But, it was soon apparent that the strains of his period in the executive had taken their toll and, now approaching his sixty-sixth birthday, he was stricken almost immediately with a recurrence of his gout. On November 14, two days after parliament convened, he wrote to Annesley bemoaning the fact that he could 'not yet be there because laid up with the gout in both feet'. By January his condition had deteriorated considerably. He was confined to his chamber with a 'violent rheumatic pain' which, he noted indignantly, did not stop people from visiting and pestering him constantly. A slight remission did enable him to attend some sessions of parliament and several Council meetings during the early spring. But by late April his health had broken to such an extent that he longed to 'take the waters.' Having 'been confined with the gout and other ails for six months' and being 'still very ill,' he hoped for an early prorogation of the parliament which would allow him to travel to Bath.[64]

---

[63] King to Stanhope, 7/10/15, TCD Ms. 2533/99-102; Lords Justices of Ireland to Stanhope, 7/10/15, PRO. S.P. 63/373/148-9; King to Stanhope, 7/10/15, TCD Ms. 2533/99-102; King to Molyneux, 8/10/15, TCD Ms. 2533/106; Galway to Stanhope, 21/10/15, PRO. S.P. 63/373/189; Lords Justices of Ireland to Stanhope, 2/11/15, PRO. S.P. 63/373/205. Disillusioned with its conduct in the past, and aware that a Whig ministry was unlikely to allow it to be convened, King had not used his position to lobby for Convocation to be summoned at the same time as parliament: King to Stanhope, 5/11/15, PRO. S.P. 63/373/209; Galway and Grafton to _____, 8/10/15, PRO. S.P. 63/373/183.

[64] King to Annesley, 14/11/15, TCD Ms. 2533/122-3; King to Molyneux, 7/12/15, TCD Ms. 2533/125-6; Same to Same, 24/1/16, TCD Ms. 2533/128-9; Victory, *Colonial Nationalism in Ireland*, p.128. King only managed to attend parliament for one day, December 14, before the Christmas recess: LJI, ii, 14/12/15; King to Wake, 1/3/16, TCD Ms. 2533/148-9; King to Irvine, 26/4/16, TCD Ms. 2533/216.

Given that, amongst other things, the House of Lords was quickly embroiled in a battle with the government over the Test clause, the likelihood of an early prorogation was slight. King had hoped that the ministry might wait a while longer before attempting to 'innovate anything' in this matter. However, while preparing for the session it had been intimated to him that Conolly had extracted a promise of repeal from the government as part of his price for undertaking to manage parliament.[65] As King had anticipated, the pretext was to be that the arraying of the Militia in the north had been hampered by the disabilities placed on Dissenters by the Test. Having been responsible for the array, he had protested vehemently that this had most certainly not been the case:

> 'If it be objected that his Majesty can't well be without the assistance of his dissenting subjects in Ireland at this time, I answer: Firstly that there is no necessity he should be without them. Secondly that the farther assistance they could give him by means of this repeal would be very little and in no ways sufficient to balance the inconveniences and hazard that the repeal of the Test would bring with it..... the Test does not hinder private soldiers from serving..... All that they can gain by this suspension of the Test is to make way for some officers of their persuasions but it is plain all the experienced dissenting officers in the Kingdom are not sufficient to officer one regiment, all that have served in the army have already taken the Test.....'

But sentiments such as these carried little weight with a Whig ministry. King was not surprised, therefore, when he received news in his sick bed that the new Lords Justices had availed of their opening *Address* to encourage the members to use,

> 'all reasonable dispatch in your proceedings and such unanimity in your resolutions as may once more put an end to all other

---

[65] King to Fitzwilliam, 12/2/15, TCD Ms. 2536/184; Conolly to Lords Justices, 9/8/15, PRO. S.P. 63/373/70; Beckett, *Dissent*, pp.71-74, 120-121; *Memorial of Dissenters* [to Conolly], 6/8/15, PRO. S.P. 63/373/72; Griffin, *Parliamentary Politics*, pp.21-36.

distinctions in Ireland, but that of Protestant and Papist.'[66]

He did not, however, consider this to be an insurmountable threat. The members, particularly the Lords, were unlikely to initiate any legislation to this effect themselves. And, more importantly, Brodrick, had indicated his opposition to any such attempt. It was with a sense of dread, then, that he learned that the administration intended to append the amending clauses to the Bill for Preservation of the King's Person (or Bill of Recognition). This was the very bill which King had hoped would be used by the parliament to affirm the loyalty of the kingdom to the new monarch. The effect of this strategy, he knew, would be to place most members in a very delicate position, since to oppose it would be interpreted as disloyalty, while to support it would undermine the Test. It would be 'construed as artifice and resented as such', he protested, 'to have it put into a bill against which a man cannot vote without hazarding the censure of disaffection to His Majesty and his government.' It would make 'such as according to their consciences vote against the Bill (as it is like many will) .....liable to be represented as disaffected.' Furthermore, being 'a surprising shock to all Churchmen' and 'a trifle of no value' to the Dissenters, it promised to achieve little but the rekindling of party animosities which he had hoped had been eliminated in the wake of the recent election. In this context it might enable the Tories, and particularly the High Church faction, to resurrect their political ambitions by presenting themselves as the

---

[66] LJI, ii, 12/11/15; King to Ashe, 8/2/16, TCD Ms. 2533/133-136d; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 19/12/15, Midleton Mss. 3/280-4; Same to Same, 23/3/16, 10/12/15, Midleton Mss. 3/280; Conolly to Lords Justices, 9/8/15, PRO. S.P. 63/373/70; Synge to Wake, 14/2/16, Gilbert Ms. 28, p.47; W. Tisdall, *The Case of the Sacramental Test stated and argued*, Dublin, 1715.

champions of an embattled church.[67]

In fact, it eventually transpired that the relief being proposed was quite limited in scope and did not involve a repeal of the Test, but merely granted Dissenters three dispensations from its effects; indemnifying those who had served in the Militia from prosecution; permitting them to continue to serve; and, finally, enabling them to take commissions in the army for a ten year period. Even these, however, and particularly that allowing Dissenters to take commissions in the army, were unacceptable to King. In his opinion this not only afforded them access to the army, but provided a precedent which might be replicated with regard to the other public positions from which they were excluded. Furthermore, it raised the possibility of the disabilities imposed on Dissenters being dismantled piecemeal until the clause no longer had any effect.[68]

King's apprehension was justified in the context of the broader political considerations within which this episode was being played out. Acting on instructions from London, Grafton and Galway had enlisted Conolly as their principal manager in the Commons. This had alienated the powerful 'Cork Squadron' led by the Brodrick family. Although Alan Brodrick had been elevated to the peerage and now sat in the Lords as Lord Chancellor, he had expected a more tangible reward for his opposition to Phipps. He now found himself both alienated from the main body of his party, 'the Cork Squadron', by virtue of his ennoblement, and excluded from the fruits of government which

---

[67] Delafaye to [Pringle], 17/12/15, PRO. S.P. 63/373/336; Same to Same, 30/1/16, PRO. S.P. 63/374/59; King to Ashe, 8/2/16, TCD Ms. 2533/136d; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 20/3/16, Midleton Mss. 3/322; Synge to Wake, 14/2/16, Gilbert Ms. 28, p.47; Pocklington to Wake, 19/1/16, Wake Mss. 12; Synge to Wake, 23/1/16, Wake Mss. 12.

[68] Lords Justices of Ireland to Stanhope, 17/2/16, PRO. S.P. 63/374/105-6; Synge to Wake, 14/2/16, Gilbert Ms. 28, p.47; King to Wake, 24/3/16, TCD Ms. 2533/160; R.E. Burns, *Irish Parliamentary Politics in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. i, 1714-1730, Washington, 1989, pp.55-61.

followed from being a manager of the Commons or a Lord Justice. With Conolly having already produced a majority in the Commons in favour of a particularly onerous Money Bill, the government were happy to oblige him on the Test clause, however. As a result they allowed Heads of a bill of Recognition, which included clauses limiting the application of the Test, to be drawn up and presented by the Commons before the Christmas recess. But, believing that he had nothing to lose, Brodrick was determined to ensure that this was opposed in the Lords.[69]

While the Commons had, after some difficulty, produced Heads of a bill to the effect desired by Conolly and the government, the Lords were likely to prove far less congenial. There, the bishops, if supported by the small group loyal to Brodrick, could push the government close on any division. Their position was strengthened by the failure of the Lords Justices to secure their nominee, an Irishman, for the vacant bishopric of Meath. Instead, in what King would come to regard as a deliberate policy on the part of the ministry to place English Whigs in the better Irish bishoprics, John Evans, Bishop of Bangor was nominated to the position. This was 'no small mortification' to the Grafton and Galway, and was portrayed by the church party as evidence of the ministry's disapproval of the Lords Justices' policy towards the Dissenters, and by others as evidence that they were unable to secure rewards for their supporters.[70]

Encouraged by this development, King, in spite of being confined to his chamber, became even more involved in the opposition to the government's

---

[69] Lords Justices of Ireland to Stanhope, 23/11/15, PRO. S.P. 63/373/256; Same to Same, 13/12/15, PRO. S.P. 63/373/304; Delafaye to Pringle, 14/12/15, PRO. S.P. 63/373/306; Same to Same, 30/1/16, PRO. S.P. 63/374/59; Victory, *Colonial Nationalism in Ireland*, pp.127-8; Griffin, *Parliamentary Politics*, pp.25-30.

[70] Lords Justices of Ireland to Stanhope, 17/12/15, PRO. S.P. 63/373/308; Same to Same, 5/1/16, PRO. S.P. 63/374/11; Synge to Wake, 14/2/16, Gilbert Ms. 28 p.47; Grafton to Lord _____, 6/1/16, PRO. S.P. 63/374/12; Delafaye to Pringle, 8/1/16, PRO. S.P. 63/374/18.

policy. According to Synge, he wrote several letters to prominent politicians and churchmen in England warning of the dangers of allowing this measure to pass. He also received visits from as many of Conolly's supporters as possible and was encouraged to observe that, in many instances, their support for the Commons bill had been grudging:

> '..... it was in no ways their inclination to come into it and many of them had declared before that they were resolved not to meddle with the Test and still seem very cold..... towards it and I do not find that of themselves they would have thought of it, much less moved it. It is therefore worth consideration how this matter will be represented or where the odium of it will fall.[71]

King and his colleagues were keenly aware that in opposing any attenuation of the Test clause they would be voting against the bill of Recognition. Lest this be misinterpreted, they decided that it would be wise to introduce an *Address of Association* to the Lords. By this means the members would be able to make a hearty declaration of loyalty to the House of Hanover while at the same time opposing the bill. When the parliament reconvened in January a committee was immediately assigned this task. With the unanimous approval of those present the draft presented by this committee was passed on January 17. Too weak to attend the House, King requested that it be brought to his palace where he might add his signature.[72]

The approval of this *Address* in the Lords coincided with a general disimprovement in the temper of both houses. In the Commons the government found itself confronting an increasingly hostile membership. The Cork Squadron, in particular, was causing difficulties, continuing to protest

---

[71] Synge to Wake, 14/2/16, Gilbert Coll. Ms. 28, p.47; King to Wake, 24/3/16, TCD Ms. 2533/160; Same to Same, 5/6/16, TCD Ms. 2533/248; Conolly to Lords Justices, 9/8/15, PRO. S.P. 63/373/70; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 23/3/16, Midleton Mss. 3/332.

[72] LJI, ii, 17/1/16; *Address of Association*, January, 1717, PRO. S.P. 63/374/6; Synge to Wake, 23/1/16, Gilbert Ms. 28, p.28-9.

about pension provisions in the Money bill and also at the fact that a Tillage bill had not been returned from England. In the Lords attentions focused still on the Test clause. Unable to debate the Commons bill, as it had not yet been forwarded to England for the approval of the Privy Council there, they attempted to seize the initiative. With, according to Delafaye, 'Dublin foremost', it was decided by 'the good Bishops' to introduce their own 'Bill for the Security of the King's Person'. It mirrored the Commons bill exactly except that the clauses granting relief to the Dissenters were omitted.[73]

Aghast at the implications of this procedure for parliament as a whole, supporters of the government expressed their annoyance: it was, they protested, intended merely 'to spoil what we had so much pains been working in the House of Commons for the Dissenters' as well as being a brazen affront to the members of the Lower House. Privately, however, they were becoming resigned to the fact that it was unlikely that the Commons Bill could be forced through. An attempt was made to exploit reports that the Pretender had landed in Scotland and that the array of the militia would be hindered if the Commons bill was obstructed, but to little effect.[74] Increasingly concerned lest the Money Bill be endangered, the government was forced to act. It was eventually decided to advise that the offending clauses be either so modified that the exemptions only applied for a limited period, or be removed altogether when the Commons bill came before the Privy Council in London. For confirmation that this was the wisest course it was suggested that Stanhope consult the

---

[73] Delafaye to Pringle, 8/1/16, PRO. S.P. 63/374/18; Same to [Same], 29/1/16, PRO. S.P. 63/374/57; Delafaye to _____, 6/2/16, PRO. S.P. 63/373/90; Lords Justices of Ireland to Stanhope, 29/1/16, PRO. S.P. 63/374/53; Grafton to Stanhope, 15/2/16, PRO. S.P. 63/374/99-100; Synge to Wake, 2/2/16, Gilbert Ms. 28, p.35; Same to Same, 14/2/16, Gilbert Ms. 28, p.47.

[74] Delafaye to _____, 6/2/16, PRO. S.P. 63/373/90; Lords Justices of Ireland to Stanhope, 20/1/16, PRO. S.P. 63/374/42-3; Same to Same, 28/3/16, PRO. S.P. 63/374/169.

Archbishop of Canterbury, William Wake, who they were sure had been fully briefed from Ireland by both his own sources and various Irish prelates.[75]

In Dublin, meanwhile, unaware that the government had adopted this course, and with debate now moved to the Privy Council, parliament having been adjourned, the bishops continued to voice their opposition. At one particular meeting, where Galway and Grafton proposed that a single bill be formed from the Commons and Lords bills, the exchanges became extremely bitter, with King, now sufficiently recovered to attend, contributing in no small measure to the ill feeling.[76] Speaking at one point for almost two hours, he 'strenuously opposed' what was being attempted, questioning whether 'it were worthwhile in point of policy to make a breach in our constitution to gratify them which would give so much offence.'[77] 'He has been much confined to his house by sickness this winter', one anonymous source explained,

> 'which has made him very sour and spleenetick. He has plainly .....hazarded his life by coming several times to council to oppose it where he vented, so I hear, the malignancy of his temper.'

Even the concession of alterations in the clause for admitting Dissenters into the army failed to mollify him. When, however, at the end of a long night of argument he proposed that the entire bill be rejected, he was narrowly defeated,

---

[75] Grafton to Stanhope, 15/2/16, PRO. S.P. 63/374/99-100; Lords Justices to Stanhope, 16/3/16, PRO. S.P. 63/374/147; Synge to Wake, 14/2/16, Gilbert Ms. 28 p.47; Same to Same, 22/3/16, Gilbert Ms. 28, p.54-5.

[76] Lords Justices of Ireland to Stanhope, 6/2/16, PRO. S.P. 63/374/80; Synge to Wake, 22/3/16, Wake Mss. 12; Same to Same, 3/2/16, Wake Mss. 12; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 20/3/16, Midleton Mss. 3/322.

[77] Lords Justices of Ireland to Stanhope, 17/2/16, PRO. S.P. 63/374/105-6; Grafton to Stanhope, 15/2/16, PRO. S.P. 63/374/100; King to Ashe, 8/2/16, TCD Ms. 2533/132; Synge to Wake, 4/3/16, Wake Mss. 12; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 23/3/16, Midleton Mss. 3/335. See, however, Lindsay to Wake, 29/3/16, Wake, Ms. 12, where the primate records his appreciation of King's efforts.

the government managing to push it's proposal through by one vote.[78]

The focus now switched to London with King urging as many bishops as possible to lobby members of the Privy Council there. Anticipating that Wake's stance would be critical, he undertook to correspond with him himself. That he secure the Archbishop's support became even more critical in view of intelligence which he received from Robert Howard, who informed him of the considerable lengths to which the ministry had gone to give Wake 'wrong impressions',

> 'namely that it [the Test clause] was forced on the Nation and imposed but lately, that they [the Anglo-Irish] have ever since been uneasy under it, that all methods must be taken to increase the force of Protestants and make the king's friends easy. But above all that the House of Commons must not be disobliged, who have unanimously desired it; this last I find chiefly insisted on though your Grace knows but for a sudden terror, artfully raised, it was not their desire.'

On King, whom he considered 'perfectly master of this important question', he urged haste in advising Wake of the true situation. King acted immediately, despatching a series of letters to Lambeth Palace, apprising the Archbishop in apocalyptic terms of the consequences of allowing any diminution in the terms of the Test clause, betraying in the process a fear of the what he believed was the subversive intent of Presbyterianism: 'They are a people embodied under their lay elders, presbyteries and synods,' he informed him,

> 'and come to their sacraments in crowds of three or four thousand from 20 and 40 miles about, and they make laws for themselves and allow not that the civil magistrate has any right to control them and will be just so far the king's subjects as their lay elders and presbyteries will allow them'.

---

[78] King to Wake, 24/3/16, TCD Ms. 2533/160; Lords Justices to Stanhope, 16/3/16, PRO. S.P. 63/374/147; Molesworth to Stanhope, (enclosing anonymous letter to Molesworth), 7/4/16, PRO. S.P. 63/374/183; Synge to Wake, 22/3/16, Gilbert Ms. 28, pp.54-5.

Not only was Wake unmoved, he was instrumental in persuading Stanhope to ignore the advice of Galway and Grafton that the Commons bill be substantially modified. Howard wrote to inform King that the bill would be returned with only minor alterations.[79]

In spite of a recurrence of his gout, King was determined to attend parliament when it reconvened on May 3, and, although displaying a public show of confidence that the bill would be defeated, he could not hide a growing sense of unease. Over the preceding weeks he had watched the government omit 'no endeavour', including bribery and intimidation, 'to drop the Test clause'. He was also concerned that 'more evident demonstrations' of antipathy to the bill had not been forthcoming. It was obvious to him that incessant government pressure, coupled with suggestions that the security of the north of the island would be undermined by the exclusion of Dissenters from the militia and army, had shaken the resistance of many in the Commons. Yet, he was confident that the Lords, and particularly the bishops, remained steadfast in their opposition. Any attempt to force such 'unpopular things' on them would meet with 'cold entertainment', he predicted.[80]

In fact, unknown to King, over the course of the adjournment the Dublin administration had come to the same conclusion. With the bishops and the Brodrick faction resolute in their opposition, it was obvious that there was little chance that the bill could pass the Lords. Eventually even Conolly was persuaded, and in the end the bill's demise was swift. After some discussion in

---

[79] King to Wake, 24/3/16, TCD Ms. 2533/160; Same to Same, 26/4/16, TCD Ms. 2533/218-9; Howard to King, 17/3/16, Lyons 1757; Same to Same, 10/4/16, Lyons 1768; Same to Same, 12/4/16, Lyons 1769; Same to Same, 27/4/16, Lyons 1775.

[80] LJI, ii, 3/5/16; King to Jenkins, 14/4/16, TCD Ms. 2533/194-5; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 23/3/16, Midleton Mss. 3/335; Synge to Wake, 3/2/16, Wake Mss. 12; Same to Same, 22/3/16, Wake Mss. 12; King to Howard, 10/4/16, TCD Ms. 2533/187; King to Molyneux, 16/4/16, TCD Ms. 2533/201-3; Delafaye to _____, 6/2/16, PRO. S.P. 63/374/90; Grafton to Stanhope, 17/2/16, PRO. S.P. 63/374/100.

the Commons it was quietly dropped and replaced by two innocuous resolutions discouraging prosecutions against Dissenters who served in the militia. With the government unwilling to allow anything to interfere with securing the Money Bill, no more was heard of relief for the Dissenters during the remainder of the session.[81]

In King's opinion this had been the most serious challenge to date to what was now a fundamental element of his constitutional scheme. It was for this reason that he considered the outcome an important victory for the church. But the wider implications of what had just occurred had not escaped him: this success in frustrating both the government and the Commons was indicative of the power which the bishops could wield in parliament, and this was something which he hoped to exploit in the future. Although a minority of the total membership of the Lords, the prelates were far more diligent in their attendance than their temporal counterparts. This, allied to their antipathy to any measure perceived as weakening the privileges of the established church, gave them an influence disproportionate to their numbers.[82]

As far as Brodrick was concerned, however, the existence of such a bloc was anathema to his own interests. The decline of the Tory party in

---

[81] CJI, iv, 5/6/16; Synge to Wake, 8/6/16, Wake Mss. 12; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 8/6/16, Midleton Mss. 3/384; Same to Same, 1/3/16, Midleton Mss. 3/316; Burns, *op. cit.*, pp.59-61. Reid was later to accuse King of having been the real architect of the defeat of this bill: Reid, *op. cit.*, iii, p.73.

[82] Delafaye to _____, 6/2/16, PRO. S.P. 63/374/90; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 15/11/15, Midleton Mss. 3/244; Molesworth to King, 28/9/14, Lyons 1524; Griffin, *Parliamentary Politics*, p.14, footnote 17; McNally, 'The Hanoverian Accession', pp.274-5. For an analysis of the influence disproportionate to their numbers which the bishops wielded by their more diligent attendance see James, 'The Church of Ireland in the early eighteenth century', pp.438-451.

Ireland had resulted not so much in a reversion to Court and Country parties, but a subdivision of the Whig faction in the Commons into personal groupings loyal mainly to Conolly and Brodrick. Attempting to mould a faction in the Lords, (which now included eleven new Whig peers), to complement his 'Cork Squadron' in the Commons, the Lord Chancellor was intent upon ensuring that a unified church party did not develop in the Upper House. It had suited him on this occasion to ally himself with the bishops in order to defy Conolly. But, this would not always be the case, especially on those occasions when he himself undertook to manage affairs for the government. Over the coming years he would consistently attempt to exploit divisions amongst the bishops, particularly that resulting from the ministry's policy of appointing a number of English-born prelates to Irish sees. The only man likely to galvanise the bishops into a cohesive force, and thereby frustrate Brodrick, was King. This was particularly so since Primate Lindsay, a Tory appointee, could never pretend to any political influence while Whigs remained in power. For this reason, Brodrick had been alarmed at King's success in orchestrating a campaign which had succeeded in defying the government: 'A victory of this nature,' he told his brother,

> 'will cement a party and set them at open defiance. I have often said a certain Archbishop [King] would be found very hard to deal with: the dispute between him and the Pr[imate] is which of the two shall be at the head of the Churchmen, but both aim at a new model of things which formerly was termed a coalition. But I think they now aim at more.'[83]

This 'more' was a unified Irish church party in the Lords, led by King, and comprising of his followers and those of Lindsay, (whose support for King had been very noticeable during the recent session), which could secure measures

---

[83] Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 23/3/16, Midleton Mss. 3/335; Same to Same, 15/11/15, Midleton Mss. 3/274; Griffin, *Parliamentary Politics*, pp.15-18; Burns, *op. cit.*, pp.57-8.

favourable to the church and frustrate any attempts to reduce its privileges. It would also be able to outvote any party which Brodrick might assemble. When King capitalised further on the Primate's political isolation by securing the appointment of his friend Edward Synge as Archbishop of Tuam, Brodrick became even more alarmed: King, 'whose power is already great enough,' would use this appointment to build a party dominated by Irish-born clerics, he warned. It was an early indication of that mutual mistrust which would characterise the relationship between the two men for the remainder of their lives.[84]

Whilst what had transpired in parliament could be counted a success, King was aware that the position of the church was being undermined in other ways. For one thing the bishops' stance on the Test clause had resulted in several church bills being lost in the Commons, where the government had orchestrated their defeat. A more compelling problem was that posed by the continuing displays of Jacobitism coming from many of the staff and students of Trinity College, a situation highlighted earlier in the year when Chief Justice Whitshed had reported on the extent of Jacobitism within the College. This was despite King 'using all possible industry to bring the fellows to a right temper' during his term as Lord Justice.[85] Indeed, shortly before parliament convened he himself had had to report on further disturbances amongst the students. On that occasion 'the statue of King William [had been] again defaced and the truncheon taken out of his hand and sword bent'. An attempt by the Provost to blame Tory activists in Dublin for the students' activities was

---

[84] Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 12/4/16, Midleton Mss. 3/360; Thomas Brodrick to Alan Brodrick, 17/4/16, Midleton Mss. 3/366; Lords Justices of Ireland to Stanhope, 9/5/16, PRO. S.P. 63/374/221.

[85] Delafaye to King, 15/6/15, Lyons 1663; King to Bishop of Dromore, 17/9/15, TCD Ms. 2533/88; Budgell to Addison, 30/5/15, PRO. S.P. 63/372/109.

contemptuously dismissed by King: 'The city of Dublin no way countenances Jacobitism,' he insisted, "Tis from the Universities this corruption infects the cities and country.' The city might 'taint their morals', he pointed out, 'but not their principles of government.'[86]

With the attainder of the Duke of Ormonde, who had been Chancellor of the University, King realised that the College authorities had been presented with 'a good opportunity to retrieve themselves'. Privately, however, he doubted that the fellows would 'make right use' of the chance to appoint a suitable replacement. Taking the initiative, he proposed that the Prince of Wales be approached and offered the position, a suggestion dismissed as 'presumptuous' by most. Undaunted, he then wrote to Wake to 'entreat' him to

> 'use your endeavours to help us in a matter of so great concern to the church and kingdom and in which his Majesty's interest has, likewise, a very great share.'

In an attempt to thwart any interference, the College authorities reacted by petitioning the king to protect their right to elect a successor themselves. In response, Grafton and Galway initiated an investigation of the College Charter to determine whether King's proposal was, in fact, viable.[87]

Although the Lord Justices insisted that by acting in this manner they had hoped to be of some assistance, King was unhappy at what he believed was merely procrastination on the part of the government. But circumstances soon

---

[86] King to Bishop of Dromore, 17/9/15, TCD Ms. 2533/88; Stearne to King, 21/9/15, Lyons 1728; King to Robert Howard, 6/10/15, TCD Ms. 2533/103. This incident reminded several commentators of a similar episode some years previously when a number of College students had defaced William's statue: Ingoldsby to Ormonde, (copy) 5/12/10, Lyons 1394. King to Ormonde, 8/12/10, Lyons 1395; J. Kelly, 'The Glorious and Immortal Memory', Commemoration and Protestant Identity in Ireland, 1660-1800', pp.33-4.

[87] King to Wake, 9/6/16, TCD Ms. 2533/254; King to Ashe, 15/9/15, TCD Ms. 2533/83; King to Nicolson, 16/7/15, TCD Ms. 2533/15-7; Synge to Wake, 3/5/16, Wake Mss. 12; Lords Justices of Ireland to Stanhope, 1/11/15, 63/373/242-3; Stearne to King, 21/9/15, Lyons 1728; *Petition of the Provost and Senior Fellows to his Majesty*, January 1716, PRO. S.P. 63/374/1.

turned to his advantage. When rumours of a Jacobite landing in Scotland reached Dublin the need to intervene became more urgent. He immediately began to canvass the possibility of the Prince of Wales as the new Chancellor more widely as well as threatening the Provost with a visitation of the College.[88] Galway and Grafton, fearful lest defiance at Trinity act as a catalyst for other displays of support for the Pretender, were now more amenable to King's suggestion. In late January they forwarded extracts from Trinity's Charter confirming that the monarch might intervene to nominate a successor. As King had hoped, they suggested that the prince be considered for the position. Reluctantly, the authorities at Trinity succumbed. They had at last, King reported, 'come to a very good temper.' He wrote immediately to Molyneux, now one of the prince's confidants, asking him to urge his Highness to agree to the position. To King's delight the prince consented, the news of which, he noted contentedly, 'had a great effect' and 'made no small alteration in the humour of the youth in the college.'[89]

An elaborate ceremony was arranged in London in the spring of 1716 to mark the prince's installation. Constrained from travelling by illness, King was forced to miss the occasion. The ceremony was well attended, however, with the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Provost, together with Irish gentlemen 'in great numbers' present. Howard sent a full account of the prince's pleasure at his appointment, reporting in the process that it was widely

---

[88] King to Howard, 6/10/15, TCD Ms. 2533/103; King to Stanhope, 25/2/16, PRO. S.P. 63/374/113-4; Delafaye to Pringle, 12/1/16, PRO. S.P. 63/374/22; Lords Justices of Ireland to Stanhope, 13/1/16, PRO. S.P. 63/374/26; Same to Same, 18/1/16, PRO. S.P. 63/374/38; Same to Same, 21/2/16, PRO. S.P. 63/374/103.

[89] Lords Justices of Ireland to Stanhope, 13/1/16, PRO. S.P. 63/373/26; Same to Same, 29/1/16, PRO. S.P. 63/374/53; Same to Same, 21/2/16, PRO. S.P. 63/374/103; Same to Same, 24/2/16, PRO. S.P. 63/374/109; King to Wake, 1/3/16, TCD Ms. 2533/148-9; Same to Same, 16/2/16, TCD Ms. 2533/142; King to Stanhope, 25/2/16, PRO. S.P. 63/374/113; King to Samuel Molyneux, 16/2/16, TCD Ms. 2533/14.

acknowledged that King had had 'the first honour of having set this whole machine in motion'. In the opinion of those present, King deserved the thanks of the whole kingdom for his wisdom and loyalty. Grateful that the College had begun to be restored to some semblance of order, several of his fellow bishops were quick to echo these sentiments. Stearne wrote to commend him for the courage he had shown in procuring this 'happy turn' for the whole church. Even the new bishop of Meath, John Evans, who would soon emerge as his most trenchant critic, gladly acknowledged that King's quick action had frustrated the plans of the College to appoint the Tory Primate Lindsay to the position.[90]

[90] Howard to King, 10/4/16, Lyons 1768; Same to Same, 12/4/16, Lyons 1769; Lords Justices of Ireland to Stanhope, 17/2/16, PRO. S.P. 63/374/105-6; Stearne to King, 21/4/16, Lyons 1772; Evans to Wake, 2/8/17, Wake Mss. 12; Same to Same, 9/8/17, Wake Mss. 12; Swift to King, 13/11/16, Swift Corr., ii, p.223.

II

King had only been able to attend the recent parliament infrequently and in much pain and it had long been his intention to travel to England to take the waters. With the threat to the Test clause overcome, he now felt free to leave and within two weeks of parliament being prorogued he had arrived in Chester and was making straight for Bath. He made it clear to all that this journey was primarily for his 'health and diversion.' He hoped to remain in Bath throughout July and August recuperating. He then intended to travel to London to attend to some business and he had no intention of returning to Ireland until late September at the earliest. His recovery was not, however, as swift as he had hoped for. As a result he was forced to remain on in England for almost a year. Nor was he unduly upset at this. Having endured an excruciating and prolonged attack of gout for almost two years he was determined to give priority to his health. His only regret was that his continued absence from the country would leave him 'in the dark as to public affairs'.[91]

Despite his promises not to involve himself in affairs of state, however, he could not resist the temptation to avail of the opportunities afforded by this prolonged stay in England. Delighted that the situation in Trinity had improved, he hoped to capitalise on the prince's Chancellorship by encouraging

---

[91] King to Annesley, 1/7/16, TCD Ms. 2533/265; Swift to Walls, 14/6/16, Swift Corr., ii, p.204; Swift to King, 17/6/16, Swift Corr., ii, p.205; King to Molyneux, 9/7/16, TCD Ms. 2533/266; King to Addison, 29/7/17, PRO. S.P. 63/375/3; King to Stearne, 1/4/17, TCD Ms. 2534/139.

him to undertake a vigorous use of the authority vested in him and depute a Vice-Chancellor to root out Jacobite sympathisers. He had written to Molyneux some months previously suggesting that 'a memorial should be laid before his Highness setting forth the necessity of University Statutes'. This, it was hoped, could be used to persuade recalcitrant fellows and students to behave. He now intended to pursue this matter. Only too willing to follow Howard's advice that he go to London to show the monarch 'the man who has done him the most service of anyone in his kingdom', he travelled to the capital hoping to arrange an audience with George. With the king detained on the continent, however, such a meeting did not materialise. Instead, with Molyneux's assistance, he was able to arrange a private audience with the Prince and Princess of Wales. This offered the ideal opportunity to present to them his views on the situation at Trinity. Having 'discoursed' with their Highnesses on the matter he was encouraged by their favourable reaction. Satisfied that he had support for his proposals to reform many of the practices at the College, he looked forward to confronting the Provost and Senior Fellows on his return.[92]

With his long-running dispute with Christ Church coming before parliament shortly, King decided to remain in London until after Christmas. Ironically, given that he had travelled to England partly with a view to escaping his various political entanglements, it was a decision which would lead, indirectly, to his reinstatement into the executive. With Grafton and Galway removed as Lord Justices in the wake of the break-up of the Townshend/Stanhope ministry, it had been rumoured that Townshend would

---

[92] King to Molyneux, 16/4/16, TCD Ms. 2533/200-1; Same to Same, 9/7/16, TCD Ms. 2533/266; King to Wake, 16/7/16, TCD Ms. 2533/270; King to Howard, 27/10/16, TCD Ms. 750/11/2/5; Howard to King, 22/9/16, Lyons 1790; King to Synge, 9/10/16, TCD Ms. 2533/311.

be proposed for the Lord Lieutenancy of Ireland. Unaware of what this would portend, King merely took the opportunity to complain about the cavalier fashion in which the government of Ireland was treated. By late January, Townshend had been offered and accepted the post, but he made it clear that he would not be travelling to Ireland. He intended instead to remain in London in the hope of frustrating the new ministry headed by Stanhope and Sunderland.[93] Unaware of this, King, anxious to lobby the new governor, made arrangements to meet him. To his chagrin Townshend asked him to accept a place in the commission of Lords Justices, along with Conolly and Brodrick.[94]

He was appalled at the prospect. His awareness of the Whig agenda for Ireland, in particular its espousal of the Dissenters' cause, persuaded him that he did not wish to be associated with it in any way. Furthermore, he found Townshend unsympathetic to the needs of the church, an opinion reinforced when some proposals he made regarding the return of crown rents to the church were peremptorily dismissed. If his name was to be in the commission then he made it perfectly clear that it would against his 'consent and advice.' 'I hope I shall be no ways concerned in the government of Ireland', he told one acquaintance, adding that pressure from the Lord Lieutenant 'would not hasten my going to Ireland.' Despite being 'plagued with importunities' by various officials, he judged it better 'to take another season at the Bath' instead.[95]

Considerations of health may well have predominated, but King was

---

[93] King to Earl of Kildare, 15/12/16, TCD Ms. 2534/33-4; King to Budgell, 20/12/16, TCD Ms. 2534/41-2; King to Parnell, 22/1/17, TCD Ms. 2534/58; King to Swift, 12/1/17, Swift Corr., ii, p.247; Swift to Walls, 3/1/17, Swift Corr., ii, p.243.

[94] King to William Burgh, 5/2/17, TCD Ms. 2534/70; Brodrick and Conolly were sworn in on March 20, 1717.

[95] King to Synge, 14/2/17, TCD Ms. 2534/91; Same to Same, 2/3/17, TCD Ms. 2534/97-8; King to Earl of Kildare, 7/2/17, TCD Ms. 2534/73-4; Wogan to Southwell, 23/2/17, B.L. Add. Ms. 37674/79; Swift to King, 2/3/17, Swift Corr., ii, p.256.

genuinely determined not to return to a post in which 'after a man has done the best he can..... he has but little thanks.' Townshend was insistent, however, and in late February King was obliged to submit. He could not imagine anything 'more uneasy' than 'being in the present circumstances put into the government of Ireland'. It was not 'out of any kindness to me' that this had happened, and he intended simply to 'keep out of harms way as long as I can and hope the job will be short.'[96] 'I assure your Lordship nothing could [have] happened more cross to my inclination at present', he protested to the Earl of Kildare,

> 'I did my endeavour to avoid it but had not interest enough to keep me out of an ugly scrape. I hate to be in circumstances where I can't hope to [do] any good and must bear the clam[our] of what is done ill.'

Stearne had the misfortune to write congratulating him on his appointment. 'I have had a grievous cold all this winter,' King snapped back,

> 'I wonder your Lordship did not congratulate me on it as well as being one of the Lords Justices, for assure yourself they are much alike acceptable.'[97]

Back in Dublin news of King's appointment was greeted with approval by many. Brodrick, however, was incensed. He had hoped that King's opposition to the government in the recent parliament might have marked the end of his involvement in the executive. The fact that King intended to remain on in England only exacerbated the situation since, with Conolly ill, most of the preparatory work for the forthcoming parliament would devolve to the Lord

---

[96] King to Earl of Galway, 14/2/17, TCD Ms. 2534/90; King to Mossom, 19/4/16, TCD Ms. 2533/210; *The London Diaries of William Nicolson, Bishop of Carlisle, 1702-1718*, ed. C. Jones and G Holmes, Oxford, 1985, 16/3/17; King to Synge, 2/3/17, TCD Ms. 2534/97-8.

[97] King to Stearne, 16/3/17, TCD Ms. 2534/124; King to Kildare, 16/3/17, TCD Ms. 2534/122. In an earlier letter to Kildare, King indicated that another reason for his reluctance to serve in the government was the huge debt which was reported to have built up over the previous year: King to Kildare, 15/12/16, TCD Ms. 2534/34.

Chancellor. In a barely concealed show of defiance, Brodrick, who knew that King was simultaneously manoeuvring to have his friend Chief Justice William Whitshed appointed Lord Chancellor in his place, queried the legality of the patent under which King had been appointed. He was politely ignored.[98]

Within a few weeks, however, the composition of the executive had become an issue once more. Events in England had precipitated a further decline in Townshend's fortunes and in March, he was removed as Lord Lieutenant. King claimed not to have been caught totally unaware by this development. Indeed, the likelihood of such 'alterations at court' had, he insisted, been one of the reasons for his reticence about accepting his commission. The only thing that disappointed him was that he would now have 'to begin again several things that I had well concerted'. Until a new governor was appointed he would continue in the commission. But in the meantime he intended to remain in Bath in the hope that he might be overlooked by Townshend's successor.[99]

With a parliament pending in Ireland in August, it was imperative that a new Lord Lieutenant be chosen without delay. In April, Charles Powlett, Duke of Bolton, an aggressive and influential Whig, who, as Lord Winchester, had served as Lord Justice between 1697 and 1699, was appointed. King was appalled at the prospect of the government being entrusted into such hands. In particular, Bolton's sympathetic attitude towards Dissenters. Nevertheless, he wrote immediately to wish Bolton a 'most happy and successful ministry'. He made no secret of his desire to be relieved of his own appointment and suggested that Bolton might go to Ireland 'before me' because he could not

---

[98] Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 1/3/17, Midleton Mss. 3/406; Same to Same, 7/3/17, Midleton Mss. 3/408; Same to Same, 31/3/17, Midleton Mss. 4/1.

[99] King to Ashe, 13/4/17, TCD Ms. 2534/148-9; King to Lord Stackallen, 4/5/17, TCD Ms. 2534/176-7.

'with any pleasure think of being concerned in the government'. Hoping to draw no further attention to himself, he decided not to attend the Duke: 'I have nothing to do,' he told Howard, 'but to be quiet.'[100]

His longing to be omitted from the commission was quite genuine. Despite almost a year in Bath and Tunbridge Wells his health had continued to decline, indeed Bolton's appointment had coincided with a serious relapse: 'I must rub on as well as I can and drag out the fag end of my life,' he wrote unsentimentally to Stearne, '.....I find myself daily go down'. After the 'tumble .....at court' which had seen Townshend removed, it seemed best 'to mind private affairs', to 'let the present ferment settle and wait till it appear on what basis business will fix'. He was delighted when, some weeks later, he heard that he might not, after all, be retained in the executive. Apart from his ill-health, the prospect of being associated with some of the policies which it was rumoured the Lord Lieutenant intended for Ireland was unwelcome. The reports were, however, premature and, although Bolton's personal inclination was to omit both Conolly and King, it soon became apparent that the original commission was to stand.[101]

Angered by the tactics employed by Bolton, King submitted grudgingly. But he remained determined to 'give all the obstruction that our station will enable' to any attempt on the Duke's part 'to hurt our constitution', a commitment fortified by Bolton's outspoken support for the repeal of the Occasional Conformity and Schism Acts in the British parliament. Assuming

---

[100] King to Bolton, 29/4/17, TCD Ms. 750/11/2/165; King to Wake, 5/6/17, TCD Ms. 2534/233; King to Ashe, 22/4/17, TCD Ms. 2534/156-7; King to Howard, 1/5/17, TCD Ms. 2534/174-5; King to Addison, 29/6/17, TCD Ms. 2534/258.

[101] King to Stearne, 1/4/17, TCD Ms. 2534/139; Howard to King, 4/6/17, Lyons 1818; King to Lord Stackallen, 4/5/17, TCD Ms. 2534/176-7; King to Coghill, 6/5/17, TCD Ms. 2534/185; Bolton to Addison, 6/11/17, Midleton Mss. 4/88. King's friend, Robert (now Viscount) Molesworth, was mentioned as one alternative.

that this presaged an attempt by the Lord Lieutenant to secure a repeal of the Test Clause in the forthcoming parliament in Ireland, he now became even more explicit in his opposition to Bolton. The new Lord Lieutenant was just another in that long succession of English politicians 'with particular views and designs opposite to the general humour and interest of the Kingdom', he protested to Wake. Such individuals merely had the effect of 'embarrassing' their own administration and making the government 'uneasy', only to be finally 'laid aside by the Ministers that set them [having been] found uncapable [sic] to serve their designs'. 'I wish his Grace, our present Lord Lieutenant, were well appraised of this,' he concluded,

> 'It would certainly discover to him those steps which may make his government uneasy and involve him and the parliament in struggles and contentions on account.'[102]

In fact a more alarming scenario that the mere repeal of the Test clause had briefly presented itself. It had been brought to King's attention that a delegation of Ulster Presbyterian elders had departed for England with the intention of lobbying the parliament there to grant a repeal. This raised the dual spectre of a repeal of the Test resulting directly from the interference of the British parliament in Irish affairs. King had written to the Bishop of Derry demanding that he 'enquire into this and possess as many as you can with the unreasonableness of it'. He himself promised to do 'anything that may tend to obstruct it'.[103] Apart altogether from the issue of the Test Clause, the

---

[102] King to Howard, 1/5/17, TCD Ms. 2534/174-5; King to Bolton, 1/6/17, TCD Ms. 2534/230-1; King to Addison, 29/6/17, TCD Ms. 2534/258; King to Wake, 6/5/17, TCD Ms. 2534/181; Same to Same, 25/5/17, TCD Ms. 2534/219; Addison to Lords Justices of Ireland, 1/6/17, *Addison Letters*, p.361; King to Annesley, 6/5/17, TCD Ms. 750/11/2/183-4; King to Wake, 15/6/17, TCD Ms. 2534/237.

[103] Swift to King, 13/11/16, Swift Corr., ii, p.223; Godwin to Wake, -/5/17, Wake Mss. 12; Evans to Wake, 30/4/17, Wake Mss. 12; King to Molyneux, 6/5/17, TCD Ms. 750/11/2/185-6; King to Ashe, 6/5/17, TCD Ms. 2534/183.

constitutional implications of what was intended were totally unacceptable to him:

> 'The parliament of Ireland in such a case are pretty good judges what is for their and the common good and since this affair no way related to Britain and that only we ourselves are concerned in it, I hope the Britannic parliament will leave it to us.....'

He took it upon himself to write to several prominent politicians 'to appraise them of the unreasonableness of concerning themselves with the Acts of Ireland. He wrote immediately to Wake outlining what the Dissenters intended, stressing that they were, by all accounts, 'exalted in their assurance that the Occasional Conformity Bill [sic] will be repealed', and 'in high hopes to get a clause in it to repeal the Test in Ireland.' A series of replies from Wake failed to reassure him. In the end only the rejection of the attempt to modify the Occasional Conformity and Schism Acts and the unwillingness of the ministry to allow the British parliament to deal with the Test clause calmed him.[104]

Nevertheless, his suspicion that the government would attempt a repeal of the Test remained. In such an event King vowed that he would 'not fail to use the best endeavour' he could to prevent such 'encroachments on our constitution'. Those who proposed such a measure were, he pronounced, 'no friends to his Majesty' and could expect vigorous opposition in Ireland. In a long letter to Wake he made it abundantly clear that the years had diminished neither his determination, nor his own sense of divine commission, and that the government could expect him to be wholehearted in his opposition:

> 'It has been my fortune to have had many struggles in the world and all of them in the way of my duty, and on that acc[oun]t I

[104] King to Wake, 6/5/17, TCD Ms. 2534/181; Wake to King, 23/5/17, Lyons 1815; Same to Same, 1/6/17, Lyons 1816; Same to Same, 11/6/17, Lyons 1819; King to Coghill, 6/5/17, TCD Ms. 2534/187.

> have been opposed, abused, and reproached by all methods that malice or wit could invent, calumniated, nicknamed and misrepresented. I have had the government of Ireland, the House of Lords, the Courts of Justice and my own clergy opposing me and studying to mischief me and have been told by my friends that I ought to be quiet for I c[ou]ld never expect to do any good. But I thank God this never gave me any trouble, nor discouraged me, but I went on in my duty without fainting or so much as uneasiness and after all I found I did a great deal of good and at last commonly gained any point and think this was St. Paul's case in all his perils.....'

He would, he promised, 'spare no pains nor decline any means that can with honesty be used to promote his Majesty's interest [and] the good of the public'. As far as he was concerned the policy of the king and the ministry should be to promote 'a hearty espousal of the church, a discountenancing [of] Atheists and Theists and an indifferency to Dissenters.' This, he insisted, would 'bring more security to the Royal Family than 20 regiments of Dragoons.'[105]

Immediately upon his return to Dublin in June, therefore, he approached Brodrick, (now Viscount Midleton), who at Sunderland's insistence was to be Bolton's 'great minister' in parliament, in an attempt to ascertain the ministry's true intentions in relation to the Test. He was mollified to some degree when Brodrick gave him 'all the assurances I can desire' that he had advised the ministry against attempting a repeal, and that the Lord Lieutenant had accepted this. In fact, he had to admit that the government were taking 'some pains to prevent any umbrage of such an intention.' Having 'discoursed a great many of the House of Commons', he was delighted to discover that they too had 'the greatest abhorrence and scruple of such an attempt'. He was further re-assured to hear that Wake, in private discussions with Bolton, had 'not one word signified to him about any liberty intended to be

---

[105] Synge to Wake, 27/7/17, Wake Mss. 12; King to Wake, 5/6/17, TCD Ms. 2534/233; King to Coghill, 6/5/17, TCD Ms. 2534/187; King to Wake, 6/5/17, TCD Ms. 2534/181; Same to Same, 26/6/17, TCD Ms. 750/11/2/250.

granted to the Dissenters'. He was soon confident enough to predict that 'nothing of that nature will be mentioned, much less attempted'. This would 'go a great way to make us easy and in good earnest', and clear the way for an 'easy' session, he predicted. When parliament eventually assembled in August, he was delighted to find that Bolton was true to his word. The matter was not mentioned in his opening *Address* and was not raised at any point during the session.[106]

As King had hoped, with the prospect of contention over the Test clause removed, this session of parliament proved both 'easy and short'.[107] 'The Tories and Jacobites keep pretty much out of sight,' one of his friends noted, 'and I pray their hopes may likewise vanish.' His only other worry had been that a Land Tax might be attempted because of the perilous state of the country's finances. This would, he argued, be something which 'the Kingdom could not bear.' As usual he was forthright in his opposition: anyone who countenanced such a proposal was 'a base betrayer of the liberties of their country.' He circulated copies of a pamphlet which he had prepared the previous year which purported to show the disproportionate tax burden already shouldered by Ireland. But the introduction of a standard, though extra burdensome, Money Bill made it obvious that the ministry did not intend such a

---

[106] King to Wake, 28/8/17, TCD Ms. 2534/297; Wake to King, 31/8/17, Lyons 1828; Same to Same, 1/6/17, Lyons 1816; King to Wake, 28/8/17, TCD Ms. 2534/297; King to Bladen, 27/8/27, TCD Ms. 2534/295; King to Wake, 21/9/17, TCD Ms. 2534/303; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 26/4/17, Midleton Mss. 4/13; Same to Same, 25/5/17, Midleton Mss. 4/31; LJI, ii, 27/8/17.

[107] King to Wake, 21/9/17, TCD Ms. 2534/303; King to Bladen, 27/8/17, TCD Ms. 2534/296. One case heard by the House of Lords during this session, Sherlock v Annesley, gave members an opportunity to vent their continued antipathy to the claims of the British Lords to judicial supremacy: Reynell to Webster, 5/10/17, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/143/2216; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 3/9/17, Midleton Mss. 4/64-6; Godwin to _____, 9/10/17, PRO. S.P. 63/375/208. This case is discussed in more detail in Chapter 8, Section II.

measure.[108]

Pleasantly surprised by the moderation of the administration to date, King hoped to capitalise on this by securing some measures of benefit to the church. On this occasion, however, this did not include support for a call by the lower clergy that Convocation be convened at the same time as parliament. Like most bishops, having considered the consequences of earlier sessions, he had concluded that little advantage would accrue from its meeting. His anger focused specifically on those individuals whose activities had so disrupted previous meetings: 'My Lord Archbishop of Dublin will never be for our Convocation sitting,' the Bishop of Kilmore observed, "till we can get a party to throw out Dean Perceval from being Prolocutor.' In any case, with little likelihood of the Tory faction amongst the lower clergy dissipating, the prospect of Convocation being allowed by a Whig ministry was slight.[109]

There was, however, one project which he hoped to see supported by both government and parliament. This was related to his continuing endeavour to curb the seditious activities of some of the staff and students of Trinity College. In spite of his having secured the Prince of Wales as Chancellor, their defiance continued to concern him. His displeasure focused increasingly on the Provost, Dr. Benjamin Pratt, whom King considered both negligent and politically suspect. If the College was to be brought under control then he considered it imperative that he be removed: 'The head is of more moment than

---

[108] King to Wake, 19/8/17, TCD Ms. 2534/289; King to Whitsed, 30/11/17, TCD Ms. 2535/31-3; Evans to Wake, 17/9/17, Wake Mss. 12; Godwin to _____, 9/10/17, PRO. S.P. 63/375/208; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 30/9/17, Midleton Mss. 4/73; C. Reynell to Webster, 29/10/17, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/143/2217; Griffin, *Parliamentary Politics*, p.41. A shortfall of £94,000 in the public purse was reported in the Commons: CJI, iv, p.393. This pamphlet, *Some Observations on the Taxes Paid by Ireland to support the Government*, was circulated in manuscript form to a small number of individuals: see R. Dudley Edwards, Introduction, *Analecta Hibernica*, viii, 1938, pp.5-14. See also Chapter 9, Section I.

[109] Godwin to Wake, 12/10/17, Wake Mss. 12; Same to Same, 9/6/17, Wake Mss. 12; Lindsay to Wake, 26/7/16, Wake Mss. 12.

any of the members,' he explained to Dr. Coghill, pointing out that if not removed, Pratt would 'always influence' impressionable students.[110]

For several months he had been manoeuvring to have Pratt transferred. He had already obtained the assistance of Wake in seeking to have him removed to the Deanery of Down for the 'good of the Kingdom'. Although he had given the impression that he would acquiesce in this, at the last moment Pratt had reneged. It soon became obvious that his intention was to stall in the hope of obtaining a bishopric.[111] 'He is the weakest of men and a very ill one', King fumed on hearing of the Provost's change of mind, 'for I have it under his hand that he was willing to come into the scheme I had laid for his removal'. He reacted to Pratt's effrontery with a threat to use his powers of visitation to expose him and others within the College as Jacobite sympathisers.[112] Then, having first of all ensured that he still had the support of Wake, he secured, with Molyneux's assistance, the backing of the prince. Confronted by this combined display of ecclesiastical and regal displeasure, Pratt succumbed. By early June King was delighted to be able to confirm that Pratt would, after all, be taking the Deanery of Down as previously arranged.[113]

---

[110] King to Wake, 18/1/17, TCD Ms. 2534/56; Same to Same, 28/8/17, TCD Ms. 2534/297-8; King to Bladen, 25/3/18, TCD Ms. 2535/127; Synge to Wake, 3/5/16, Wake Mss. 12; Evans to Wake, 16/2/18, Wake Mss. 12; King to Coghill, 9/2/17, TCD Ms. 2534/80-1; Swift to King, 17/11/16, Swift Corr., ii, p.222; King to Swift, 22/11/16, Swift Corr., ii, p.227.

[111] Synge to Wake, 17/4/16, Gilbert Ms. 28, p.59; King to Wake, 28/8/17, TCD Ms. 2534/297-8; Swift to King, 13/11/16, Swift Corr., ii, p.223; King to Howard, 9/2/17, TCD Ms. 750/11/2/83; Same to Same, 2/3/17, TCD Ms. 750/11/2/101; Howard to King, 2/2/17, Lyons 1802.

[112] King to Dr. Bolton, 7/2/17, TCD Ms. 2534/71-2; King to Swift, 12/3/17, Swift Corr., ii, p.260-1; Same to Same, 21/3/17, Swift Corr., ii, p.262; King to Pratt, 2/3/17, TCD Ms. 2534/104; Evans to Wake, 15/2/17, Wake Mss. 12.

[113] King to Swift, 21/3/17, Swift Corr., ii, p.262; Molyneux to Wake, 25/4/17, Wake Ms. 12; Wake to King, 11/6/17, Lyons 1819; King to Wake, 5/6/17, TCD Ms. 2534/232-3; Marley to Wake, 1/6/17, Wake Mss. 12; King to Ashe, 11/5/17, TCD Ms. 2534/194.

This had happened just prior to parliament convening, and in King's opinion, the church's success in defying Tory sympathisers in the College merited some recognition from the members. An appropriate gesture, he intimated, would be a commitment of the funds necessary to complete the new library in the college. Lest the members had forgotten, he reminded them that in a previous session they had promised this reward if the prince could be persuaded to accept the Chancellorship. Once more he obtained the support of both the prince and the Archbishop of Canterbury for this proposal. The prince, whose dispute with the king was causing him to show an unusual interest in the matter, even agreed to sign a petition to the members. By the autumn the unanimous approval of both Houses had been obtained. Delighted at the outcome, King was only too happy to accept the plaudits for having secured the necessary finance to complete what was, in his opinion, a project of vital importance to the whole kingdom.[114]

[114] King to Molyneux, 19/8/17, TCD Ms. 2534/292-3; Wake to King, 31/8/17, Lyons 1828; King to Wake, 21/9/17, TCD Ms. 2534/303; Whitshed to King, 28/11/17, Lyons 1839; Howard to King, 18/10/16, Lyons 1794; Burns, *op. cit.*, p.71.

III

For the first time in many years King was, despite some reservations, happy with the outcome of parliament. He was particularly pleased that Bolton had not attempted a repeal of the Test clause. Coupled with the fact that the ministry had been unable to secure the repeal of the Occasional Conformity and Schism Acts in the British parliament, he hoped that this marked the end of English inspired attempts to force a repeal on Ireland. He was also delighted that over the course of the previous two sessions of parliament some legislation of benefit to the church had been passed. Furthermore, with the Hanoverians firmly secured on the throne, albeit weakened by a rift between king and prince, the Protestant succession appeared secure. It seemed to him that a political settlement close to that which he had long championed had almost been achieved.

On a personal level he was sure that after two successful periods in the executive, his own political stock had never been higher. He was especially gratified to hear that both the king and the prince had publicly commended his 'integrity and ability' in subduing the crypto-Jacobite activities of the staff and students at Trinity.[115] In fact, with plaudits such as these being widely advertised he was soon being mentioned once again as a potential Lord Justice. This was anathema to Brodrick who was determined to see King excluded. He

[115] Duke of Tyrrell to King, 19/11/17, Lyons 1842; Whitshed to King, 28/11/17, Lyons 1839.

arranged a meeting with Bolton on the matter. King, he objected, had 'no very good rights' to be included in the commission after his performance in the last two parliaments. He was reassured to find that Bolton was also of the view that he was in 'no way proper' for such a position. The Lord Lieutenant's 'manner of expressing himself', Brodrick concluded, 'showed that he looked on him [King] to have opposed the king's measures and ..... publicly declared and interested himself in opposition to any new fund on tax.' He took it 'for granted that the A[rchbishop] will not be recommended.'[116]

While he concurred personally with Brodrick's opinion of King and confirmed these sentiments in a letter to Addison, Bolton could not allow his own preferences to dictate the composition of his government. Not only was he constrained by the conspicuous support of the monarch for King, but he also considered it necessary to include a churchman in the commission. In this he was supported by Conolly who argued that both King and Kildare should be included, particularly as Brodrick had indicated his intention to travel to England for the duration of the parliament there. As a result, King soon heard rumours that he might indeed be nominated. Again he protested his lack of interest. He had hoped that he had 'declared myself [so] freely on that head that there was no thought of me'. With a view to the next parliament, however, Bolton had already decided that he could not afford to ignore Conolly's advice. On the second last day of the session, therefore, without, King protested, 'intimation or..... insinuation that it was intended', he was informed that he was to be nominated as a Lord Justice.[117]

---

[116] Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 11/11/17, Midleton Mss. 4/93; Same to Same, 7/11/17, Midleton Mss. 4/90.

[117] Bolton to Addison, 6/11/17, Midleton Mss. 4/88; King to Whitshed, 21/11/17, TCD Ms. 2535/14-5; King to Fitzwilliam, 30/11/17, TCD Ms. 2535/25; Conolly to _____, 9/10/17, PR375/207; King to Whitshed, 21/11/17, TCD Ms. 2535/14-5; King to Bladen, 1/2/18, TCD Ms. 2535/69; *Patent of Appointment*, 7/1/18, Marsh's Library Ms. Z3, 1.1.

He was genuinely unhappy at the prospect of being once more in a position where he had 'neither the profit nor power that is proper and necessary to execute it with advantage'. Apart altogether from his annoyance at being in the government, he was upset at the short notice he had been given. The only reason for this, he concluded, had been to 'leave me no time to deliberate or excuse myself.' This was especially so since he was being asked to govern on behalf of a ministry which he was still convinced intended to repeal the Test clause. Nor was he reassured by the seeming pleasure of others, which he ascribed to a 'natural proneness to flatter'. Once nominated, however, it was impolitic to decline. Pressed repeatedly by Bolton to accept he eventually yielded. But he did so grudgingly, acquiescing only on condition that 'if I fail that it will excuse me ever hereafter from the like trouble'. He would 'serve the public', he informed Bolton's secretary, only 'as far as my health and abilities will enable me' and none should expect any more from him. 'I pray God it may turn to good', he confided in Chief Justice Whitshed, 'but I have an ugly suspicion in my mind that doth presage otherwise'.[118]

This sense of foreboding was not unrelated to the refusal of the Lord Lieutenant to acquaint him with the terms of the commission. Two weeks after learning of his appointment he found himself still uncertain as to what was expected of him: 'I have not seen the commission by which I am to act and of all things I hate implicit faith', he informed Whitshed, in a particularly revealing comment. Fearful lest it placed onerous administrative duties on him, he eventually sought a meeting with Bolton during which he insisted, in a 'somewhat obstreperous' manner, that the Lord Lieutenant disclose what he intended the Lords Justices to do in his absence. When he saw what the

[118] King to Delafaye, 21/12/17, TCD Ms. 2535/48; King to Annesley, 31/12/17, TCD Ms. 2535/50-4; King to Whitshed, 21/12/17, TCD Ms. 2535/41-3; Same to Same, 6/1/18, TCD Ms. 2535/55-7.

government proposed he was horrified. He found the paucity of church bills in the proposed legislative programme particularly galling: 'the inheritance of God and the church has less security, and fewer friends than the salaries of publicans', he protested. It was, however, the firm indication that 'some endeavours' would be used 'to repeal the Test and some other laws that churchmen look on as their security' which induced his strongest protest: 'We have too many divisions already,' he complained, 'and this will break us, I am afraid, all to pieces. The very apprehensions of such a thing has alienated thousands of hearts from the government.' He immediately 'remonstrated against' these proposals and to some extent 'obliged his Grace to relax something in them'. But, he was left in no doubt about the government's determination to ensure that the repeal of the clause would be attempted when parliament resumed.[119]

The manner and terms of his appointment soured King's attitude to both the government and his responsibilities: 'I own to your Grace I am one of those whimsical men that will not always do or say or think what I am bid', he admitted in a moment of candour which Wake must still have considered something of an understatement,

> 'I never was so complacent to my Governors and I hope my friends will not expect it from me and if it has pleased God to make me an instrument to do any good in my station in the world 'tis chiefly due to this obstinacy.....'

Long after Bolton had departed he was still complaining of having been forced to accept the position;

> 'I was given to understand that this was put on me by persons that I must not dis-oblige or refuse and under that consideration

---

[119] King to Whitshed, 21/12/17, TCD Ms. 2535/41-3; Same to Same, 6/1/18, TCD Ms. 2535/55-7; King to Delafaye, 21/12/17, TCD Ms. 2535/48; King to Wake, 11/1/18, TCD Ms. 2535/59-62; King to Conolly, 8/5/18, TCD Ms. 2535/164. King's fellow Lords Justices were Brodrick and Conolly.

> and some others, not altogether so good natured, I found myself obliged to accept of the ungrateful drudgery which amongst other disgusting views gives nearer and most afflicting knowledge of a miserable country that every day falls under new misfortunes.'

'I was never more tired of anything in my life,' he told the same correspondent some time later, 'than being in a station where I can do no good and am obliged by office every day to do things contrary to his Majesty's interest and mischievous to the kingdom.....' Indignant at both the delay in Conolly's appointment and the fact that Brodrick had departed for England on the same packet as Bolton he resolved to have as little to do with official duties as possible.[120]

It was somewhat ironic, therefore, that this particular term in the executive was to prove the easiest and least controversial of his four periods in office. In fact, with the exception of some uneasiness about the activities of criminals and rapparees throughout the kingdom and the constraints placed upon the government by a worsening money supply, King found the term pleasantly devoid of serious problems.[121] He was, as a result, in a position to conduct his triennial visitation personally during June 1718. He was also able to retire to the country for most of July and August when afflicted by a recurrence of his gout. Some months later, when plagued with a 'most violent colic [and] a severe fit of the gout being more like to die than live', he was again able to depart for his country residence with little difficulty.[122]

---

[120] King to Wake, 12/4/18, TCD Ms. 2535/146; King to Bladen, 1/2/18, TCD Ms. 2535/69-71; Same to Same, 25/3/18, TCD Ms. 2535/128; Bolton to Lords Justices of Ireland, 16/1/18, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/143/2223.

[121] Bolton to Lords Justices of Ireland, 28/1/18, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/143/2229; Same to Same, 10/7/18, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/143/2262; King to Robert Ross, 3/7/18, 3535/190; King to Bladen, 25/3/18, TCD Ms. 2535/126-9; King to Brodrick, 5/6/18, TCD Ms. 750/11/3/173.

[122] King to Synge, 4/6/18, TCD Ms. 2535/172; King to Fitzwilliam, 13/17/18, TCD Ms. 2535/211-2; King to Robert Peirson, 7/11/18, TCD Ms. 750/5/53-4; Annesley to King, 8/11/18, Lyons 1890; Synge to Wake, 16/10/18, Wake Mss. Epistolatory, 13, [hereafter:

As usual, in spite of his aversion to the ministry, King showed no reticence about availing of his position to influence ecclesiastical appointments. In March he wrote to Addison proposing a series of preferments. Not surprisingly they favoured Irish-born churchmen. But, he was furious when his recommendations were ignored. When, some time later, his advice in relation to a minor benefice in his own diocese was disregarded, he reacted angrily: 'a little clerk [has] more interest with you there than the government and people of Ireland', he complained to another official. Indeed, it was soon obvious that any proposals he might make carried little weight with his superiors in London. Realising this, he became even more incensed. He objected so strenuously to one particular appointment that Synge was obliged to write to Wake to explain that his friend's furious outburst had been induced by fatigue and the responsibilities of office.[123] In fact, within a short while King had effectively ceased to canvass, particularly in the matter of vacant bishoprics: 'We have no more influence in disposing them than the man in the moon', he wrote morosely to Molyneux, 'the meanest employment is not in our power, but is disposed in England'. His exasperation was particularly evident in a letter to Bolton: 'I made it my study and care to promote the interest of the Royal Family both before and since his Majesty's happy accession to the Crown,' he told him,

> 'and the favour I am supposed to have from his Majesty and the government has been a great instrument to enable me to influence the clergy and laity and I thank God I have entirely used it to that end and have constantly sacrificed all private interest and friendship to the Royal interest and my doing so has had a very good effect for his service. But if it appear that I do

---

Wake Mss. 13], fo.19; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 17/10/18, Midleton Mss. 4/134.

[123] King to Story, 12/2/17, TCD Ms. 2534/89; King to Wake, 12/4/18, TCD Ms. 750/11/3/146; King to Bladen, 25/3/18, TCD Ms. 2535/128; King to Saunders, 17/3/18, TCD Ms. 750/11/3/114; King to Addison, 3/3/18, TCD Ms. 2535/92-3; Synge to Wake, 29/4/18, Wake Mss. 12; Same to Same, 4/11/18, Wake Mss. 13, fo.23; Same to Same, 16/10/18, Wake Mss. 13, fo.19.

> not have so much favour as to be consulted in the disposal of benefices in my own diocese whilst in the government I apprehend that I shall lose that credit that I have hitherto used with considerable advantage.....'

Protesting at 'this usage' which made him 'look very little', he threatened 'to apply to his Majesty' to accept his resignation.[124]

The vehemence of his reaction to these developments betrayed his suspicion that a significant change in the policy of appointments to Irish sees had been initiated in England. In fact, he was convinced that, with Wake's connivance, the government was fostering a group of English-born prelates on the Irish episcopal bench specifically to promote the Whig political and ecclesiastical agenda. Nor were his fears without foundation. Indeed, an analysis of the various episcopal appointments made during this period gives considerable credence to his contention.[125]

During the period from 1714 to 1718 there was an unusually large number of vacancies in the Irish hierarchy, with eight new appointees being installed. Of the three Irishmen given sees only one, Edward Synge, Bishop of Raphoe, would play an active role in politics. The comparison with the five Englishmen appointed, all of whom had impeccable Whig credentials, was telling: Timothy Godwin had been Chaplain to the Earl of Shrewsbury before his appointment to Kilmore in 1714; John Evans had been Bishop of Bangor prior to his transfer to Meath in 1716; Ralph Lambert, appointed to Dromore in 1717, had been chaplain to the Earl of Wharton, and the man involved in the protracted struggle with the Irish Convocation; Henry Downes, appointed in

---

[124] King to Molyneux, 8/11/18, TCD Ms. 750/5/59-60; King to Wake, 12/4/18, TCD Ms. 750/11/3/146; Same to Same, 10/5/18, TCD Ms. 750/11/3/166; King to Bolton, 8/3/18, TCD Ms. 750/11/3/102-5.

[125] King to Wake, 18/1/17, TCD Ms. 750/11/2/56-7; Same to Same, 10/5/18, TCD Ms. 750/11/3/166; King to Bolton, 8/3/18, TCD Ms. 750/11/3/102-5; Victory, *Colonial Nationalism in Ireland*, pp.124-133.

the same year to Killala, was the least politically experienced of this group, but would soon emerge as one of the most vituperative of King's critics; and William Nicolson, translated from the bishopric of Carlisle to King's former seat at Derry in 1718, was a veteran of the English political scene and a determined champion of the English interest in Ireland. There was nothing unusual in the appointment of this number of Englishmen to Irish sees. What marked them out, and what inspired such apprehension in King, was their political cohesiveness allied to the fact that they could be depended upon by their patrons in London to obstruct anything which was contrary to the English interest.[126]

The antipathy with which these two groups viewed one another was soon evident. The Irish-born prelates, particularly King, Stearne and Synge, despised their English brethren as 'foreign' and politically suspect. Synge was quick to identify the potential for conflict: 'if such persons (as they one-by-one come in) shall be found to oppose what both Lords and Commons are (I think I may say) universally persuaded to be the right of the kingdom', he warned Wake, 'they will have but an uneasy time of it'.[127]

The English-born bishops reacted by demanding that even more of their number be appointed. In Nicolson's opinion 'neither Bishop nor Judge should be bred' in Ireland. Godwin echoed these sentiments adding that the Irish-born bishops were becoming increasingly paranoid about the intentions of the government as to future preferments. King found himself the butt of the most persistent attack. As Archbishop of Dublin and Lord Justice, he was viewed by

---

[126] McNally, 'Irish and English Interests', pp.295-315; idem., 'The Hanoverian Accession', pp.280-2; Jeremiah Falvey, 'The Church of Ireland episcopate in the eighteenth century: an overview', in *Eighteenth Century Ireland*, 8, 1993, pp.103-114.

[127] Synge to Wake, 30/9/17, B.L. Add. Ms. 6117/126-9; Nicolson to Wake, 2/7/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.74; Godwin to Wake, 13/2/18, Wake Mss. 13, fo.12.

the new arrivals as a major impediment to the success of their policy. While he had 'a good head for schemes', Godwin admitted, 'his greatest fault is that he is too national'. He was, he elaborated, 'wholly in the Irish interest as distinct from the English, and thinks all church preferments do of right belong to natives.' Sentiments such as these accounted for their reaction to suggestions that King might succeed to the primacy when rumours circulated of the impending demise of Lindsay: 'I care not who has it (when void),' Evans declared, 'if Dub[lin] ..... miss it.'[128]

King was well aware that the presence of such a powerful faction in the Irish church and parliament was contrary to his interests. He wrote on several occasions to Wake, whose appointment as Archbishop of Canterbury had, he felt, been an important factor in the formulation of this strategy, complaining of the fact that 'his Majesty had disposed of six bishoprics in Ireland since his accession and only two of them have been given to persons educated in Ireland.' Hoping to 'prevail with him to let an equal share of his favour be extended to his faithful servants in Ireland when their merits are equal', he proceeded to make a series of suggestions as to preferments, all of which were politely ignored.[129] When William Nicolson, Bishop of Carlisle and confidant of Wake, was granted the see of Derry, a 'horn mad' and 'downright angry' King, who had kept an assiduous eye on his former diocese throughout the incumbencies of Hickman and Hartstonge, (two men he despised for their failure to continue his reforms), sent a sarcastic rebuke to Wake: 'Since the

---

[128] Kilmore to Wake, 27/11/16, Wake Mss. 12; Evans to Wake, 8/3/17, Wake Mss. 12; Same to Same, 16/8/18, Wake Mss. 13, fo.14; Same to Same, -/11/18, Wake Mss. 13, fo.27; Godwin to Wake, 1/1/17, Wake, Ms. 12; Same to Same, 13/2/18, Wake Mss. 13, fo.12; Same to Same, 19/11/18, Wake Mss. 13, fo.28; Nicolson to Wake, 2/10/19, B.L. Add. Ms. 6116/171; Godwin to Wake, 24/1/16, Wake Mss. 12, fo.318-9.

[129] King to Wake, 18/1/17, TCD Ms. 750/11/2/56-7; Same to Same, 3/3/18, TCD Ms. 750/11/3/94-6; Same to Same, 12/4/18, TCD Ms. 750/11/3/146; King to Dr. Bolton, 7/2/17, TCD Ms. 750/11/2/71.

person nominated for the Bishopric of Derry is so very useful to your Grace,' he began,

> 'I have been thinking of a way by which your Grace may have the benefit of his assistance, without hurting his wife and family. I do consider that a man may govern a country diocese in Ireland as well if he live in London as in Dublin..... [and] that he will have so many and strong precedents to justify him on the practice that he need not bear any condemnation from the world for his absence, most of his brethren being examples to justify him in it. And so without any trouble, or giving himself pain of visiting a miserable country he may get above two thousand pounds per annum.'

He wrote in a similar vein to Molyneux who he hoped would use his influence with the prince to effect a change: 'I am sure it does not serve the church to have men put into the principal posts that are entirely strangers to the business, persons and concerns of the Dioceses where they are to govern', he insisted,

> 'The truth is the common way practised by them hitherto is to take a house in Dublin, spend their time there or in England and let their dioceses shift for themselves. Thus the diocese of Derry has been served by my two predecessors; thus the diocese of Meath, Kilmore and several others have been used, in all which there have not only been great neglects but destructions and dilapidation's.'

The decision of John Evans, who would become King's most implacable critic, to accept a translation from Bangor to the rich diocese of Meath elicited an even more caustic response: there would 'never want a rapacious, covetous English or Welsh bishop who, merely for filthy lucre's sake ..... will cast his eye on our fat bishoprics and leave his lean one', he complained to Molyneux. Furthermore, it constituted 'a discouragement..... to the university and clergy' of Ireland to see someone who already held a bishopric outside of Ireland offered one of the wealthiest sees in the British Isles. Confirmation that Ralph Lambert, who had played such a prominent part in the controversy in Convocation some years previously, was about to be offered Dromore prompted yet another outburst: 'it is our interest that some of our bishoprics

should be very poor,' he wrote from Bath to Synge, who by this time had been elevated to the relatively impoverished Archbishopric of Tuam,

> 'for the value of them has such a reputation here that we are extremely envied and our bishoprics greedily coveted by the hungry clergy who withal are so proud and selfish that they think nobody deserves anything but themselves and grudge every preferment that is disposed of to any in Ireland.'[130]

But, bemoaning that 'crowd of harpys', that 'swarm of dependants, chaplains, relations,' who accompanied such men and, who like locusts, 'eat up every green thing that belongs to our church,' achieved little. By 1718 it was evident that the ministry would not relent. In fact, it was the prelude to a period of intense political infighting amongst the bishops during which time the English-born bishops, led by Evans, would play a key role in dismantling two key elements of the constitutional scheme which King had laboured so hard to secure.[131]

---

[130] King to Wake, 25/3/18, TCD Ms. 750/11/3/125; King to Molyneux, 12/7/17, TCD Ms. 750/11/3/215-6; King to Synge, 21/3/17, TCD Ms. 750/11/2/129-30; Godwin to Wake, 12/4/19, Wake Mss. 12, fo.252-3; Evans to Wake, 25/3/18, Wake Mss. 12, fo.246.

[131] King to Synge, 21/3/17, TCD Ms. 750/11/2/129-30; King to Charlett, 25/5/17, TCD Ms. 750/11/2/221-3; King to Ewan Christian, 17/3/18, TCD Ms. 750/11/3/117; King to Wake, 25/3/18, TCD Ms. 750/11/3/125.

CHAPTER 8

1719-1720: *'..... the worst we feared has befallen us.....'*[1]

In spite of the suspicions engendered by the presence of the English faction on the bishops bench, and belying his earlier scepticism as to the prospects for Ireland under the Hanovers, King could not hide his pleasure at the way matters had progressed in the years since the coronation of George I. Many of the elements of the constitutional scheme which he favoured had been, if not irreversibly secured, at least set in place. For one thing the Protestant succession appeared to have been accepted by the majority of the body politic, a fact confirmed by the successful negotiation of the Jacobite threat and the suppression of overt displays of Jacobitism at Trinity College. For another, various attempts at forcing a repeal of the Test clause on parliament had been successfully fended off, if only temporarily. And on a personal level he was pleased that he had acquitted himself as a very capable Lord Justice whose competence had been readily acknowledged by the king as well as his political and ecclesiastical peers.

But the optimism which this excited in King was to prove short-lived. In fact, the next decade would be one of considerable disappointment for him. His own physical decline would be paralleled by the realisation that his cherished ambition of a strong national church, supported by the crown and an autonomous Irish parliament would be frustrated by the subordination of Irish interests to those of England in matters political as well as ecclesiastical. The

---

[1] King to Molesworth, 16/4/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/61.

events of the Irish parliament in 1719 and the British parliament in 1719-20, in particular, would provide him with conclusive evidence that Ireland's status had been undermined by political developments in England. By the middle of 1720 he would have to come to terms with not only the granting of an effective toleration to Dissenters and the embodiment in statute of the subordination of the Irish parliament to that at Westminster, but the realisation that notions of dual monarchy had, in the wake of the Revolution and the Hanoverian Succession, been superseded by the concept of the crown-in-parliament, a development anathema to all that King had strived for.

I

The inability of successive governments to secure the repeal of the Test clause testified to the enduring influence of the Church of Ireland, at least in its capacity to frustrate the introduction of legislation to which it was fundamentally opposed. It also attested to the importance which churchmen attached to the continuation of the Test on the statute books. In fact, to many churchmen it had come to signify far more than a means by which the theologically suspect might be excluded from power. To King it had become a pillar upon which the good ordering of society itself was established. 'The true point' at issue, he explained to Wake,

> 'is whether the Presbyterians and lay elders in every parish shall have the greatest influence over the people to lead them as they please, or the landlords over their tenants.'[2]

It was for this reason that the government could count on his wholehearted opposition to any attempt to 'meddle' with it: 'as to my being a positive, opinionative man and wedded to my own way, it is no news to me', he wrote defiantly to one acquaintance prior to the 1719 parliament convening, informing him of his intention to oppose any attenuation of the clause regardless of what others might think,

> "Twas the constant clamour of Sir Constantine Phipps and all that party, and no wonder when I was almost single in opposition to their designs. And I believe I shall take the same

[2] King to Wake, 1/8/19, TCD Ms. 750/5/189.

> way if I should perceive anything carrying on to the prejudice of his Majesty's prerogative, to the interest of religion or the public. But I have had the fortune in everything wherein I was reckoned to be positive to be justified by the event ..... I have universally been acknowledged to be in the right ..... I never yet, that I remember, stood out against the current of common opinion but I have, at long running, either gained my point or seen the repentance of those that blamed me'.[3]

This display of self-important obduracy which so infuriated his peers had been brought on by the fact that various factors had conjoined to threaten the church's ability to persist in defying a repeal of the Test. For King the most ominous development had been the realisation that the English-born bishops were willing to agree to 'some relief' for Dissenters, though not to the extent of completely removing the Test. Another had been the appointment of William Conolly, rather than Brodrick, as a manager for the forthcoming parliament in Ireland. As in 1715, he had proposed that a repeal be attempted. This had been eagerly acceded to by the now entrenched Whig ministry of Stanhope and Sunderland, particularly since the repeal of the Occasional Conformity and Schism Acts in England in December 1718 begged the question of why such relief was not extended to Ireland.[4]

That the government was exploring ways of achieving some relief for Dissenters was soon apparent. At a meeting in London in February, 1719, Sunderland, Stanhope, Bolton and Craggs discussed the possibility of securing a repeal of the Test in the forthcoming Irish parliament. To assist them they had gathered the opinions of Conolly, Brodrick and several bishops, although not those of men such as King who they knew to be inveterately hostile to any such proposal. The consensus of the meeting was that, while some measure of

---

[3] King to John Spranger, 3/3/19, TCD Ms. 750/5/124-8.

[4] Bolton to [Craggs], 27/6/19, PRO. S.P. 63/377/234-5; Conolly to Stanhope, 2/7/19, PRO. S.P. 63/377/230; King to Annesley, 9/3/19, TCD Ms. 750/5/134; Annesley to King, 17/1/19, Lyons 1899; Griffin, *Parliamentary Politics*, p.62; Beckett, *Dissent*, pp.71-82.

relief should be attempted, a repeal would be 'difficult, if not impossible'. Bolton, conscious that even broaching the subject in parliament might prejudice other government business, and aware via Conolly that the Dissenters would be satisfied with nothing less than a full repeal, advised against attempting any relief at all for the time being. Stanhope and Sunderland, acting upon the misguided notion that a body politic which described itself as 'Whiggish' would support at least a Toleration, were not convinced by the Lord Lieutenant. The meeting broke up, therefore, with little agreement as to how matters should proceed, other than a vague commitment to exploring ways in which the Dissenters might be assisted.[5]

The issue upon which Stanhope and Sunderland eventually seized was the steady emigration to America of large numbers of Ulster Presbyterians. King, while Lord Justice, had attempted to downplay the significance of this, remarking instead on the 'good behaviour' of those Dissenters who remained. Indeed, to the extent that he had acknowledged this exodus at all, he had sought to manipulate it to highlight the detrimental effects of English legislation on the Irish economy. There have been 'hundreds [of] families of Protestants gone out of this kingdom', he pointed out, and the reasons they gave were,

> 'the landlords raising the land so on them that they are not able to live; the great discouragement put on Ireland by the parliament of England; the cramping [of] their trade.....'

By 'destroying the little that is left us', it was the British parliament's mercantilist policy which was responsible for this exodus. This 'and other discouragements [were] drawing away the few Protestants that are amongst us.'[6]

---

[5] Bolton to [Craggs], 27/6/19, PRO. S.P. 63/377/234-5.

[6] King to Smith, 5/7/18, TCD Ms. 2535/198-201; King to Wake, 6/2/18, TCD Ms.

However, he had soon come to realise that this haemorrhage from the north might actually provide those favouring a repeal of the Test clause with the justification they required. When Bolton wrote seeking 'a particular account of the reasons that move them', the implications of what was happening began to dawn on him:

> 'I am afraid there will not want those that will put it on the restraint that is on them on account of religion..... I am afraid, as this affair may be managed by persons ill affected to the church. It may have ill consequences and therefore it concerns us to be watchful and obviate the ill designs of perverse men.'[7]

He became particularly agitated when informed that it seemed to be accepted in England that Irish Presbyterians were leaving because they were being systematically persecuted. This was a perception which had been reinforced by a recent delegation of Presbyterian representatives to London, headed by Clotworthy Upton, one of Conolly's most trusted lieutenants. Contrary to what these 'schismatics' were saying, King countered, they were 'never more easy', and had 'never thought of leaving the kingdom 'till oppressed by excessive and other temporal hardships' by the English parliament.[8]

In the face of what he considered disinformation, he was heartened to find that all of the bishops, including the 'foreign' party, remained steadfast in

---

2535/78-80; King to Molyneux, 25/8/18, TCD Ms. 750/5/22-4; Bolton to Lord Justices of Ireland, 25/11/18, Cal. Dept. Corr. 52/143/2287; Beckett, *Dissent*, p.75.

[7] King to Smith, 20/12/18, TCD Ms. 750/5/102-3; King to Wake, 2/6/19, TCD Ms. 750/5/165-6; Bolton to Lord Justices of Ireland, 25/11/18, Cal. Dept. Corr. 52/143/2287; Same to Same, 30/11/18, Cal. Dept. Corr. 52/143/2300.

[8] King to Wake, 2/6/19, TCD Ms. 750/5/166; Bolton to [Craggs], 27/6/19, PRO. S.P. 63/377/234-5. The experience of William Hair, a Presbyterian living in Longford, tended to support the government's view: 'The dissenting interest still groans under the yoke of the sacramental test', he wrote to a cousin in Scotland in 1718, 'and though essays have been made for taking it off, yet all have proven in vain'. It was, he insisted, the main reason for the migration of huge numbers of Presbyterians, including their ministers, to America: Hair to Wodrow, 10/5/18, Wodrow Coll., 20, p.129; Same to Same, 11/11/18, Wodrow Coll., 20, p.135.

their opposition to repeal of the Test.[9] The prospect put even Evans and Nicolson, two of those most supportive of English government policy, 'into a very grave scare'. It had also resulted in a 'very wonderful' collaboration on the part of King and Primate Lindsay. Confirming this unity of purpose, Nicolson had warned Wake that the entire bench had 'unanimously agreed to oppose any attempt that should be made towards a repeal of the Test Act.' A rumour that some of the prelates might waver was not taken seriously: 'Dub[lin] will soon bring them off it,' Evans predicted. This resolution had merely been reinforced by events at the recent British parliament: 'Your repealing the Occasional and Schism Bill [sic] in Great Britain has given great encouragement to favourers of the repeal of the Test here,' King told Wake, but 'friends of the Church in Ireland' would not countenance similar relief for Irish Dissenters.[10]

Yet, this show of episcopal solidarity went only so far. It did not, for example, extend to a complete refusal on the part of the English-born prelates to consider some form of toleration for Dissenters. This was consistent with Wake's position that only a repeal of the Test, and not a Toleration, should be opposed.[11] That this had been adopted by the English-born prelates became apparent during a meeting which Bolton held with some of with the country's political leaders shortly after he had received the draft of a relief bill from London which provided for both a repeal of the Test and a Toleration.

---

[9] King to Wake, 2/6/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.62; Godwin to Wake, 20/1/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.38; Same to Same, 2/6/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.64; Evans to Wake, 20/12/18, Wake Mss. 13, fo.33; Lindsay to Wake, 26/6/19, Wake Ms.13, fo.70; Nicolson to Wake, 27/6/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.72.

[10] King to Wake, 2/6/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.62; Synge to Wake, 3/1/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.35; Annesley to King, 17/1/19, Lyons 1899; Nicolson to Wake, 2/7/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.74; Evans to Wake, 11/7/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.83; Same to Same, 16/12/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.137; Lindsay to Wake, 21/9/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.110; Same to Same, 3/12/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.133.

[11] McNally, 'Irish and English Interests', pp.302-4; Wake to King, 12/6/19, Lyons 1915a; Evans to Wake, 11/7/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.83.

Addressing Conolly, Brodrick, Lord Tullamore, and bishops Evans, Nicolson and Downes, as well as various members of the government, the Lord Lieutenant, sought their reactions. Both Conolly, who 'generally espouses' the cause of the Dissenters, and Brodrick advised him against attempting a repeal of the Test. The bishops concurred, pointing out that it would meet considerable opposition in the Lords. But Bolton did detect 'a pretty general disposition among them to do something for the relief of the Dissenters'. This willingness, he noticed, extended to the English-born bishops, who, while steadfastly opposed to a removal of the Test, were less hostile to the extension to Irish Dissenters of the same toleration enjoyed by their non-conformist brethren in England. After all others had left, Bolton and Conolly discussed matters together. They decided that the best course would be to allow Conolly and his supporters to introduce the Heads of a bill in the Commons which, while not repealing the clause, would give generous concessions to the Dissenters. This, it was hoped, would pass the Commons because of Conolly's sponsorship and attract sufficient support from the English faction on the episcopal bench and various temporal peers to pass the Upper House. Bolton, hoping that this change in strategy would be accepted by the ministry, wrote to London to explain that the reason it should be left to the Commons 'to frame heads of a bill as they shall think reasonable for the purpose', was that Conolly considered it 'impossible to know how far gentlemen will go ..... if a bill shall be transmitted under the great seal in which anything further is allowed than the parliament is inclined to give them.....'[12] The ministry, distracted by internal rivalry and war with Spain, reluctantly acquiesced and approval was soon

[12] Bolton to [Craggs], 27/6/19, PRO. S.P. 63/377/234; Same to Same, 21/4/19, PRO. S.P. 67/7/41; Same to Same, 8/7/19, PRO. S.P. 63/377/167; *Memorandum of meeting at Dublin Castle*, 25/6/19, PRO. S.P. 63/377/175; Conolly to Stanhope, 2/7/19, PRO. S.P. 63/377/230; Griffin, *Parliamentary Politics*, pp.63-77.

returned to allow Bolton to proceed to his 'satisfaction'.[13]

It was not long before King became aware that at least some measure of relief for Dissenters was being proposed. Urged on by Swift, who reckoned him 'the best able and most willing to do service to the church' in this matter, he immediately undertook to oppose it. It was noticeable, however, that he was not entirely confident of success: it had been 'with some difficulty we prevented any breach on the Test Act here the last two sessions of parliament', he remembered. Now he could only 'hope gentlemen will not alter their opinion.' In two strongly worded letters to Wake on the same day he protested vigorously at what was being proposed, hinting at a more sinister purpose behind this alliance of Whig and Dissenter: a Toleration had been 'offered them again and again', he pointed out,

> 'and it has been refused by their leaders; by which I think it is evident that the ease of their conscience, and the liberty of serving God in their own way is not what they aim at; their design is plainly to get the whole power in their hands and settle presbytery in Ireland, as it was in Scotland.....'

The most interesting aspect of these communications with Wake, however, was his insinuation that, if the measure passed, it would 'reflect' badly on his Majesty's care of the church. It was one of the earliest indications of King's growing disillusionment with George's neglect of the church, particularly his failure to oppose the repeal of the Occasional Conformity and Schism Acts in England. The true extent of his disenchantment would only become obvious over the course of the next twelve months.[14]

---

[13] Craggs to Bolton, 14/7/19, PRO. S.P. 63/377/234; Webster to Craggs, 2/7/19, PRO. S.P. 63/377/226; Beckett, *Dissent*, pp.75-9; Griffin, *Parliamentary Politics*, pp.69-70.

[14] King to Wake, 2/6/19, TCD Ms. 750/5/165-7; Same to Same, 2/6/19, TCD Ms. 750/5/171-2; King to Annesley, 9/3/19, TCD Ms. 750/5/134.

In a strongly worded speech on the opening day of parliament Bolton left the members in no doubt as to the intentions of the government. Having reiterated his Majesty's commitment to the Church of Ireland, he suggested to the members that it would nevertheless,

> 'be very pleasing to him if any method could be found..... to render the Protestant Dissenters more useful and capable of serving his Majesty, and supporting the Protestant interest, than they now are; they having on all occasions given sufficient proofs of their being well effected to his Majesty's person and Government.....'

The familiar tactic of overstating the threat posed by Jacobites in Scotland and the constraints which the Test clause caused by excluding Presbyterian officers from the militia, was enjoined to help to persuade members of the urgency of passing such a measure. It was then left to Conolly to indicate that what was intended was not a repeal of the Test clause, but some form of toleration.[15]

In attempting to foist even this on the parliament, however, both the Lord Lieutenant and his advisers were soon shown to have seriously misjudged the mood of both Houses. The response of the Lords was particularly hostile. They felt 'obliged' to co-operate, they replied, but would only do so to the extent which they considered 'consistent with the safety of our constitution in Church and State.' In the Commons, too, it became apparent that any relief would be more strenuously opposed than Conolly had expected. This was first evident in the objection by many members to the fact that the House committee delegated the task of drawing up the Heads was so packed with placemen that the bill would effectively amount to a government bill.[16]

---

[15] LJI, ii, 1/7/19; Bolton to Craggs, 8/7/19, PRO. S.P. 63/377/167; Same to Same, 8/7/19, PRO. S.P. 63/377/169; Victory, *Colonial Nationalism in Ireland*, pp.138-9.

[16] Bolton to Craggs, 27/6/19, PRO. S.P. 63/377/234; Webster to Craggs, 2/7/19, PRO.

King, who could not resist remarking on 'how falsely those undertakers had informed them that the people of Ireland were uneasy under the Test and groaned to have it removed', hoped that this might persuade the government to drop the whole scheme. Instead, the officials endeavoured to regain the initiative by allowing the members of the Commons to frame their own Heads of a 'Bill for rendering Protestant Dissenters more useful'. On July 6 a committee of the House was assigned the task.[17] This raised fears amongst several of the bishops that the members 'being so hard pressed', might frame a bill which incorporated a repeal of the Test. But these were relieved when, on the proposal of St. John Brodrick, acting on his father's instructions, a bill proposing minimal relief was introduced.[18] In fact, by releasing Dissenters from several penalties imposed by the Act of Uniformity it did little more than recognise the *de-facto* situation. Furthermore, not only did it leave the Test clause intact, it specifically affirmed that Dissenters were still required to pay tithes to the established church and reasserted the role of ecclesiastical courts.

S.P. 63/377/226; Conolly to Stanhope, 2/7/19, 63/377/230; LJI, ii, 3/7/19; King to Charlett, 16/7/19, TCD Ms. 750/5/179; King to Irvine, 16/7/19, TCD Ms. 750/5/175; *A Brief account of some proceedings in the parliament of Ireland*, 16/7/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.90. Among those on the committee were Sir Ralph Gore (Chancellor of the Exchequer), Isaac Manley (Post-Master General), and John Rogerson (Solicitor-General). At Conolly's insistence it was headed by Marmaduke Coghill.

[17] King to Charlett, 16/7/19, TCD Ms. 750/5/179; [Nicholson] to Wake, 16/7/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.90; Bolton to [Craggs], 27/6/19, PRO. S.P.O. SP. 63/377/234; Same to Same, 7/7/19, SP 63/377/173; Same to Same, 8/7/19, PRO. S.P. 63/377/167; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 16/8/19, Midleton Mss. 4/156-7; CJI, iii, 4/7/19, 6/7/19; Beckett, *Dissent*, p.77.

[18] King to Wake, 1/8/19, TCD Ms. 750/5/189-192; Nicolson to Wake, 9/7/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.82; *A Brief account of some proceedings in the parliament of Ireland*, 16/7/19, Wake Ms, 13, fo.90; Bolton to Craggs, 8/7/19, PRO. S.P. 63/377/167; Evans to Wake, 16/7/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.88; Connolly, *Religion*, pp.165-6.

On July 16, after considerable debate, the Commons agreed these Heads.[19]

Although disappointed, Bolton reckoned the government fortunate to have gained even this limited measure. King, on the other hand, was hugely encouraged. He wrote immediately to England to detail what had happened:

> 'Yesterday the House of Commons here took the matter into consideration in a committee of the whole house and fell upon a Bill for Toleration, such as in England which we had often offered Dissenters and they, as often, refused. Many clauses were offered in their favour by a few of their party but all rejected almost unanimously and they did not so much as offer anything that tended to repeal the Test or restrain the obligations of taking it by all that formerly were obliged.'

Even more gratifying was the fact that some of the 'most zealous Whigs' had 'declared themselves with warmth for preservation of the constitution..... in relation to the Test'. Nor would he 'claim the merit of this steadiness of the Commons' to himself or any of the bishops: while it was 'true many of them discoursed me on the subject', they 'were always beforehand with me and declared that they were resolved not to suffer any breach on the Test.'[20]

However, his sense of relief was soon shown to have been somewhat misplaced. Discussing the contents of the bill with several of the members, he was horrified to discover that, in their haste, the Commons committee had omitted several important provisions. They 'were resolved to preserve the Test in its full latitude' he explained to Wake,

> 'but being so hardly pressed..... they seemed under a necessity to do something which might be reckoned a compliance; one of the adverse party..... moved for leave to bring in heads of a bill to

---

[19] King to Irvine, 16/7/19, TCD Ms. 750/5/175; CJI, iii, 16/7/19; Lindsay to Wake, 15/7/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.87; Bolton to Craggs, 16/7/19, PRO. S.P. 63/377/139; Evans to Wake, 16/7/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.88; Webster to Delafaye, 16/7/19, PRO. S.P. 63/377/226.

[20] King to Charlett, 16/7/19, TCD Ms. 750/5/179; King to Irvine, 16/7/19, TCD Ms. 750/5/175; Bolton to Craggs, 16/7/19, PRO. S.P. 63/377/139; Pocklington to Wake, 15/7/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.84; Bolton to Craggs, 18/7/19, PRO. S.P. 63/377/131.

> ease Dissenters; they were afraid if he brought it in it would not be such as they would like and therefore some of them got together and drew up 'heads' in great haste and brought them in before the others could be ready and resolved to stand by the bill, imperfect as it was and admit no clauses to be added; by which they avoided a great deal of debate.'

The consequence of this misguided zeal was that those who framed the Heads had forgotten to include those clauses requiring subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles and the doctrines of the Trinity. Amongst other things, this would mean that 'none should be presented in any ecclesiastical court' or penalised for denying basic Christian doctrines. Having enquired why these clauses had not been added when the bill was debated by the whole House, King was informed that the members 'were not much solicitous for the bill, and believed it never would pass as it was sent'. They reckoned that, if necessary, it could be amended by the Privy Councillors themselves.[21]

This, King realised, had effectively returned the initiative to the government which, outmanoeuvred in the Commons, controlled a majority on the Council. Once parliament reconvened Bolton could present the members with a bill which did not contain several crucial clauses, and point out that it was exactly as the House of Commons had framed it. This would guarantee its passage through that House, and might persuade a sufficient number of the temporal peers and English-born bishops to support it in the Lords. Alternatively, using the bill as a threat, he could exploit the situation to extract more significant concessions from the church party. Whatever tactic he decided to employ, the Council meeting at which the Commons bill would be debated was likely to be particularly contentious.[22]

Bolton opened the meeting by proposing simply that the bill as

---

[21] King to Wake, 1/8/19, TCD Ms. 750/5/189-192.

[22] ibid.

presented be approved and forwarded to London. This was strenuously opposed by some and 'a longer [and] warmer debate' than King had ever heard at Council ensued. King had such 'an ill opinion of it', Evans reported, that he said 'publicly that it would make way for the Pretender.' Both he and Synge, in particular, 'laboured with the utmost diligence to have the omitted clauses inserted.' 'This alteration was accidental,' King contended,

> 'and yet it seemed to us of great moment; and I believe, if it pass, will be found so, for everything that is not settled by some temporal law will be reckoned as a matter of mere non-conformity, and so marriages, and a great many other things, will be left at large.'

By the time Bolton brought the debate to a conclusion several members had been persuaded to support the two Archbishops in their opposition. As a result, when it was put to a vote that the relevant clauses should be instated there were 'ten for it ten against it'. Only the casting vote of the Lord Lieutenant ensured that it would be forwarded to London exactly as it had been received from the Commons.[23]

This was a severe blow to those who opposed any relief for Dissenters. Yet just as disconcerting was a breach amongst the bishops themselves. The English-born bishops on the Council had voted with the government in favour of retaining the Commons bill unaltered. Their rationale was simply that it did not involve any dilution of the Test clause, while granting Dissenters no more than their counterparts in England. As such there were no valid reasons why it should be opposed. In adopting this approach they would soon show that they fully reflected the views of Archbishop Wake.[24]

---

[23] King to Wake, 1/8/19, TCD Ms. 750/5/189; Evans to Wake, 22/7/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.92; Beckett, *Dissent*, p.77; Griffin, *Parliamentary Politics*, p.67; King to Charlett, 7/1/20, TCD Ms. 750/5/240-2.

[24] Evans to Wake, 22/7/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.92.

But while King was fearful lest the government manipulated circumstances more to their advantage, Bolton was also in something of a dilemma. He could recommend that the bill as it stood be returned to parliament without amendment. In that case, having framed it, the Commons would be obliged to approve it. Despite the support of several of the English-born bishops, however, it would be strongly resisted in the Lords where both Primate Lindsay and King had vowed to continue their resistance. Indeed, in a private meeting with him at the Castle, King had pledged as much when dismissing a compromise proposal from the Lord Lieutenant by which Bolton had undertaken to write to London advising that the bill be 'mended' if King would drop his opposition. Alternatively, Bolton could advise that the Commons bill be put aside and request that a bill incorporating the repeal of the Test be forwarded from London. This would satisfy Conolly and some government supporters. Yet even the House of Commons had already demonstrated their aversion to a complete repeal. Finally, he could drop all attempts to move anything in favour of the Dissenters. Apart altogether from the fact that this was unlikely to be acceded to by the ministry in London, this would have the effect of annoying Conolly, alienating the many members who had supported the government thus far, and embarrassing those bishops who had indicated their willingness to support a limited toleration.[25]

King was not, however, about to wait for Bolton's to decide on his strategy. Instead, persuading himself that the Lord Lieutenant's offer of a compromise 'proceeded from the struggle that was apparent in the council' and an 'apprehension' on the government's part that the bill would not pass, he decided to take the initiative. With the help of Synge and Lindsay he framed

[25] King to Wake, 1/8/19, TCD Ms. 750/5/189-192; Lindsay to Wake, 15/7/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.87.

Heads of a bill which mirrored the Commons bill in everything, but which included those clauses which the Lower House had omitted. These he presented to the Lords for discussion. It easily passed its first and second readings. By the time it was to be given its third reading, however, the government had decided to intervene. Obtaining what King condemned as 'an artificial adjournment', officials managed to defer further debate on it until the House resumed in the autumn.[26]

During this adjournment it became clear that the English-born bishops had more correctly gauged the sentiments of the Archbishop of Canterbury than had King. Wake's ambiguous commendation of King's 'stand' as showing 'what you are able to do in defence of the Church' was less than the wholehearted support he might have expected. In fact, Wake had decided not to oppose the Commons bill when it came before the Privy Council on the grounds that the reliefs offered were minimal. Sensing as much, King wrote to him in August intimating that he might now drop his opposition: 'An Act of Toleration may be proper', he told him

> 'in hopes that it may stop their mouths for the future, and ease the ministry of their importunity; who may truly answer them if clamorous that they have done as much as they can for them, and if the gentlemen of Ireland continue in the mind they are in at present ..... they will never get more from a parliament here.'[27]

In fact, King had no intention whatsoever of taking such a step. On the contrary, encouraged by supporters in England, when the members reconvened

---

[26] King to Wake, 1/8/19, TCD Ms. 750/5/189-192; Wake to King, 2/9/19, Lyons 1929; Evans to Wake, 6/11/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.123; King to Southwell, 12/11/19, TCD Ms. 750/5/210.

[27] LJI, ii, 27/7/19, 31/7/19, 11/8/19; Bolton to Craggs, 15/10/19, PRO. S.P. 63/378/83; King to Wake, 1/8/19, TCD Ms. 750/5/189; Wake to King, 2/9/19, Lyons 1929; Evans to Wake, 6/11/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.123; King to Southwell, 12/11/19, TCD Ms. 750/5/210; King to Charlett, 7/1/20, TCD Ms. 750/2/240; Webster to Delafaye, 6/10/19, PRO. S.P. 63/378/83; Same to Same, 22/10/19, PRO. S.P. 63/378/102.

in September he re-introduced his own bill for its third reading. In spite of opposition from Evans and Downes, it was approved by a committee of the whole House. The Lords then directed that it be presented to the Lord Lieutenant and debated at Privy Council. 'Dub[lin]'s Bill about the Dissenters is gone to the Lord Lieutenant, being passed the House,' Evans reported to Wake,

> 'He hopes to sink that which is returned to us from England and so let the world see what interest he has in it..... his present admirers say he deserves a statue of gold to be erected for him for his great and bold zeal...'

An indignant Lord Lieutenant agreed to receive it. Furious at King for proceeding with a bill which the government had no intention of allowing to progress, but which had inflamed the Lords at a time when other government bills were being presented, he refrained for the time being from rebuking him. Only when the Commons bill had been returned from England with one minor amendment did he feel confident enough to do so. When, at a Council meeting, King objected to the fact that the Common's bill was being given precedence over his own, Bolton took great pleasure in pointing out to him that this was exactly the procedure required under Poyning's Law. To the delight of his officials he then ordered that he desist from making any further objections based on procedure. With his determination not to be deflected evident, Bolton then had little difficulty in having it agreed that the Commons' bill should be presented to parliament without delay.[28]

On October 16, having passed the Commons with a minimum of difficulty, it was presented to the Lords. Despite being encouraged by the ease with which it had passed the Commons, the ministry remained apprehensive.

---

[28] Charlett to King, 25/8/19, Lyons 1928; Godwin to Wake, 12/9/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.108; Webster to Delafaye, 1/10/19, PRO. S.P. 63/378/65; Same to Same, 6/10/19, PRO. S.P. 63/378/71; LJI, ii, 28/9/19; Evans to Wake, 29/9/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.111.

The fact that King's own bill had passed the House seemed to suggest that opposition to any form of relief was more entrenched than had been suspected. Forecasting that it was 'like to meet with a vigorous opposition from the Archbishops', Nicolson urged Bolton to do all in his power to counter them. Anticipating that King and Synge would be 'indefatigable in perverting as many as they can', the Lord Lieutenant had already taken steps to this end. There would, he promised, 'be nothing omitted on my side that can contribute to the passing of it', to which end he had gathered as many proxies as possible in the government's favour. Nevertheless, expecting to be 'run hard', he warned his 'troops' to 'stand firm'.[29]

King was encouraged by the initial refusal of the House, and of the 'foreign' bishops in particular, to deal with the bill immediately. But the English-born bishops reticence was misleading - they had already decided to support the Commons Bill. By October 22 the government, confident of success, had brought sufficient pressure to bear on the members to ensure that it was dealt with promptly.[30] When debate opened in committee, King argued against it with 'all my might', and along with Synge and Lindsay, co-ordinated the opposition. The Dissenters, they pointed out, were themselves indifferent to the bill, since, they added rather disingenuously, they saw little tangible benefits in the rather limited scope of the reliefs. Their most significant point, however, was that allowing such a measure to pass would break the 'contract between the people of Ireland and Henry II.' This compact promised an 'exact

---

[29] LJI, ii, 16/10/19; Bolton to Craggs, 15/10/19, PRO. S.P. 63/378/83; Same to Same, 12/10/19, PRO. S.P. 63/378/79; Webster to Delafaye, 15/10/19, PRO. S.P. 63/378/81; Same to Same, 22/10/19, PRO. S.P. 63/378/100; Nicolson to Wake, 17/10/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.117; Godwin to Wake, 17/10/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.116.

[30] Webster to Delafaye, 17/10/19, PRO. S.P. 63/378/88; Same to Same, 22/10/19, PRO. S.P. 63/378/102; Bolton to Craggs, 17/10/19, PRO. S.P. 63/378/90; Same to Same, 22/10/19, PRO. S.P. 63/378/106; Evans to Wake, 23/10/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.118; Godwin to Wake, 12/9/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.108.

conformity' between the Churches of England and Ireland and the effect of this bill would be to negate this. To a chorus of disapproval from some of the members and various officials, they then concluded by insinuating that his Majesty would be denying his coronation oath if he were to sign this bill. It was yet another indication of King's growing disillusionment with George's stewardship of his 'prerogative'. In fact, having pressed the matter this strongly, King did manage to 'get a negative on it' at the committee stage.[31]

This was extremely worrying for government officials who feared lest a majority of members might be persuaded to oppose it when the whole House convened. When the committee presented its report the arguments resumed with the bill continuing to be 'vigorously opposed..... in almost every part of it'. 'Dublin, Tuam, Limerick and Clogher speeched often against it,' Evans reported, '.....Tuam made a speech of about an hour long against proceeding any further upon it; this was seconded by Dublin.' 'It lay some time under long and strong debates', King recalled,

> 'and I think was opposed with as many and strong reasons as ever I heard on any occasion, to which no replies were made; and one of the opposite party confessed he could not answer them, and wished the bill would be mended.'

However, an attempt to insinuate that Archbishop Wake had come around to the view that the bill should be rejected, proved a turning point, when the English-born bishops were able to provide evidence that this was simply untrue. King and Synge were 'authors of this tricky stratagem,' Evans pointed out, and would have succeeded were it not for the fact that it was the English-born bishops who now had Wake's confidence.[32]

---

[31] Synge to Wake, 19/11/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.128; King to Wake, 1/12/19, TCD Ms. 750/5/216; King to Annesley, 10/11/19, TCD Ms. 750/5/201; King to Southwell, 12/11/19, TCD Ms. 750/5/210; Evans to Wake, 23/10/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo. 118; Webster to Delafaye, 22/10/19, PRO. S.P. 63/378/102.

[32] King to Charlett, 7/1/20, TCD Ms. 750/5/240; Webster to Delafaye, 22/10/19, PRO.

The bill had by now occupied the House for several days and was affecting the progress of several other bills, most notably a Popery bill, (to which King was also opposed, not least because of a proposal to castrate any priests 'discovered').[33] But as the debate had progressed it had become clear that both the English-born bishops and the government's supporters amongst the temporal peers had not wavered. Unwilling to allow the matter to deflect the members from other business any longer and reasonably confident that they commanded a majority, these members forced a vote. Aided by numerous proxies, the government secured victory, albeit by a slim margin.[34]

King was extremely disappointed, convinced that the bill's passage represented the removal of a central 'pillar' of the constitution of church and state. Along with fifteen others, he insisted on being allowed to record his dissent in the journals of the House. This statute would, they objected,

> 'tend to the total subversion even of Christianity itself as well as the Established religion and civil constitution of this Kingdom; there being no way left..... of discovering and restraining them but what is liable to the greatest difficulties.'

In his private correspondence, King was even more disconsolate: 'We have

---

S.P. 63/378/102; Bolton to Craggs, 22/10/19, PRO. S.P. 63/378/102; Evans to Wake, 23/10/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.118; Same to Same, 6/11/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.123.

[33] King remained opposed to the augmentation of the 'Popery code'. Writing to Southwell, he denounced the fact that these laws appeared to serve no other function than to allow Protestants to 'oppress the poor people and make them subject to their power for their own profit.....': King to Southwell, 2/12/19, NLI Ms. 2056; Same to Same, 12/11/19, TCD Ms. 750/5/210-2.

[34] LJI, ii, 22/10/19; King to Annesley, 10/11/19, TCD Ms. 750/5/200; Southwell to King, 1/10/19, Lyons 1932; King to Southwell, 12/11/19, TCD Ms. 750/5/210; Webster to Delafaye, 22/10/19, PRO. S.P. 63/378/102; Evans to Wake, 6/11/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.123. King enjoyed some small measure of revenge when, later in the session, he initiated a change to the standing rules of the House by which the proxies any one person could carry would be limited to two (the previous limit was three). This enabled the subsequent defeat of a 'Popery Bill' by the House of Lords, much to the annoyance of both the government and the House of Commons: King to Southwell, 12/11/19, TCD Ms. 750/5/210; Synge to Wake, 19/11/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.128; Bolton to Craggs, 3/11/19, PRO. S.P. 63/378/ 133.

granted them such a wide Toleration as I think is not precedented in the whole earth,' he wrote indignantly to Wake. He 'could not see', he continued somewhat melodramatically, 'how our church can stand here if God do not, by a peculiar and unforeseen providence, support it.' The measure was 'of an unprecedented nature', he insisted,

> 'no such liberty being granted in any country in the world..... by it Jews, Turks, Deist[s], Socinians and all the most wild and fanatic sects have liberty to set up and are not obliged to give any account of themselves or principles to any. Nor has anybody power to examine or control them.'

He was, he concluded, 'for making all mankind easy, especially in matters of religion', but

> '..... some account should be had of men's principles and practices..... and, likewise, some power reserved in the hands of the government to restrain them, when they grow exorbitant. But these are quite taken away by our act.....'[35]

Some months later he was still gathering instances of 'the ill effects of our Toleration Bill' to forward to Wake:

> 'The Dissenters in the North are already divided and a great many of the young men have set up against their seniors..... they have likewise got the Arians pamphlets and now we have no hold on them, God knows where this will end..... to allow every man that pleases to set up for a teacher to make proselytes and parties and vent what doctrines he pleases I believe has never been allowed in any well regulated commonwealth and dread the consequences of it.'

By providing an 'indemnity for all Sects', it might even, he predicted, be availed of by Catholics to escape the effects of the law. Nevertheless, he remained characteristically defiant: 'if one would observe the state of Religion in these kingdoms in our own time', he wrote to his friend, Edward Synge,

---

[35] King to Annesley, 9/3/19, TCD Ms. 750/5/134; King to Southwell, 12/11/19, TCD Ms. 750/5/210; King to Wake, 10/11/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.127; Same to Same, 1/12/19, TCD Ms. 750/5/216; LJI, ii, 22/10/19.

> '..... it will appear that the church never gained more true friends than when the civil power gave her doctrines and worship least encouragement, nor lost more the hearts and affections of her people than when seeming most encouraged'.[36]

Even his most consistent critics were taken aback by the ferocity of his reaction, but they did capitalise on it to discredit him. Evans, who had by this stage emerged as the leader of the English-born bishops, made a point of portraying him in as poor a light as possible when writing to Wake:

> 'he will leave no stone unturned to gain his revenge. The opposition he made to the late bills, (with endless words, without some to the purpose), is sufficient to convince anyone that heard him that he has an untameable spirit.....'

King, for his part, was in no doubt as to where the blame lay: 'The bill could not have passed,' he pointed out bitterly to Wake, 'if our brethren that came to us from your side of the water, had not deserted us and gone over to the adverse party.' Evans, Godwin, Nicolson, Downes and Lambert were, he fumed,'five (Presbyterian) prelates' and no better than 'English schismatics'[37]

In fact, King's unhappiness owed more to his own intolerance than to the actual toleration granted. What had passed allowed less to the Dissenters than they already enjoyed in practice and they had already indicated their dissatisfaction with what had passed. The fact was that the church party, including the English-born bishops, had, with the active support of Brodrick, once again succeeded in thwarting a repeal of the Test.[38]

---

[36] King to Wake, 5/3/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/44-7; King to Synge, 24/4/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/65-9.

[37] Evans to Wake, 7/11/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.125; King to Wake, 10/11/19, TCD Ms. 750/5/206; King to Charlett, 7/1/20, TCD Ms. 750/5/240; Nicolson to Wake, 17/10/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.117.

[38] In fact, it was not this bill, but an Indemnity Bill which passed at the same time by which office-holders who had failed to take the Test as prescribed by the 1704 act were allowed to retain their posts if they did so by March 1720, and which went almost unmentioned in King's correspondence, which effectively circumvented much of the practical effect of the Test: Wake to King, 10/12/19, Lyons 1939; LJI, ii, 28/10/19; McGuire, 'Government attitudes to religious non-conformity in Ireland 1660-1719', pp.276-

II

In addition to the furore over relief for the Dissenters, this session of parliament was also forced to address the constitutional question regarding the relative authorities of the London and Dublin parliaments. That this was still an issue could be traced to the fact that, in spite of declarations of its supremacy, the British Lords had never been able to impose its writ. As a result the Irish Lords could convince themselves that their prerogative, and that of the king-in-parliament, (a notion which had been redefined in Britain in the wake of the Glorious Revolution and the Hanoverian Succession), remained intact.

There had been several cases similar to King's over the course of the intervening twenty years.[39] The most important of these had centred around a dispute between the Earl of Meath and one Edward Ward. This had followed a course quite similar to that of King's own litigation. In 1695 the Irish Lords had overturned an earlier decision of the Court of Chancery and returned certain lands in Tipperary to the Earl. In 1699 Ward lodged an appeal against this decision with the English House of Lords. They found in Ward's favour

---

9; Connolly, *Religion*, p.166. The extension granted to Dissenters by this act was renewed on a further 23 occasions, until 1779, when the Test clause was finally repealed: Beckett, *Dissent*, p.81.

[39] These cases are discussed in more detail in M.G. Fitzpatrick, *Irish Lords' Jurisdiction: the War over Appellate Review, 1692-1720*, [hereafter: Irish Lords' Jurisdiction], unpublished MA thesis, UCD, 1992, pp.83-118 and Flaherty, *op. cit.*, pp.614-19; I. Victory, 'The Making of the 1720 Declaratory Act', pp.9-29.

and again declared the Irish Lords judgement to have been *coram non judice*. When the Irish parliament convened in 1703 Meath appealed this decision to the Lords. Ormonde, determined that the appeal would not develop into a repeat of King's case, attempted to engineer a sufficient delay in the Lords' addressing the case to enable further deliberation with the Earl. But he encountered stiff opposition from King and some other peers who condemned this procrastination as a 'civil way of dismissing it', intended merely to assist the English Lords in enforcing their claim. Within a short while several others had been persuaded to join with the protesters. This posed a delicate problem for the government. Southwell had to write to London seeking instructions: 'Ormonde requires special direction in Lord Meath's case,' he informed Nottingham,

> 'Your Lordship said that you thought offence would be taken by the House of Lords in England upon any decree for possession passed by the House here..... How to obviate this difficulty we do not know, for the Lords have resolved to do my Lord of Meath right and to vindicate their jurisdiction even if he withdraws his petition.'

Even more alarming was the fact that, in the light of this, King was threatening the 'ripping up' of his own case again.[40]

In spite of Ormonde's attempts to arrange an amicable solution, the House eventually decided the case in Meath's favour. Richard Cox, the Lord Chancellor, wrote to Nottingham to explain what had happened;

> 'I feared the debates in the House of Peers and that they would vindicate their jurisdiction as inherent in their house, and not to be opposed by the Lords in England..... my fears were justified. Lord Meath's case has given us more trouble than all the other business in parliament.....'

---

[40] LJI, i, 15/10/95, 29/10/95, 24/11/03, 11/2/04; Ormonde to Nottingham, 7/12/03, CSP Dom. 1703-4, p.226; Southwell to Nottingham, 2/7/03, CSP Dom. 1703-4, p.38; Same to Same, 10/1/04, CSP Dom. 1703-4, p.491; Cox to Nottingham, 28/10/03, CSP Dom. 1703-4, p.177.

Strenuous efforts were made by the government to ensure that Ward did not provoke matters with another appeal to England. In the event, neither side need have worried. Ward's death shortly afterwards meant that any intention to appeal died with him.[41]

The fact that in neither the King nor Meath cases had the English Lords managed to enforce their writ allowed the Irish Lords to persuade themselves that they retained *de-facto* supremacy, if only by default. This had been reinforced by the determination of successive ministries to ensure that incidents likely to lead to a resurrection of this dispute were defused before either House of Lords had the opportunity to assert its privilege. In 1709, for example, Wharton had decided to forego the opportunity to pursue an appeal to London, conscious that to have done otherwise would have threatened a Supply bill then being steered through the Irish parliament.[42]

In 1716, however, a case came before the courts which the government proved incapable of obstructing. In the spring of that year an appeal was lodged in the Irish Lords by one Hester Sherlock against a decision of the Irish Court of Exchequer in favour of one Maurice Annesley. On June 19 the Lords overturned the lower court's verdict and ruled in Sherlock's favour. Unhappy at this, and having exhausted the legal process in Ireland, Annesley decided to appeal this decision to London, despite government attempts to restrain him. Ruling that they could not accept an appeal which referred only to the merits of the case and not the substantive issue of appellate jurisdiction, however, the British Lords decided against accepting the appeal. This elicited the required

---

[41] LJI, i, 11/2/04; Southwell to Nottingham, 2/1/04, NLI. Ms. 991/209; Cox to Nottingham, 13/2/04, CSP Dom. 1703-4, p.531.

[42] Addison to Godolphin, 6/6/09, *Addison Letters*, pp.152-3; Addison to Sunderland, 25/6/09, PRO. S.P. 63/366/288. For evidence of government suspicions that King was more than willing to involve himself in this case if Wharton had persisted see Addison to Godolphin, 16/6/09, *Addison Letters*, pp.152-3.

response. Within days Annesley had submitted an appeal which cited the inability of the Irish Lords to hear such cases as the basis of his appeal to Westminster. With the House about to be prorogued the members were constrained in what they could do. They did, however, order a stay in the Irish Lord's decree in favour of Sherlock as well instructing the Irish Barons of the Exchequer to ensure that the lands were returned to Annesley.[43]

Realising that the members would prove extremely difficult to manage if this was not resolved before parliament reconvened in 1717, the Dublin government moved to defuse the situation. An attempt by Bolton to arrange compensation for Sherlock on condition that she drop her appeal was unsuccessful, however. Instead, she insisted upon being allowed to lodge an appeal with the Irish Lords against the British Lords' ruling.[44] When this came to the attention of the Irish peers they responded by resolving to 'support [their] honour, jurisdiction and privileges', instructing the sheriff of Kildare, who had ignored the British Lords order, to ensure that Sherlock remained in possession. Not satisfied with this, they then exacerbated the situation by voting compensation to her for the hardships she had endured so far, ordering the sheriff of Kildare to seize and sell some of Annesley's other lands in order to raise the requisite funds. They then turned their attention to those Barons of the Exchequer who had attempted to enforce the British order. King, ably assisted by Synge, was particularly vocal in his condemnation of their role in carrying out orders from London. Some of the newly arrived English-born bishops were taken aback by the depth of feeling generated by the issue:

---

[43] LJI, ii, 25/5/16, 19/6/16; Victory, *Colonial Nationalism in Ireland*, pp.133-6. The early progress of the Sherlock v Annesley case is outlined in Fitzpatrick, *Irish Lords' Jurisdiction*, pp.118-154.

[44] LJI, ii, 23/9/17; Addison to Bolton, 5/9/17, *Addison Letters*, pp.373-4; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 9/9/17, Midleton Mss. 4/68; Griffin, *Parliamentary Politics*, pp.50-61.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE Library CORK

Godwin, having sat through a debate on the matter for the first time, was confirmed in his view that there was 'no other way of putting an end to this contention but by passing an Act in England to take away our jurisdiction.' It was a sentiment with which, critically, the bulk of the English-born bishops concurred.[45]

The prorogation of parliament defused the situation somewhat. But King continued to protest at the British Lords 'laying their hands on Ireland and throwing themselves into the administration of it'. Exploiting fears amongst many Anglo-Irish of the 'republican' tendencies of English Whigs, he explained that there was 'a notion got into people's heads' that it was Irish Anglicans' 'firm adherence to his Majesty's interest' that was at the bottom 'of the violence used against us.' But, perhaps most interestingly, there was also a hint that King suspected that George had no intention of defending his 'loyal Irish subjects' in the face of this onslaught: 'I humbly conceive', he began in a long letter to Wake:

> 'that it is the interest of the crown to keep them from fingering what properly belongs to the king as much as possible, and though it may not be convenient to struggle with them on every occasion, yet all care should be taken by his Majesty and Ministers to preserve that valuable jewel in his Crown.'

If his misgivings proved well founded, then the attempts of the Irish Lords to fend off British designs in this area, which depended so much upon the monarch upholding the 'original compact' between Henry II and the Irish parliament, would be seriously hampered.[46]

---

[45] LJI, ii, 4/10/17; Synge to Wake, 30/9/17, Wake Mss. 12; Judge Caulfield to _____, 1/10/17, PRO. S.P. 63/375/194; Evans to Wake, 23/9/17, Wake Mss. 12; Godwin to Wake, 10/9/17, Wake Mss. 12; Same to Same, 21/9/17, Wake Mss. 12; Same to Same, 26/9/17, Wake Mss. 12; McNally, 'Irish and English Interests', pp.300-02.

[46] King to Southwell, 4/3/18, TCD Ms. 2535/99-100; King to Brodrick, 24/2/18, TCD Ms. 2535/86; King to Wake, 21/12/17, TCD Ms. 2535/36-8; King to Bishop of Carlisle, 3/2/18, TCD Ms. 2535/76; Nicolson to King, 13/2/18, Lyons 1850.

The British Lords resumed discussion of the case when they reconvened in early 1719. They first of all voted that Alexander Burrows, the Sheriff of Kildare, be brought into custody for refusing to comply with their order to place Annesley in possession. They then turned to dealing with the constitutional issues raised by Annesley's appeal - the question of whether the Irish Lords had any right to act as a court of appeal in such cases. Their deliberations were short. On January 25 the English peers repeated the *coram non judice* decision they had handed down in the Derry and Meath cases.[47]

The English-born prelates monitored the reaction to this in Ireland: 'What has passed in your House about the jurisdiction has set this little world in a flame,' Evans reported to London. 'It is impossible for your Grace to conceive how far their prejudices run,' another apprised Wake. King, who had threatened to resign his Lord Justiceship if the authorities did not intervene, excited their particular interest, being characterised as the leader of this 'new sect of State-Independents': 'the OLDMAN has a wonderful influence over them all, especially where country is concerned', Evans informed Wake,

> '..... numbers of them said in the hearing of sensible Englishmen that his zeal for his country deserved a pillar to be erected for him in regard to his steadiness to its interest etc..... Monstrous!'[48]

The consequence of all of this, he advised, was that when the Irish parliament convened in July 1719, members of both Houses could be expected to be 'on fire about our jurisdiction'. In fact, he had already informed the government that several of the Irish Lords were 'resolved to carry on, to the disturbance of

---

[47] William Cowper to Baron Gilbert, n.d., [1719], PRO. S.P. 63/377/20; *The London Diaries of William Nicolson, Bishop of Carlisle, 1702-1718*, 1/2/18, p.677; Fitzpatrick, *Irish Lords' Jurisdiction*, pp.138-154; Flaherty, *op. cit.*, pp.615-6.

[48] Evans to Wake, -/2/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.41; Same to Same, 29/3/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.46; Same to Same, -/5/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.56; King to Molesworth, 5/3/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/50; Nicolson to Wake, 31/10/19, B.L. Add. Ms. 6116/91-2.

the Public and their own House.' Hearing that King had written to discount such rumours, he became even more apprehensive: 'For God's sake', he pleaded with Wake, 'trust him not.....' Downes had managed to gather more specific information. The 'patriots', he reported to London, intended to begin the session by seeking an order to have Baron Pocklington, who had attempted to coerce the Sheriff of Kildare into complying with the British Lords' order, jailed.[49]

Their intelligence proved remarkably accurate. Within a few days of parliament reconvening King, along with Molesworth and Synge had been elected to a committee of the House chaired by Stearne delegated the task of investigating the actions of the Barons. The first Baron to be called was Chief Baron Jeffrey Gilbert whose insistence that he was 'not answerable to the Lords of Ireland, but the Lords of England', merely inflamed matters. Receiving no satisfaction there, however, the committee turned to Barons Pocklington and St. Leger, who tried to present themselves as innocent parties in 'an unhappy position between the two houses'. But their refusal to explicitly acknowledge the Irish Lords authority opened them up to a gruelling cross-examination.[50] King, singled out by the English-born bishops as being the 'most warm in the prosecution', and 'not wanting' in displaying his usual 'good nature' towards those who disagreed with him, immediately confronted them. He demanded to know from Pocklington whether he thought 'the overthrow of

---

[49] Evans to Wake, -/2/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.41; Same to Same, 9/7/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.81; Bolton to Craggs, 11/7/19, PRO. S.P. 63/377/157; Webster to Delafaye, 29/7/19, PRO. S.P. 63/377/109; Godwin to Wake, 26/4/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.55; Same to Same, 2/6/19, Wake Ms.13, fo.64. Gilbert, Pocklington and St. Leger were all Englishmen who had arrived in Ireland since 1714.

[50] Nicolson to Wake, 11/7/19, Gilbert Ms., 27 fo.226; Fitzpatrick, *Irish Lords' Jurisdiction*, pp.135-145; Victory, *Colonial Nationalism in Ireland*, p.140; *A Second Letter to a Gentleman of the Long Robe in Great Britain: Wherein some of the late illegal proceedings of the Barons of the Exchequer in the Kingdom of Ireland are plainly and impartially set forth*, Dublin, 1719, p.15.

this House a support to the king's prerogative?' The Baron was allowed to decline answering only after Brodrick intervened to protest at the nature of the questioning. King then accused Pocklington of denying his oaths by his actions. 'This', the beleaguered Baron protested,

> 'was pressed by the Archbishops of Dublin and Tuam with more rancour and virulence, (if possible), than any of the other questions, but..... it was dropped, though endeavours was [sic] used by one of the most Reverend prelates to take it up again who..... said a gaol was too good for us, nay death itself was too good for us.....'[51]

Once again, Brodrick rebuked the two prelates for pursuing the matter too vigorously, warning them that some of their own sentiments verged on being seditious, a point echoed by Evans who accused King of using language which itself 'bordered on high treason'.[52] Even Bolton signalled his displeasure at the 'several warm expressions of resentment dropped from some of the Lords'. In spite of these rebukes, however, the members of the committee were conspicuous by their support for King. When they reported to the House, therefore, they took the opportunity to utterly condemn the Barons, who had,

> 'acted in manifest derogation to and diminution of the king's prerogative of finally judging in his high court of parliament in Ireland; as also of the rights and privileges of this Kingdom and the parliament thereof.'[53]

In attempting to impose the writ of the British Lords, they continued, the

---

[51] Nicolson to Wake, 15/7/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.86; Bolton to [Craggs], 18/7/19, PRO. S.P. 63/377/131; King to Thomas Southwell, 29/7/19, TCD Ms. 750/5/188; Nicolson to Wake, 18/7/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.91; Pocklington to Wake, 15/7/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.84; Same to Same, 30/7/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.94; Bolton to Craggs, 14/7/19, PRO. S.P. 63/377/147;

[52] Evans to Wake, 22/7/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.92; Bolton to Craggs, 29/7/19, PRO. S.P. 63/377/115. Synge was singled out by another English-born bishop as having 'signalised himself' in the committee by 'outdoing his leader [King]': Nicolson to Wake, 12/7/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.85.

[53] LJI, ii, 28/7/19; King to Thomas Southwell, 29/7/19, TCD Ms. 750/5/188; Evans to King, 22/7/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.92; Bolton to Craggs, 29/7/19, PRO. S.P. 63/377/115.

Barons 'were betrayers of his Majesty's prerogative and the undoubted ancient rights and privileges of this House and the rights and liberties of the subjects of this kingdom'. Brodrick and all five of the English-born bishops appointed since 1714 attempted to counter this, but were rebuffed, although they were given leave to register their protest in the journals of the House. On a vote of the whole House, Gilbert, Pocklington and St. Leger were consigned peremptorily to 'the custody of the Black Rod to be put in chains and darkness for a judgement to come.'[54]

Ignoring warnings from the government that they were pursuing their cause in a manner which might prove 'not ..... serviceable to themselves', the 'patriots' now pressed their case further. Hoping to capitalise on their numerical strength, they made arrangements to prepare an *Address* to the king which would outline their claim to judicial supremacy. Some members of the select committee assigned this task wanted merely to recount the details of the Annesley v Sherlock case. However, the majority, led by King, intended to set out explicitly the case of the Irish House in the form of a *Representation* to his Majesty.[55]

Not wishing to see parliament embroiled in controversy, the government attempted to defuse the situation. 'They blow their furnace between the Lords of England and us into such a flame as I fear will not be quenched', an angry Brodrick reported to London, seeking some direction. An adjournment resulted which did lead to some reduction in tempers. But within a short time of their reconvening the members had returned to their task with

---

[54] LJI, ii, 29/7/19; Nicolson to Wake, 6/8/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.100; Bolton to Craggs, 29/7/19, PRO. S.P. 63/377/115; Pocklington to Wake, 30/7/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.94.

[55] Webster to Delafaye, 6/8/19, PRO. S.P. 63/377/59; McNally, 'Irish and English Interests', pp.302-3; Nicolson to Wake, 6/8/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.100.

renewed vigour. Evans kept Wake fully informed of the progress of King and 'his' select committee in formulating the *Representation*: it was 'the most monstrous paper that ever was,' he reported, after being alerted to its contents, and it went much further than either he or the other English-born bishops had expected. Enquiring of one member of the committee whether 'Dublin meant nothing else by it but the jurisdiction of this House and not, rather, independency,' Evans found that he had 'judged rightly, for this his Grace had been upon these 21 years.' 'Dub[lin] and others openly declare for an independence etc.', he concluded, sharpening tensions even more, '..... words cannot express their rage and fury against everything that is English.' An attempt by both himself and Nicolson to modify the wording was dismissed:

> 'Dub[lin] etc.'s Representation to the king..... will certainly pass as extravagant as it is. They roundly affirm..... that this Kingdom is as distinct, free and independent as Scotland ever was before the Union.'[56]

Confident that he could not be denied, King now almost made a serious miscalculation when he reported to the full House on behalf of the committee. Moving 'that the House might forthwith agree with the committee and swallow it in the lump without chewing', he encountered some opposition from Brodrick and several of those members who had 'neither seen nor heard one word' of the *Representation* until then and wanted time to reflect on it. But these requests were contemptuously dismissed. A vote was immediately forced on several paragraphs and it was decided to deal with the remaining sections once members gathered the following morning. By that stage, however, opponents of the *Representation* had managed to mount some form of resistance: 'The supreme judicature of this Kingdom was asserted in such a

---

[56] Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 16/8/19, Midleton Mss. 4/156; Meath to Wake, 29/9/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.111; Same to Same, 7/9/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.106; Same to Same, 18/9/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.109; Same to Same, 23/10/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.118.

strain' it would never be allowed by the British parliament, Nicolson pointed out, strongly supported by Evans, Godwin and Downes. They were immediately rebuked by the majority of the peers who objected to their denouncing the *Representation* as 'seditiously expressed.'[57] Alarmed at the tenor of the debate and at the embarrassment which such an *Address* would cause him, Bolton attempted to apply some pressure to individual members. With Brodrick's help he succeeded in persuading several temporal peers to modify their stance. But such tactics were ultimately to no avail. While some were swayed, most remained steadfast. King was among the 'more brave,' Nicolson informed Wake,

> 'He stood to his old doctrine of independency and strenuously avowed that no Acts made by a parliament in Great Britain signify it more than by-laws of a court of py-powder unless confirmed by our own two Houses..... This is what is daily preached by our senators and the mob falls down and worships.'

In fact, it was only the intervention of Brodrick, who urged them 'to consider the precipice they were on and to look before they made the final leap,' which persuaded King and his associates to modify some paragraphs of the text. After a 'long squabble' of several hours those opposing the *Representation* were forced to concede and further sections were approved by the members. When it was presented for final approval on October 17 it was overwhelmingly endorsed, only eight members dissenting.[58]

In essence the *Representation* presented the case of the Irish Lords to be recognised as the final judicial authority in Ireland. The 'compact' between

---

[57] LJI, ii, 1/10/19; Nicholson to Wake, 2/10/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.113; Bolton to Craggs, 1/10/19, PRO. S.P. 63/378/63; Webster to Delafaye, 1/10/19, PRO. S.P. 63/378/65.

[58] LJI, ii, 2/10/19, 17/10/19; Nicholson to Wake, 6/10/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.114; Same to Same, 17/10/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.117; Webster to Delafaye, 3/10/19, PRO. S.P. 63/378/67; Same to Same, 17/10/19, PRO. S.P. 63/378/88; Bolton to Craggs, 3/10/19, PRO. S.P. 63/378/69; Same to Same, 17/10/19, PRO. S.P. 63/378/90; Godwin to Wake, 17/10/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.116.

Henry II and the English in Ireland, various Elizabethan Acts of parliament and the historic rights of the kingdom were all cited in support. The 'Great Security' of Ireland, it was claimed, was that it was subject to the Imperial Crown and not the British parliament. The royal grant of common law and parliament were presented as conclusive evidence that an Irish parliament could not be superseded in judicial matters by Westminster. As far as the Irish Lords were concerned the original compact had been with Henry II as king and it was only his successors who could, with the Irish parliament's explicit approval, alter this: '..... though the Imperial Crown of this Realm was formerly inseparably annexed to the Imperial Crown of England', it proclaimed,

> 'yet this kingdom, being of itself a distinct Dominion, and no part of the kingdom of England, none can determine concerning affairs thereof, unless authorised thereto by the known laws and customs of this kingdom, or by the express consent of the king'.

Any attempt by the British Lords to act contrary to this compact threatened not only the integrity of the kingdom of Ireland, it continued, but the royal prerogative itself: 'If all judgements, decrees and determinations made in this your kingdom are subject to be nulled and reversed by the Lords in Great Britain', it concluded,

> 'the liberties and properties of all your subjects of Ireland must thereby become finally dependant on the British peers; to the great diminution of that dependence which by law we always ought to have immediately upon the Crown itself'.[59]

These sentiments were reiterated in an accompanying *Address* directed to the Lord Lieutenant and also introduced by King. The recent actions of the British House of Lords were condemned on the basis that it was both his Majesty's prerogative and the rights of his parliament in Ireland which were

---

[59] LJI, ii, 17/10/19; Flaherty, *op. cit.*, pp.617-8; Victory, *Colonial Nationalism in Ireland*, pp.142-3; idem., 'The Making of the 1720 Declaratory Act', pp.19-20.

being threatened. Ireland was 'a distinct Dominion', it proclaimed, and nobody could assume authority over her 'unless authorised thereto by the known laws and customs of this kingdom or by the express consent of the king.' Since the Irish parliament had not delegated its authority to any other body, the original relationship between the Imperial Crown and the Kingdom of Ireland could not be altered. Synge summed up this argument in a long explanation of the patriot position to Wake which would have met with King's approval:

> 'Now although Ireland is both a poor and an annexed Kingdom, yet still it is a Kingdom, modelled according to the constitution of England. And within itself and in those matters where itself is only concerned, has all the courts, powers and jurisdictions which belong to the Kingdom of England, AS A KINGDOM, and as its constitution was before its late union with Scotland.'

What he was sure had been 'represented to your Grace as warmth in our House of Peers' by Evans and Godwin would, once he was 'fully informed', he assured him,

> 'appear to be no more than a just and necessary resentment which such an assembly must either express for the treatment they received from the Barons of the Exchequer or else forever render themselves contemptible to all the world.'

King expressed himself even more forthrightly, particularly in emphasising the central role which he ascribed to the crown in protecting the sovereignty of the Irish parliament: 'All the rights and privileges we claim are derived from the crown and from the Compact between the kings of England and the people of Ireland', he explained to Lord Perceval,

> 'we have their Charters to show for our parliament and Judicatures as full and express as the Magna Charta of England, if we claim or use more than they grant us, the Crown from whom we derive them may stop us, but we claim nothing from the Lords of England, nor have they any power over us, every step that way is an usurpation of the Right of the Crown as well as over us.'[60]

---

[60] King to Perceval, 25/1/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/14-15; LJI, ii, 17/10/19; Synge to

But, while sentiments such as these might be judged agreeable to the Irish political nation and to the monarch, constitutional developments in England had rendered appeals to the notion of a 'dual-monarchy' redundant. The powers of the English parliament, strengthened originally in 1688, had been further reinforced by the circumstances of the Hanoverian succession. The new dynasty had been forced to accept the *de-facto* authority of a parliament which had effectively placed it on the throne. Whether King wished to acknowledge the fact or not, he was about to place his hopes for the protection of Ireland's parliamentary privileges in a monarch who, even if capable, was ultimately unwilling to defy the British parliament on this point.

This, however, would only become evident once the parliament in London took up the *Representation.* In the meantime, the tensions which events in the Irish parliament had generated continued long after the session had been prorogued. The English-born bishops were the focus of particular antipathy. Both Evans and Downes found themselves 'heartily railed at' and the butt of violent 'slurs'. 'If some speedy care be not taken of us,' Nicolson complained, 'we that have been so unfortunate as to be born in England are like to have a sorry time of it.' The effect of this hostility, however, was merely to confirm these men in their opposition to the patriot cause: 'I cannot help being of opinion,' Nicolson advised,

> 'that, instead of parting with our old one, we ought to have a new Test; requiring all officers, civil and military, solemnly to recognise the dependence of this Kingdom on the imperial Crown of Great Britain.....'[61]

Evans was of a similar opinion: 'Nothing can quiet and settle us on a true

---

Wake, 17/12/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo,136.

[61] Nicholson to Wake, 1/9/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.104; Evans to Wake, 12/2/20, Wake Mss. 13, fo.148; Same to Same, 18/9/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.109; Godwin to Wake, 30/7/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.95.

bottom,' he told Wake, 'but an Act of parliament on your side'. If this was not done quickly then 'the English interest must sink.' They took particular pains to report on attempts 'to irritate a giddy populace into barefaced rebellion'. A 'seditious spirit is arisen', Nicolson observed, 'which is daily animating the populace to assert their Irish liberties'.[62] And this had been excited further by the appearance of yet another edition of Molyneux's *The Case of Ireland Stated* which 'passes among them as altogether unanswerable'.[63]

However, their strongest onslaught was reserved for King himself. This 'whole fit of madness', Nicolson believed,

> '[was] owing to the resentments of a single Ecclesiastical Grandee, who, feeling himself to sink in the esteem of his late associates in power, resolved to make himself considerable by an after-game with the mob, whose darling he now is, as amply as he was, a few months ago, their aversion. The Angel of St. Patrick's is now the Guardian of the Kingdom.'[64]

But, once the British parliament enforced its claim, the mob would 'be at last convinced,' Evans hoped, 'that he is a greater enemy to it [Ireland] than those he calls foreigners.' At the very least they expected the ministry to exclude him from the executive. 'If you continue the authors [of the *Representation*] in places under the Government,' they protested, '.....you are not true to the

---

[62] Evans to Wake, -/10/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.120; Downes to Wake, 13/1/20, Wake Mss. 13, fo.143; Nicolson to Wake, 18/12/19, B.L. Add. Ms. 6116/179; Same to Same, 1/9/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.104. The English-born bishops also attached some significance to the fact that a Popery Bill had been defeated during this session: 'I can't help thinking,' Evans suggested, 'that their view is to make fair weather with the Papists in case their Representation meets not with (hoped for) success .....': Evans to Wake, -/10/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.120; Pocklington to Wake, 3/11/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.122.

[63] Evans to Wake, 9/8/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.101; P. Kelly, 'William Molyneux and the Spirit of Liberty in Eighteenth Century Ireland', p.136. King, who had been unhappy at the book's appearance in 1698, was now unstinting in his admiration: King to Samuel Molyneux, 2/1/20, TCD Ms. 750/5/238-9

[64] Nicolson to Wake, 31/10/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.119. (It is obvious from the context, where the individual alluded to is a Lord Justice, that the 'Angel of St.Patrick's' is a reference to King, not Swift.)

interest of Great Britain nor yet that of Ireland.' In an account calculated to provoke the government, Evans reported that many of King's supporters were taunting members of the administration, claiming that the ministry 'DARED not put Dub[lin] out of the Government.' He was delighted, therefore, to hear that the government were 'sensible of the wrong measures Dub[lin] and his followers are engaged in.'[65]

In fact, their canvassing was unnecessary. After his experiences of recent months Bolton needed little urging to exclude King. Long before parliament had ended he had decided that he could no longer accommodate a man who had so recently and so conspicuously opposed the government on several crucial issues. When the Lord Lieutenant departed for London, therefore, he left behind a commission which continued only Conolly and Brodrick in the executive. Downes took great pleasure in relating the despondency of King's supporters at this development:

> 'I believe it was a great mortification to the zealots that a certain third man [King] was left out because it looked as if he had far less credit and power on the other side of the water than he has on this. However, he was so wise as to dissemble his dislike of that step and ..... seemed as pleased with his release from trouble as others can possibly be with the addition to theirs; but his heart you can guess at as well.'

King's interpretation of events was somewhat different: 'By my opposition ..... I have quite lost the favour of the government here and interest in it', he informed Wake,

> 'but that doth very little concern me. I lost the favour of the former government by struggling for the succession and I think the cause of the church is of no less moment. I shall, with God's help always use my best endeavours to discharge a good conscience. I thank God I did it when a young man to the best

---

[65] Meath to Wake, 7/9/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.106; Same to Same, -/10/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.120; Same to Same, 29/9/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.111; Godwin to Wake, 7/11/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.125.

> of my power and 'twere great folly and wickedness in me at this time of the day for favour or duty to decline my duty.'[66]

King was now the undoubted champion of those dismissed derisively by Evans as 'patriots' and 'State-Independents'. This was especially the case since both Conolly and Brodrick, the two most influential politicians in the country, had declared themselves 'enemies to this..... Doctrine of Independency.' 'He is not very willing to be under any government but his own,' Godwin cautioned Wake, on hearing that King intended to travel to London to present the *Representation* personally to his Majesty,

> 'He is capable of saying anything in pursuit of his own perverse will. He will certainly, I think, join the most disaffected among you if the Representation takes not the turn he expects ..... how far he must succeed time must show.'

Evans was equally vigilant. Ever alert to King's strategies, he advised the British authorities to expect 'strong opposition and altercations' from '[t]he Great Man of St. Sepulchre's who is never willing to be directed or outdone by any other', particularly now that the restraints placed upon him as a member of the executive had been removed.[67]

None of this was news to the ministry in London. They had kept a close watch on King for some time and were fully aware that, presenting himself as one who had 'a true zeal for the good of my country', he had been in

---

[66] Downes to Nicolson, 24/11/19, reproduced in *Letters on various subjects, literary, political and ecclesiastical to and from William Nicolson, 1683-1727*, ed. J. Nicholls, London, 1809, ii, p.497; King to Wake, 10/11/19, TCD Ms. 750/5/206-7.

[67] Nicolson to Wake, 31/10/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.119; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 21/11/19, Midleton Mss. 4/170; Evans to Wake, 26/11/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.130; Same to Same, 6/11/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.123; Same to Same, 25/11/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.129; Godwin to Wake, 7/11/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.125.

correspondence with several Irish Lords in London exhorting them not to be 'indolent but [to] bestir themselves amongst their friends and meet and concert measures how to manage in this critical juncture' when the 'liberty of our country and being of our parliament is at stake'. Indeed, he had already enlisted the support of his friends Robert Molesworth, Francis Annesley and Samuel Molyneux as well as that of Lords Perceval, Limerick and Gowran who were then in London. Lord Limerick had expressed the sentiments of many of his colleagues in his reply to King's request that he involve himself: 'It was your Grace's conduct overcame the difficulties this affair met with in Ireland', he wrote, alluding to recent events in the Irish parliament,

> 'and since you have been so good as to continue your care of it now 'tis called into question this side [of] the water. I hope better from the Justice of our cause than to despair of it.'[68]

The willingness of these men to press Ireland's case became critical when King was suddenly struck by a recurrence of his gout. Having overexerted himself during the previous few months, particularly on the Toleration bill and the *Representation*, he was forced to retire to his chamber. But in spite of his physician's orders to rest, he lobbied even more furiously. Annesley, Southwell, Wake, Perceval and Molesworth, all then in London, were only some of those with whom he maintained an almost frenetic correspondence over the coming months. Indeed, in spite of the fact that illness prevented him from travelling to London, it was he who, to all intents and purposes, initiated and co-ordinated much of the strategy adopted by the

---

[68] Lord Limerick to King, 9/2/20, Lyons 1945; King to Gowran, 25/1/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/12; King to Perceval, 25/1/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/14-15; King to Molesworth, 25/1/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/7-8; King to Fitzwilliam, 25/1/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/9-10. King implied in a letter to Samuel Molyneux that he had to be guarded in what he wrote during this time as he suspected that his mail was being tampered with: King to Molyneux, 7/7/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/100.

patriots.[69]

This strategy was based on two assumptions; firstly that the establishment of precedent and common law right in the Irish Lords favour would be critical and secondly that, if all else failed, the monarch could be depended upon to defend the historic rights of 'his loyal Irish subjects', as William had done twenty years previously. With these considerations in mind, King had already 'ordered our journals and the rolls to be searched for precedents of our jurisdiction.' He had also made arrangements for a full account of Ireland's historical claims to jurisdiction and privilege to be prepared. These, he was confident, would conclusively discredit any claim the British Lords might put forward and could be presented to either the British parliament or the king as and when necessary.[70]

His confidence that the Irish Lords would be successful in asserting its authority was reflected in the contempt with which he dismissed the right of the British Lords to even discuss the privileges of the Irish Lords: he would never, he promised, 'pay any deference to them by letting our case come before them' since the rights of the Irish parliament were as 'express as the Magna Charta of England'. The British House of Lords were 'none of our judges,' and the Irish parliament 'derive[d] no authority from them, but from the crown,' he explained,

> '..... we are ready to produce his Royal predecessors charters and the possession and execution of the rights, powers and privileges granted by them and till they make out their right to judge us they wrong us and usurp on the crown.'

---

[69] King to Molyneux, 16/4/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/61-2; Kelly, 'Archbishop William King, (1650-1729)', pp.85-94; idem., 'William Molyneux and the Spirit of Liberty in Eighteenth Century Ireland', p.141; Victory, 'The Making of the 1720 Declaratory Act', pp.21-3.

[70] King to Perceval, 25/1/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/14-15; Same to Same, 23/2/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/34; Flaherty, *op. cit.*, pp.610; Victory, *Colonial Nationalism in Ireland*, p.146.

'The question I conceive', he explained to Fitzwilliam,

> 'ought not to be whether we have a jurisdiction or no, but whether they have any ..... he that claims the jurisdiction ought to prove it [which] they can never do in this case. Suppose we have not yet, it will not follow that they can call us to account for that will only belong to his Majesty's prerogative.'[71]

In his judgement the British Lords had only three options, each of which, he calculated, could be countered. If they ordered the Irish judges to observe the jurisdiction of the British Lords then he was sure that they would refuse to obey. If, on the other, the Lords had the temerity to attempt 'by an act of parliament to reverse our constitution', then, he proposed, the Irish Lords should simply;

> 'Stand our ground [and] it will necessarily make such a convulsion and open such a gap into the fundamental maxims of the constitution of the Britannic Government that I persuade myself that it can't long stand.....'[72]

But the course which he felt the British Lords were most likely to adopt was a petition to the king requesting that he affirm their ascendancy over the Irish Lords and thereby 'do their drudgery for them and land them the royal power'. In that event he was confident that his Majesty's concern for his own prerogative, together with the long history of Irish parliamentary independence, the list of precedents which he was having extracted from the Rolls and the loyalty shown by the Irish Protestants in 1689 and 1715 would be sufficient to ensure royal protection. Indeed, ultimately, Ireland had, he

---

[71] King to Perceval, 25/1/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/14-15; King to Thomas Southwell, 25/1/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/11-12; Godwin to Wake, 16/1/20, Wake Mss. 13, fo.144; King to Fitzwilliam, 25/1/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/9-10.

[72] King to Thomas Southwell, 8/1/20, TCD Ms. 750/5/242-5; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 16/1/20, Midleton Mss. 4/195.

believed, 'no defence but in the power of the crown.'[73]

However, political developments in England had not been conducive to either this reasoning or to the patriot cause in general. Indignation at the Irish parliament's *Representation*, combined with tensions within the ministry, had made it expedient for the House of Lords there to consider legislating to themselves the power which they had claimed for so long. Anxious to ensure the support of the Lords for a Peerage Bill, the ministry was willing to encourage them in this course.[74] Thus, when the British parliament reconvened in November 1719, there was widespread endorsement for any move which would assert the authority of the British over the Irish Lords. There were even suggestions that this might extend to support from the crown, a possibility given some credence by George's intimation that he would be 'graciously pleased' to accommodate the British Lords request that a copy of the Irish Lords *Representation* to him be laid before them.[75]

Still convinced that the matter would be decided by the king and not by parliament, King was somewhat taken aback by George's willingness to accede to the British Lord's request. It's effect was to cause him to press those Irish Lords then in London to arrange to explain to his Majesty both the integrity of the Irish case, and the implications for the crown of any subordination of the Irish Lords. He wrote immediately to Lord Fitzwilliam asking that he take the initiative on this: 'I hear a great deal of the threats of the Lords in England

---

[73] King to Perceval, 25/1/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/14-15; King to Southwell, 6/2/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/25-6.

[74] Wake to King, 10/12/19, Lyons 1939; Thomas Brodrick to [Alan Brodrick], 1/12/19, Midleton Mss. 4/172; Same to Same, 16/1/20, Midleton Mss. 4/195; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, -/12/19, Midleton Mss. 4/186; Same to Same, 14/12/19, Midleton Mss. 4/188; Victory, *Colonial Nationalism in Ireland*, 148-151.

[75] Craggs to Bolton, 24/12/19, Cal. Dept. Corr. 52/143/2345; *Address of House of Lords*, 18/12/19, Cal. Dept. Corr. 52/143/2345a; *Report on Annesley v Sherlock including relevant Papers*, PRO. S.P. 63/378/12-22.

against our judicature here', he wrote,

> 'but if an act of parliament be the method designed by them I am not much afraid of it at present. I rather apprehend their applying to his Majesty to interpose his power. If any address should be made that way I am of opinion that all the Lords of Ireland that are in London should join in a counter-address to lay before him the hardship it would be to condemn the proceedings of the parliament of Ireland without hearing them.'

In a move which only incensed the British Lords further, he also announced plans to have additional copies of the *Representation* printed and forwarded to London for general circulation.[76]

Several days later, however, when Annesley wrote informing him that a Declaratory Bill incorporating the British Lords claims had been framed, he was abruptly awakened to the fact that he had completely misjudged matters. Not only did this make it clear that the British Lords intended to look to the Commons rather than the crown for assistance, but it was now apparent that what was being proposed was a bill which also explicitly stated that it was for the British parliament as a whole to legislate for Ireland. King was horrified. He had never believed that the British Lords would attempt such a radical step - it did nothing but 'demonstrate their want of law or reason'.[77] 'If this bill pass,' he declared, '.....it must make Ireland the most miserable people [sic] in Europe'. For a time the prospect even conjured up images of a more insidious ambition on the part of some 'disaffected' British politicians: 'To deal ingenuously with your Lordship' he confided in Molesworth, who by this stage had emerged as the most active of the Irish peers in London,

---

[76] King to Fitzwilliam, 25/1/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/9-10; Thomas Brodrick to Alan Brodrick, 24/1/20, Midleton Mss. 4/205.

[77] Annesley to King, 23/1/20, Lyons 1943; Wake to King, 24/3/20, Lyons 1947; Perceval to King, 9/2/20, B.L. Add. Ms. 47029/9-10, (quoted by Burns in, *op. cit.*, p.101); Thomas Brodrick to Alan Brodrick, 27/1/20, Midleton Mss. 4/207; Thomas Brodrick to Alan Brodrick, 6/2/20, Midleton Mss. 4/214.

> 'I am apprehensive that there is a farther design in this proceeding, at least of some that seem very zealous in it. Your lordship knows that many both in England and in Scotland are much disaffected to his Majesty's government which they have showed by several rebellions, whereas the body of the Protestants of Ireland were sincerely in his interest ..... this has brought a great odium on them [the Irish Protestants] from the disaffected and their business is to separate them from the royal interest. They omit no means to prejudice us against it.'

And he found the fact that the bill was being presented as one which would promote the powers of the monarch particularly reprehensible: '[a]s to passing a bill to secure the dependency of Ireland on the crown of Great Britain,' he sneered,

> 'that can't be the true intent of it for it is settled inseparably and united inseparably to it. But the true meaning is to take off its dependence on the Crown and place it on the House of Lords there. They by their Peerage bill endeavour to make themselves independent on [sic] King and Commons and being baffled in that they are willing to play a small game.....'

It was, he convinced himself, the first step in the replacement of the monarchy with a republic and 'making Ireland an appendage of the projected aristocracy.'[78]

This was not the only disconcerting part of the various communications he had been receiving, however, since it had also been reported to him that the initiative for this bill had probably come from the Court party itself. If this were the case then it suggested that it might already have received some measure of royal approval, thereby exposing King's confidence in George's zeal for his own prerogative as grossly misplaced. Indeed, King's response did betray signs of his trust in the crown having been somewhat undermined: 'It seems the Lords there found their votes were not of

---

[78] King to Molesworth, 13/2/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/30; King to Thomas Southwell, 13/2/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/32-3; King to Thomas Southwell, 13/2/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/32-3; King to Molesworth, 13/2/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/30.

force to destroy our parliament,' he protested,

> 'and therefore they fly to the King and Commons to help them by an Act of parliament. But I hope his Majesty will be better advised than to lend his assistance to oppress some of his best subjects and the Commons than to give theirs to enlarge a power against law and reason which is already too hard for them.'

The intention was 'plainly to alienate the hearts of the Protestants of Ireland from his Majesty,' he persuaded himself, and,

> 'to separate their interest from his, to transfer the dependence of his most loyal subjects from his person and transfer it to the Lords, and thereby disable his Majesty to protect his subjects here and them to assist him if there be occasion.'

It was obvious that King could not yet bring himself to accept that the monarch had deserted his 'most faithful subjects'. If George was in any way culpable then it was, he believed, simply because he was being wrongly advised: 'If his Majesty or those that are in earnest for the Revolution be rightly apprised of this matter,' he told Southwell,

> "tis impossible they should ever concur with the Jacobites to promote this Bill, the design of which is to revenge His Majesty's enemies on his friends for their loyal adherence to him.....'

All the more reason, he insisted, why those Irish Lords in London should proceed with the additional *Address* to his Majesty without delay.[79]

In spite of attempts such as this to rally the patriots, the fact that George was being, at best, equivocal in his support for their cause, could no longer be ignored. Privately several of their number began to voice serious concern for their prospects. Evans claimed to detect a marked change in both

---

[79] Annesley to King, 23/1/20, Lyons 1943; Perceval to King, 9/2/20, B.L. Add. Ms. 47029/9-10, (quoted by Burns in, *op. cit.*, p.101). King to Southwell, 6/2/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/25-6; King to Thomas Southwell, 13/2/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/32-3; Thomas Brodrick to Alan Brodrick, 14/2/20, Midleton Mss. 4/222; Bolton to Lord Justices of Ireland, 26/3/20, Cal. Dept. Corr. 52/143/2365.

their tactics and their mood. Their hopes were increasingly being placed in the members of the English House of Commons, who, it was felt, might obstruct a bill intended to increase the power of the English Lords: 'The bill will answer all material purposes,' he remarked happily,

> 'but the faction here flatter themselves that the Lower House will not pass it and this is all they have at present to keep up one anothers spirits ..... many of the wisest among them begin to ..... lay all on the ecclesiastics; the three metropolitans and their obsequious or faction followers.'

Confirming this, Brodrick reported that many in Ireland were beginning to question the wisdom of individuals such as King in precipitating this crisis. If the bill did pass, he opined, then 'those who put the nation..... under these difficulties are answerable.' Evans was only too happy to concur:

> 'They have for some years past worked one another into [such] a high opinion of their greatness, independency, etc., that they think nobody is able to control them. Some say the bill will not pass the Commons and if it should go through they will not obey the law. Others say there can be then no more parliaments here and money will not be granted. Dub[lin] thinks it a good sign that the right was of [illegible] side since nothing but a new law must yoke us, with much more of this sort of stuff dressed up in the coarsest language.'

'God forgive Dub[lin] etc.,' he added, 'I am well assured there is not one single man in this kingdom ..... who is pleased with this bill.'[80]

Evidencing signs of being aware of this growing criticism, King was now in a quandary as to what to advise. For one thing the likelihood of the Commons opposing the bill was looking increasingly slight. This was particularly the case since Stanhope and Sunderland had seized upon the bill as

---

[80] Evans to Wake, -/2/20, Wake Mss. 13, fo.147; Same to Same, 12/2/20, Wake Mss. 13, fo.148; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 7/2/20, Midleton Mss. 4/216; Thomas Brodrick to Alan Brodrick, 18/2/20, Midleton Mss. 4/226; Same to Same, 14/2/20, Midleton Mss. 4/222; Same to Same, 16/2/20, Midleton Mss. 4/224; Victory, 'The Making of the 1720 Declaratory Act', pp.24-27.

a means of healing the breach which had emerged between themselves and Walpole following the setting side of the Peerage Bill by the Commons. Indeed, Annesley had already informed him that, regardless of who was promoting the bill, 'everybody seemed to assent to it.' It was obvious, therefore, that his original suggestion, another *Address* to George, would no longer suffice. In fact, all that he could suggest was that the various Irish politicians in London attempt to exploit any lingering tensions that existed between Lords and Commons in the wake of their confrontation over the Peerage Bill: 'Great diligence ought to be used with the members of the House of Commons,' he advised, 'to apprise them of the absurdity of the thing.' 'It were more reasonable' he suggested shrewdly, 'for the House of Commons to guard themselves from the power of the Lords and to settle a more equal tribunal for appeals than confirm it by Act .....'[81] The bill was, however, 'artfully enough worded,' he acknowledged, particularly in assuming to the entire parliament at Westminster the right to legislate for Ireland. "Tis very hard we should be bound by laws made by legislators so extremely ignorant of our circumstances and constitution', he told Perceval, 'and yet that is not the worst, their malice seems equal to their ignorance'. He could offer little more than the hope that the bill might yet fail on account of political jealousies in the British body politic: 'I doubt not but it will go through the Lords,' he admitted, finally, to Molesworth,

> 'with the same expedition that the Peerage Bill did, though in my opinion much more unjust and unreasonable. I hope it will meet with the same fate [as the Peerage Bill] in the House of Commons..... I hope they will consider of what moment it is, that a whole nation is concerned in it, that they ought at least to be heard before they be judged..... and that the Lords' power is

[81] Annesley to King, 23/1/20, Lyons 1943; Wake to King, 24/3/20, Lyons 1947; King to Thomas Southwell, 13/2/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/32-3; Swift to Ford, 4/4/20, Swift Corr. ii, p.342-3.

already so exorbitant that the whole people of Great Britain groan under it.'[82]

In fact, when parliament reconvened matters initially progressed somewhat differently from what King had expected. Discussion of the bill was deferred by the Lords until they had first dealt with the behaviour of the Irish Lords in censuring the Barons of the Exchequer for attempting to reinstate Annesley in his lands. In a series of speeches the imprisonment of the Barons was almost unanimously condemned.[83] Only the Earl of Wharton offered any defence of the Irish Lords' actions. Noting his admiration of the Earl's 'noble beginning', King recorded his appreciation. When news of Wharton's intervention reached Dublin, there was even, Nicolson sneered, 'some dispute amongst us whether old St. Patrick [King] or the young Duke of Wharton has the present guardianship of Ireland.' But Wharton's was one of the few voices raised in favour of the Irish Lords, the majority rejecting any arguments in its favour. In attempting to enforce the British Lords' ruling the Irish Barons were declared to have acted properly and were duly commended. In obstructing them the Irish Lords were declared to have impinged on the king's rights. 'Tis pretty pleasant to hear them vote that the Barons have acted in support of his Majesty's prerogative', King remarked on hearing of this resolution,

> '..... as if taking the power of doing right to his subjects in Ireland out [of] his Majesty's hands and putting it into power of the Lords in England were an accession to his prerogative, the

---

[82] King to Perceval, 23/2/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/34; King to Molesworth, 13/2/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/29-31; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 7/2/20, Midleton Mss. 4/216. Molesworth did succeed in persuading John Toland to write a pamphlet putting forward the case of the Irish Lords, but this was subsequently used by the British Lords to substantiate their claim that the Anglo-Irish were on the point of rebellion: [John Toland], *Reasons offered to the House of Commons why the bill sent down to them from the House of Lords entitled An act for the better securing the dependency of the Kingdom of Ireland upon the crown of Great Britain, should not pass into law*, London, 1720; King to Molesworth, 10/9/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/117-8.

[83] Bolton to Lord Justices of Ireland, 23/1/20, Cal. Dept. Corr. 52/143/2349; Same to Same, 26/1/20, Cal. Dept. Corr. 52/143/2354.

> consequence of which is plainly this: that he shall not be able to do justice to some of his most faithful subjects and most attached to his interest without leave from Lords in England.'[84]

More disconcerting for King, however, was George's reply to the British Lords' request for confirmation of their authority over the Irish Barons, in which he seemed to indicate his support for the Lords' ambition. It elicited the first overt expression of King's growing disillusionment with the monarch:

> 'We have the answer of his Majesty to the Lords' *Address* in which he approves all the Barons' proceedings and promises to reward them. I admire that his Majesty should conclude himself in such a matter as this without any deliberation.'

It seemed to be necessary, he observed indignantly, 'to apprise His Majesty of what concern it is to him to support the people of Ireland.'[85]

But King would still not allow himself to admit that George's acquiescence could be traced to the increasingly dominant role of parliament, since it gave him too 'melancholy [a] prospect'. Instead, determined to persist in the notion that George retained the power to frustrate the British Lords' design, but was simply refusing to employ it, he began to criticise the monarch for failing to protect his own prerogative: 'I understand that it is alleged the crown is too weak to protect us in this case though we have right,' he wrote in

---

[84] King to Molesworth, 6/2/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/22-4; Nicolson to Wake, 23/2/20, Wake Mss. 13, fo.151; Thomas Brodrick to Alan Brodrick, 11/2/20, Midleton Mss. 4/220; King to Southwell, 5/3/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/52-3; King to Perceval, 5/3/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/52-3. The Duke of Leeds had indicated his disapproval at what was being proposed in pamphlet form: *The Late Duke of Leeds Reasons for protesting against a vote made in the House of Lords in England which declared a certain Trial before the House of Lords in Ireland to be 'coram non judice'*, Marsh's Library, Ms. Z3.2.5; Viscount Tadcaster, (Earl of Thomond in the Irish peerage), had also registered a brief protest in the Lords. However, Molesworth and Molyneux attempted a more vigorous defence of the Irish case in the Commons: Burns, *op. cit.*, pp.100-105; Hansard's *Parliamentary History of England*, vii, 1714-22, London 1811, pp.642-3; Victory, 'The Making of the 1720 Declaratory Act', pp.25-27.

[85] King to Thomas Southwell, 13/2/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/32-3; King to Molesworth, 6/2/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/22-4; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 7/2/20, Midleton Mss. 4/216.

reply to a letter from Molesworth,

> 'and I find by your Lordship's that his Majesty is of opinion that he must break off with his parliament of Great Britain if he attempt to screen us. But his Majesty does not consider how much more he will weaken the crown by unreasonable compliance in ruining his most sincere friends to gratify his enemies .....'

Nor did Southwell's confirmation that the crown's authority was 'so depressed that it is not sufficient to interpose between us and our adversaries,' cause him to change his mind. Appealing to him to use his influence as Secretary of State to arrange for more time to be made available for the Anglo-Irish to present their case and for 'all parties to be heard properly,' he rejected such an assessment. '..... if his Majesty and ministers please', he persisted,

> 'they may stop this bill in the House of Commons and never suffer it to be offered to his Majesty for his royal assent and if they do not all will believe that it is by their contrivance.....'

Indeed, it was his opinion that yet another petition to his Majesty might have the desired effect. Such an *Address*, 'well worded' and recounting precedents and the history of Anglo-Irish loyalty, might at least force the king to consider the merits of the patriot cause.[86]

But neither the king nor the ministry had any intention of intervening in the Commons, to which the bill had been passed on February 22, having had an easy progress through the Lords. The Irish peers in London now focused their efforts entirely on lobbying members of the Commons since, with George unlikely to refuse it, this represented the final opportunity for the defeat of the measure. 'I hear they now endeavour to poison the gentry with strange notions of your tyranny etc.,' Evans wrote from Dublin, 'the better to cover the

---

[86] King to Molesworth, 23/2/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/36-8; Same to Same, 5/3/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/50; King to Thomas Southwell, 23/2/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/39-41; Swift to Ford, 4/4/20, Swift Corr. ii, p.343.

wildness of their own noble achievements. They still flatter one another that Commons will reject the bill .....'[87]

Their efforts were not helped, however, by reports from Ireland that the country was on the verge of rebellion. The British Lords had attempted to make capital of these accounts and had stated in the preamble to the Declaratory Bill that this was one motivating factor in their pressing for it. But even Brodrick, who was anxious to remain aloof from the fray, was moved to refute these rumours: 'it would be hard for one who knows the contrary to be true,' he acknowledged,

> 'to hear it suggested as if the Protestants of this Kingdom in general affected an independency on the Crown of Great Britain.'[88]

The fact that much of this misinformation was being supplied by the English-born bishops was especially infuriating to King. He wrote to Wake requesting support in apprising the members of the Commons of the true situation: 'I find we are taxed with the design to subtract this kingdom from our dependence on the crown of England,' he informed him,

> 'and I am told, though I can't believe it, that some have written to Your Grace that the Protestants of Ireland are ripe for a rebellion. If they had said that some in Ireland are ready to remove the Christian religion and indeed all revealed religion there had been some ground for it since it is certain there are many infidels amongst us though few of our own growth.'

In fact, he suggested mischievously, 'the design' of the House of Lords might well be to incite such a rebellion, since this would facilitate the 'forfeiture of

---

[87] Evans to Wake, 25/2/20, Wake Mss. 13, fo.153; King to Perceval, 5/3/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/52-3; Godwin to Wake, 5/3/20, Wake Mss. 13, fo.154.

[88] Thomas Brodrick to Alan Brodrick, 14/2/20, Midleton Mss. 4/222; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 5/3/20, Midleton Mss. 4/230. Bolton complained that a book of a very 'seditious nature', *A History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in Ireland*, intended to insinuate that the Anglo-Irish were about to rebel, had been published to coincide with the debate in parliament: Bolton to Lords Justices of Ireland, 26/3/20, Cal. Dept. Corr., 52/143/2365.

estates' in Ireland and complement their legislative avarice. Nor was he re-assured by Wake's insistence that these reports were not being taken seriously. He was in no mood for delicate politicking: 'If they take away our parliament, as such a bill, if it pass, will certainly do', he told Southwell, 'we shall heartily give all our assistance to take away the British one also and ours will be a very good precedent to that step.....' 'God only knows', he told Molesworth menacingly, 'what desperation may make a people do'.[89]

Insinuations such as these were unlikely to deflect the members of the Commons, however. Attracted by the increased powers which the bill gave to the British parliament as a whole, and encouraged by Harley, they showed every sign of being eager to see their claims to legislative authority over Ireland incorporated in legislation signed by the king. By early March the bill had come before the House of Commons for its second reading. King wrote to Molesworth with 'concern and vexation' that it would take some months before the relevant precedents could be extracted from the Rolls. He could no longer hide his disillusionment. He was, he admitted to Perceval, 'prepared for the worst'.[90]

Immediately, and typically, he began to seek out those he could blame. In a letter to Wake he castigated the Tories who had so 'often complained that Ireland was a dead weight on them' and their designs. Ireland's steadfastness and loyalty had 'hindered' their rebellion of 1715 and '[t]his sticks in the Jacobites' stomachs,' he insisted, 'and is the true root of the confederacy against us.' Others who he believed had acted with less than full vigour included some of those Irish Lords then in London: 'We have several peers in Ireland that are

---

[89] King to Wake, 5/3/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/44-7; King to Southwell, 6/2/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/25-6; King to Molesworth, 13/2/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/30.

[90] King to Thomas Southwell, 3/3/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/43-4; King to Molesworth, 3/3/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/50-1; King to Perceval, 5/3/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/52-3.

likewise peers in England,' he pointed out,

> 'It seems that they are ashamed of their honours and willing to abolish them. Time may come when they may repent it.'

Lord Fitzwilliam, for example, had refused to sign the *Representation* to the king for fear that it would prejudice a private bill he was sponsoring. Despite the fact that his own long-running litigation against Christ Church was pending in the British Lords giving him 'greater reasons to be silent', King promised that he would continue to exert all of his energies to achieving the defeat of the Bill. This obduracy was confirmed by Evans: 'It may be depended upon,' he told Wake, 'that while Dub[lin] and his followers live they will never leave off pursuing the old Game.'[91]

In a more considered letter to Molesworth, however, King showed a surer grasp of the political reality: 'Tis now pretty apparent', he remarked,

> 'that the Ministry is at the bottom of this oppressive bill for if they pleased it were easy for them to stop it..... I find by all hands that this bill is entirely the creature of the Ministry and that the framing, pushing on and finishing it was their sole work. But none has so much as offered a reason for it, nor can I imagine what should move them to it.'

Furthermore, he was willing to allow that there might be no motives behind this bill other than the stated aim of enacting the legislative and juridical supremacy of the British parliament: 'it can't be,' he accepted,

> 'that they are desirous to take away the prerogatives of the crown and having failed in their attempts to do it in Great Britain are resolute to go as far as they can and destroy it in Ireland first which may be a step to it in England. Nor can I think that their principles are Republican and that their design is to vest the real power in the Lords which rather looks aristocratical.'

---

[91] King to Thomas Southwell, 3/3/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/43-4; King to Molesworth, 3/3/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/50-1; Evans to Wake, 25/2/20, Wake Mss. 13, fo.153; King to Perceval, 5/3/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/52-3.

He was finally prepared to admit that what was happening was, like the attempt to secure the Peerage Bill, nothing more than the logical consequence of British political developments over the previous decade and the gradual centralisation of power in Westminster by Whigs.[92]

King had finally come to the realisation that notions of 'dual monarchy', common law right, and appeal to precedent now counted for little. What mattered was power, and since King's last great constitutional defence over two decades previously, the balance had shifted even more from crown to parliament: 'We have law, right and justice on our side', he wrote sadly to Perceval, 'but, say they, what is that to power? ['Tis] a most miserable and wicked case.' The best he could offer by way of advice was one final canvass of influential members of the Commons: they should be encouraged, he told Molesworth,

> '[to] consider a little, if they think at all, what an addition they make by this to the Lords' power and it were a proper opportunity to get something peculiar to themselves, at least to deliver their own right in exempting such causes ..... from their jurisdiction.'[93]

As the date of the vote approached, he was not surprised to hear that such canvassing had proven futile. Political concerns at Westminster far outweighed any purely Irish considerations. When debate on the bill resumed the fact that it would pass quickly became apparent. Some members did baulk at giving additional powers to the Lords, but a clear majority favoured the bill. Only the preamble was adjusted to exclude all references to a possible Irish rebellion as having been a motivating factor in framing it. By an overwhelming

---

[92] King to Molesworth, 16/4/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/61-2; Same to Same, 5/3/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/50-1; King to Perceval, 5/3/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/52-3.

[93] King to Perceval, 5/3/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/52-3; King to Molesworth, 5/3/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/50-1; Swift to Ford, 4/4/20, Swift Corr. ii, p.343.

majority the bill was passed on March 26. Several days later it received the royal assent. 'I see', King remarked on hearing the news, 'the worst we feared has befallen us'.[94]

The events of the previous six months had proven traumatic for King. Following so soon on the passing of the Toleration and Indulgence Acts, he had now witnessed the dismantling of another of the 'pillars' of his constitutional scheme. The remaining judicial independence of the Irish parliament had now been summarily removed. Furthermore, as Perceval had observed earlier, this had opened up the possibility of the British parliament not only legislating to remove the Test clause in Ireland, but, by imposing taxation directly, negating the need to summon an Irish parliament in the first place.[95]

But equally disturbing had been the realisation that the monarch was no longer willing to, or capable of, defying the wishes of the British parliament on matters relating to Ireland. For a man who had placed such faith in the presence of a strong monarchy, this was a severe blow. In fact, even after the act had been passed, King had harboured hopes that, in a defiant assertion of his prerogative, George might have refused to sign the Act. But, unlike William in 1698, his Majesty had offered no opposition and had given the royal assent to the bill without quarrel. In one fell swoop, King believed, George had both weakened the monarchy and betrayed his loyal Irish subjects. He

---

[94] Thomas Brodrick to Alan Brodrick, 10/3/20, Midleton Mss. 4/232; King to Molesworth, 16/4/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/61-2; Godwin to Wake, 31/3/20, Wake Mss. 13, fo.158.

[95] Perceval to King, 10/3/20, B.L. Add. Ms. 47029/27, (quoted by Burns in, *op. cit.*, pp.103-4).

could not help but feel betrayed by the man whose accession he had so vigorously championed.[96]

The crown might not have provided the protection so many Irish had expected, but King was not willing to allow the British parliament to enforce its designs with impunity. He turned immediately to considering how enforcement of the bill might be frustrated. He was convinced that, as before, British claims could be made unworkable with time and unity of purpose: If the Irish body politic remained 'unanimous and steady', he insisted, then 'some remedy may be found to make us easy'. 'It must be worse before it is better', he remarked cryptically to Molesworth,

> 'I have much to say [on] this head, but am unwilling to enter into it 'till I have discoursed your Lordship and others concerned by what I can learn. This Act has made a very great alteration in the tempers of the Protestants here. What effects that may produce I can't foresee. I wish they may be good. As to what methods we are to use to screen ourselves as much as possible from the mischiefs of this, it will require our joint, cool and most serious consideration.....'

Consequently in private correspondence he simply cautioned patience and forbearance: it would, he advised, 'be prudent to let the ferment and agitation produced at present to settle before we come to any resolution'. He was also encouraged by the reaction of many of the Anglo-Irish: 'I have an account of the universal disaffection of all people through the whole kingdom,' he told the same correspondent some time later,

> 'and that they vent their anger with such speeches as perhaps may not be very safe, but above all the Whigs seem most provoked. They say they will do everything but forfeit their estates and others say they know not whether they have any estates or no after this 'enslaving act'. How far this conduct may hurt the kingdom I know not but am of opinion that things can't long stand on this foot. Perhaps they will grow worse. For I

[96] King to Wake, 5/3/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/44-7.

see not yet how they can mend.'

Pocklington had already begun to experience this disaffection at first hand - he and the other Barons were once again being abused and obstructed on their circuits by local officials. The patriots were 'out of their wits' with anger, Evans confirmed. Nicolson found the same in Derry: their rage 'could not be described,' he wrote,

> '"Here's an end," says one of the wisest of them in my hearing, "of all the liberties and properties of Ireland. The House of Lords is already demolished and we are slaves," etc. This sort of seditious talk is so general that conversation is become extremely hazardous.'[97]

Publicly, however, King maintained an uncharacteristic silence, conscious, perhaps, that by forcing to a head the question of the status of the Irish parliament at a time when the British and Irish governments had been content to leave its position deliberately vague, he had precipitated this dénouement. In fact, it was left to Swift to denounce the manner in which 'the most loyal, submissive, complying subjects that ever [a] Prince had', had been 'so ill treated'. In a series of pamphlets, including one in which he lauded King's 'heroic' role in the whole episode, he gave an early indication that it was he, and not King, who would henceforth champion the patriot cause. Even more importantly, he evidenced a break with King's dependence upon precedent and common law. Instead, linking the economic and political grievances of the Anglo-Irish, and broadening the argument to include the notions of natural right which had been evident in Molyneux's *The Case of Ireland Stated,* he showed how he would approach other issues such as the Bank proposal and Wood's Halfpence in the years ahead.[98]

---

[97] King to Molesworth, 16/4/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/61-2; Same to Same, 10/5/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/73-6; Pocklington to Wake, 7/4/20, Wake Mss. 13, fo.160; Evans to Wake, 7/4/20, Wake Mss. 13, fo.161; Nicolson to Wake, 3/4/20, Wake Mss. 13, fo.159.

[98] Swift to Ford, 4/4/20, Swift Corr. ii, p.344; Synge to Wake, 15/8/20, Wake Mss. 13, fo.194; Bolton to Lord Justices of Ireland, 7/6/20, Cal. Dept. Corr. 52/143/2391; Same to

But while publicly silent, King had, in his private correspondence, proved quite unerring in his assessment of the likely immediate consequences of the Act. As he had predicted, it did not lead to a flow of legislation from London. This was due in part to the awareness on the part of the ministry that enforcing such legislation would prove extremely difficult. But in the main it derived from the fact that the Act really owed its existence to purely internal British political considerations: it had been as much the product of a struggle between the parliament, government and court in England, as an attempt by parliament to control its Irish counterpart. When the tensions in British politics which had given rise to it subsided so too did the desire of the members to test their new powers.

But these were little more than balms for King. In the space of a few months he believed that he had witnessed the church's exclusive establishment being compromised, the judicial and legislative privileges of the Irish parliament being undermined, and the monarchy being exposed as incapable of protecting the Anglo-Irish constitution from the ambitions of the British parliament. Embittered, disillusioned and exhibiting an uncharacteristic indifference induced by both old-age and persistent pain, King seemed more concerned with apportioning blame than with seeking to circumvent these new restrictions. But once he had re-entered the fray what would emerge was that the target of his ire would be not only the British parliament and ministry, but the monarch himself.

Same, 11/6/20, Cal. Dept. Corr. 52/143/2395; Victory, *Colonial Nationalism in Ireland*, pp.154-8; J. Swift, *A Proposal for the universal use of Irish Manufacture in clothes and furniture of Houses etc., utterly rejecting and renouncing everything wearable that comes from England*, Dublin, 1720; idem., *An Excellent New Song*, Dublin, 1720.

CHAPTER 9

1721-1729: *'..... one foot in the grave .....'*[1]

However Anglo-Irish patriots might wish to see themselves, from the perspective of those who had framed the Declaratory Act they were 'Britons' colonising a territory on behalf of the British king and people. The notion of Ireland as a separate political entity subject solely to the monarch as king of Ireland had been summarily rejected. For King it was a crushing blow which was compounded by personal loss - from the north of the country had come news of the death of both his father, then in his nineties, and one of his brothers. It was not surprising, then, that his seventieth birthday on May 1, 1720, passed off with little celebration.[2]

Yet, in spite of these disappointments King showed no sign of having lost his appetite for political involvement: '..... all the signal mutations in the manners of men', he began in a long letter to Molesworth,

> 'all the raising and destruction of great empires, kingdoms and commonwealths have been the effects of certain principles firmly believed and embraced by the persons who constituted them. Whilst those principles remained firm and unshaken in the minds of men the constitution has likewise remained and flourished which was founded on them. But as those principles lost their vigour or came to be changed or disbelieved the constitution in proportion decayed and at last was dissolved.'[3]

---

[1] King to Gorge, 12/12/24, TCD Ms. 2537/197.

[2] James Crawford to King, 5/6/19, Lyons 1914.

[3] King to Molesworth, 2/1/22, TCD Ms. 750/7/60-64.

Consistent with these sentiments, and belying the effects of both age and illness, he was about to embark upon a series of political and ecclesiastical involvements from which can be gauged the profound effect which the passing of the Declaratory Act had on him. While this period would witness his eclipse by Swift as the pre-eminent ideologue of the patriots, he would demonstrate that he was still a force to be reckoned with, displaying in a series of episodes his conviction that economic well-being and parliamentary independence were intertwined.

Perhaps the most significant thing to emerge from an analysis of these episodes is the extent to which he appeared to hold the king himself responsible for the subordination of Ireland's political and ecclesiastical constitution. Far from protecting the integrity of the Irish church and parliament, as King believed he should have done, George, it seemed to him, had actually been a party to the whole process. What has most commonly been presented as the demise of King's ambitions for the Irish parliament actually involved something even more shattering for him: the realisation that the monarchy, in which he had placed such hope, was no longer either willing or capable of providing protection from those intent upon undermining the constitutional arrangement which he believed had so far spared Ireland many of the political and religious perversions of English society.

I

In the wake of the passing of the Declaratory Act the English-born Bishops found themselves the focus of considerable hostility: '[We] are commonly called Traitors to Ireland,' one of their number complained. Evans was jeered by the mob as the 'English Champion,' while Nicolson was denounced as a 'foreign spy.' 'We are all treated by friend and foe, Whigs and Tories, as enemies of the public interests of this kingdom', Nicolson informed Wake, pleading that something be done. Nor were they under any illusions as to who was responsible for orchestrating this abuse: 'Dub[lin] and his Dean [Swift] have ..... a great hand in these sad managements', an exasperated Evans pointed out to his masters in London. The effect of such treatment, however, was merely to confirm these men in their determination to secure even more English-born individuals in Irish offices. In the meantime, they assured themselves, once the 'patriots' realised the effect of their folly, 'this heat will abate'. Then, Nicolson predicted boldly, 'we who are as yet aliens to the stock of the Irish Israelites shall have our days of grace and be listed among the prophets.'[4]

King, who would have been horrified at the prospect of any Englishman assuming such a mantle, was, with the assistance of Synge and Swift,

[4] Evans to Wake, 7/4/20, Wake Mss. 13, fo.161; Same to Same, 23/4/20, Wake Mss. 13, fo.170; Bolton to Craggs, 22/4/20, PRO. S.P. 63/379/17; Bolton to Wake, 19/4/20, Wake Mss. 13, fo.168; Pocklington to Wake, 9/7/20, Wake Mss. 13, fo.188; Synge to Wake, 17/11/20, Wake Mss. 13, fo.205; Nicolson to Wake, 23/2/20, Wake Mss. 13, fo.151; Same to Same, 3/4/20, Wake Mss. 13, fo.159.

simultaneously canvassing more strenuously for Irish-born appointees. Denouncing that 'parcel of scandalous creatures' that accompanied English appointees to Ireland and received large pensions or benefices, they argued the case for appointing Irish-born clerics to ecclesiastical posts.[5] They had little success. King wrote directly to Grafton, the new Lord Lieutenant, complaining that it appeared 'a resolution' had been taken 'that none educated in this Kingdom shall be made a bishop or a judge'. In a letter to his clergy he sharpened these tensions further: decrying 'the little care that was taken of the church', and the fact that it was being 'so neglected' by the recently-arrived English-born prelates, he urged them to be patient as 'it always flourishes when it was under apprehension.'[6]

The English-born bishops reacted to this type of attack with invective of their own. Increasingly this took the form of direct attacks on King himself. Evans, in particular, favoured this line: 'Dub[lin] [would] use ways and means which are not agreeable to his character or even manhood itself' to gain his own ends, he warned. Therefore, he was 'not to be consulted in anything..... having always conundrums of his own, much out of the way.....' Denouncing him for persistently ridiculing the English churchmen who came to Ireland as incompetents who 'flock hither to fill all beneficial vacancies to the great hurt of

---

[5] Synge to Wake, 17/11/20, Wake, Ms.13, fo.205; Godwin to Wake, 20/12/20, Wake Mss.13, fo.216; Bolton to Lord Justices of Ireland, 21/4/20, Cal. Dept. Corr. 52/143/2368; Same to Same, 21/5/20, Cal. Dept. Corr. 52/143/2380; King to Bishop of London, 20/7/22, TCD Ms. 750/7/165.

[6] King to Duke of Grafton, 20/12/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/169; Duke of Grafton to Lord Justices of Ireland, 23/6/20, Cal. Dept. Corr. 52/143/2406; King to Wake, 12/4/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/58-60; King to Crow, 21/4/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/64; King to Synge, 24/4/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/65-9; Pocklington to Wake, 4/6/20, Wake Mss. 13, fo.177.

the Kingdom', he continually demanded that King be censured.[7] The authorities were, however, becoming increasingly irritated by this unseemly wrangling. Brodrick, despite the fact that he had much to gain from this rift amongst the lords spiritual, was annoyed with King and Evans in particular: 'whichever of them was responsible for perpetuating it', he protested, 'it was better he had been hanged than introduce it.' Hoping to ingratiate himself once more with the government, he pleaded with both to cease. But, the recalcitrance of both men forced him to abandon his attempt to resolve matters, although not before he had expressed the view that, if the friction continued, it was the English faction which would emerge the stronger.[8]

In fact, the bishops were soon diverted from this internecine squabbling by more pressing matters. A severe winter and continued economic malaise had begun to manifest themselves in famine and disease. An outbreak of plague in France and the resultant quarantine of vessels further restricted trade.[9] By mid-1720 the situation had deteriorated dramatically and was being vividly portrayed by Swift.[10] Similarly, the English-born prelates were moved to report on the horrific conditions in many parts of the country. Godwin wrote to England complaining of the 'sinking' trade, while Downes described a

---

[7] Evans to Wake, 15/6/20, Wake Mss.13, fo.180; Same to Same, 21/1/21, Wake Mss.13, fo.224; Same to Same, 23/4/20, Wake Mss.13, fo.170; Same to Same, 28/3/20, Wake Mss. 13, fo.157. See, however, Conolly to Grafton, 24/9/20, Castletown Ms. T/2825/A/14, where Conolly commends King for his advocacy of Irishmen for these positions.

[8] Alan Brodrick to Honourable Alan Brodrick, 30/12/20, Midleton Mss. 4/385; Swift to Chetwode, 9/5/21, Swift Corr. ii, p.387.

[9] Delafaye to Lord Justices of Ireland, 23/8/20, Cal. Dept. Corr. 52/143/2417; Lords Justices of Ireland to Delafaye, 1/11/20, PRO. S.P. 63/379/77; Delafaye to Commissioners of Customs, 6/9/20, Cal. Dept. Corr. 52/143/2420.

[10] J. Swift, *A Proposal for the Universal Use of Irish Manufacture in Clothes and Furniture of Houses, etc., utterly rejecting everything that comes from England*, Dublin, 1720; J. Kelly, 'Jonathan Swift and the Irish Economy in the 1720's', *Eighteenth-Century Ireland*, 6, 1991, pp.7-36.

situation in the west where 'above 40,000 head died of poverty' in six months. The 'miseries of this Kingdom are truly deplorable,' Nicolson confirmed from Derry, '[t]he numbers of starving beggars daily increases in proportion to the general want of money.'[11] In Dublin, the situation was exacerbated by people fleeing from the countryside: 'the ague rages most violently here and many die of it', King observed, 'the poor people are like to be undone for they are not able to earn anything by their labour'. His own response was to contribute several hundred pounds to the relief of those affected and to arrange numerous church collections. But the situation did not improve: 'The poverty of the Kingdom is not to be imagined,' he informed Secretary Flower some months later, 'the cry of the weavers of all sorts, linen, wool and silk, was intolerable. They sold and pawned all they had for bread.....' He wrote directly to Grafton, regretting that on his return to Ireland he would 'not find us in so good a condition as you left us and, I am afraid, not in so good a humour'. But he also took the opportunity to denounce the 'many things [which] have passed both in church and state which not a few here count hardship', a reference to the Toleration, Indemnity and Declaratory Acts as well as the various constraints placed on Irish exports, which he consistently characterised as enriching England at Ireland's expense, and which, he believed, had contributed to the country's 'misery'. It was an early indication for the Lord Lieutenant that King remained bitter at developments over recent months and could well prove difficult in the forthcoming parliament.[12]

---

[11] Godwin to Wake, 5/11/20, Wake Mss. 13, fo.203; Nicolson to Wake, 24/1/21, Wake Mss. 13, fo.227; Same to Same, 6/10/20, Wake Mss. 13, fo.209; Downes to Wake, 31/5/21, Wake Mss. 13, fo.248; Nicolson to Wake, 30/4/21, Wake Mss. 13, fo.245; Same to Same, 19/3/21, Wake Mss. 13, fo.237.

[12] King to Stearne, 12/5/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/76-8; King to Grafton, 28/6/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/94; King to Tollet, 28/8/12, TCD Ms. 2532/48; King to Bishop of Carlisle, 21/2/18, TCD Ms. 2535/83-5; King to Annesley, 24/12/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/171-5; King to Flower, 8/4/21, TCD Ms. 750/6/216-8. Reports of plague in Dublin, coupled with the fact that he was struck by another bout of sickness, resulted in rumours of King's death circulating in

The worsening economic climate was soon exacerbated by the effects of the collapse of the South Sea Company, in which several Anglo-Irish gentlemen had invested. Innately suspicious of such schemes, King had been alarmed by the nonchalant manner in which many individuals had invested their money in the first place. 'When', he told Molesworth, he had

> 'enquired of some that have come from London; What is the religion there? They tell me it is South Sea stock; what is the policy of England? It is the same; what is the Trade? South Sea still; and what is the Business? Nothing but South Sea.'

Claiming later to have circulated his friends with a memorandum which urged them not to invest, he denounced it as yet another hardship imposed on the kingdom by England.[13] Now he expected 'to hear of a great many wrecks' in Ireland. Nor was he sympathetic to their plight, reckoning that 'they richly deserve it'. The immediate effect of the collapse had been to worsen the already depressed economy; 'Half of Dublin would starve' as a consequence, he calculated wildly.[14] 'I will say no more to your South Sea,' he informed Wake,

> '..... it has made us miserable to the highest degree, if starving be a misery. I lately had a petition from 300 families concerned in the linen, silk and woollen trade ..... I have ordered collection in every church for them ..... the poor are in danger of starving and many have perished. The jails are full, not of state prisoners ..... but of debtors.'

England: Samuel Adams to King, 26/8/21, Lyons 1988.

[13] Annesley to King, 9/7/20, Lyons 1955; King to Molesworth, 10/5/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/73-6; King to Southwell, 6/2/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/25-6; Swift to Esther Vanholmrigh, 15/10/20, Swift Corr. ii, p.361. King had been encouraged to put his arguments into print, but declined on the basis that 'whoever said anything against the South Sea was looked on as disaffected to the Government and Ministry': King to Wake, 9/2/21, TCD Ms. 750/6/191; King to Abercorn, 18/5/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/79-80; Same to Same, 27/5/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/88.

[14] King to Dr John Hawkshaw, 16/9/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/122; King to Molesworth, 29/9/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/124-6; King to Gore, 30/9/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/127-30; King to Annesley, 24/12/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/171-5; King to Molyneux, 19/4/25, TCD Ms. 2537/231-2; Pocklington to Wake, 10/12/20, Wake Mss. 13, fo.212; Nicolson to Wake, 24/1/21, Wake Mss. 13, fo.227.

Conolly and Brodrick confirmed these reports, although in less melodramatic terms: 'The bad effect of the South Sea has reached this kingdom to a great degree,' Conolly informed the Lord Lieutenant,

> 'insomuch that numbers are ruined by it ..... We have no manner of trade and the kingdom is quite drained of money ..... where all this will end I cannot tell.'[15]

It was in these circumstances that proposals to found a National Bank of Ireland were revived. In 1720 a petition had been submitted to the crown by Lord Abercorn and several others interested in obtaining a charter for such a venture. In July 1721 a charter was granted, subject to approval being obtained at the next Irish parliament.[16] King wasted no time in making his opposition clear. It would, he protested, 'put it in power of the few to cheat the whole kingdom and bring in the villainous trade of Stock-jobbing and paper credit to the ruin of the unwary'. The collapse of the South Sea Company had merely confirmed him in this view: a bank would, he predicted, prove to be Ireland's 'bubble'. He was encouraged to find that scepticism about both the scheme itself and the *bona-fides* of its sponsors seemed widespread. And he found an unusual ally in Bishop Nicolson who concurred that 'so many have

---

[15] King to Wake, 23/3/21, TCD Ms. 750/6/213; King to Annesley, 23/3/21, TCD Ms. 750/6/211-3; King to Flower, 8/4/21, TCD Ms. 750/6/216-8; Swift to Ford, 15/4/21, Swift Corr. ii, p.379-81; Conolly to Grafton, 18/10/20, Castletown T/2825/A/15; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 12/4/21, Midleton Mss. 5/15.

[16] Petition of Lord Abercorn and others to King George I, June 1720, NLI Ms. 2256/7; Grafton to Lord Justices of Ireland, 8/9/20, Cal. Dept. Corr. 52/143/2424; Grafton to Abercorn *et al.*, 6/8/20, Cal. Dept. Corr. 52/143/2424h; Abercorn *et al.* to Grafton, 23/8/20, Cal. Dept. Corr. 52/143/2424i; F.G. Hall, *The Bank of Ireland 1783-1946*, Dublin, 1949, pp.15-16. The sponsors included 9 Temporal Peers, 8 Privy Councillors and 52 members of the House of Commons.

lately perished' in the South Sea debacle 'that few are left amongst us that have any great stomach for the launching any more into such dangerous gulfs.' It was an 'experiment [which] most of us were unwilling to try.'[17]

In the months prior to the convening of parliament pamphlets and tracts on the subject abounded. Henry Maxwell, an avid supporter of the bank, provided the most cogent argument in its favour. He was answered by his uncle, Hercules Rowley, who predicted that a bank was a preliminary to a land tax. Even more ominously, it would soon be controlled by Catholics since they could not invest their capital in land. But the most telling publications by the bank's opponents were produced by Swift. His two pamphlets, *The Wonderful Wonder of Wonders* and *The Wonder of all the Wonders*, denounced the idea of a National Bank, parodying it as likely to induce economic disaster.[18]

Swift's arguments owed much to the points made by King in a tract first written in 1716, which he had updated and circulated privately.[19] For King however, the question of a National Bank had become embroiled in the larger constitutional issue. That this was so could be traced to some disturbing

---

[17] King to Southwell, 17/10/21, TCD Ms. 750/7/49; King to Gorge, 30/9/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/128; King to Abercorn, 18/5/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/79; Abercorn to King, 18/5/20, Lyons 1953; Grafton to Lord Justices of Ireland (copy), 8/9/20, Midleton Mss. 8/41; King to Stearne, 5/10/21, TCD Ms. 750/7/6; Stearne to King, 9/10/21, Lyons 1990; King to Molesworth, 29/9/21, TCD Ms. 750/6/124-6; Nicolson to Wake, 15/8/21, Wake Mss. 13, fo.262; Same to Same, 6/1/21, Wake Mss. 13, fo.220.

[18] Henry Maxwell, *Reasons offered for erecting a Bank in Ireland*, Dublin, 1721. Hercules Rowley, *An answer to a book entitled, Reasons offered for erecting a Bank in Ireland*, Dublin, 1721; [J. Swift], *The Wonderful Wonder of Wonders*, Dublin, 1721; [J. Swift], *The Wonder of all the Wonders*, Dublin, 1721. See O.W. Ferguson, *Jonathan Swift and Ireland*, Urbana, 1962, pp.69-75, for a discussion of the authorship of these pamphlets.

[19] King to Annesley, 24/12/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/71-4. In 1716 King wrote a tract entitled *Some Observations on the Taxes Paid by Ireland to Support the Government*, which he circulated in manuscript form to a few acquaintances. Updated in 1721, and again in 1723, it was intended to galvanise opposition to attempts to increase the amounts transferred from Ireland to England as a result of a fiscal and economic regime which King characterised as inherently prejudicial to Ireland: see R. Dudley Edwards, Introduction, *Analecta Hibernica*, 8, 1938, pp.5-14. For a discussion of the verbal and statistical parallels between King's tract and Swift's pamphlets see Ferguson, *op. cit.*, Appendix A, pp.187-8.

intelligence he had received from Annesley shortly after the passing of the Declaratory Act. In May 1720 he had alerted King to a series of meetings involving Sunderland, Stanhope and Grafton at which matters of great import to Ireland had been discussed, the effect of which, he intimated, would be to 'make you more slaves than at present you are'. According to his information, convinced of 'discontents and dispositions in Ireland to become independent of the crown of Great Britain', the ministry was actively exploring the possibility of financing the Irish government solely out of the hereditary revenues. If this could be achieved then it would remove the need to summon regular parliaments in Ireland, thereby resolving one of every ministry's more intractable problems. Although these plans were overtaken by changes in the ministry, the South Sea collapse and the realisation that it was unlikely that the Irish hereditary revenue could be made to cover both the military establishment and the numerous pensions imposed upon it in the short term, King was unnerved by the fact that the possibility was even being discussed. In particular, he could now appreciate the significance of the fact that the sponsors of the bank had promised to provide an initial payment of £50,000 together with an annual subvention. If a number of similar payments could be secured on a regular basis, then the gap between the hereditary revenue and the government's requirements might well be bridged. Indeed, rumours were already rife that another group had offered £100,000 for a fire insurance franchise.[20]

[20] Annesley to King, 30/5/21, Lyons 1979; *Memorial for Proposed Savings in the Military Establishments*, 22/9/20, PRO. S.P. 63/379/61-4; Burns, *op. cit.*, pp.114-6; King to Molesworth, 19/11/21, TCD Ms. 750/7/29; *Memorial re: Fire Insurance Co.*, n.d., Midleton Mss. 8/113-5.

The deaths of Stanhope and Craggs, coupled with the collapse of the South Sea and Mississippi Companies, had resulted in the emergence of Walpole as leader of a new ministry. One of the most immediate consequences for Ireland had been the replacement of Bolton by the Duke of Grafton who had served as Lord Deputy in 1715. With its hold on power still tenuous, the new ministry was determined not to be undermined by events in Ireland. This was reflected in its programme for the forthcoming Irish parliament where Grafton was under instructions to secure a two year supply and to deflect any attempts by King or others to resurrect constitutional issues. If this was to be achieved then it was essential that the new Lord Lieutenant secure the co-operation of Conolly and Brodrick as the two principal political managers in the country, and of King as the individual most likely to cause difficulty in the Lords.[21]

Conolly posed fewest problems. A friend of Grafton with whom he had maintained a regular correspondence since 1715, he had undertaken to manage the House of Commons in the forthcoming session. Although sceptical about the prospects of the required capital being raised, he had agreed to support Abercorn's bank proposal when it came before the members. His one demand was that the government do everything in its power to ensure Brodrick's 'good behaviour'.[22] Conolly and Grafton had every reason to be wary of the Lord Chancellor. For almost a year Conolly had been attempting to persuade the government to replace Brodrick as Chancellor with his own

---

[21] Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 12/6/20, Midleton Mss. 4/271.

[22] Conolly to Grafton, 11/5/21, Castletown Ms. T2825/A/25; Same to Same, 9/1/21, Castletown Ms., T2825/A/21; Same to Same, 8/7/21, Castletown Ms., T2825/A/26; Levinge to Southwell, 25/9/21, *Levinge Jottings*, p.62; Alan Brodrick to Grafton, n.d., [1721], Midleton Mss. 8/128.

nominee, Jeffrey Gilbert, the Lord Chief Baron. Indeed, after his performance in the Irish parliament in 1719 and in the British parliament in 1720, Brodrick had fully expected to be removed. However, hoping to capitalise on Brodrick's stated desire to accommodate himself once more to the ministry, Grafton had decided to retain him in office. This was in spite of his uncertainty as to whether the Cork Squadron could be depended upon to forego the opportunity to challenge Conolly in parliament. In particular, there were worries over Brodrick's attitude to the bank. While he had publicly indicated his support, there was always the possibility that, if the scheme ran into difficulties, both he and St. John Brodrick would exploit it to embarrass the government in the Lords and Commons respectively.[23]

King posed a different set of problems. He had made no secret of his determination to raise the matter of Ireland's constitutional subordination at the earliest opportunity. Indeed, as he informed Molesworth, he had already had 'some discourse with some of our House about grievances and we intend to moddle something' once parliament assembled. Aware of this, several of the English-born bishops were encouraging the government to isolate him even further. He and his 'odd, national and whimsical' supporters could be depended upon to 'carry on the cause with their dying breath for the honour of Ireland', they warned. His obstructionist intentions were already evident at Privy Council meetings where, they reported, he 'moves heaven and earth' in

---

[23] Craggs to Grafton, 4/10/20, PRO. S.P. 67/7/81; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 5/6/21, Midleton Mss. 5/37; Same to Same, 22/1/21, Midleton Mss. 4/401; Griffin, *Parliamentary Politics*, pp.94-6; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 26/6/20, Midleton Mss. 4/285; Same to Same, 5/6/21, Midleton Mss. 5/37; Same to Same, 13/9/21, Midleton Mss. 5/83.

opposing government business.[24] Not only that, but he continued to 'declare independency' and was now even questioning the validity of Poyning's Law. With a view to seeing King's influence in the Lords curbed, Brodrick added to this chorus. Warning of the perils of trying to accommodate such a man, he reminded Grafton that he continued in his 'very indifferent opinion of our Bank' and would definitely oppose the proposal when it came before the House. The only way to deal with him was to exclude him from all decision making bodies.[25]

Contrary to such advice, however, Grafton was determined to try to pacify King, if only because the alternative of giving him free reign to vent his animosity seemed less attractive. As a result, government officials were instructed to 'mollify' him. Much to his chagrin, Brodrick was ordered to visit King and 'to soothe', rather than admonish, him following some derogatory comments he was reported to have made about Grafton's style of government. Evans was particularly galled by the Lord Lieutenant's policy. When rumours circulated that Grafton had 'committed all church matters to the Archbishop of Dublin' pending his arrival, he felt compelled to protest: 'If so,' he wrote to Wake with considerable trepidation, 'God help us'.[26]

Despite such protests, Grafton was determined to continue his policy of appeasement in the hope that this would facilitate a quiet session of parliament.

---

[24] King to Molesworth, 10/9/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/117-9; Same to Same, 29/9/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/124; Evans to Wake, 21/1/21, Wake Mss. 13., fo.224; Same to Same, 23/4/20, Wake Mss. 13., fo.170; Same to Same, 31/8/21, Wake Mss. 13, fo.265; Same to Same, 22/8/21, Wake Mss. 13, fo.264; Nicolson to Wake, 13/1/21, Wake Mss. 13, fo.225.

[25] Evans to Wake, 19/5/21, Wake Mss. 13, fo.247; Same to Same, 13/2/21, Wake Mss. 13, fo.231; Same to Same, 12/7/21, Wake Mss. 13, fo.255; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 15/7/21, Midleton Mss. 5/85.

[26] Levinge to Southwell, 14/9/21, *Levinge Jottings*, p.60; Griffin, *Parliamentary Politics*, pp.98-9; Evans to Wake, 23/3/21, Wake Mss.13, fo.239; Swift to King, 28/9/21, Swift Corr. ii, p.405; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 7/4/21, Midleton Mss. 5/7; Same to Same, 15/7/21, Midleton Mss. 5/61.

In his opinion only the bank proposal posed a serious threat, but he was confident that Conolly would deliver a majority in the Commons and that Brodrick could be persuaded to refrain from opposing it in the Lords. Indeed, as the members gathered the general opinion appeared to be that the charter would be approved. Even those who opposed it thought it unlikely it would be voted down. Swift was particularly pessimistic: 'I hear you are likely to be the sole opposer of the Bank,' he wrote to King, who had been confined to his chamber by yet another attack of gout,

> '..... you will certainly miscarry because it would prove a most perfidious thing. Bankrupts are always for setting up banks; how then can you think a bank will fail of a majority in both Houses?'

These sentiments were echoed by Annesley. But King was not so gloomy. He had continued 'on all occasions and to all my friends' to argue against the scheme and was encouraged by reports that many more people than either Conolly or Abercorn were willing to admit were opposed to the scheme. His hope was that this would communicate itself to the members, particularly the Lords,in due course.[27]

King was not the only one who suspected that opposition might be quite widespread. Brodrick, whose support for the project was less than wholehearted, felt under some obligation to see that the business of the Lords was not complicated by controversy. Warning Grafton that several peers were opposed to it and that King, who was 'from the bottom of his heart against it', was intent on fomenting a 'great contest' in the Lords, he advised him to take

---

[27] Nicolson to Wake, 15/8/21, Wake Mss., 13; King to Gorges, 30/9/20, TCD Ms. 750/6/126; Swift to King, 28/9/21, Swift Corr. ii, p.405; King to Vesey, 10/10/21, TCD Ms. 750/7/. This attack was so acute that, once again, rumours of his death began to circulate in England: Bishop of Peterborough to Wake, 25/8/21, Wake Mss. 13, fo.267; Levinge to Southwell, 30/5/21, *Levinge Jottings*, p.58; Annesley to King, 22/8/21, Lyons 1987; Same to Same, 18/11/21, Lyons 1994; King to Annesley, 8/6/21, TCD Ms. 750/6/225.

the threat posed by the Archbishop more seriously. The Lord Lieutenant responded by arranging a private meeting with King. At this he entreated him not to press his opposition, his insinuation that resistance on this issue might have more far reaching consequences for the church not escaping King. His instinctive reaction was to protest that there was little which the ministry could do to either the church or the kingdom which it had not already done. Yet he did feel constrained to respond to Grafton's personal intervention. Reluctantly, and somewhat insolently, he promised that 'he would not disturb' the session. '"For", says he', Evans reported him as remarking, '"we have nothing else to do but to give money", in his way of jocularity.' He did, however, make a point of warning the Lord Lieutenant that, in the opinion of many, opposition to the scheme was greater than his parliamentary managers were willing to admit. He advised him to expect trouble in both Houses.[28]

The parliament of 1721 opened with an *Address* by Grafton which, alluding to the Bank project, proposed that the members consider 'remedies' that would 'restore the nation to a flourishing condition.' He was careful, nevertheless, to present the scheme, not as a government initiative, but as one that had come from individuals within the kingdom. With little else of note to consider, both Houses retired in order to prepare *Addresses of Thanks* to his Majesty. In the Commons, Conolly ensured that this was achieved without difficulty. In the Lords, however, King, despite his promise not to involve himself, was finding

[28] Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 13/9/21, Midleton Mss. 5/85; Evans to Wake, 12/9/21, Wake Mss.13, fo.271; King to Molesworth, 18/11/21, TCD Ms. 750/7/32; King to Coningsby, 18/11/21, TCD Ms. 750/7/27; Conolly to Grafton, 11/5/21, Castletown Ms. T/2825/A/25.

it difficult to hold his tongue. Determined to register his disgruntlement at the passing of the Declaratory Act, it seemed to him that the debate on the Bank charter offered the only opportunity to do so. As a result, when it was proposed that his Majesty be thanked for allowing the parliament to debate the scheme at all, he intervened. Raising 'a good deal of warmth' at the fact that the members should consider this a concession and not a fundamental right of a sovereign parliament, he proposed that this part of the reply be deleted. In choosing a course which involved implicit criticism of the king, he had, however, calculated badly. Not one other peer supported him. Even Synge refused to be associated with him. The government was delighted. Although still unsure as to Brodrick's intentions, they had viewed King as the man most likely to instigate problems. This setback would, they hoped, cause him to be 'modest and good' for the remainder of the session.[29]

Far from quietening him, the incident seemed to galvanise King. Two days later, when other aspects of the *Address* were being considered, his resentment at the role he believed the monarch had played in allowing the Toleration and Declaratory Acts to pass was further highlighted. Reminding the members that they had forwarded a *Representation* to his Majesty in 1719, he demanded to know, 'in a most unparliamentary way', why the king had not yet had the courtesy to reply. He was immediately called to order for this 'strange reflection' on the crown and for being 'somewhat plain with his Majesty'. Those who looked to him to lead the opposition to the bank project thought his approach ill advised. Even Synge, who had offered some support

---

[29] LJI, ii, 12/9/21, 14/9/21; King to Molesworth, 19/11/21, TCD Ms. 750/7/32; Levinge to Southwell, 14/9/21, *Levinge Jottings*, p.60; LJI, ii, 12/9/21; Evans to Wake, 12/9/21, Wake Mss. 13, fo.271; *Minutes of Dom[estic] Proc[eedings]*, 12/9/21, Midleton Mss. 5/83. Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 13/9/21, Midleton Mss. 5/84; Carteret to Grafton, 11/10/21, Cal. Dept. Corr. 52/143/2476; Nicolson to Wake, 14/9/21, B.L. Add. Ms. 6116/210.

earlier in the debate, immediately distanced himself. Grafton, Brodrick and several of bishops 'cried out of him' and tried to get him to retract. But he could not 'be persuaded to withdraw' in spite of the fact that 'his friends much press him to it'. The result was that, when a vote was taken, he was once again alone in recording his dissent to an *Address* which thanked his Majesty in effusive terms for his 'gracious acceptance of the expressions of the duty and loyalty of the Lords in former sessions'.[30]

King's clumsy attempt to raise constitutional issues in this manner was testament to the bitterness which he felt over what he believed to have been George's refusal to protect both the Irish kingdom and church from the ambitions of the British body politic. His opponents, surprised, but delighted at this turn of events, were hopeful that it would lead to his complete alienation from the government. Rather than risk allowing King a free hand, however, Grafton decided once again to attempt to placate him 'when the contrary was generally expected'. He dispatched Levinge to 'mollify him' and to let him know that 'he took nothing ill' from these incidents. Before the Chief Justice could reach him, however, Grafton had received King 'very kindly' at the Castle. There he had extracted a more unequivocal promise from a chastened King not to raise the constitutional question again. When Levinge did eventually meet up with him he was amazed at 'the good effects of this young Duke's prudence.' King assured him that he would be 'very careful not to disturb the Duke's affairs and that he will not meddle again with the Barons.' Convinced that Grafton had persuaded him not to cause any further difficulty

---

[30] LJI, ii, 14/9/21; *Minutes, 14/9/21, on reporting the Address to the King*, Midleton Mss. 5/86; Evans to Wake, 16/9/21, Wake Mss. 13, fo.270; Same to Same, 19/9/21, Wake Mss. 13, fo.276; Same to Same, 29/9/21, Wake Mss. 13, fo.279; Same to Same, 22/11/21, Wake Mss. 13, fo.297; Nicolson to Wake, 14/9/19, Wake Mss. 13, fo.273; Levinge to Southwell, 14/9/21, *Levinge Jottings*, p.60; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 13/9/21, Midleton Mss. 5/84.

over constitutional issues, he took this to mean that King would also drop his opposition to the bank. Evans, however, was not so easily persuaded: his friends might 'seem [to have] smothered Dub[lin]'s protest,' he warned Wake, but 'still they say he has somewhat in his sleeve to ruffle'.[31]

Evans' misgivings would, as usual, prove well founded, but in the meantime, with King constrained from opposing it, at least publicly, the bank proposal seemed assured of success. On September 29 the Commons approved a resolution affirming that a national bank would be beneficial to the trade and credit of the country and leave was given to bring in Heads of a bill approving the patent. The fact that 'all the speaking men in the House of Commons are for it, being concerned as subscribers' gave many observers the impression that its passage was guaranteed. But King was of the opinion that this was only because attendance at both houses was 'thin' on account of a late harvest. He was hopeful that once the rest of the members arrived the more widespread nature of the opposition might become evident.[32]

In the Lords, with Brodrick refusing to become publicly identified with the opposition, it devolved on those few opposed to the scheme to take the initiative. One of these was Bishop Stearne who had been persuaded by King to become involved: '[t]he Bank, the pernicious bank is tumbling upon us', he had informed him, 'and we need your help to prevent our being overwhelmed by it. We need no South Sea to drown us for a little water will do it.' One means by which pressure might be applied, Stearne replied, would be to convince the numerous English subscribers that because of the dire economic

---

[31] Levinge to Southwell, 16/9/21, *Levinge Jottings*, p.61; Same to Same, 25/9/21, *Levinge Jottings*, p.62; Evans to Wake, 29/9/21, Wake Mss. 13, fo.279.

[32] CJI, iv, 29/9/21; King to Stearne, 5/10/21, TCD Ms. 750/7/6; Nicolson to Wake, 25/9/21, Wake Mss.13, fo.278; Conolly to Grafton, 9/1/21, Castletown Ms. T/2825/A/18; Evans to Wake, 12/9/21, Wake Mss. 13, fo.271; King to Molesworth, 19/11/21, TCD Ms. 750/7/29.

condition of Ireland they would certainly lose their deposits if the Bank went ahead. While valid of itself, this reminder of the large English presence amongst the subscribers was calculated by his friend to goad the Anglophobic King into even greater efforts. It had the desired effect. The proponents of the bank were attempting 'to cram it down our throats by their own strength and countenance of court from England', King duly protested, when he wrote almost immediately to his London agent, asking him to show his letter to as many politicians and subscribers as possible.[33]

Despite these efforts, however, opposition to the scheme had so far been muted. But on one point King had correctly gauged the situation: it did appear that the progress of the bill had been facilitated by the non-attendance of those members detained by the late harvest. Once these had arrived in Dublin it became apparent that there was a large group in both Houses quite hostile to it. A disimproving economic environment, combined with scepticism as to the ability of the promoters to deliver the capital base necessary to sustain the proposed rates of interest, weighed heavily with many members. By early October Swift's wager of five guineas that King would be unable to persuade others to join with him had begun to look decidedly unwise.[34]

In mid-October the Bank bill eventually came before the Commons. Now, however, in spite of the fact that it was still 'solicited most violently by all the speaking men in the House', resistance was more evident. Those arguing against it now included Clotworthy Upton, one of Conolly's most trusted lieutenants. Sensing that the proposal might be in difficulty, St. John Brodrick, at, King believed, his father's prompting, indicated that he too would

---

[33] King to Stearne, 5/10/21, TCD Ms. 750/7/6; Stearne to King, 9/10/21, Lyons 1990; King to Annesley, 28/10/21, TCD Ms. 750/7/18.

[34] Nicolson to Wake, 21/10/21, B.L. Add. Ms. 6116/221-4; King to Stearne, 5/10/21, TCD Ms. 750/7/6.

be voting against granting a charter. This meant that the numerically powerful Cork Squadron would also oppose the measure. Alarmed at the possibility of further defections, the government forced a vote immediately. In a close contest, the first clause of the bill was rejected by a margin of 102 votes to 95. Although most reckoned this to be the project's 'death stroke', in accordance with procedure, it was agreed that the matter might be raised again in two months time.[35]

King, who had anticipated that the strongest opposition would come from the Lords, was delighted at this turn of events. Blaming Conolly and Abercorn for having misled Grafton, he hoped that the proposal was now 'damned'.[36] It was soon obvious, however, that the bank sponsors were not willing to allow this to happen. Arguing that they were merely anticipating a resumption of the debate in two months time, they continued to advertise the Bank and to open subscription books. They then endeavoured to secure an *Address* from the Lords to his Majesty, requesting that the project be proceeded with by royal decree.[37]

This was a direct challenge to parliament and it made the attitude adopted by the Lords critical. In the sponsors' favour was the fact that several of the more influential subscribers were themselves members of the upper House. But against that Brodrick had finally decided to make his opposition

---

[35] King to Vigors, 10/10/21, TCD Ms. 750/7/9; Same to Same, 17/10/21, TCD Ms. 750/7/11; Levinge to Southwell, 14/10/21, *Levinge Jottings*, p.69; King to Annesley, 28/10/21, TCD Ms. 750/7/19; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 14/10/21, Midleton Mss. 5/99; Nicolson to Wake, 14/10/21, Wake Mss., 13, fo.283; Burns, *op. cit.*, pp.127-9.

[36] King to Annesley, 17/10/21, TCD Ms. 750/7/12; King to Vigors, 17/10/21, TCD Ms. 750/9/11; Nicolson to Wake, 14/10/21, Wake Mss. 13, fo.283; Evans to Wake, 10/10/21, Wake Mss. 13, fo.285; Levinge to Southwell, 24/10/21, *Levinge Jottings*, p.72.

[37] CJI, iv, 7/11/21; Levinge to Southwell, 28/10/21, *Levinge Jottings*, p.73; Same to Same, 11/11/21, *Levinge Jottings*, p.76; Same to Same, 19/11/21, *Levinge Jottings*, p.79; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 14/10/21, Midleton Mss. 5/97; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 5/11/21, Midleton Mss. 5/107-8.

public. Buoyed by this the Bank's opponents attempted to halt the opening of the subscription books by requesting that all official papers relating to the Bank be presented to the members at once for their perusal. When these arrived a committee of the whole House undertook an investigation of the history of the entire project. In a succession of speeches the Bank and its promoters were condemned, in particular for persisting in advertising the project after the Commons vote. Synge and Tullamore were particularly vociferous, although Brodrick singled out one of King's interjections, when he had denounced the project as promoting 'private advantage and public mischief', as the key contribution.[38] King, in turn, gladly acknowledged the key role the Lord Chancellor had played in using 'great industry ..... to apprise the members and keep them steady'. On November 8, after a long debate, the Lords, with only 6 against, declared themselves totally opposed to a National Bank as being 'prejudicial and of extreme ill consequence to the kingdom.'[39]

In King's opinion this was a victory of major significance, signalling, he hoped, a resurgence in patriotic fervour. He took particular pleasure from chiding those 'managers [who had] persuaded my Lord Lieutenant before he came here that it was the general desire of the kingdom'. However, he was soon unsettled by reports that the promoters of the project remained unrepentant. When many of the members had retired to the country, they

---

[38] Grafton to Walpole, 19/12/23, *Memoirs of the life and administration of Sir Robert Walpole*, W. Coxe, ed., 3 vols, London, 1798-1800, ii, p.352; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 9/11/21, Midleton Mss. 5/129-30; Same to Same, 14/11/21, Midleton Mss. 5/142; *Minutes in Dom[estic] Proc[eedings] in House of Lords*, 9/7/21, Midleton Mss. 121-2; *Minutes of Committee of House of Lords*, 7/11/21, Midleton Mss. 5/115-6; Levinge to Southwell, 31/11/21, *Levinge Jottings*, p.77; King to Stearne, 5/10/21, TCD Ms. 750/7/6; King to Molesworth, 18/11/21, TCD Ms. 750/7/29-32.

[39] LJI, ii, 6/11/21, 8/12/21; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 6/11/21, Midleton Mss. 5/109; *Minutes of House of Lords*, 6/11/21, Midleton Mss. 5/111-3; King to Molesworth, 18/11/21, TCD Ms. 750/7/29-32; King to Annesley, 28/10/21, TCD Ms. 750/7/19; Burns, *op. cit.*, p.130; Nicolson to Wake, 9/11/21, Wake Mss. 13, fo.293.

attempted to move in the Commons that an indemnity be granted to those who had solicited subscriptions. 'They seem resolved to carry on their design,' King informed the Earl of Coningsby indignantly, 'in spite of the opposition of Lords and Commons and the general dissatisfaction and as some express it, "cram it" down our throats'.[40]

Determined now to see the proponents of the bank punished for this effrontery, several of the Lords decided on a more radical course. According to Levinge a 'project..... was hatched' by King, Synge, Fitzwilliam and Tullamore to frame an *Address* to his Majesty on the matter. This, however, would have embarrassed not only Grafton, but also his political masters in London, portraying them as incapable of managing parliament. Hearing rumours of what was intended, Levinge alerted his superiors. Grafton moved immediately, summoning King to the Castle, and warning him of the dire consequences of any such attempt. Reluctantly, King agreed to drop the proposal. Foiled, the Lords were reduced to ordering the Earl of Abercorn, the intended Governor of the Bank, to come before them for examination. When Abercorn did appear he was censured for his actions, which were deemed to have been an affront to the privileges of the House. Having condemned his attempt to secure indemnity, the peers then resolved that;

> 'if any Lord Spiritual or Temporal of this Kingdom, shall solicit or attempt the erecting of a Bank..... he shall be deemed a condemner of the authority of this House and betrayer of the liberty of his country.

Faced with a similar resolution in the Commons the government eventually succeeded in persuading the sponsors of the project to withdraw.[41]

---

[40] King to Earl of Coningsby, 18/11/21, TCD Ms. 750/7/27; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 5/11/21, Midleton Mss. 5/107-8; King to Vigors, 10/10/21, TCD Ms. 750/7/9; CJI, iii, 7/11/21; Nicolson to Wake, 9/11/21, Wake Mss. 13, fo.293; Levinge to Southwell, 19/11/21, *Levinge Jottings*, p.79.

[41] LJI, ii, 9/12/21, 16/12/21; CJI, iii, 13/12/21; King to Crow, 25/11/21, TCD Ms.

With the exception of this episode this session of parliament, which lasted from September 12, 1721 to January 18, 1722 proved remarkably non-contentious. This was not unrelated to Grafton's determination to ensure that, in the aftermath of the debacle over the bank, nothing else was allowed to cause a disruption. In the Commons an attempt to pass a tillage bill contrary to the wishes of the government caused some anxiety as did the decision of the members to reject three bills which had been amended in England. But Grafton was happy that matters had not got out of hand. In particular, debate on the Declaratory Act had been stifled. When a two year supply was finally secured on December 21, he made arrangements to bring the session to a conclusion as soon as possible.[42]

The decision to prorogue parliament pleased King. Now in his seventy-third year, and once again stricken by gout, he was anxious to extricate himself from his various political involvements. He intended to take advantage of the opportunity afforded by the early proroguing to travel to Bath. Indeed, he had already made arrangements to depart. But, once again, he was forced to change his plans when Grafton, at Conolly's behest, decided that he would name him in the commission of Lords Justices. An incensed Brodrick, who was to be removed from the executive for what Grafton believed was his duplicity in relation to the Bank, recorded King's account of the Lord Lieutenant's almost frantic determination to persuade him to accept:

750/7/39; *Copy of House of Lords Order*, 9/12/21, Midleton Mss. 5/156; Nicolson to Wake, 9/12/21, Wake Mss. 13, fo.303; Levinge to Southwell, 19/11/21, *Levinge Jottings*, p.79; Same to Same, 23/12/21, *Levinge Jottings*, p.80; Swift to Chetwode, 5/12/21, Swift Corr. ii, p.411; *The Last Speech and Dying Words of the Bank of Ireland which was Executed at College Green on Saturday the 9th Inst.*, Dublin, 1721.

[42] CJI, iii, 16/10/21, 3/1/22 and 9/1/22. Because of illness, King only managed to attend 27 of the 46 sittings of the House. The parliament was eventually prorogued on January 18, 1722.

> 'The Archbishop of Dublin called on me [and] told me he was followed by the D[uke o[f] Gr[afton] and begged, as for Alms, to accept being one of the Lord Justices; that he followed him from his embarking [at] the Strand where he came into his coach and stayed three hours in it and tired him out.'

Surprised to have been even considered after his role in opposing the bank project, King undertook merely to seek the advice of his friends. When he mentioned it to Lords Tullamore and Fitzwilliam they both replied that Grafton's decision 'was the wisest act of his government.' No less attracted than before to positions of power, King was, however, reluctant to accept because of the severity of his illness: 'I write this in pain,' he told Annesley some days later,

> 'The force used on me to put me in the Government here in which I can neither hope to do good nor prevent evil and yet must share the blame of what is done wrong, has put me into a violent fit of the gout and God only knows when I shall get out of it.'

He wrote in similar vein to Edward Southwell complaining of having been forced into this 'Journeyman justiceship'. 'You can't be so weak as to imagine that I was put into it out of any kindness to me', he chided him, 'My Lord Chancellor was to be put out and it was not easy to find another to put it upon.' Obliged to accept the position, he refused to let it change his original plans. He made plain his determination, if he 'lived so long', to travel to Bath as soon as possible.[43]

His political adversaries, and in particular the English-born bishops were as surprised as King at this unexpected development. King had accepted the nomination only after 'mature deliberation', Downes reported. But, he

---

[43] King to Southwell, 24/3/22, TCD Ms. 750/7/88; King to Sir George Saunders, 27/2/22, TCD Ms. 750/7/79; King to Annesley, 10/3/22, TCD Ms. 750/7/84-5; King to Dean Mossom, 9/1/22, TCD Ms. 750/7/65; Evans to Wake, 15/3/23, Wake Ms, 14, fo.60; *Memorandum (endorsed by Alan Brodrick)*, 15/2/22, Midleton Mss. 5/186; Thomas Brodrick to Alan Brodrick, 8/2/22, Midleton Mss. 5/184. He was nominated along with Conolly and Viscount Shannon.

added sarcastically, 'they who long hesitate about preferment should go without it, especially such who think their acceptance [a] matter of obligation and consequently not worth our thanks'. Nor were they reassured by King's protestations of indifference: he pretended to be 'not pleased with the trust reposed in him and ..... was sure it would kill him,' Downes told Nicolson, but the truth was that 'he would have been as uneasy if he had been left out.' They were especially concerned that the appointment of King, Conolly and the Earl of Shannon gave too much power to those born in Ireland.[44] 'Whether our friends on the other side wanted power I cannot tell', Downes concluded bitterly, '..... they wanted regard to us Foreigners who are put entirely into the hands of the natives'. Indeed, Evans was convinced that King had only accepted the position after extracting some guarantees from Grafton with regard to the appointment of Irishmen to vacant benefices.[45] Nor was their foreboding without substance. Within a short period of his appointment King had secured the vacant bishopric of Clonfert for his close friend Theophilus Bolton, while one of his protégés, John Parnell, had been suddenly elevated to the King's Bench.[46]

This final period in the executive proved to be the longest of King's four terms as Lord Justice, ending only in August 1723 with Grafton's return.[47]

---

[44] Godwin to Wake, 30/3/22, Wake Mss. 13, fo.323; Downes to Nicholson, 17/2/22, quoted in Mant, *op. cit.*, ii, p.362; Nicolson to Wake, 4/3/22, Wake Mss. 13, fo.324.

[45] *Memorandum endorsed by Alan Brodrick*, 15/2/22, Midleton Mss. 5/186. Nevertheless, even Evans had to admit that he 'was glad he [King] was in for this single reason viz.: to prevent encroachments on the church's rights etc.': Evans to Wake, 15/3/23, Wake Manuscripts Epistolatory 14, [hereafter: Wake Mss. 14], fo.60.

[46] King to Wake, 13/1/22, TCD Ms. 750/7/69-70; King to Parnell, 28/8/22, TCD Ms. 750/7/203; Grafton to Lord Justices of Ireland, 19/5/22, Cal. Dept. Corr. 52/143/2497; Same to Same, 11/8/22, Cal. Dept. Corr. 52/143/2516; Meath to Wake, 28/7/22, Wake Mss. 14, fo.31. The English faction was not ignored, however. The nomination of Josiah Hort to the diocese of Ferns and Leighlin was indicative of Grafton's determination to maintain a balance between the competing interests.

[47] Grafton to Lord Justices of Ireland, 14/2/23, Cal. Dept. Corr. 52/143/2545; Lords

With the exception of a brief Jacobite alarm, however, it was also remarkably uneventful.[48] But his relationship with his fellow Lords Justices was not a happy one. He found the unwillingness of Conolly and Shannon to challenge the government on any matter especially galling: 'Whether his Grace of Dublin is pleased with himself I cannot tell,' Godwin was only too happy to report to London,

> 'but as far as I can hear he is pleased with nobody else. Particularly he is so angry with his two colleagues in the government that he thinks them as bad as Englishmen.'

In fact, tired, frustrated and sick, King had no intention of undertaking a huge workload. In July 1722 he departed for Bath determined to remain there until fully recovered.[49]

Justices of Ireland to Carteret, 2/3/23, PRO. S.P. 63/380/179. Brodrick was eventually added to the commission early in 1723, though only after King had, unsuccessfully, objected to the manner of his appointment. This action on King's part could be traced to Brodrick's similar opposition to King's addition to the commission in 1717.

[48] King to Grafton, 27/3/22, TCD Ms. 750/7/91-2; Same to Same, 6/11/22, TCD Ms. 750/7/230-1; King to Hopkins, 15/5/22, TCD Ms. 750/7/110-1; Synge to Wake, 27/6/22, Wake Mss. 14, fo.25; Grafton to Lord Justices of Ireland, 5/5/22, Cal. Dept. Corr. 52/143/2491; Carteret to Lord Justices of Ireland, 8/5/22, Cal. Dept. Corr. 52/143/2493.

[49] Godwin to Wake, 29/11/22, Wake Mss. 14, fo.41; Annesley to King, 25/8/22, Lyons 2013; King to Grafton, 10/4/22, TCD Ms. 750/7/95-6; Stoyte to King, 28/8/22, Lyons 2014; King to Irvine, 3/7/22, TCD Ms. 750/7/148.

II

When King arrived back in Dublin in October he found 'the generality of the people here alarmed' over a coinage patent held by an Englishman, William Wood. The patent, to coin £108,000 of copper half-pence and farthings, equivalent to one quarter in value of all coin circulating in Ireland, had been granted in July. However, it had not been officially announced and the fact that news had only reached Ireland through private correspondence meant that extravagant rumours abounded.[50]

King had first heard of the patent while in England. The fact that he had objections to the patent, and that they were based on both economic and constitutional grounds, was evident from letters which he dispatched almost immediately to the Lord Lieutenant and his secretary: 'I believe you are sensible how much they [the Anglo-Irish] were soured of late by the treatment with which they have met', he wrote to Edward Hopkins, Grafton's Chief Secretary, alluding to the Declaratory Act, 'I am afraid this patent, if it pass, will complete their ruin'. He was just as forthright when writing to Grafton himself, protesting at not only the huge size of the patent, which would 'drain the kingdom of the little gold and silver that is left', but the fact that it had been granted without consulting the Irish parliament or Privy Council. In his

[50] King to Grafton, 10/7/22, TCD Ms. 750/7/159a; King to Annesley, 3/9/22, TCD Ms. 750/7/208-9; Commissioners of the Revenue to Hopkins, 7/8/22, PRO. S.P. 63/380/110; Commissioners of the Revenue to Lords of the Treasury, 13/9/22, PRO. S.P. 63/380/111.

opinion, there was 'only one remedy' if the government proceeded and that was to boycott the coins. If the bulk of the population could be persuaded to support such a policy then he was convinced that it would 'break the neck of the project.' The fact that those opposed to the patent included both Shannon and Conolly, who was not only Lord Justice, but also the government's chief manager and one of the Commissioners of the Revenue, emphasised the widespread nature of the resistance. Pointing out the economic and political folly of such a scheme, he advised the ministry to arrange for its revocation. The circumstances in which the patent had originated, however, meant that such a course was not possible. Originally granted by the king to his mistress, the Duchess of Kendall, it had been sold on by her to Wood. This made it a matter which touched the king and any attempt to rescind it might incur his wrath at the very time when Walpole's administration was under considerable strain. The government was, therefore, in no position to act on such advice.[51]

Opposition to the scheme intensified in Ireland during the winter of 1722 and the early months of 1723. Pamphlets warning of the dire economic consequences of allowing such a volume of coin into the country proliferated.[52] The fact that parliament was due to meet in the autumn heightened tensions even more. But despite warnings from Conolly that supply could be threatened if the patent was not rescinded, the government refused to budge. By the

---

[51] King to Annesley, 3/9/22, TCD Ms. 750/7/208-9; Commissioners of the Revenue to Hopkins, 7/8/22, PRO. S.P. 63/380/110; Commissioners of the Revenue to Lords of the Treasury, 13/9/22, PRO. S.P. 63/380/111; King to Grafton, 10/7/22, TCD Ms. 750/7/159a; King to Hopkins, 21/7/22, TCD Ms. 750/7/166-70; A. Goodwin, 'Wood's Halfpence', *English Historical Review*, 51, 1936, pp.647-674. A boycott of the coins would be legal since, by law, only gold and silver coins had to be accepted in satisfaction of a debt.

[52] Grafton to Walpole, 22/8/23, PRO. S.P. 63/381/3; James Maculla, *Ireland's Consternation in the Losing of £200,000 of their Gold and Silver for Brass Money, Set Forth by an Artificer in Metals And a Citizen of Dublin Showing the fatal Consequences of Coining in another Kingdom Three Hundred Ton Weight of Copper Half-Pence*, Dublin, 1723; Maples, *Remarks on the copper coin intended for the use of Ireland*, Dublin, 1723.

summer it was obvious that the patent's approval would form part of the agenda for parliament. As a consequence, Conolly and Shannon, however reluctantly, agreed to press the members to approve it.[53]

King, the third Lord Justice, had no intention of supporting the government on this matter. On the contrary, still seething at the Declaratory Act, he was determined to exploit the affair. Dismissing Conolly and Shannon as 'tools to Great Britain' and 'as bad as Englishmen', he called on all Anglo-Irishmen to unite in opposition to the patent. By March 1723 he had, according to Evans, set himself up 'as the only patriot' and was promising to 'strenuously oppose' it when it came before parliament in the autumn. In this he was ably supported by Swift, none having 'a greater hand in these heats than Dub[lin] and his Dean. Both equally hate everything called English.' 'They who brought him in to be a Lord Justice..... have surely repented it', Evans concluded, alluding to Grafton, who he now considered 'Irish governed'.[54]

While King and Swift would emerge as the most vociferous opponents of the patent, the man with the potential to cause the government greatest difficulty was Brodrick. The Lord Chancellor, who had recently been reinstated as a Lord Justice at the insistence of his patron Lord Carteret, had been quite vociferous in his opposition. Walpole and Townshend were not convinced by 'his assurances of doing everything in the best and smoothest way' and expected that he would attempt to exploit difficulties with the patent to embarrass the ministry to Carteret's advantage. The fact that Carteret was the Secretary of State to whom Grafton was accountable made Brodrick an

---

[53] King to Molyneux, 23/8/23, TCD Ms. 2537/5-7; Nicholson to Wake, 10/9/23, Wake Mss. 14, fo.94; Southwell to King, 7/1/23, Lyons, 2022; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 26/8/23, Midleton Mss. 5/302.

[54] Evans to Wake, 15/3/23, Wake Mss. 14, fo.60; Same to Same, 28/5/23, Wake Mss. 14, fo.77; Same to Same, 28/6/23, Wake Mss. 14, fo.82; Godwin to Wake, 29/11/22, Wake Mss. 14, fo.41; Same to Same, 16/1/23, Wake Mss. 14, fo.48.

even more potent opponent.[55]

In a series of private meetings in the days immediately prior to parliament convening Grafton attempted to assess the mood of various parliamentary leaders. King promised obstinate resistance: 'none must expect that I will do anything that I am convinced will prejudice either Church or State', he told the Lord Lieutenant. He was even more explicit in his lobbying of potential supporters: 'I am sensible there is no great probability of stopping a current when once in motion', he told the Bishop of Cork, in a letter which betrayed all the signs of a man who felt that opposition to the patent was a sacred charge,

> 'and that only God can quell the raging of the sea or madness of a people. But I conceive all that God requires of me is to do my endeavour to prevent evil and do good. The success is in His hand and I am not answerable for it and, therefore, I am easy though things are carried against me. And this is my answer to my friends when they ask me, "Why will you appear in this affair, you see it will be carried against you?" After all I must declare I have succeeded in many things against the opinion of my friends and mine own.....'

Brodrick also confirmed that he would not be supporting the proposal. Conolly, meanwhile, against his better judgement, undertook to attempt to obtain a majority for the government. In his opinion, however, the opposition of Brodrick's Squadron probably doomed the project.[56]

The cumulative effect of the preliminaries was that when Grafton arrived to give his opening *Address* he found men from all factions rigidly opposed to the patent. The House of Commons was quickly on the offensive

---

[55] Grafton to Walpole, 14/9/23, PRO. S.P. 63/381/122; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 8/12/23, Midleton Mss. 5/339-340.

[56] King to Annesley, 25/11/23, TCD Ms. 2537/24-6; Annesley to King, 23/7/23, Lyons 2039; King to Browne, 14/9/23, TCD Ms. 2537/9-10; Grafton to Walpole, 22/8/23, PRO. S.P. 63/381/3; Grafton to Alan Brodrick, 4/7/23, Midleton Mss. 5/152.

and on September 13 the members formed themselves into a committee to debate it.[57] St. John Brodrick was amongst those 'making the most inflammatory speeches' and under instruction, the government believed, from the Lord Chancellor, he and his supporters made things difficult for the government. Grafton initially refused to comply with their request that he forward a copy of the patent to the House claiming that he had not brought one from England. But when, two days later, he was forced by their continued insistence to place a copy of the patent before them, he was entirely discredited. On September 27, after a long and heated debate, the Commons declared the patent to be 'highly prejudicial to your Majesty's revenue, destructive of the Trade and Commerce of this nation and of the most dangerous consequence to the properties of the Subject.' Their advice was that the ministry should arrange to have it rescinded.[58]

In the House of Lords opposition to the patent was just as widespread. But, before dealing with it, the members were required to respond to the opening *Address*. Impatient, King hoped to exploit the anger of the members and engineer a denunciation of the 'slavery' of the kingdom which had followed the Declaratory Act, presenting the attempted 'imposition' of the patent as just one more example. Consequently, when the draft reply came before the members he objected to the inference contained in the *Address* itself that Ireland enjoyed a 'happy' constitution. In his opinion, Ireland's constitutional

---

[57] Grafton to Walpole, 22/8/23, PRO. S.P. 63/381/3; Annesley to King, 23/7/23, Lyons 2039; Griffin, *Parliamentary Politics*, pp.119-147; Alan Brodrick to _____, 16/9/23, PRO. S.P. 63/381/1-2; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 18/9/23, Midleton Mss. 5/312; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 1/11/23, Midleton Mss. 5/325.

[58] CJI, iii, 13/9/23, 27/9/23; King to Browne, 14/9/23, TCD Ms. 2537/9-10; Alan Brodrick to _____, 16/9/23, PRO. S.P. 63/381/1-2; Alan Brodrick to _____, 21/9/23, PRO. S.P. 63/381/135; Grafton to Walpole, 14/9/23, PRO. S.P. 63/381/7; Same to Same, 24/9/23, PRO. S.P. 63/381/145-6; *Copies of Letters re Patent laid before the House*, September, 1723, PRO. S.P. 63/381/5-6; Burns, *op. cit.*, pp.139-143.

position was anything but, its constitutional integrity having been undermined by British avarice, an avarice facilitated by the king's refusal to defend his 'loyal supporters'. Ably assisted by Synge, he denounced the new constitutional arrangement and the 'pernicious imposition put on the kingdom relating to Wood's brass halfpence' which it facilitated. Amongst other things he threatened the government with *Addresses* to this effect from Grand Juries and Corporations around the country. 'I never heard bolder things said in my life on any occasion,' a shocked Evans informed Wake,

> 'viz. that we had no constitution, being under apprehensions, tyranny and what not, affirming we should never be right till Poyning's etc. law were abrogated.'

As had been the case in 1721, however, King had miscalculated. Adopting a course which involved implicit criticism of the king was not acceptable to the bulk of the members. Brought to a vote, this initial bid to embarrass the administration was easily defeated. Confident that 'as this attempt to open the old wound [had] miscarried', the newly installed Bishop Hort, who had yet to sit through a session of the Irish parliament, predicted naïvely that 'no more' would be heard of constitutional grievances.[59]

This optimism was soon shown to be misplaced. Far from being dropped, the opposition to the patent intensified. Indeed the Lords were intent on following the Common's example by framing their own *Address* on the matter. King led a deputation to the Commons to discuss the 'State of the Nation' and the strategy which might be adopted by both Houses. He reported back that the members of the Commons had begun their deliberations and would willingly provide the Lords with all of the papers and documents at their

---

[59] LJI, ii, 5/9/23, 7/9/23; Evans to Wake, 9/9/23, Wake Mss. 14, fo.90; King to Browne, 14/9/23, TCD Ms. 2537/9-10; Same to Same, 5/10/23, TCD Ms. 2537/13; Hort to Wake, 26/9/23, Wake Mss. 14, fo.97.

disposal. On September 26 the Lords debated the matter in earnest. They first of all resolved to address the crown along similar lines to those adopted by the Commons. King was one of those appointed to the committee charged with drafting such an *Address*. It was his intention, he informed the other members when they convened, to use the opportunity 'to damn Woods Halfpence', and he would allow no one to deflect him. He then embarked upon a bitter tirade against the British parliament, the government, the patent and those charged with implementing it. Indeed so forthright was he that at one point Brodrick was obliged to check him on the grounds that he was totally dominating the order of business, there having been 'hardly one motion been made in our House this session but by him.'[60]

Once again, however, in his eagerness to capitalise on the palpable anger of the members, he almost pressed matters too far when, along with Synge, he proposed some resolutions which would have censured any persons who had assisted Wood in obtaining the patent. Ostensibly 'these little endeavours' were simply intended 'to cast dirt' on those who had advised the king to approve the project. But, it was pointed out by several of the English-born bishops, such sentiments might also be interpreted as implying some culpability on his Majesty's part. Refusing to withdraw their motion, King and Synge made no effort to deny this. Indeed, 'so heroic' were those 'champions', Nicolson recorded, that after the members had indicated their unwillingness 'to embrace their motion' they questioned whether this was in accordance with the rules of the House. King's recollection of this episode was somewhat different: 'We had some struggle about halfpence,' he told Bishop Browne, 'all agreed to

[60] King to Annesley, 28/9/23, TCD Ms. 2537/11; Evans to Wake, 1/10/23, Wake Mss. 14, fo.100; LJI, ii, 23/9/23, 24/9/23, 25/9/23, 26/9/23; CJI, iii, 24/9/23; Grafton to Walpole, 19/10/23, PRO. S.P. 63/381/15-19; Alan Brodrick to Hon. Alan Brodrick (jr.), 27/9/23, Midleton Mss. 6/70.

condemn them, but there was some difference about the method.' In fact, this merely marked the beginning of a day of intense debate. On several occasions only the intervention of Brodrick from the woolsack ensured that some of the more extreme resolutions intended for the *Address* were withdrawn or modified. Nevertheless, King was delighted that the *Address* as finally approved by the House contained an explicit denunciation of the scheme and warned of the 'ill consequences' which would 'inevitably follow' any attempt to impose it.[61]

In his official correspondence, Grafton declared himself pleased with the outcome, reckoning it 'better than worse.' But privately he was furious. He was especially critical of those who, he believed, had manipulated events to the embarrassment to the government. Significantly, it was Brodrick that he singled out in this regard. Although King had been more outspoken, Grafton suspected the Lord Chancellor of furtively orchestrating much of the opposition. He also believed that Carteret was involved. But he could not ignore the fact that Conolly was unable to guarantee a Commons majority, while only the English-born bishops could be depended upon to support it in the Lords. Reluctantly he wrote to Walpole advising that the project be dropped. If this was not done, he warned, there was every possibility that there would be problems in obtaining a two year supply. Constrained by royal sensitivities on the point, however, the ministry were in no position to comply. Orders to enforce the patent and to counter the excesses of its opponents were returned almost immediately.[62]

---

[61] King to Browne, 5/10/23, TCD Ms. 2537/13-4; Nicolson to Wake, 1/10/23, Wake Mss. 14, fo.101; LJI, ii, 28/9/23; Alan Brodrick to Hon. Alan Brodrick (jr.), 27/9/23, Midleton Mss. 6/70; Same to Same, 30/9/23, Midleton Mss. 5/318. The Lords' *Address* omitted any suggestion that the patent had been gained by fraudulent means, an accusation made by the Commons.

[62] Grafton to Walpole, 24/9/23, PRO. S.P. 63/381/145; Same to Same, 19/10/23, PRO. S.P. 63/381/15-9; Same to Same, 20/10/23, PRO. S.P. 63/381/21-4; Grafton to _____,

But refuting the increasing number of those opposed to the project was proving ever more difficult. As Grafton had feared, transmission of the *Address* had not managed to 'quiet the evil spirit Dub[lin] etc. have raised here.' Indeed, he now found that 'the party which has hitherto given us so much disturbance' was being 'very vigilant and active in gaining new friends'. While Irish politicians might 'differ in opinion in other debates', he found them almost unanimous on this issue. Furthermore, 'with insinuations that the welfare of their country is at stake', King and his supporters were skilfully fomenting anti-English prejudices: 'aborigines before Henry the Second's time never abhorred the name of English more.....', Evans complained. On top of this, both King and Brodrick were pestering the administration over their failure to elicit a prompt reply to their *Addresses*.[63]

Severely reprimanded by Walpole for allowing matters to get so out of hand, Grafton was unsure where to turn. His only hope now was that the king's reply to the *Addresses* from Ireland would be diplomatic. If it did not 'irritate..... the ill-blood' which persisted, then there was still a hope that supply might be secured. In the meantime he ordered a recess until December 12. But this did little to calm matters and the focus simply moved to the Privy Council where even mundane business was affected: 'A party here endeavour to give me disturbance almost in every part of my administration,' he explained to his superiors in London when asked to account for the lack of government

---

2/11/23, PRO. S.P. 63/382/1-2; Hopkins to Stanyan, 22/10/23, PRO. S.P. 63/381/13; Walpole to Grafton, 3/10/23, PRO. S.P. 63/381/190-1; Same to Same, (extract), 26/9/23, PRO. S.P. 63/381/11; Same to Same, 24/9/23, PRO. S.P. 63/381/141-3; Walpole to Townshend, 1/10/23, quoted by Coxe in, *op. cit.*, ii, pp.270-5; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 1/11/23, Midleton Mss. 5/326.

[63] Evans to Wake, 24/10/23, Wake Mss. 14, fo.107; Grafton to Walpole, 20/10/23, PRO. S.P. 63/381/21-4; Grafton to _____, 2/11/23, PRO. S.P. 63/382/1-2; Walpole to Townshend, 26/10/23, quoted by Coxe in, *op. cit.*, ii, pp.285-6.

business being transacted at meetings.[64]

To Grafton's relief, the king's reply, which arrived during the recess, was just what he had hoped for. Promising that any abuses would be summarily punished, his Majesty pledged to 'do everything in his power for the satisfaction of his people.' Hopeful that this might be acceptable, he summoned several parliamentary leaders to the Castle. Not placated by such bland assurances, King was forthright in his response. It was 'merely court language and evasive', he told Grafton, 'and plainly a design to put the halfpence on us.' Unless the Lord Lieutenant could obtain a more explicit confirmation that the patent would be dropped, then he promised a repeat of the previous term's resistance. Brodrick indicated that he was in agreement with these sentiments. But, as Speaker of the Lords, he promised not to interfere from the woolsack. Conolly, meanwhile, although continuing to voice his reservations, promised to do his best to galvanise support.[65]

When parliament reassembled it became clear that King intended to fulfil his pledge. Reviving the proposal which had been rejected only two months previously, he moved that all 'confederates' of Wood be censured. This, however, was a repeat of a tactic which involved implicit criticism of the king, an approach to which, on three previous occasions, the members had shown themselves unwilling to be party. Lord Kildare countered with a proposal that his Majesty's 'gracious answer' be simply approved without comment. King 'warmly opposed this', ridiculing Kildare's misguided

---

[64] Grafton to Walpole, 20/10/23, PRO. S.P. 63/381/21-4; Grafton to Townshend, 20/11/23, PRO. S.P. 63/382/19-20; Ferguson, *op. cit.*, p.89; Victory, *Colonial Nationalism in Ireland*, pp.200-1.

[65] LJI, ii, 12/12/23; Nicolson to Wake, 14/12/23, Wake Mss. 14, fo.131; Grafton to Carteret, 14/12/23, PRO. S.P. 63/382/70; *Copy of Address*, PRO. S.P. 63/381/218; Grafton to Walpole, 9/11/23, PRO. S.P. 63/382/13; Burns, *op. cit.*, pp.146-8; King to Southwell, 6/3/25, NLI Ms. 2056; Same to Same, 6/2/25, TCD Ms. 2537/212; Same to Same, TCD Ms. 2537/239.

allegiance and, in the process, 'putting the hardest construction on his B[rother's] words that ever were heard, which no grammatical rule could possibly bear.' It was soon clear that King had again allowed his bitterness to cloud his judgement. When a vote was eventually called the king's reply was accepted by a majority of 30 to 7. A 'very dutiful' *Address* of thanks to his Majesty followed, proclaiming 'an entire confidence in and reliance upon the assurance his Majesty had been pleased to give.'[66]

With little opportunity remaining in this session in which to register his anger, the government having successfully managed to keep further discussion of the patent off the order of business, King was bitterly disappointed: the Anglo-Irish had been treated 'with the utmost contempt [and] endeavoured to be imposed on as fools and children,' he protested, 'as if we had not common understandings, or knew when we were abused.' He took some consolation from the addition of an embarrassing amendment to the Commons answer to the king's reply. But this could not take from the fact that he had failed once again to mount a meaningful challenge to the government.[67]

This was not the only issue occupying King's mind as he left Dublin to spend Christmas at Kilbrew with his friend, General Richard Gorge. A particularly disconcerting feature of recent parliaments had been his inability to persuade any of his fellow bishops, with the exception of Synge, to support him in his various parliamentary endeavours. While Swift seemed capable of rousing

---

[66] Evans to Wake, 17/12/23, Wake Mss. 14, fo.133; LJI, ii, 17/12/23; Godwin to Wake, 18/12/23, Wake Mss. 14, fo.135; *Copy of Address*, PRO. S.P. 63/382/92.

[67] King to Southwell, 26/12/23, TCD Ms. 2537/43-5; Same to Same, 6/3/25, NLI Ms. 2056.

popular resentment at the treatment of the kingdom by the British, King, it appeared, was no longer capable of translating this into support in the Lords. In many ways this was testament to the effect of an appointments policy on the part of the government which had increasingly favoured Englishmen for Irish bishoprics. Since 1719 three prelates, all of whom happened to be Irish-born, had died. These vacancies had been used to augment the English-born complement with the appointment of Josiah Hort to Ferns and Leighlin and of Francis Hutchinson to Down and Connor. Only one Irishman had been elevated: Theophilus Bolton, who had accepted Clonfert. This had returned numerical supremacy on the bench to the English-born faction. More importantly it had seen the addition to that group of two politically active Whig prelates. These men now joined a party which, under the guidance of Evans, whose opinion of Irish candidates for the episcopal bench was that it was 'hard to find (even nationality left aside), one of them fit to be of the order', pursued an agenda quite at variance with that of King's diminishing band of predominantly Irish-born peers. By 1724 this approach to appointments was being strongly pressed by the ministry.[68] Early in that year Townshend wrote to tell Grafton that the ministry had been successful in persuading the king that it was 'extremely right that English men should be preferred to the bishoprics in Ireland' in future. While Irishmen might be elevated to 'deaneries and other inferior preferments', he did not expect to see them recommended for any vacant sees. More sensitive to political realities in Dublin, Grafton and his successor, Carteret, attempted to ensure that this approach was not rigorously enforced. But they were not always successful, as it was a policy to which, with Wake's support, Walpole was increasingly attracted. This was best

[68] Evans to Wake, 28/5/23, Wake Mss. 14. fo.77; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 1/8/24, Midleton Mss. 6/45. Those who had died were Fitzgerald of Clonfert, Smyth of Down and Connor, and Vigors of Ferns and Leighlin.

epitomised in the circumstances surrounding the appointment of Henry Maule, an Irishman, to the bishopric of Cloyne in 1724. In the eyes of the ministry in London the only reason he was even considered was that he was a protégé of Wake, a friend of the Bishop of London, and could be depended upon not to ally himself with the Irish party.[69]

The worst aspect of this for King was that he was powerless to influence matters. Indeed, his position was about to be weakened further. After two successive parliaments in which all attempts to accommodate him had failed, Grafton had finally lost patience with him: King was, the Lord Lieutenant admitted, 'charitable, hospitable, a despiser of riches and an excellent bishop', for which reasons he enjoyed 'a great influence'. But, he was moved to bemoan, he was 'as uncommon a mixture' as he had ever come across; 'Indiscreet in his actions and expressions', he was given to 'wild notions' which made him 'impractical in business' and impossible to deal with. Worst of all he was 'to a ridiculous extent, national. Upon some points (of which the jurisdiction of the house of Lords is one), he loses his temper and his reason.....' In short, he was 'pretty ungovernable' and the Lord Lieutenant had grown tired of trying to appease him. The ministry in London concurred. In Townshend's opinion, 'at the bottom of all the noise' over the half-pence was 'an earnest desire for independency' in which King was deeply involved. In fact, it soon became apparent that they were considering replacing both King and Brodrick, since their 'behaviour..... makes it not advisable to name either of them.'[70]

---

[69] Townshend to Grafton, 17/3/24, PRO. S.P. 63/383/104; Same to Same, 23/1/24, PRO. S.P. 63/383/59-60; Grafton to Townshend, -/3/24, PRO. S.P. 63/383/114; Same to Same, 4/3/24, PRO. S.P. 63/383/81; Evans to Wake, 29/1/24, W14. fo.155; King to Maule, 10/3/24, TCD Ms. 2537/85.

[70] Grafton to Walpole, 19/12/23, quoted by C.S. King in *op. cit.*, pp.275-6; Alan Brodrick to Walpole, 21/9/23, PRO. S.P. 63/381/135; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 8/12/23, Midleton Mss. 5/339-40; Townshend to Grafton, 23/1/24, PRO. S.P. 63/383/60; Same to

Before dealing with the Lord Justices, however, Walpole and Townshend had decided on an even more fundamental change. Dissatisfied with the Lord Lieutenant's own performance, they had decided to replace Grafton. With a view to removing Carteret from London, they decided to appoint him to the post. This, however, meant that Brodrick, Carteret's close friend and ally, would have to be retained in the executive (although the new Lord Lieutenant was given orders to exclude him as much as possible from government business). The result was that when the new commission of Lords Justices was finalised King had not been included.[71]

This loss of office did not upset King unduly. It was the preliminary, however, to a decision by the ministry in relation to another appointment which would cause him an anguish which he could not hide. In July of that year, the aged Primate Lindsay, who had been declining for several years, finally died.[72] In the eyes of most Irishmen, King was the obvious candidate to succeed. His supporters, who in this instance included Conolly, had already begun to canvass for him: 'the wishes of the whole Kingdom are for the Archbishop of Dublin,' Coghill told Southwell, 'and indeed no man in the Kingdom can so justly claim it'. His 'personal merits ..... steadiness and sufferings at the time of the revolution and his zeal after the cause here' were such that it was 'amazing that anybody should be thought of for this station but himself.' Even in England his claims to advancement were widely acknowledged: 'The vogue [is

---

Same, 1/4/24, PRO. S.P. 63/383/129; Burns, *op. cit.*, pp.152-5.

[71] King to Southwell, 23/3/24, TCD Ms. 2537/88; Townshend to Grafton, 23/1/24, PRO. S.P. 63/383/60; Same to Same, 1/4/24, PRO. S.P. 63/383/129; Burns, *op. cit.*, pp.152-5; St. John Brodrick to Alan Brodrick, 23/5/24, Midleton Mss. 6/27; Basil Williams, *Carteret and Newcastle: A Contrast in Contemporaries*, Cambridge, 1943, p.71; Godwin to Wake, 23/3/24, Wake Mss. 14, fo.179; Pocklington to Wake, 21/4/24, Wake Mss. 14, fo.193.

[72] William Lingen to King, 14/7/24, Lyons 2107; Swift to King, 14/7/24, Swift Corr. iii, p.20; Coghill to Southwell, 14/7/24, B.L. Add. Ms. 21122/11-2; Nicolson to Wake, 31/7/24, Wake Mss. 14, fo.209.

that] your Grace will succeed..... if you please', Swift informed him from London. 'If there were virtue enough', the Dean continued in that manner which he knew delighted King,

> 'I could wish your Grace would accept the offer if it should be made you because I would have your name left to posterity among the Primates; and because entering into a new station is entering after a sort on a new lease of life; and because it might be hoped that your Grace would be advised with a successor; and because that diocese would require your Grace's ability and spirit to reform it; and because..... but I should never be at an end if I were to number up the reasons why I would have your Grace in the highest station the Crown can give you.[73]

His opponents were just as determined to ensure that he did not succeed: while 'the schemists [had] laid out Armagh for the Archbishop of Dublin', they intended to do everything in their power to ensure that an Englishman was nominated. Almost a year previously, when Lindsay had begun to decline, Evans had taken the opportunity to refute King's claims: '.....even his best friends,' he told Wake, thought him 'too free in his observations and censures on all his Brethren on this side who will not entirely submit to his dictatorship.' Furthermore, 'he never spares English secular politics, for nothing passes among you right in his opinion.' 'He must be owned to be very knowing and active in his station,' he admitted, but

> '..... He generally governs himself, more by his own infallible will than by any other light, after declaring he was <u>never</u> mistaken in his judgement or opinion of things etc.'

With Evans having died in the intervening months the task of campaigning against King fell to other English-born prelates. They were relieved to hear that King's performance in recent parliaments was weighing heavily with those charged with nominating the next primate. They also made a point of

---

[73] Coghill to Southwell, 14/7/24, B.L. Add. Ms. 21122/11-2; King to Coghill, 21/7/24, TCD Ms. 2537/137; Same to Same, 27/7/24, TCD Ms. 2537/139-40; Conolly to Carteret, 14/7/24, PRO. S.P. 63/384/9; Swift to King, 14/7/24, Swift Corr. iii, p.20.

reminding the government that any promotion for him would encourage the 'national party' in their opposition to the coinage patent. It was obvious, they advised, that he would never be 'for cool measures', and, as such, simply could not be trusted in so sensitive a position. He was, Godwin protested, 'a peculiar instance of being a minister and finding fault with everything that is done.' To assist the government, he forwarded a list of various English clerics that he thought might be suitable.[74]

Aware of the government's determination to appoint Englishmen where possible, King was reluctant to openly declare his interest believing that 'none of this kingdom must pretend to it.' 'We shall', he predicted, 'have a primate from England'. Besides, he could not 'imagine how a crazy, lame and superannuated primate can be of any service.' Consequently he feigned disinterest: 'The Lord Primate..... ought to be a man of knowledge and weight,' he told Lord Harcourt. He had known 'great inconveniences happen to his Majesty's service and the public by the unfitness of the person who possessed that high station.' In any case he was 'apt to think it was long ago determined who should be his successor,' he told Swift,

> 'for I understand that it is the method taken by this Ministry to determine on supposition that such or such die who shall succeed. I have been importuned by my friends to apply for myself ..... I have writ to several who I believe will have an interest in the disposal of preferments apprising them of what moment a proper person in this place will be to his Majesty's service etc., and entreating their good offices towards procuring such an one. How this will be construed I am not much concerned, but let it take its course.'[75]

---

[74] Downes to Nicolson, 16/7/24, quoted in Mant, *op. cit.*, p.415; Evans to Wake, 28/6/23, Wake Mss. 14, fo.82; Godwin to Wake, 5/10/23, Wake Mss. 14, fo.103; Same to Same, 23/3/24, Wake Mss. 14, fo.179; Nicolson to Wake, 31/7/24, Wake Mss. 14, fo.209; Maule to Wake, 14/7/24, Wake Mss. 14, fo.205.

[75] King to Whitshed, 19/7/24, TCD Ms. 2537/132-3; King to Swift, 20/7/24, Swift Corr. iii, p.23; King to Coghill, 21/7/24, TCD Ms. 2537/136-7; King to Viscount Harcourt, 15/7/24, TCD Ms. 2537/136; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 1/8/24, Midleton Mss.

It was clear, nevertheless, despite his disclaimers, that he would gladly have accepted the position had it been offered to him. It was no coincidence, for example, that, while he did not openly canvass, within twenty-four hours of hearing of Lindsay's demise he had written to several individuals who would influence the choice of the successor. Indeed, recalling the episode some time later, Swift maintained that King had 'laid claim to the primacy as a preferment to which he had a right'. Furthermore, although professing to be 'settled to my heart's content' at St. Sepulchre's, he did concede that 'if providence should throw this upon me, I submit.' Nor did his fondness for St. Sepulchre's stop him accepting the nomination of the diocesan clergy to act as Administrator of Armagh pending the appointment of Lindsay's successor.[76]

The relative speed with which the position was eventually filled, however, confirmed King's belief that the matter had been settled long before the aged Lindsay had died. Within three weeks of the latter's death, Dr. Hugh Boulter, Bishop of Bristol, had been elevated to the position. A Whig and a close friend of Wake, he was a formidable churchman who could be expected to replace Evans as the leader of the English-born party. Though disappointed, King was not surprised. At least, he told his friends, he had the satisfaction of having 'judged better of matters' than they. For their part, the English-born bishops were delighted. Boulter was 'the very man we all wished for,' Nicolson announced contentedly, 'and in whom we shall all think ourselves completely happy.' More importantly, it seemed to promise a series of appointments

---

6/45.

[76] King to Coghill, 21/7/24, TCD Ms. 2537/136-7; King to Carteret, 14/7/24, TCD Ms. 2537/124; King to Wake, 14/7/24, TCD Ms. 2537/125; King to Edmund Gibson, Bishop of London, TCD Ms. 2537/126-7; King to Viscount Harcourt, English Privy Councillor, 15/7/24, TCD Ms. 2537/128-9; King to Sir Peter King, Lord Chief Justice of Court of Common Pleas, 15/7/24, TCD Ms. 2537/129-30; Rev. Richard Daniel, Dean of Armagh, to King, 13/7/24, Lyons 2106; Evans to Wake, 28/7/22, Wake Mss. 14, fo.34.

favourable to the 'English interest.'[77]

Throughout this period the hostility to Woods' halfpence had continued unabated.[78] For the government the most disconcerting development had been that Lords Justices Conolly, Brodrick and Shannon, had all indicated their unwillingness to be involved in any further attempt to impose the coinage. Memorials from various Corporations around the country and from the Privy Council itself maintained the pressure on the authorities.[79] Equally importantly, perhaps, King, with the assistance of Brodrick, had managed to persuade Swift to become more involved in the fray. While the long term significance of Swift's involvement would be that it would lead to him superseding King as the pre-eminent spokesman and ideologue of Anglo-Irish patriotism, in helping to galvanise ordinary Anglo-Irishmen in their opposition to the patent, his impact was immediate.

One of King's main worries had been that, with parliament prorogued, the ministry might have attempted to impose the patent by stealth. But Swift's

---

[77] King to Coghill, 1/8/24, TCD Ms. 2537/142; Edmund Gibson, Bishop of London, to King 30/7/24, Lyons 2112; Sir John St. Leger, Second Baron of the Exchequer, to King, 10/9/24, Lyons 2115; Southwell to King, 8/8/24, Lyons 2113; Same to Same, 3/9/24, Lyons 2114; Nicolson to Wake, 21/8/24, Wake Mss. 14, fo. 212; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 1/8/24, Midleton Mss. 6/45.

[78] King to Southwell, 23/3/24, TCD Ms. 2537/88; Synge to Wake, 25/4/24, Wake Mss. 14, fo.194; Coghill to Southwell, 1/8/24, B.L. Add. Ms. 21122/13-4; Same to Same, 7/9/24, B.L. Add. Ms. 21122/17-18; *Order by Lord Lieutenant and Council of Ireland*, 27/4/24, Midleton Mss. 8/91.

[79] Grafton to Townshend, 20/3/24, PRO. S.P. 63/383/97; Grafton to Newcastle, 29/4/24, PRO. S.P. 63/383/206; *Address of the Council of Ireland to the King re Wood's halfpence*, 20/5/24, Midleton Mss. 8/99; *Petition by Dublin Grand Jury against the Halfpence*, PRO. S.P. 63/383/208; *Memorial from Sheriff, Mayor and Corporation of Mayo*, PRO. S.P. 63/384/18.

contributions were so effective in maintaining popular opposition that this was never seriously considered. His *Drapier's Letters*, the first of which was published in March 1724, excited enormous interest. Both their content and the controversies surrounding their publication ensured that popular sentiment remained hostile. The result was that, while his position in the Privy Council guaranteed King's position as official spokesman for the opponents of the patent, and Brodrick lobbied in the background, Swift quickly established himself as the champion of the populace.[80]

Notwithstanding their success, King's attitude to the *Drapier's Letters* was somewhat ambivalent. He was delighted to see the controversy broadened to incorporate the constitutional arrangement which he believed had enabled such a situation to develop. On the other hand he 'did by no means approve of several things'. One of these was his Dean's tendency to criticise members of the executive in strong and injudicious terms. He was fearful lest this compelled the government to proceed with the project as a matter of honour. He was also nervous about Swift's use of emotive appeals to the population in general. This betrayed his deeply held misgivings about moving any debate from the parliament or council chamber into the streets. Of one letter he complained that it was 'very foolish, unseasonable and, I may justly say, a wicked paper.' He also made a point of contrasting Swift's 'ludicrous and satirical style' with the 'modesty and directness of others'. But, these were minor quibbles. On the whole, he was happy to acknowledge that the *Letters* succeeded in bolstering 'the spirit of this poor Kingdom' whenever the patent's

---

[80] Swift to Ford, 2/4/24, Swift Corr. iii, p.9; Swift to Carteret, 28/4/24, Swift Corr. iii, p.13; Ferguson, *op. cit.*, p.96; Victory, *Colonial Nationalism in Ireland*, pp.201-18; Pocklington to Wake, 21/4/24, Wake Mss. 14, fo.193; Swift to Ford, 2/4/24, Swift Corr. iii, p.9; M.B., Drapier [J. Swift], *A Letter to the Shop-keepers, Tradesmen, Farmers and Common-people of Ireland, concerning the Brass half-pence coined by Mr. Woods with a view to having them pass in this Kingdom*, Dublin, March 1724. Within a month of publication of this first *Drapier's Letter* almost 2,000 copies were in print.

direct imposition seemed a possibility.[81]

King's hope that the government might relent had been raised by the appointment of Carteret as Lord Lieutenant. While this had served Walpole's need to remove one of his more intractable opponents from London, it had also placed in charge of imposing the patent a man who had made no secret of his opposition to it. People in Ireland found it difficult to interpret the governments intentions. Some were sure that it signalled the end of the scheme. Swift, for one, had been of this mind and had written to 'represent..... the apprehensions' of the country to the new Lord Lieutenant. 'Your Excellency knows the unanimous sentiments of the parliament upon that matter,' he reminded him,

> 'And upon enquiry you will find that there is not one person of any rank or party in this whole kingdom who does not look upon that patent as the most ruinous project that ever was contrived against any nation..... your justice and compassion for an injured people will force you to employ your credit for their relief.'

King was similarly optimistic. He had admired Carteret's stance on the patent thus far and welcomed the appointment of such 'a wise and honest governor' at this time.[82]

It quickly became apparent, however, that whatever Carteret's private sentiments, he was obliged to proceed with the patent. Earlier in the year Walpole had enlisted the support of Sir Isaac Newton to prepare a report on the quality of the coins being minted. Although the results of this were not

---

[81] King to Southwell, 10/9/24, TCD Ms. 2537/115; Same to Same, 24/11/24, TCD Ms. 2537/190-3; King to Molyneux, 24/12/24, TCD Ms. 2537/187-8; King to Gorge, 12/12/24, TCD Ms. 2537/195-8; Ferguson, *op. cit.*, p.120.

[82] King to Southwell, 4/7/24, TCD Ms. 2537/115; Same to Same, 23/3/24, TCD Ms. 2537/88; Southwell to King, 2/4/24, Lyons, 2074; Swift to Carteret, 28/4/24, Swift Corr. iii, p.12; Same to Same, 9/6/24, Swift Corr. iii, p.13-4; Carteret to Swift, 20/6/24, Swift Corr. iii, p.16-7; Swift to Ford, 16/6/24, Swift Corr. iii, p.15.

made public until July, Southwell leaked details of the results to King some months earlier.[83] The ministry, he told him, felt compelled by his Majesty to proceed with the project and proposed to use Newton's favourable report to this end. The only concession was to be a reduction in the amount of coinage to be produced to £40,000. At a Council meeting in August 1724 intended to endorse Newton's report, the majority of the members, including Brodrick, Conolly, Shannon and King, objected strenuously to being asked to take so repugnant a step.[84] They also refused to accept a directive from London that the coin be used to pay the army. This was seized upon by Swift as evidence of the impossibility of imposing the patent and led to two more *Drapier's Letters* which stimulated popular resentment even more.[85] Newspapers published full page lists of traders and merchants who promised not to accept the coin in payment. 'People of every religion, country and party here are alike set against Wood's half-pence,' the newly-arrived Boulter reported.[86]

The unwillingness of any of the Lords Justices to support the government persuaded Walpole to embark on a more radical course. Resigned to the fact that no Irish politician would undertake to champion the patent, he

---

[83] *Resolution of a Committee of His Majesty's Privy Council*, 24/7/24, PRO. S.P. 63/384/19-22; Townshend to Carteret, 8/8/24, PRO. S.P. 63/384/38; Southwell to King, 30/4/24, Lyons 2091.

[84] King to Southwell, 10/9/24, TCD Ms. 2537/162; Same to Same, 6/2/25, TCD Ms. 2537/212; Same to Same, 6/3/25, NLI Ms. 2056; Carteret to Lords Justices of Ireland, 8/8/24, Midleton Mss. 8/105; Townshend to Carteret, 8/8/24, PRO. S.P. 63/384/38; Dr. John Hawkshaw to King, 23/9/24, Lyons 2116.

[85] M.B., Drapier, [J. Swift], *A Letter to Mr. Harding the Printer, upon occasion of a Paragraph in his News-paper of August 1st relating to Mr. Woods Half-Pence*, August, 1724; idem, [J. Swift], *Some Observations upon a Paper Called the Report of the Committee of the Most Honourable the Privy Council in England relating to Woods Half-Pence*, September, 1724.

[86] Boulter to Newcastle, 19/1/25, *Letters written by Hugh Boulter, Lord Primate of All Ireland to Several Ministers of State in England and some others*, 2 vols, Oxford, 1769, [hereafter: *Boulter Letters,*] i, p.7; Southwell to King, 8/8/24, Lyons 2113.

decided that the 'English party', already bolstered by the new Primate, would have to be strengthened further. In addition, despite the fact that parliament was not due to be convened for over a year, he decided to dispatch Carteret to Ireland immediately, with orders to cajole Conolly into supporting the government if at all possible, but to isolate Brodrick. The Lord Lieutenant was also expected to do everything in his power to dampen the spirit of 'independency' which had so exacerbated the situation.[87]

Carteret approached his task with quiet confidence, sure that with a little careful inducement sufficient members of parliament could be persuaded to support the patent. He was given an almost immediate opportunity to test this sanguine assessment when greeted on his arrival by another *Drapier's Letter*, the publication of which was calculated to coincide with his disembarkation. Combining a strident disavowal of English legislative, judicial and commercial claims on Ireland with a blistering attack on the policy of appointing Englishmen to senior government and church positions, it was a blend which could easily have come from King's pen. Indeed, Brodrick was convinced that King had played a considerable part in advising Swift, particularly on constitutional points.[88]

To some extent this was true. However, in making this observation the Lord Chancellor was actually betraying a lack of appreciation of the subtleties of 'patriotic' ideology, since Swift's constitutional thinking, as evidenced by the

---

[87] Walpole to Newcastle, 1/9/24, PRO. S.P. 63/384/54-5; Newcastle to Lords Justices of Ireland, 3/10/24, PRO. S.P. 63/384/96-105; Newcastle to Conolly, -/9/24, PRO. S.P. 63/384/73-4; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 1/8/24, Midleton Mss. 6/45.

[88] Carteret to Delafaye, 10/9/24, PRO. S.P. 63/384/67; M.B., Drapier, [J. Swift], *A Letter to the Whole People of Ireland*, Dublin, October 1724; King to Gorges, 3/11/24, TCD Ms. 2537/184; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 17/11/24, Midleton Mss. 6/92; Carteret to Newcastle, 28/10/24, PRO. S.P. 63/384/159-161; Swift to Oxford, 27/11/24, Swift Corr. iii, p.41; Nicolson to Wake, 30/10/24, Wake Mss. 14, fo.220; Victory, *Colonial Nationalism in Ireland*, pp.213 and 274. See also Coxe, *op. cit*, ii, pp.382-402.

Drapier's Letters, represented not an elaboration of King's approach but its replacement. For almost thirty years King had been the pre-eminent ideologue amongst Anglo-Irish patriots. During that time he had championed that vision of Ireland as a separate kingdom subject only to the monarch as king of Ireland, which he had inherited from seventeenth-century writers. In support of this he had appealed to both precedent and common law. Appreciating that the Declaratory Act had effectively rendered these bases void, Swift, sought a more subtle rationale. He found it in Locke's notion of 'natural right' which had formed a minor part of Molyneux's thesis in his *The Case of Ireland Stated*, and which, but for Molyneux's death, might well have become the predominant ideology of Anglo-Irish patriotism. Indeed, it was the fact that the latest *Drapier's Letter* was predicated upon this notion of Ireland as a separate kingdom unjustly treated, since 'in *Reason,* all Government without the consent of the *governed* is the very Definition of Slavery', that caused such consternation. Even Brodrick was moved to opine that it 'seemed to treat the king in an undutiful and dishonourable manner..... [and] asserted an independency of this kingdom'.[89]

In the face of this challenge Carteret moved to assert his authority, hoping to exploit the fact that several prominent politicians, while steadfast in their opposition to the patent, had expressed alarm at the tenor of the Drapier's latest contribution. Within days he had issued an Order denouncing it as seditious and scandalous.[90] He made it clear that his intention was simply to

---

[89] Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 17/11/24, Midleton Mss. 6/92. See also Coxe, *op. cit.*, ii, p.397. For a discussion of Swift's contribution on this point see Victory, *Colonial Nationalism in Ireland*, pp.192-217 and Ferguson, *op. cit.*, pp.118-121. See also J.Th. Leerson, 'Anglo-Irish Patriotism and its European Context: Notes towards a Reassessment', Eighteenth-Century Ireland, 1988, pp.7-24.

[90] *Order (signed by Carteret)*, 27/10/24, PRO. S.P. 63/384/141; Carteret to Newcastle, 28/10/24, PRO. S.P. 63/384/159-61.

punish the author for maligning the king and British parliament. Calling a Privy Council meeting to endorse his action, he let it be known that he would brook no dissension, nor would he allow the question of the patent to be raised. But King was determined that this opportunity would not be allowed to pass. Protesting vehemently until a shocked Lord Lieutenant was forced to allow him to speak freely, he insisted on linking the two issues. A heated debate followed and, although King and Bishop Bolton were the only ones who actually opposed him 'directly', Carteret could sense that most members agreed with King's view that what was being attempted was really 'an oblique way of forcing the halfpence.' Goaded by King, he was forced, reluctantly, to address the question of the patent directly; 'I asserted the legality of Wood's patent,' he told Newcastle, because

> '..... I observed that the extravagant rage against the patent which had been so artfully fomented by the incendiaries, being in their opinion now come to its full height, they began to apply it [Drapier's Letter] to their treacherous designs and make it serve as a cover to the seditious and traitorous intentions of those men who would persuade the people to shake off their allegiance to the king and their depending upon England.'

Threatening those who expressed 'traitorous intentions' with the full force of the law, he insisted on Council's support. Indeed, he 'harangued the Council so effectually' that the majority of members eventually succumbed.[91] But King, supported by Bolton, Coghill and Lord Allen refused to submit. A further six hours of debate followed in which King and Carteret swapped accusations. In the end the proclamation was modified so that only 'several seditious and scandalous paragraphs', and not the *Letter* as a whole, were condemned, at

---

[91] Godwin, *op. cit.*, p.672; Carteret to Newcastle, 28/10/24, PRO. S.P. 63/384/162-3; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 31/10/24, Midleton Mss. 6/29-80; Carteret to Newcastle, 28/10/24, PRO. S.P. 63/384/159-61; Ferguson, *op. cit.*, pp.122-3; Thomas Tickell to Delafaye, 1/11/24, PRO. S.P. 63/384/170.

which point Bolton, Coghill and Allen dropped their opposition. King alone refused to yield. Realising that he could not be brought to change his mind, Carteret brought the meeting to a close.[92]

Government officials, and particularly those who had served under Grafton, were delighted by this show of authority on the part of the Lord Lieutenant. In the opinion of one, although 'by no means extinguished', the 'Spirit of Sedition is certainly damped'. But, opponents of the patent saw things somewhat differently. King was satisfied that the Lord Lieutenant had not been allowed to have his own way entirely. Furthermore, he was sure that in bringing matters to a head so quickly, the Lord Lieutenant had made a tactical error. While he would have preferred it had the Councillors been more resolute in their opposition, he was happy that the majority had left Carteret in no doubt as to their antipathy to the patent. Indeed, he felt sufficiently emboldened to make a loud prediction, within earshot of Carteret, that the government would soon 'have reason to repent what had been done' by the Lord Lieutenant.[93]

But, in spite of such bravura there where several aspects of recent developments which did cause King some concern. One was that Brodrick, while still vehemently opposed to the patent, had begun to distance himself from overt criticism of official policy. One reason for this was that he felt constrained by his friendship with Carteret to ensure that he did not exacerbate matters, particularly since the Lord Lieutenant was under instruction to reduce

---

[92] Carteret to Newcastle, 28/10/24, PRO. S.P. 63/384/162-3; King to Molyneux, 24/11/24, TCD Ms. 2537/187-8; King to Stearne, 12/12/24, TCD Ms. 2537/198; Pocklington to Wake, 7/11/24, Wake Mss. 14, fo.222; Swift to Ford, 27/11/24, Swift Corr. iii, p.43-4. Bolton and Coghill, were dismissed by Brodrick as merely 'creatures of the former [King]': Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 31/10/24, Midleton Mss. 6/79-80; Griffin, *Parliamentary Politics*, pp.150-2.

[93] Tickell to Delafaye, 1/11/24, PRO. S.P. 63/384/170; King to Gorge, 3/11/24, TCD Ms. 2537/184-8; Carteret to Newcastle, 28/10/24, PRO. S.P. 63/384/164.

his influence. But a more compelling reason was his annoyance at both King and Swift for linking the opposition to the patent to the constitutional issue. In so doing, Brodrick believed, the two churchmen had placed the ministry in a very delicate position and done more damage to the kingdom 'than it would have been in the power of its worst enemies to have brought upon it'. Another worry for King was that Swift, by issuing so strong an attack on the government, might well have forced Carteret and Walpole into a position from which they could not be seen to retreat. Certainly, this was the impression which the Lord Lieutenant had given at Council. There was also the possibility that Carteret might interpret his success at Council as a sign of wavering on the part of those opposed to the patent.[94]

For these reasons, and intending to apprise him of the continued solidarity of the nation, King sought a meeting with Carteret in the Castle the following day. There, after 'discoursing of the affairs of the Kingdom in a very extraordinary manner,' he gave the Lord Lieutenant the impression that Swift intended to declare his authorship publicly, confident that 'in the present conjecture the Author might safely put himself upon the country and stand his trial.' Infuriated by King's impertinence, Carteret interpreted this as a direct challenge to his authority: 'no man in the Kingdom how great and considerable soever he might think himself, was of weight enough to stand a matter of this nature,' he retorted. Threatening to apply the full rigour of the law against Swift, he dismissed King contemptuously. 'By this', he wrote to Newcastle later that evening, 'you may see what opinion the Archbishop of Dublin and Swift have of the humour of the people whose affections they have exceedingly gained of late by inveighing against the halfpence.' Lest there be any

---

[94] Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 31/10/24, Midleton Mss. 6/78; King to Southwell, 6/3/25, NLI Ms. 2056; See also Coxe, *op. cit.*, ii, p.402 and Ferguson, *op. cit.*, pp.120-5.

misunderstanding as to his intentions, he ordered that a warrant for the arrest of John Harding, Swift's printer, be issued without delay.[95]

Although somewhat taken aback, King remained confident that 'our own obstinacy in refusing them..... will be an effectual bar' to any coins that might be introduced. This was despite the fact that it seemed to him that 'all possible artifices' were now being employed by the government 'to put these half-pence on us'. He was also sure that, while Carteret might threaten, he and Swift had more accurately gauged the humour and determination of the nation. In fact, reacting to the Lord Lieutenant's challenge, and Harding's subsequent arrest, Swift produced yet another pamphlet, *Seasonable Advice,* in which he urged the Grand Jury to acquit Harding.[96] Carteret instantly directed the Jury to issue an order against this new pamphlet, denouncing it as 'scandalous and seditious.' To his amazement they refused. Chief Justice Whitshed immediately ordered that this Jury be dissolved and a new one be instituted.[97] Undertaking to present an order as requested, the new jurors assembled. Far from complying with Carteret's express instructions, however, they produced a presentment which commended 'the services of all such PATRIOTS as have been eminently ZEALOUS for the interest of his Majesty and this country in

---

[95] Carteret to Newcastle, 31/10/24, PRO. S.P. 63/384/166-7; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 31/10/24, Midleton Mss. 6/79-80; Newcastle to Carteret, 5/11/24, PRO. S.P. 63/384/175; King to Gorge, 3/11/24, TCD Ms. 2537/184-8; Same to Same, 12/12/24, TCD Ms. 2537/195-198; Burns, *op. cit.*, pp.124-5. However, Carteret's aggressive stance did persuade Swift not to publish a pamphlet which he had just completed. This was *A Letter to the Lord Chancellor Midleton* which was not published until 1735.

[96] King to Annesley, 3/11/24, TCD Ms. 2537/185; [J. Swift], *Seasonable Advice to the Grand Jury concerning the Bill preparing against the Printer of the Preceding Letter,* Dublin, 1724; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 17/11/24, Midleton Mss. 6/92; Swift to Ford, 27/11/24, Swift Corr. iii, p.43.

[97] Carteret to Newcastle, 22/11/24, PRO. S.P. 63/384/193-4; Swift to Ford, 27/11/24, Swift Corr. iii, p.43; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 17/11/24, Midleton Mss. 6/92; King to Southwell, 6/3/25, NLI Ms. 2056.

detecting the fraudulent imposition of the said Wood.'[98] This was a major embarrassment for Carteret. Unable to proceed with a prosecution, and with the judicial term ending, he was forced to release Harding. This was the catalyst which emboldened others. Taking their cue from events in Dublin, Justices of the Peace, Corporations and Grand Juries in various parts of the country dispatched *Representations* and *Addresses* to the Lord Lieutenant urging that the patent be dropped.[99]

Carteret was now in an invidious position. Unable to persuade the political leadership of the country to accept the scheme, he knew that the measure would never be approved by parliament, an evaluation supported by the new primate, who confirmed to London that allowing the affair to continue was having the effect of cultivating the 'very popular notion' of 'independency'.[100] The Lord Lieutenant also knew that the continuing controversy threatened the prospects of obtaining a two year supply in the forthcoming session. With these considerations in mind, he was forced to advise his superiors that the project should be dropped. "Tis impossible to describe the flame they are in Dublin', Godwin wrote, reiterating Carteret's assessment. Maule was of the same opinion: 'The ferment throughout the whole Kingdom has really been greater than can be imagined or has ever

---

[98] *Memorial of Grand Jury*, 28/11/24, Midleton Mss. 6/96; Carteret to Newcastle, 24/11/24, PRO. S.P. 63/384/196-8; Same to Same, 1/12/24, PRO. S.P. 63/384/205; Manley to _____, 9/1/25, PRO. S.P. 63/385/7.

[99] King to Stearne, 12/12/24, TCD Ms. 2537/198-9; Nicholson to Wake, 30/10/24, Wake Mss. 14, fo.220; Carteret to Newcastle, 14/11/24, PRO. S.P. 63/384/183-4; *Memorial of Grand Jury*, 28/11/24, Midleton Mss. 6/96. Memorials were also received from, amongst others, the Corporations of Cork, Waterford and Cavan, PRO. S.P. 63/384/137-191, *passim*; A *Declaration* submitted from Dublin was signed by King: King to Gorge, 3/11/24, TCD Ms. 2537/184-6.

[100] Carteret to Newcastle, 14/11/24, PRO. S.P. 63/384/183-4; Same to Same, 16/12/24, PRO. S.P. 63/384/226-7; Maule to Wake, 19/11/24, Wake Mss. 14, fo.223; Godwin to Wake, 30/12/24, Wake Mss. 14, fo.226; Boulter to Newcastle, 3/12/24, *Boulter Letters*, i, p.3.

happened since the Revolution', he told Wake. If the matter was not settled soon then a successful parliament would be impossible. But Walpole, who would dearly have liked to comply, thereby discrediting Carteret who had promised to resolve the matter, was still constrained by the delicacy of the matter. It fell to Townshend to repeat official policy. He had spoken to the king, he informed Carteret, and there was to be no change. The Lord Lieutenant was to proceed with implementation of the patent as a matter of urgency.[101]

Having been kept fully aware of these developments by his informants in London, King was now more confident of success. If he could be persuaded that supply would be threatened by a continuation of this impasse, then he was sure that Walpole could arrange a resolution. Assuming a demeanour of biblical proportions, he vowed that he would never allow himself to be deflected from this course: 'as Nehemiah said,' he told his friend General Gorge,

> 'to those that advised him to hide himself from the enemy when he was building the temple, "should such a man as I am fly?" If ever I can expect to do my country any good, now is the time, and I am sure no harm can befall me, [or] can grieve me so much as to see the mischief that must attend the whole Kingdom if this patent be executed. And therefore I reckon it my duty to do all in my power to prevent it and to leave the issue to providence which has been my principle and practice all my life and God forbid I should fall from it now I have one foot in the grave.'

Hopes in government circles that this audacity might prove 'too fierce to last long' were misplaced. More so than ever, one angry member of the administration was forced to admit, King and 'his labourers' now went 'safely

---

[101] Carteret to Newcastle, 14/11/24, PRO. S.P. 63/384/183-4; Same to Same, 16/12/24, PRO. S.P. 63/384/226-8; Same to Same, 9/1/25, PRO. S.P. 63/385/9; Godwin to Wake, 30/12/24, Wake Mss. 14, fo.226; Maule to Wake, 22/12/24, Wake Mss. 14, fo.231; Townshend to Carteret, 29/12/24, PRO. S.P. 63/384/231-5.

on to make very free with his Majesty and his ministers', an impression reinforced by the fact that no action was taken when yet another *Drapier's Letter* appeared.[102]

In the end it was the inability of the government to enforce the coinage throughout the first half of 1725 which finally proved the death knell to the scheme. The need to renew the supply, coupled with rumours of Jacobite unrest in Scotland, had meant that parliament had been called for the autumn and the ministry could not afford to allow the dispute over the patent to jeopardise the session. Aware of this, Carteret repeated his earlier warnings: 'several persons of figure here having declared that they would resume that matter in parliament', he cautioned Newcastle, alluding to Brodrick and King, he 'apprehend[ed] very ill consequences from the matter remaining in suspense.'[103] Nicolson echoed these sentiments: 'the greatest part of our heat [in] parliament will arise from our raking in the dross and embers of Mr. Wood's copper money', he predicted,

> 'Some of the zealous Patriots of poor Ireland will not be persuaded that the dread of that plague can be laid aside 'till his Majesty make null and void his letters patent.....'

Boulter and the new Lord Chancellor, an Englishman, Richard West, who had recently replaced Brodrick, concurred. Faced with this weight of advice and with the very real possibility that supply would only be granted for a short

---

[102] Annesley to King, 27/10/24, Lyons 2117; Same to Same, 16/1/25, Lyons 2121; King to Southwell, 25/5/25, TCD Ms. 2537/239-241; King to Gorges, 12/12/24, TCD Ms. 2537/197; Same to Same, 28/1/25, TCD Ms. 2537/210-1; M.B., Drapier, [J. Swift], *A Letter to the Right Honourable Viscount Molesworth*, Dublin, December 1724; Pocklington to Wake, 2/1/25, Wake Mss. 14, fo.236.

[103] Newcastle to Carteret, 13/3/25, PRO. S.P. 63/385/61; Same to Same, 13/7/25, PRO. S.P. 63/385/275; Same to Same, 27/7/25, PRO. S.P. 63/385/321; Godwin to Wake, 14/7/25, Wake Mss. 14, fo.276; Carteret to Newcastle, 6/7/25, PRO. S.P. 63/385/263; Same to Same, 6/8/25, PRO. S.P. 63/386/5; Carteret to Townshend, 20/7/25, PRO. S.P. 63/385/307. Same to Same, 7/8/25, PRO. S.P. 6/386/22; King to Southwell, 5/6/25, TCD Ms. 750/8/5-6.

period, Walpole accepted that imposition of the patent was no longer viable. In spite of the difficulty it would cause with his Majesty he was forced to agree that the potential for embarrassment was greater if the patent was proceeded with. Shortly before the members assembled, therefore, Delafaye wrote to inform Carteret that the king had agreed to a surrender of the patent. In recognition of this, he was expected to extract a promise that an adequate supply would be granted without any complications.[104]

Confident that this marked the resolution of the affair, Carteret, in his opening *Address* to parliament in September simply announced that 'an entire end [was] put to the patent formerly granted to Mr. Wood'. But the opponents of the scheme had other plans. Intent upon extracting at least some acknowledgement of culpability from those responsible, they were determined to raise the matter.[105] King, for one, indignant at Ireland having been so 'barbarously used' throughout the whole episode, had publicly declared his intention to press for an apology. Brodrick knew well what this might portend: 'If this happen,' he advised, 'no man can tell how far the whole proceedings may be taken into consideration.' Taking this advice to heart, the government moved to pre-empt such an outburst. In an unusual step, Carteret summoned King to the Castle where, in a private meeting, he warned him that he would employ 'all his strength and interest' against any move to raise the matter. He received, in response, what he understood to be a promise on

---

[104] Nicolson to Wake, 27/8/25, Wake Mss. 14, fo.281; Delafaye to Carteret, 19/8/25, PRO. S.P. 63/386/30; Carteret to Delafaye, 27/8/25, PRO. S.P. 63/386/46; West to Newcastle, 6/8/25, PRO. S.P. 63/386/9. Boulter added a note to this letter stating that he agreed with the Lord Chancellor's advice: Boulter to Newcastle, 14/8/25, *Boulter Letters*, i, p.30.

[105] LJI, ii, 21/9/25; Annesley to Conolly, 16/9/25, Castletown Ms. T/2825/A/30; Swift to Worrall, 31/8/25, Swift Corr. iii, p.93; Delafaye to Carteret, 19/8/25, PRO. S.P. 63/386/30; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 27/8/25, Midleton Mss. 6/289; West to _____, 1/9/25, PRO. S.P. 63/386/54; Swift to Chetwode, 27/5/25, Swift Corr. iii, p.61.

King's part not to proceed with his protest. A knowledge of King's performance in previous parliaments would have persuaded him otherwise. Having waited since 1720 to exact some revenge, he had no intention of foregoing such an opportunity. His promise to Carteret merely required that he be a little more circumspect. No sooner had parliament convened than he saw his opportunity.[106]

The last place the government expected to encounter trouble was in the committee elected by the Lords to respond to the king's *Address*. In fact, since it was in this that his Majesty had confirmed the demise of the patent, they expected quite the opposite. The committee's early deliberations gave no hint of impending trouble. Indeed, when King attempted to have the seemingly innocuous words 'great wisdom' added to a passage praising his Majesty for agreeing to the withdrawal of the patent, the government were pleasantly surprised. It seemed to some a wholly magnanimous gesture on the Archbishop's part.[107] But Boulter was not convinced. In private conversation he pressed King as to his motivation. 'The reason he gave,' Boulter reported, was 'that the ministry had been the authors of that patent but that His Majesty had been wise enough to see the ill consequences of it and so had revoked it'. The 'impropriety' of what was intended suddenly dawned on him: if revoking the patent was an act of 'great wisdom' on his Majesty's part, then, by implication, his initial decision to grant it had been anything but. Boulter immediately attempted to reconvene the committee but it was too late; 'thinking it a compliment', the members had allowed the words to stand.[108] In a

---

[106] King to Southwell, 7/8/25, TCD Ms. 750/8/20; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 1/9/25, Midleton Mss. 6/295; Same to Same, 27/8/25, Midleton Mss. 6/289; *Memorandum (in hand of Alan Brodrick)*, 24/9/25, Midleton Mss. 6/314-9.

[107] LJI, ii, 21/9/25; Nicolson to Wake, 21/9/25, Wake Mss. 14, fo.286; Tickell to Delafaye, 24/9/25, PRO. S.P. 63/386/138.

[108] Boulter to Newcastle, 21/9/25, *Boulter Letters*, i, pp.34-5; Nicolson to Wake, 21/9/25,

virtual panic, the primate informed Carteret and West of what had transpired at the committee stage. If this passed the full House and was forwarded to the king it would represent a major embarrassment for the government. When the House convened in full session, therefore, the members were warned that the consequences of allowing this insult to remain would be considerable. Feigning innocence, King protested that no such offence was ever intended. But he knew that Boulter had foiled him. Unwilling to be associated with such a contrivance the members voted to remove the words by a margin of 23 to 12.[109]

King claimed to be not unduly worried by this defeat. What mattered was that the patent had been vanquished and the wishes of the kingdom clearly asserted. In many ways, however, the episode marked the end of an era. A breakdown of the votes showed that of the sixteen bishops present, only three had supported King. Indeed, of the thirteen who had followed Boulter's lead, three were Irish-born. Nor did it escape people's attention that it was now the primate, and not King, who 'govern[s] the House of Lords.' The English-born bishops were delighted: 'My Lord Primate makes a good figure in our House,' an obviously impressed Godwin observed,

> 'and will be a match for his Grace of St. Sepulchre's [King] who has none that stick close to him but Tuam and Ossory.'[110]

Wake Mss. 14, fo.286; Boulter to Wake, 24/9/25, Wake Mss. 14, fo.289; LJI, ii, 21/9/25; Griffin, *Parliamentary Politics*, pp.154-5.

[109] LJI, ii, 23/9/25; *Memorandum (in hand of Alan Brodrick)*, 24/9/25, Midleton Mss. 6/314-9; Boulter to Newcastle, 23/9/25, *Boulter Letters*, i, pp.35-6; Boulter to Wake, 24/9/25, Wake Mss. 14, fo.289; Nicolson to Wake, 25/9/25, Wake Mss. 14, fo.291; Newcastle to Townshend, 1/10/25, PRO. S.P. 63/386/171; King to Kildare, 22/9/25, TCD Ms. 750/8/27.

[110] Swift to Rev. James Stopford, 26/11/25, Swift Corr. iii, p.116; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 27/9/25, Midleton Mss. 6/314; Godwin to Wake, 20/10/25, Wake Mss. 14, fo.297; Boulter to Newcastle, 12/10/25, *Boulter Letters, i*, p.39.

One of those who did not share this assessment was Swift, whose own ambitions stood to suffer by virtue of Boulter's ascendancy. Indeed, anxious to boost King, and employing that mixture of flattery and genuine admiration which so pleased King, he produced a number of poems extolling King's role in the whole episode. One of these, *To His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin*, linked him, in effusive terms, with Charles I:

> 'GREAT,GOOD and JUST was once appy'd
> To One who for his Country died:
> To One who lives in its Defence,
> We speak it in a Happier Sense.
> O may the *Fates* thy Life prolong!
> Our Country then can dread no wrong:
> In thy great Care we place our Trust,
> Because thou'rt GREAT and GOOD and JUST.'

Another assigned the credit for the defeat of the patent to King rather than the Drapier:

> 'I Sing not of the *Drapier's* Praise, Nor yet of *William Wood*;
> But I Sing of a *Famous Lord*, who seeks his *Country's* Good
> Lord WILLIAM's Grace of *Dublin* Town, 'tis he that first appears,
> Whose Wisdom and whose Piety do far exceed his years.'[111]

But King's enjoyment of even these was spoiled by Boulter. Wasting no time in securing Carteret's support, the primate obtained a resounding condemnation of these tracts by the Lords as being 'base, scandalous and malicious, highly reflecting upon the honour of this House'.[112]

---

[111] J. Swift, *To his Grace the Archbishop of Dublin*, Dublin, 1725; idem, *On Wisdom's Defeat in a Learned Debate*, Dublin, 1725; Honest Jo, [J. Swift], *An Excellent New Song upon His Grace, our Good Lord Archbishop of Dublin*, Dublin, 1725.

[112] LJI, ii, 1/10/25; Nicolson to Wake, 12/10/25, Wake Mss. 14, fo.296; Alan Brodrick to Thomas Brodrick, 2/10/25, Midleton Mss. 6/324-5.

III

With Carteret returned to England after he had prorogued parliament, Brodrick out of favour, Conolly weakened by illness, and King visibly declining, Boulter was now in a position of great influence. Believing that the real lesson to be learned from the Wood's Halfpence episode was that government business could not be conducted effectively unless public and ecclesiastical offices were in the hands of loyal and dependable men, he turned immediately to the task of strengthening the presence of Englishmen in those positions. And the fact that he had the active support of Newcastle meant that his recommendations carried considerable weight.[113]

His attention focused first on the church where he had not been slow to discern the hostility which existed between the English and Irish factions on the episcopal bench in Ireland. On the very day he disembarked at Ringsend he had commented on the fact that most of the Irish bishops seemed to resent their English brethren as 'intruders.' He had been quick to single out King as particularly hostile and head of a faction intent on opposing him. Writing to Newcastle, he advised him of the necessity of subduing him: if he was 'not allowed to break the present Dublin faction on the bench,' he warned him bluntly, 'it will be impossible for me to serve his Majesty further than in my

---

[113] Boulter to Newcastle, 3/6/25, PRO. S.P. 63/385/129; Same to Same, 19/5/26, *Boulter Letters*, i, p.59; Boulter to Carteret, 19/5/26, *Boulter Letters*, i, p.60; Same to Same, 21/5/26, *Boulter Letters*, i, p.61; Newcastle to Boulter, 22/6/25, PRO. S.P. 63/385/147; King to Annesley, 5/4/26, TCD Ms. 750/8/87; King to Carteret, 17/7/27, TCD Ms. 750/8/237.

single capacity.' 'The Archbishop of Dublin's party,' as he called the Irish-born bishops, would have to be gradually dismantled, he advised, and this could only be achieved by appointing men of English birth. It was a policy which, he warned, would have to be extended to embrace the principal secular posts in the kingdom: 'When anything is transacting in Council that can be thought to be for the advantage of England more than of Ireland,' he had observed,

> '..... the best we can hope from a native of this place is that he will stay away..... There are so many Irish in the Council and many of them more opposite to England than anyone there ought to be, that it is of the last importance to us to have two of the Judges who shall always be in the interest of England.'[114]

Promoting the English interest in Ireland would, however, prove 'impossible' if it was not 'thoroughly supported from the other side.' Accordingly, he encouraged Newcastle to use his influence 'to have none but Englishmen put into the great places here for the future'.[115]

Carteret, (and Grafton before him), had attempted to follow a more balanced approach to appointments than Boulter or the other English-born bishops would have wished. Indeed, this had been a persistent complaint of Evans and Godwin in particular, a point conceded by King who had had to admit that Grafton had been 'somewhat more indulgent to the [Irish] clergy' than might have been expected. However, with the Lord Lieutenant now returned to England and further eclipsed by political developments there, it was to the primate that Walpole, Townshend and Newcastle listened. A succession of appointments soon followed which reflected Boulter's influence.[116] It was

---

[114] Boulter to Newcastle, 4/3/25, *Boulter Letters, i,* p.12; Same to Same, 26/8/27, *Boulter Letters, i,* p.158; Nicholson to Wake, 3/3/24, Wake Mss. 14, fo.172; Godwin to Wake, 18/5/25, Wake Mss. 14, fo.263; McNally, 'Irish and English Interests', pp.310-313.

[115] Boulter to Townsend, 29/4/25, *Boulter Letters,* i, p.17; King to Irvine, 26/6/25, TCD Ms. 750/8/9; Boulter to Newcastle, 29/4/25, *Boulter Letters, i,* p.19; Newcastle to Boulter, 22/6/25, PRO. S.P. 63/385/147.

[116] Godwin to Wake, 11/4/22, Wake Mss. 14, fo.6-7; Evans to Wake, 15/3/23, Wake Mss.

not long before King was moved to protest: 'as to the grievances under which the people of Ireland labour', he began in a long letter to the British Lord Chancellor,

> 'they are such as would take up a good deal of paper to put them in a just light. I must not pretend to undertake so difficult a task. Only give me leave to mention one matter of complaint which is in everybody's mouth. 'Tis only that the gentlemen of Ireland are excluded out of the church, out of the army which they pay, out of the revenue and out of the offices relating to the law or other civil business in so much that they are in the greatest anxiety what to [do] with their children or how to provide for them.'

Furthermore, once appointed, English-born bishops proceeded to fill the most lucrative benefices with more of their countrymen. It seemed to him that 'a resolution' had been taken in London, 'that every chaplain that comes over with any Lord Lieutenant must have a bishopric or at least £400 *per annum.*' Over the previous two years, he calculated, positions worth a total of £20,000 *per annum* had been assigned to Englishmen.[117] Swift, sure that his own chances of advancement were being reduced by this policy, was equally dismissive of 'those odious beasts' sent over from England. 'The misfortune of having bishops perpetually from England', he protested,

> 'produces another Great Discouragement; that those prelates usually draw after them colonies of sons, nephews, cousins or old college companions to whom they bestow the best preferments in their gift; and thus the young men sent into the church from the University here have no better prospects to be curates or small country vicars for life.'[118]

---

14. fo.60; King to Annesley, 26/11/25, TCD Ms. 750/8/53; McNally, 'Irish and English Interests', pp.307-310.

[117] King to Sir. P. King, 2/7/26, TCD Ms. 750/8/114-5; King to Rev. John Blair, 18/5/25, TCD Ms. 2537/245; King to Southwell, 29/12/25, TCD Ms. 750/8/71-4; King to Bishop of London, 9/6/22, TCD Ms. 750/7/131; King to Southwell, 29/12/25, TCD Ms. 750/8/71-4; Nicolson to Wake, 3/3/24, Swift Corr. iii, p.172.

[118] Swift to Worrall, 15/7/26, Swift Corr. iii, p.142; Swift to Pope, 15/10/26, Swift Corr. iii, p.171; Swift to Carteret, 3/7/25, Swift Corr. iii, p.70; Swift to Walls, 9/7/25, Swift Corr.

The vacancy caused in 1727 by the death of Archbishop Nicolson, who had been transferred to Cashel some months previously, illustrated well Boulter's influence. The Irish bishops, with King's hearty approval and the encouragement of both Carteret and Conolly, proposed Bishop Bolton for the position.[119] Boulter was quick to counter: Bolton, he argued, '[was] an enterprising man and..... would soon set himself, if he had that station, at the head of the Irish interest.' It would, he insisted, 'be too dangerous a step to trust him in that post.' Moreover, it would 'be a very great blow to the English interest in this kingdom,' if an Irishman were appointed. 'The new Archbishop ought to be an Englishman either already on the bench here or in England,' he declared forthrightly,

> 'As for a native of this country, I can hardly doubt but whatever his behaviour has been or his promises may be, when he is once in that station he will put himself at the head of the Irish interest in the church at least.'

In fact, he pointed out, it was absolutely necessary that the English-born bishops be supplemented by one of their own if the Irish-born bishops were to be kept from becoming a majority on the bench, 'which we think will be a dangerous situation.' He recommended either Bishop Ellis of Kildare, 'an hearty Englishman,' or Bishop Godwin of Kilmore, 'the best beloved by his Majesty's friends of any that have been mentioned from England,' for the position. If, however, the ministry wished to be particularly farsighted then, he suggested, the opportunity might be used to translate an Englishman to the see with a view to his ultimately succeeding King. But this was not imperative: the important thing was that it was 'of great consequence that it should be given to

---

iii, p.73.

[119] King to Carteret, 18/3/27, TCD Ms. 750/8/184-5; Conolly to Clutterbuck, Secretary to Carteret, 2/1/27, Castletown Ms. T/2825/A/45; Carteret to Newcastle, 10/12/26, PRO. S.P. 63/388/101; Boulter to Carteret, 7/3/27, *Boulter Letters, i,* p.116.

an Englishman.' Although disappointed at their overlooking the long-term consideration, Boulter was more than pleased when Godwin was nominated to fill the vacancy. This was 'very agreeable,' he observed, and he had 'not heard of any who has found fault ..... but the Archbishop of Dublin.'[120]

Not surprisingly Boulter had identified King's own see as key to his strategy of securing a majority of English bishops on the Irish bench. Indeed, so vexed was he by King's hostility that within a short time of his arrival he had begun to make tentative suggestions about a successor for him. In early 1725, having heard reports that King was very ill, he wrote to Newcastle to remind him that

> '..... his Majesty's service absolutely requires that, whenever he drops, the place be filled with an Englishman and one with whom I may hope to have a very good agreement.'

Nor was King slow to reciprocate. The two were 'at open enmity,' one layman observed, 'never to be reconciled.' According to Godwin, King 'never speaks of my Lord Primate but with great contempt'. But, he predicted confidently, Boulter would definitely 'get the better of him.' This mutual dislike was soon exacerbated by a dispute over their relative episcopal authority in relation to the issuing of marriage licences. Episodes such as this only confirmed Boulter in his determination to have an Englishman succeed King. To do otherwise, he protested, would be to install someone 'who would set himself up against the primate, would be sure of being caressed, flattered and followed by the Irish interest here.'[121]

---

[120] Boulter to Bishop of London, 11/2/27, *Boulter Letters, i,* p.115-6; Same to Same, 25/4/27, quoted in Mant, *op. cit.*, ii, p.462; Boulter to Carteret, 9/2/27, *Boulter Letters, i,* p.107; Same to Same, 26/1/27, *Boulter Letters, i,* p.102; Same to Same, 24/8/27, *Boulter Letters, i,* p.154; Boulter to Newcastle, 18/2/27, *Boulter Letters, i,* p.111; Same to Same, 30/3/27, *Boulter Letters, i,* p.122.

[121] Boulter to Newcastle, 19/1/25, *Boulter Letters, i,* p.11; Swift to Chetwode, 14/2/27, Swift Corr. iii, p.199; Coghill to Southwell, 23/12/25, B.L. Add. Ms. 21122/27; Boulter to Wake, 21/5/26, *Boulter Letters, i,* p.61; Same to Same, 12/7/26, *Boulter Letters, i,* p.74;

In spite of their internal squabbling, the two episcopal factions remained of one mind on the need for legislation favourable to the church which, as a consequence of the coinage dispute and a particularly bitter conflict over supply in the Commons in 1725, had been neglected in recent parliaments. Where matters of religion were concerned, however, it seemed to most of the prelates that the church was constantly on the defensive: 'We are here struggling in parliament to defend the church,' King had informed Annesley during the course of the 1723 parliament.[122] 'The church is violently attacked in this session of parliament,' he informed the Bishop of Cloyne in a similar vein, '[w]e shall want all the force we can make to oppose the invasions endeavoured to be made upon us.'[123]

These 'invasions' included a policy of encouragement towards Dissenters: '[t]he church has been the great but[t] at which many poisonous arrows have been shot,' King protested, having reviewed the legislative programme for the 1723 parliament,

> 'Our jurisdiction is attacked by exempting marriages from our cognisance, our doctrine by encouraging Quakers and our revenues by repealing, under the notion of explaining, the Act ..... for preservation of the inheritance of the church.'

His only consolation was 'to find the bishops unanimous' in their opposition to

---

Godwin to Wake, 31/3/26, Wake Mss. 14, fo.333.

[122] King to Annesley, 26/11/25, TCD Ms. 750/8/53; Same to Same, 1/11/23, TCD Ms. 2537/19-21; King to Southwell, 30/11/25, TCD Ms. 750/8/59; Downes to Wake, 16/11/25, Wake Mss. 14, fo.304; Godwin to Wake, 20/10/25, Wake Mss. 14, fo.297; King to Gibson, 23/11/23, TCD Ms. 2537/21-2. As far as King was concerned, one of the few positive developments in relation to the church during this period was that, after 20 years, he had emerged triumphant in his dispute with the Dean and Chapter of Christ Church, the latter having exhausted all of the appeal mechanisms available: King to Annesley, 30/4/24, TCD Ms. 2537/251-2.

[123] King to Crow, 5/11/23, TCD Ms. 2537/22; King to Browne, 5/10/23, TCD Ms. 2537/13-4; King to Milles, 5/11/23, TCD Ms. 2537/23; Evans to Wake, 19/11/23, Wake Mss. 14, fo.119; King to Annesley, 1/11/23, TCD Ms. 2537/19-21.

any further relief for Dissenters.[124] Testifying to this, Evans wrote to Wake complaining of 'the low ebb religion is in at present,' exhorting him to lobby against these bills in London, while Nicolson confirmed that the entire episcopal bench was determined to 'salvage' the church's authority on this point.[125] That many of the measures designed to benefit Dissenters had their origin in the Commons did not help the church's cause in securing favourable legislation. When, for example, the bishops managed to defeat a Commons bill legitimising Dissenter marriages, the members of the lower house reacted by obstructing a bill dealing with the inheritance rights of bishops and the salaries of curates, denouncing the lords spiritual in the process as 'a beggarly bunch of bishops.'[126]

These tensions were exacerbated in 1723 by disagreement between the two houses over a 'Popery bill' which had originated in the Commons but was resisted in the Lords.[127] King, consistent with the attitude to the penal code he had displayed previously, was outspoken in his opposition: 'We have a violent bill against priests and their harbourers', he informed Southwell,

> 'Both are to be hanged and £200 for discovering and prosecuting a priest and an £100 for a harbourer. I can by no means come into the bill. I think it in itself barbarous and, if I mistake not, at this time unreasonable. There are in my opinion more gentle and effectual ways to root out Popery, but being for

---

[124] King to Southwell, 2/12/23, TCD Ms. 2537/27-30; King to Annesley, 1/11/23, TCD Ms. 2537/19-20; Same to Same, 5/12/23, TCD Ms. 2537/33-5; Annesley to King, 7/1/24, Lyons 2058; Same to Same, 21/1/24, Lyons 2059a; King to Wake, 17/12/23, TCD Ms. 2537/37-9; Evans to Wake, 5/12/23, Wake Mss. 14, fo.128.

[125] Evans to Wake, 5/12/23, Wake Mss. 14, fo.128; Nicolson to Wake, 4/2/24, Wake Mss. 14, fo.158; Synge to Wake, 3/1/24, Wake Mss. 14, fo.147.

[126] CJI, iii, 24/12/23; King to Wake, 17/12/23, TCD Ms. 2537/37; Evans to Wake, 26/12/23, Wake Mss. 14, fo.141; Godwin to Wake, 18/12/23, Wake Mss. 14, fo.135; King to Crow, 5/11/23, TCD Ms. 2537/22.

[127] Evans to Wake, 17/12/23, Wake Mss. 14, fo.133; King to Bishop of London, 10/1/24, TCD Ms. 2537/50-2; Nicolson to Wake, 14/12/23, Wake Mss. 14, fo.131.

> the present profit of landlords they will not hear of them. If this Act pass I am well assured that it will never be executed and then we shall have the scandal of a barbarous law without any benefit from it.'[128]

When the bill came before Privy Council the majority of bishops made their opposition known. A debate 'as hot as purgatory itself' followed, with King and Synge foremost in condemning what was being proposed. Even Nicolson, who was 'appalled at the severe penalties' being proposed, demurred. In the end the bill was amended by Council to such an extent that it lost all attraction to those in the Commons who had framed it.[129]

Although political debate over the recent past had been dominated by issues such as the Bank project, Woods' Halfpence and various Money bills which touched directly on the economy, there had, ironically, been little noticeable improvement in the economic condition of the country. Indeed, if anything, matters had disimproved, exacerbated by poor harvests and a particularly damp summer in 1725. In a series of pamphlets Swift, now clearly King's successor as the churchman most capable of engaging the authorities, castigated successive ministries for their failure to regenerate the Irish economy.[130] And,

---

[128] King to Southwell, 2/12/23, TCD Ms. 2537/27-30; Same to Same, 26/12/23, TCD Ms. 2537/43; Tuam to Wake, 13/12/23, Wake Mss. 14, fo.130; Maule to Wake, 19/12/23, Wake Mss. 14, fo.116; Evans to Wake, 17/12/23, Wake Mss. 14, fo.133.

[129] Nicolson to Wake, 14/12/23, Wake Mss. 14, fo.141; Nicolson to Wake, 19/11/23, Wake Mss. 14, fo.117; Southwell to King, 15/2/24, Lyons 2065; King to Wake, 12/7/27, TCD Ms. 750/8/231-2; Evans to Wake, 17/12/23, Wake Mss. 14, fo.133.

[130] For example, J. Swift, *Horace, Book I, Ode xiv, Paraphrased and Inscribed to Ireland*, Dublin, 1724; idem., *A Short View of the State of Ireland*, Dublin, 1728; idem, *An Answer to a paper called a Memorial of the poor inhabitants, tradesmen and labourers of the Kingdom of Ireland*, Dublin, 1728; idem., *A Modest Proposal for preventing the children of poor people from being a burden to their parents*, Dublin 1729; J. Kelly, 'Jonathan Swift and the Irish economy in the 1720's', pp.17-30; Ferguson, *op. cit.*, p.59.

in spite of now almost persistent illness, King rallied to the assistance of the man he called his 'copper farthing Dean'. In long letters to influential Englishmen he bemoaned the condition of the country: 'Ireland is this day the poorest in Europe,' he told Wake:

> 'What with the want of trade, the oppression of landlords and our gentry and nobility living out of the kingdom. Add to this the pensions, the officers, civil and military, and many other drains and 'twill be no wonder that even this severe weather you shall see many going in the snow without shoes or stockings. For my own part I am teased out of my life with beggars of all sorts, disbanded officers and their families, farmers turned out of their farms by cruel landlords, broken tradesmen, widows and children of clergymen with many other sorts.....'

'The generality of the people here are in a most miserable condition', he persisted, and if I may believe those who have lately travelled France, Italy and Turkey, in a worse condition than the peasants there.' Only the 'near prospect of my grave' gave him any comfort.[131]

The deterioration in his health in 1726 which brought on this morbidity, forced him to desist temporarily from this theme while he travelled to Bath for the summer months. But the ignorance of the true situation in Ireland displayed by the 'several statesmen' he 'discoursed' while there, who seemed to depend for their information on 'the false and self-interested representations' of enemies of Ireland, prompted him to resume his letter writing: 'For near sixty years I have applied my best endeavours to observe what has passed in this kingdom,' he told the English Lord Chancellor,

> 'and except in King James' time I do not remember that our circumstances were worse ..... As to coin we have hardly any

---

[131] King to Wake, 15/2/24, TCD Ms. 2537/81-2; King to Sir Peter King, 17/7/25, TCD Ms. 750/8/13-4; King to Hopkins, 1/6/23, TCD Ms. 750/7/341; King to Jeffrey Paul, 19/1/28, TCD Ms. 750/9/41; King to Annesley, 30/5/26, TCD Ms. 750/8/97. During this period King compiled his final Will and Testament by which he distributed his assets between various individuals and endowments intended to benefit the church. The text of the Will is reproduced in C.S. King, *op. cit.*, pp.43-8.

> silver left ..... The balance of trade is so much against us that there is no species of gold passed here ..... The common people are so sensible of those things and so uneasy in their present circumstances, that hundreds of families, all Protestants, are daily going to the West Indies.....'

'I am not so ignorant as to expect any government should be perfect', he told the same man some weeks later, 'but, there is, I conceive, a difference between tolerable and intolerable oppressions'.[132]

King's capacity for confrontation was, however, rapidly diminishing. Throughout the latter half of 1727, after a very arduous visitation, he began to decline markedly. Even the death of George I could not stir him, passing virtually unremarked in his correspondence. When a new parliament was called for November he was unable, for the first time in 35 years, to involve himself in either the election or the preparations. Nevertheless, the government in Dublin remained anxious that he should not be given any opportunity to cause a disturbance, although there was more than a hint of condescension in Coghill's suggestion that Carteret should

> 'bring some kind message from His Majesty to the Archbishop [King] as [to] his depending on his ..... assistance in the affairs of the Kingdom and his regard for him. It would captivate the old gentleman who is highly pleased with such compliments and has besides a real true affection for their Majesties and has assured me that he will use his endeavours to make this session as easy as he can.....'[133]

The ministry need not have worried, however,as for most of the session King was confined to his chambers. Indeed, ironically for a man who had

---

[132] King to Dr. Trotter, 18/6/26, TCD Ms. 750/8/105-7; Godwin to Wake, 31/3/26, Wake Mss. 14, fo.333; King to Sir. Peter King, [11]/6/26, TCD Ms. 750/8/101-2; Same to Same, 2/7/26, TCD Ms. 750/8/114-5; Same to Same, 6/12/26, TCD Ms. 750/8/163-5; Swift to Peterborough, 28/4/26, Swift Corr. iii, p.132-4; Boulter to Carteret, 20/7/27, *Boulter Letters, i*, p.151; King to Somers, 2/7/26, TCD Ms. 750/8/114-5.

[133] King to Swift, 3/6/27, Swift Corr. iii, p.212; King to Jenkins, 12/11/26, TCD Ms. 750/8/158-9; Coghill to Southwell, 25/9/27, B.L. Add. Ms. 21122/32-3; King to Southwell, 3/10/27, TCD Ms. 750/9/28-30.

played so prominent a role in parliament for almost four decades, he only attended the final few days of the session in the spring of 1728 after being warned by Lord Chancellor Wyndham that if he did not do so, his name would be 'called over'. It threatened to be an ignominious end to a remarkable parliamentary career. Characteristically, however, as if determined to spite his political enemies, King managed to attend the House on a number of days, and even contributed to a debate on members privileges, the matter being 'of so great moment' that he thought it 'worth his venturing to assist'.[134]

[134] Wyndham to King, 18/4/28, Lyons 2180; King to Southwell, 27/4/28, TCD Ms. 750/9/58-60.

IV

This rather innocuous debate proved to be King's final parliamentary involvement. By the winter of 1728, and well into his seventy-ninth year, he had been ordered by his doctor to remain in his chambers at St. Sepulchre's: 'Our Archbishop is very ill,' Coghill reported,

> 'if he should go off it is a matter of great importance to this city and the kingdom to provide a good successor which, he says, if he would be satisfied of it, he could die in peace.'

Little concerned about his dying in peace, Boulter, with Wyndham's assistance, was manoeuvring to ensure that a successor with whom King would not be satisfied was appointed. A continuous stream of letters from him to London kept the government apprised of his condition. It was, he reminded Townshend, 'of the last consequence to the kings service,' that King's successor 'be an Englishman.'[135]

King himself was not surprised at hearing what the primate was attempting. Indeed, he had resigned himself to the fact that his see was unlikely to be granted to an Irishman, and that at least twenty English bishops would contend for it. As if determined to frustrate Boulter's plans, however, he made a brief recovery in March, even going so far as to make arrangements to travel to London where he hoped, amongst other things, to have his portrait

---

[135] Coghill to Southwell, 14/1/29, B.L. Add. Ms. 21122/61; Boulter to Townshend, 16/1/29, *Boulter Letters, i,* p.219; Boulter to Bishop of London, 21/12/28, *Boulter Letters,* i, p.217; Boulter to Newcastle, 8/5/29, *Boulter Letters, i,* p.241; Wyndham to Newcastle, 11/1/29, PRO. S.P. 63/390/173-4.

painted, a consideration induced by the fact that a Mr. Wilkinson, a mezzotint artist, had produced an unauthorised portrait of him which he felt gave him a face 'more like a lion' than a human. Indeed, he even made plans to hold his triennial visitation.

But in April he suffered a relapse and was immediately ordered to bed by his physicians. Throughout the next few weeks his condition changed little. But in early May he began to deteriorate dramatically. The gout which had plagued him for over fifty years had flared again. Attempts to relieve him were unsuccessful and he was ordered to bed. For a number of days various dignitaries and friends visited him in his chambers at St. Sepulchre's in spite of his manservant's attempts to exclude them. But by May 7 the gout had spread to his stomach and his physicians decided that there was nothing further they could do. His sister and other close relatives were called to the palace and informed that he was unlikely to recover and probably had less than a day to live. On the evening of May 8 a small group gathered around the unconscious King's bed. Finally, just after eight o'clock, only seven days after entering his eightieth year, and as his nephew, the Rev. Robert Dougatt read prayers, King died.[136]

His passing was the cause of genuine sorrow: '[t]he town is almost as if a general calamity had happened', *The Dublin Gazette* recounted, 'so deeply is the loss taken by our citizens.' 'Nothing has been heard hardly for these two days past but laments for his loss', *The Dublin Intelligence* reported on the day of his burial, 'he being in the public opinion the best friend to this nation that ever enjoyed such a dignity in it.' The funeral itself was a huge affair, attended

---

[136] *Dublin Gazette*, 6/5/29, quoted by C.S. King, *op. cit.*, pp.313-4; King to Annesley, 8/3/29, TCD Ms. 750/9/113-4; Boulter to Newcastle, 9/5/29, *Boulter Letters, i,* p.243; Boulter to Newcastle, 8/5/29, *Boulter Letters, i,* p.241. King to Carteret, 18/3/27, TCD Ms. 750/8/184.

by all of the senior public and ecclesiastical figures in the kingdom and viewed by a large crowd as the cortège made its way from St. Patrick's Cathedral to St. Mary's churchyard in Donnybrook.[137]

For Boulter, however, his rival's death was an opportunity to consolidate English influence and he wasted little time in canvassing the government for a suitable replacement. Within hours of receiving confirmation of King's demise he was writing to Townshend explaining that '[f]or the support of the English interest here it was absolutely necessary that it should be bestowed on a native of England.' He was more than pleased with the transfer of the English-born John Hoadly, Bishop of Ferns and Leighlin, to fill the vacancy later that year. It was confirmation of both the ascendancy of the English interest throughout the kingdom and the demise of King's hopes for a strong, independent Irish church.[138]

---

[137] *Dublin Gazette*, May 1729, quoted in C.S. King, *op. cit.*, pp.313-4; *Dublin Intelligence*, May 1729, quoted in C.S.King, *op. cit.*, p.314. One of the many apocryphal stories which circulated after King's death was that he had 'ordered his grave to be dug twelve feet deep and his body put in perpendicular, his head downmost': HMC Egmont Diaries, iii, 7/1/1743. Because of the death shortly afterwards of his executor, no monument was ever placed over the grave.

[138] Boulter to Townshend, 9/5/29, *Letters* i, p.242; Boulter to Carteret, 9/5/29, *Boulter Letters, i*, p.241-2; Boulter to Newcastle, 9/5/29, *Boulter Letters, i*, p.243; Carteret to Newcastle, 14/12/29, PRO. S.P. 63/391/256.

Conclusion

In assessing the nature and extent of King's impact upon the world in which he lived there is a need for caution, something not always appreciated by those who have sought to extrapolate from his rather idiosyncratic perspective a view of the Anglo-Irish mindset which may not bear closer scrutiny. The fact is that, regardless of the extent to which he attempted to influence the way in which Anglo-Irish society evolved, King himself was not representative of the community he tried so hard to fashion. Thus, while a study of King's life can give the impression that ecclesiastical and constitutional politics were the overriding concerns of the political nation during the decades immediately following the Battle of the Boyne, this was far from being the case. The experiences of those such as Brodrick and Conolly (both of whom died within eighteen months of King's death), for whom matters of land security, party loyalty, and accommodation with the English body politic were more immediate concerns, serve to confirm this. So too do the difficulties which contemporaries had in making sense of his rather unique blend of patriotism, various whiggish positions, occasional high church sympathies, and inveterate opposition to any relief for Dissenters. To one he was a 'passionate, tenacious and vindictive' man, a 'state Whig, a church Tory, [and] a good bishop', who was also 'firm to the interest of his country'. To another, Jonathan Swift, with whom he was involved at both an ecclesiastical and a political level, he was a particularly

frustrating enigma. Within the space of one six-month period, for example, the dean was forced to change his assessment of his archbishop from 'half a Tory' to a 'great Whig prelate'.[1]

What made King so different was the extent to which his outlook was dominated by a desire to secure a prominent role for the church in any settlement for Ireland. This commitment was induced by a strong evangelical faith which gave him a zeal for the things of God and a determination to ensure the all-pervasive influence of the church into which he had been accepted. After what he viewed as the anarchy of Presbyterian world in which he was raised, the doctrines, structures and rubrics of the Church of Ireland seemed to him synonymous with the relative peace and good order which characterised the Anglican society in which he began to move. It was this, together with his experiences during the war years, which led him to conceive a vision of Irish society in which the church, acting as an independent corporation, would, in tandem with both the monarch and the state, play a fundamental role as both arbiter and enforcer of the common moral good.

If King is assessed on the basis of the extent to which this vision was realised, then it may well be acceptable to label him as one of the 'losers in Irish history'.[2] By the time of his death that 'free, national church' ideal, which owed its genesis to men such as Ussher and Bramhall, and of which King was guardian for his generation, was far from being achieved. In fact, although the pastoral integrity of the church was slowly improving, under the influence of

---

[1] John Perceval, [1711], quoted in Ehrenpreis, op. cit., ii, p.10; Swift to Ford, 3/5/19, Swift Corr. ii, p.322.; Same to Same, 8/12/19, Swift Corr. ii, p.331.

[2] I take this assessment of King to be implied by the inclusion of an article relating to him in C. Brady, ed., *Worsted in the Game: Losers in Irish History*, Dublin, 1989. The article is P. Kelly, 'Archbishop William King, (1650-1729), and Colonial Nationalism', pp.85-96.

English-born prelates such as Boulter it was becoming a more latitudinarian, Erastian and Anglocentric institution. Likewise, his hopes for the Irish parliament, which had slowly evolved into a patriot ideal in its own right, had been thwarted by the subordination of Ireland's legislative and judicial authority to that of the parliament at Westminster. The fact that this had been facilitated by a Revolution Settlement which eschewed notions of 'dual monarchy' in favour of a scheme which understood the royal power to reside in the 'crown-in-parliament', merely compounded this situation.

But such a simplistic assessment does not do justice to a man who was more than the sum of his ambitions. King's life testifies to both the complexity and the fluidity of the world in which he lived. This was particularly so in the wake of the cathartic events of the Glorious Revolution and the ensuing war when men and women were forced to accommodate themselves to changed circumstances, while simultaneously endeavouring to locate and explain themselves in a new socio-political environment. King provides a unique record of how one individual reacted to the political and religious changes he experienced and subsequently attempted to reconcile these in a way which respected both a strong personal faith and a pragmatic, if cantankerous, nature. In the process he evinces a world replete with its own tensions, aspirations and contradictions, which he himself played no small part in generating, and in which people were being forced to make choices with regard to a variety of economic, political and religious issues.

It is here that King's real significance is to be found: throughout his life he sought not only to explain this new world to any who would listen, but to influence the choices which those around him were making, hoping thereby to shape the religious, political and economic order which would emerge. In scope and ambition it was an endeavour unmatched by any of his

contemporaries. And while, with the benefit of hindsight, it is possible to see that the various elements of his 'constitution of church and state' were never secured, this should not be allowed to obscure what he did achieve. Over the course of a period of almost forty years he succeeded in articulating, and to a lesser extent sustaining, a world in which such an all-embracing vision of the role of the church could seem credible.

Bibliography

1. Manuscript Sources

A. REPUBLIC OF IRELAND

Trinity College, Dublin:

Mss. 750/1; 750/2; 1489/1; 1489/2; 750/3; 750/11; 750/4; 2531; 2532; 2533; 2534; 2535; 2536: 750/5; 750/6; 750/7; 750/8; 750/9; 2537: King's Letterbooks, (originals and transcripts), 1696-1725.
Ms. 751: King's Account books, 1692-1711, 1715-1723 (3 vols.).
Ms. 668: Minutes of Convocation, 1704-11 and lists of committees, 1704.
Ms. 865: Commonplace Book of Samuel Foley.
Ms. 890: Molyneux's copy of *The Case of Ireland Stated.*
Ms. 945: Commonplace Book of William Lloyd.
Ms. 1039: Copies of letters re: Convocation, 1703-4.
Ms. 1041-2: W. King, *A Treatise in defence of the Church against Protestant Dissenters.*
Ms. 1047: Sermons by King.
Ms. 1121: Transcript copy of Rev. J. King, *Paraphrase of the Life of William King,* 1737.
Ms. 1123: Sermons by King
Ms. 1179: Southwell papers.
Ms. 1688: Sermons by Dopping.
Mss. 1995-2008: Lyons Collection, mainly letters to and from King, 1680-1729.
Ms. 2021-2: Letters of Shrewsbury and Bolingbroke.
Ms. 2252-4a: Transcript copy of correspondence between King and Dopping in Dopping Collection, Armagh Public Library.
Ms. 2875: Sermons by King.
Ms. 2929: Transcript copy of Bonnell-Strype Correspondence, Baumgartner Papers, University Library, Cambridge.
Mss. 1490; 2181; 2203; 2467; 2957.

Public Library, Pearse Street, Dublin:

Mss. 27 and 28: Gilbert Collection, letters from King, Synge and Nicolson to Wake.

Marsh Library, Dublin:

Ms. Zz. 2.3b: Transcript copy of Diary of Archbishop Narcissus Marsh.
Ms. Z3, 2.5: Documents relating to right of appeal to parliament, 1693-7.
Mss. Z3, 1.1.; Z2. 1.7.; Z3. 1.6.; Z3. 2.6..

National Library of Ireland:

Ms. 991: Ormonde Letters
Ms. 2055-6: Letters by King (unfoliated).
Mss. 40: 120; 3780.

Public Records Office:

Ms. 1A/52: Calendar of Departmental Correspondence, 1683-1714.
Ms. 1A/41/70A: Wyche papers.
Ferguson Mss.
Lodge Mss.
Sarsfield/Vesey Mss.

Bolton Library, Cashel:

Ms. M.4. 16: Sermon before Queen Anne, 1705.

B. ENGLAND:

Guildford Muniment Room, Surrey

Mss. 1248/1-1248/8: Midleton papers: Letters to and from Brodrick family, 1690-1725.

British Library, London:

Add. Ms. 6116-7: Letters of Synge and Nicolson to Wake, (consulted on microfilm at NLI).
Add. Ms. 9,715: Southwell papers, (consulted on microfilm at NLI).
Add. Ms. 9,716-7: Ormonde letters, (consulted on microfilm at NLI).
Add. Ms. 20,716: Letters re: Irish Affairs, 1706-08, (consulted on microfilm at NLI).
Add. Ms. 21,122-3: Coghill/Southwell letters, (consulted on microfilm at NLI).
Add. Ms. 21,136-8: Phipps/Southwell letters, (consulted on microfilm at NLI).
Add. Ms. 32,686-7: Newcastle manuscripts, (consulted on microfilm at NLI).
Add. Ms. 34,265: Nicolson/Downes letters, (consulted on microfilm at NLI).
Add. Ms. 34,733-8: Southwell letters of Irish interest, (consulted on microfilm at NLI).
Add. Ms. 37,673: Wogan letters, (consulted on microfilm at NLI).
Add. Ms. 38,016: Carteret correspondence, (consulted on microfilm at NLI).
Add. Ms. 38,154-7: Cox/Southwell letters, (consulted on microfilm at NLI).
Add. Ms. 38,173: Dawson/Southwell letters, (consulted on microfilm at NLI).
Egerton Ms. 917: King to Southwell, 6/1/97, fo.151-7, (consulted on microfilm at NLI).
Stowe Ms. 227-8: Delafaye letters, (consulted on microfilm at NLI).
Lansdowne Ms. 352: letters to and from Wake, (consulted on microfilm at NLI).

Public Record Office, London:

Mss. S.P. 63/361-384: Irish State Papers, Anne to George I, (consulted on microfilm at NLI).

Christ Church, Oxford:

Wake Mss. 12, 13 , 14: letters from various Irish bishops to Wake, (consulted on microfilm at NLI).

C. SCOTLAND

National Library Scotland, Edinburgh:

Wodrow Collection.

D. NORTHERN IRELAND

Public Record Office, Belfast:

Castletown Mss: Manuscripts of William Conolly, occasional letters to the Duke of Grafton.
De Ros Mss.

2. Printed Sources:

A. CALENDARS, JOURNALS, REPORTS:

Calendar of State Papers, domestic series, 1689-1704, 7 vols., London, 1895-1937.
Calendar of Treasury Papers, 1556-1728, 6 vols., London, 1868-1889.
Journals of the House of Lords of Ireland, vols. i and ii, Dublin, 1779-1780.
Journals of the House of Commons of Ireland, vols. iii, iv and v, Dublin, 1753-1791.
The Statutes at Large passed in the parliaments held in Ireland, iii-v, Dublin, 1786.
Hansard's Parliamentary History of England, vii, 1714-22, London 1811,
Reports of the Historical Manuscript Commission:
Second Report, appendix, London, 1874: Report on the Lyons Collection.
Fourteenth Report, appendix ii, London, 1896.
Buccleuch and Queensbury Mss, ii, parts 1 and 2, London, 1903.
Finch Mss., iii, iv, London, 1957, 1965.
Portland Mss., iii, iv, v, viii, London, 1894, 1897, 1899, 1907.
Ormonde Mss., (new series), viii, London, 1921.
Egmont Mss., ii, London, 1909.
Report on the Letter-books of William King, 4 vols., Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts, London, 1983

B. BIOGRAPHICAL, FAMILY AND PERSONAL PAPERS:

Addison, J., *The Letters of Joseph Addison*, ed. W. Graham, Oxford, 1941.

Belcher, T.W, ed., *Memoir of Sir Partick Dun, Physician-General to the Army, President of the College of Physicians*, Dublin, 1866.

Birch *et al.*, eds., *Bayle's General Dictionary*, London, 1738.

Caulfield, R., ed., *Autobiography of the Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cox, Lord Chancellor of Ireland*, London, 1860.

Boulter, H, *Letters written by Hugh Boulter, Lord Primate of All Ireland to Several Ministers of State in England and some others*, 2 vols, Oxford, 1769.

Coxe, W., ed., *Private and Original Correspondence of Charles Talbot, Duke of Shrewsbury*, London, 1821.

Coxe, W., ed., *Memoirs of the life and administration of Sir Robert Walpole*, 3 vols, London, 1798-1800.

de Beer, E.S., ed., *Diary and Correspondence of John Evelyn*, Oxford, 1955.

Douglas, J., ed., *The State Letters of Henry, Earl of Clarendon*, Dublin, 1765.

Hamilton, W., *The Life and Character of James Bonnell, esq., late Accountant-General of Ireland*, Dublin, 1703.

Harris, W, ed., *De praesulibus Hiberniae: The Whole Works of Sir James Ware concerning Ireland, revised and improved*, 3 vols. in 2, Dublin, 1739-1746.

King, C.S., *A Great Archbishop of Dublin: William King, D.D., 1650-1729, autobiography and selected correspondence*, London, 1906.

Lawlor, H.J., 'William King, Archbishop of Dublin', *Peplographia Dublinensis*, London, 1902, pp.99-142.

Lawlor, H.J., ed., 'The Diary of William King, D.D., Dean of St. Patrick's, afterwards Archbishop of Dublin, during his imprisonment in Dublin Castle', in *Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland*, 1903, pp.119-138, 139-152, pp.255-283 and pp.389-411.

Levinge, R.G., ed., *Jottings of the Levinge Family*, Dublin, 1877.

Nicolson, W., *The London Diaries of William Nicolson, Bishop of Carlisle, 1702-1718*, ed., C. Jones and G. Holmes, Oxford, 1985.

Nicolson, W., *Letters on various subjects, literary, political and ecclesiastical, to and from William Nicolson, 1683-1727*, ed., J. Nichols, 2 vols, London, 1809.

Swift, J., *Journal to Stella*, ed., H. Williams, Oxford, 1948.

Williams, H., ed., *The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift*, 5 vols., Oxford, 1963-5.

C. CONTEMPORARY BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS:

An Account of the Sessions of Parliament in Ireland 1692, London, 1693.

A Full and True Account of the Late Revolution in Dublin, and of what happened there from the time of the Defeat of King James and his army at the Boyne, London, 1690.

A Long History of a Short Session of a certain Parliament in a certain Kingdom, Dublin, 1714.

A True and Perfect Journal of the Affairs in Ireland since His Majesty's Arrival in that Kingdom, London, 1690.

A Jacobite Narrative of War in Ireland, 1688-1691, ed., J.T. Gilbert, Dublin, 1892.

[Annesley, F.], *Some Thoughts on the Bill, Depending before the Right Honourable the House of Lords for Prohibiting the exportation of the Woollen Manufactures of Ireland to Foreign Parts*, London, 1698.

[Boyse, J.], *Some impartial reflections on D[r]. Manby's Considerations etc. and Mr King's Answer*, Dublin, 1687.

Boyse, J., *Remarks on a late Discourse of William, Lord Bishop of Derry, concerning the Inventions of Men in the Worship of God*, Dublin, 1694.

Boyse, J., *A Vindication of the Remarks on the Bishop of Derry's Discourse about Human Inventions, from what is objected against them in the Admonition annexed to the Second Edition of that Discourse*, Dublin, 1695.

[Brewster, F.], *An Answer to a Letter from a Gentleman in the Country to a Member of the House of Commons; on the votes of the 14th instant relating to the Trade of Ireland*, 1698.

[Brodrick, St. J.], *Short remarks upon the late Act of Resumption of the Irish Forfeitures, and upon the manner of putting that Act in execution*, London, 1701.

[Collins, A.], *Vindication of the Divine Attributes in some remarks on the Archbishop of Dublin's sermon*, London, 1710.

Cox, R., *Hibernia Anglicana: or the History of Ireland from the conquest thereof by the English to the present time*, 2 vols, London, 1689 and 1690.

Darcy, P., *An argument delivered by Patrick Darcy, esq., by the express order of the House of Commons in the Parliament of Ireland, 9 June, 1641*, Waterford, 1641, (reprinted Dublin, 1764).

Defoe, D., *The Parallel, or Persecution of Protestants, the Shortest Way to Prevent the Growth of Popery in Ireland*, London, 1704.

Dopping, A., 'Remedies Proposed for the Church of Ireland, 1697', ed, J Brady, in *Archivum Hibernia*, 22, 1959, pp.163-173.

Dopping, A., *A Form of Reconciliation of Lapsed Protestants*, Dublin, 1691.

Dopping, A., *Modus Tenendi Parliamenta in Hibernia, Published out of the ancient record by the right reverend father in God Anthony, Lord Bishop of Meath. To which is added the rules and customs of the house, gathered out of the journal books from the time of Edward the Sixth*, Dublin, 1692.

[Hutchinson, F.], *A Letter to the gentlemen of the landed interest in Ireland, relating to a bank*, Dublin, 1721.

Lambert, R., *A Letter printed in a pamphlet, Partiality Detected, relating to the Convocation of Ireland*, Dublin, 1708.

[Leslie, C.], *An Answer to a Book Intitled, 'The State of the Protestants of Ireland'*, London, 1692.

McBride, J., *A Vindication of Marriage as Solemnised by Presbyterians in the north*, 1702.

Maculla, J., *Ireland's Consternation in the Losing of £200,000 of their Gold and Silver for Brass Money, Set Forth by an Artificer in Metals And a Citizen of Dublin Showing the fatal Consequences of Coining in another Kingdom Three Hundred Ton Weight of Copper Half-Pence*, Dublin, 1723.

Manby, P., *The Considerations which Obliged Peter Manby, Dean of Derry, to Embrace the Catholique Religion*, Dublin, 1687.

Manby, P., A *Reformed Catechism, in Two Dialogues concerning the English Reformation, collected for the most part, Word for Word, out of Dr. Burnet, John Fox and other Protestant Historians for the information of the people*, Dublin, 1687.

Manby, P., *A Letter to a Friend showing the Vanity of this opinion: that every Man's Sense and Reason is to guide him in matters of Faith*, Dublin, 1688.

Maples, *Remarks on the copper coin intended for the use of Ireland*, Dublin, 1723.

Matthews, L., *The Argument of Archdeacon Matthews for a Commission of Delegates upon his Appeals and Querel of Nullities*, London, 1704.
Matthews, L., *A Letter to the Right Reverend William, Lord Bishop of Derry*, 1703.
[Maxwell, H.], *An Essay Towards a Union of Ireland with England, most humbly offered to the consideration of the queen's most excellent majesty and both Houses of parliament*, London, 1703.
Maxwell, H., *Reasons offered for erecting a Bank in Ireland*, Dublin, 1721.
Molyneux, W., *The Case of Ireland 's being bound by Acts of Parliament in England Stated*, Dublin, 1698.
Nicolson, W., *The Irish Historical Library*, Dublin, 1724.
Perceval, W., *Remarks upon a Letter printed in a pamphlet entitled Partiality Detected, relating to the Convocation of Ireland*, Dublin, 1709.
Perceval, W., *A Letter to Dr. Synge in Answer to his Letter entitled 'Dr. Synge's Defense of himself against unjust aspersions thrown upon him in a late pamphlet entitled 'a reply to a vindication of the Letter published in a pamphlet called Partiality Detected'*, Dublin, 1711.
Rowley, H., *An answer to a book intitled, Reasons offered for erecting a Bank in Ireland*, Dublin, 1721.
Sheridan, W., *St. Paul's Confession of faith, or a brief account of his religion; in a sermon preached at St. Werburgh's Church in Dublin, March 22, 1685 by William Lord Bishop of Kilmore and Ardagh*, Dublin, 1685.
[Swift, J.], *A Letter from a Member of the House of Commons in Ireland to a Member of the House of Lords in England concerning the Sacramental Test*, London, 1708.
[Swift, J.], *A Short Character of his Ex[cellency], T[he] E[arl] of W[harton]*, Dublin, 1710,
[Swift, J.], *Seasonable Advice to the Grand Jury concerning the Bill preparing against the Printer of the Preceding Letter*, Dublin, 1724.
M.B., Drapier, [Swift, J.], *A Letter to the Shop-keepers, Tradesmen, Farmers and Common-people of Ireland, concerning the Brass half-pence coined by Mr. Woods with a view to having them pass in this Kingdom*, Dublin, March 1724.
M.B., Drapier, [Swift, J.], *A Letter to Mr. Harding the Printer, upon occasion of a Paragraph in his News-paper of August 1st relating to Mr. Woods Half-Pence*, August, 1724.
M.B., Drapier, [Swift, J.], *Some Observations upon a Paper Called the Report of the Committee of the Most Honourable the Privy Council in England relating to Woods Half-Pence*, September, 1724.
M.B., Drapier, [Swift, J.], *A Letter to the Whole People of Ireland*, Dublin, October 1724.
M.B., Drapier, [Swift, J.], *A Letter to the Right Honourable Viscount Molesworth*, Dublin, December 1724.
Honest Jo, [Swift, J.], *An Excellent New Song upon His Grace, our Good Lord Archbishop of Dublin*, Dublin, 1725.
Swift, J., *A Letter to the Lord Chancellor Midleton*, 1735
Swift, J., *A Proposal for the universal use of Irish Manufacture, in clothes and furniture of houses, etc., utterly rejecting and renouncing everything wearable that comes from England*, Dublin, 1720.
Swift, J., *An Excellent New Song*, Dublin, 1720.
Swift, J., *A Proposal for the Universal Use of Irish Manufacture in Clothes and Furniture of Houses, etc., utterly rejecting everything that comes from England*, Dublin, 1720.
Swift, J., *The Wonderful Wonder of Wonders*, Dublin, 1721.
Swift, J., The Wonder of all the Wonders, Dublin, 1721.
Swift, J., *To his Grace the Archbishop of Dublin*, Dublin, 1725.

Swift, J., *On Wisdom's Defeat in a Learned Debate*, Dublin, 1725.
Swift, J., *Horace, Book I, Ode xiv, Paraphrased and Inscribed to Ireland*, Dublin, 1724.
Swift, J., *A Short View of the State of Ireland*, Dublin, 1728.
Swift, J., *An Answer to a paper called a Memorial of the poor inhabitants, tradesmen and labourers of the Kingdom of Ireland*, Dublin, 1728.
Swift, J., *A Modest Proposal for preventing the children of poor people from being a burden to their parents*, Dublin 1729.
[Synge, E.], *An Answer to a vindication of Marriage*, Dublin, 1704.
Synge, E., *Defense of himself against unjust aspersions thrown upon him in a late pamphlet entitled 'a Reply to a vindication of the letter published in a pamphlet called Partiality Detected', wherein some justice is done to the Archbishop of Dublin*, Dublin, 1710,
Tisdall, W., *The Case of the Sacramental Test stated and argued*, Dublin, 1715.
[Toland, J.], *A Letter from a Gentleman in the Country to a Member of the House of Commons; in Reference to the Votes of the 14th instant*, London, 1697.
Trimnell, C., *Partiality Detected*, London, 1708.
Wetenhall, E., *The Case of the Irish Protestants in relation to recognising or swearing Allegience to and Praying for King William and Queen Mary, stated and resolved*, London, 1691.
Wettenhall, E., *Hexapla Jacobaea, a specimen of Loyalty towards James II in six pieces*, Dublin, 1686.
Wettenhall, E., *A sermon preached October 23, 1692*, Dublin, 1692.

D. KING'S PUBLISHED WORKS: CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF FIRST EDITIONS:

King, W., *A Sermon preached at Christ Church Dublin on the 23rd of October 1685, before Michael Boyle, Lord Primate and Lord Chancellor and Arthur Forbes, Earl of Granard, Lords Justices, on Isaiah 59-6-7*, Dublin, 1685.
King, W., *Of the Bogs and Loughs of Ireland*, London, 1686.
King, W., *An Answer to the Considerations which Obliged Peter Manby, Dean of Londonderry in Ireland, (as he pretends) to embrace what he calls the Catholique Religion*, Dublin, 1687.
King, W., *A Vindication of the Answer to the Considerations that obliged Peter Manby etc. to embrace, as he pretended, what he calls the Catholique Religion, being an Answer to the first Dialogue already printed of his Reformed Catechism*, Dublin, 1688.
King, W., *A Vindication of the Christian Religion and Reformation against the Attempts of a late Letter wrote by Peter Manby, dean of Derry, pretending to show that all Religions have a like Plea and that there can be no such Sins as Heresy and Schism, if every Man's Sense and Reason are to guide him in Matters of Faith*, Dublin, 1688.
King, W., *Europe's Deliverance from France and Slavery: a sermon preached on 16 November, 1690, being the Day of Thanksgiving for the preservation of his Majesty's Person, his good success in our deliverance, and his safe and happy return to England.* Dublin, 1691.
[King, W.], *The State of the Protestants of Ireland under the late King James's Government, in which their carriage towards him is justified and the absolute*

necessity of their endeavouring to be freed from his government and of submitting to their present majesties is demonstrated, London, 1691.
King, W., *A Discourse Concerning the Inventions of Men in the Worship of God*, Dublin, 1694.
King, W., *An Admonition to the Dissenting Inhabitants of the Diocese of Derry Concerning a Book lately published by Mr. Joseph Boyse, Intitled Remarks, etc.*, Dublin, 1694.
King, W., *A Second Admonition to the Dissenting Inhabitants of the Diocese of Derry*, Dublin, 1695.
King, W., *The Case of William, Lord Bishop of Derry, on an Appeal before the Right Honourable The Lords Spiritual and Temporal in Parliament Assembled, against the Society of the Governor and Assistants, London, for the Plantation in Ulster, the Mayor, Commonalty and Citizens of Londonderry and others*, [1698]
King, W., *De Origine Mali*, Dublin, 1702.
King, W., *A Sermon preached before their Excellencies, The Lords Justices on the 7th of September, 1704, being the Thanksgiving Day for the Late Glorious Victory obtained over the French and Bavarians at Blenheim*, London, 1704.
King, W., *Christian Humility: A Sermon Preached before the Queen at St. James's Chapel, on Palm Sunday*, London, 1705.
King, W., *The Advantages of Education, Religious and Political, in a Sermon preached at St. Margaret's Westminster*, London, 1706.
King, W., *The Mischief in Delaying Sentence against an Evil Work in a sermon preached before the Lord Mayor and Magistracy of Dublin in St. Michael's Church*, Dublin, 1707.
King, W., *Questions, To Which Each Incumbent is Desired to Give an Answer*, Dublin, 1709.
King, W., *Divine Predestination and Foreknowledge, consistent with the Freedom of man's will in a sermon Preached at Christ Church Dublin before his excellency Thomas, Earl of Wharton and the Honourable the House of Lords*, Dublin, 1709.
King, W., *An Account of the manner of Manuring Lands by Sea-Shells as practised in the Counties of Londonderry and Donegal in Ireland*, London, 1710.
King, W., *At A Visitation, Anno Dom. 1712*, Dublin, 1712.
King, W., *An Answer to All that has Ever been Said, or Insinuated in favour of a Popish Pretender, exhibited in an Abstract of The State of The Protestants of Ireland under King James the Second's Government*, London, 1713.
King, W., *The remembrance of the Righteous, in a Sermon preached at the funeral of the most Reverend Father in God, Narcissus, Lord Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of all Ireland, Novemer 6, 1713*, Dublin, 1714.
King, W., *Instructions and Queries for the Clergy of the Diocese of Dublin agreed to at a Synod and Visitation held in St. Patrick's Church April 23, 1718, in order to the better execution of the late Act for the Union and Division of Parishes*, Dublin, 1718.
King, W., *Offices to be used for the Consecration of a Church new built and restoartion of a Church rebuilt in the Diocese of Dublin*, Dublin, 1719.

E. UNPUBLISHED THESES:

Carpenter, A.I., *Archbishop King and Dean Swift*, unpublished Ph.D., UCD, 1970.

Doyle, T, *Parliament and Politics in Williamite Ireland, 1690-1703*, unpublished MA. UCD, 1992.

Fitzpatrick, M.G., *Irish Lords' Jurisdiction: the War over Appellate review 1692-1720*, unpublished MA, UCD, 1992.

Gilmore, M., *Anthony Dopping and the Church of Ireland, 1685-1695*, unpublished MA, QUB, 1988.

Griffin, J., *Parliamentary Politics in Ireland during the reigh of George I*, unpublished MA, NUI, 1977.

Hayton, D., *Ireland and the English Ministers, 1707-16: A Study of the Formulation and Working of Government Policy in the Early Eighteenth Century*, unpublished D. Phil., Oxford, 1975.

Kennedy, R., *The Administration of the Diocese of Dublin and Glendalough in the Eighteenth Century*, unpublished M.Litt., TCD, 1968.

Luebben, N., *Tolerance in an Irish Context: Archbishop William King*, unpublished M.Phil., TCD, 1989.

McGuire, J.I., *Politics, Opinion and the Irish constitution, 1688-1707*, unpublished MA, NUI, 1968.

Victory, I.L., *Colonial Nationalism in Ireland, 1692-1725: from Common Law to Natural Right*, unpublished Ph.D., TCD, 1984.

3. Secondary Sources:

Ball, F.E., *The judges of Ireland*, 2 vols., New York, 1927.

Bagwell, R., Ireland under the Stuarts, 3 vols., London, 1909-16.

Barnard, T.C., 'Protestants and the Irish Language, *c.*1675-1725', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 44, 1993, pp.243-72.

Barnard, T.C., *Cromwellian Ireland: English Government and Reform in Ireland 1649-1660*, Oxford, 1975.

Barnard, T.C., 'Planters and Policies in Cromwellian Ireland', *Past and Present*, 61, 1973, pp.31-69.

Barnard, T.C., 'Reforming Irish Manners: The Religious Societies in Dublin during the 1690s', *The Historical Journal*, 35, 1992, pp.805-838.

Barnard, T.C., 'Improving Clergymen, 1660-1760', in Ford, McGuire and Milne, eds., *As by Law Established*, pp.136-151.

Barnard, T.C., 'The Uses of 23 October, 1641 and Irish Protestant Celebrations', *English Historical Review*, 106, 1991, pp.889-920.

Barnard, T.C., 'Athlone, 1685; Limerick, 1710; Religious Riots or Charivaris?', *Studia Hibernica*, 28, pp.61-75.

Barnard, T.C., 'Lawyers and the law in later seventeenth-century Ireland', *IHS*, 28, 1993, pp.256-282.

Barnard, T.C., 'Crises of Identity among Irish Protestants, 1641-85', in *Past and Present*, 127, 1990, pp.39-83.

Barnard, T.C., 'Historiographical Review: Farewell to Old Ireland', *The Historical Journal*, 36, 1993, pp.909-928.

Bartlett, T., The Fall and Rise of the Irish Nation: The Catholic Question, 1690-1830, Dublin, 1992.

Beckett, J.C., *The Making of Modern Ireland, 1603-1923*, London, 1966.
Beckett, J.C., 'The Government and the Church of Ireland under William III and Anne', *IHS*, 2, 1940-1, pp.280-302.
Beckett, J.C., *The Anglo-Irish Tradition*, London, 1976.
Beckett, J.C., 'Swift as an Ecclesiastical Statesman', in Cronne, Moody and Quinn, ed., *Essays in British History in honour of James Eadie Todd*, London, 1949, pp.151-62.
Beckett, J.C., *Protestant Dissent in Ireland*, 1687-1780, London, 1948.
Beckett, J.C., 'William King's administration of the Diocese of Derry, 1691-1703', *IHS*, 4, 1944, pp.164-180.
Bennett, G.V., *The Tory Crisis in Church and State 1688-1730: the career of Francis Atterbury, Bishop of Rochester*, Oxford, 1975.
Berman, D., *A History of Atheism in Britain: From Hobbes to Russell*, London, 1988.
Berman, D., *Notes and Queries*, 58, December, 1982, p.529.
Berman, D., 'The Jacobitism of Berkeley's Passive Obedience', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 1986, pp.309-319.
Berman, D., Introduction to Archbishop King's Sermon on Predestination, in *Writings from the age of Swift*, ed., Andrew Carpenter, iv, Dublin, 1976, pp.9-20.
Bolton, F.R., *The Caroline Tradition of the Church of Ireland, with particular reference to Bishop Jeremy Taylor*, London, 1958.
Bottigheimer, K.S., 'Kingdom and Colony: Ireland in the Westward Enterprise:1536-1660', in K.R. Andrews *et al*, eds., *The Westward Enterprise: English Activities in Ireland, The Atlantic and America 1480-1650*, Liverpool, 1978, pp.45-64.
Bottigheimer, K.S., 'The Restoration Land Settlement in Ireland: A Structural View', *IHS*, 18, 1972, pp.1-21.
Bottigheimer, K.S., 'The Glorious Revolution and Ireland', in L.G. Schwoerer, ed., *The Revolution of 1688-1689*, Cambridge, 1992, pp.234-41.
Brady, C. and Gillespie, G., eds., *Natives and Newcomers: Essays on the making of Irish Colonial Society*, Dublin, 1986.
Brooke, P., *Ulster Presbyterians: The Historical Perspective*, Dublin, 1987.
Brynn, E., *The Church of Ireland in the Age of Catholic Emancipation*, New York, 1982.
Burnet, G., *History of His Own Time*, 6 vols., Oxford 1833.
Burns, R.E., 'The Irish Popery Laws: A Study in Eighteenth Century Legislation and Behaviour', *Review of Politics*, 24, 1962, pp.485-508.
Burns, R.E., *Irish Parliamentary Politics in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. i, 1714-1730, Washington, 1989.
Caldicott, C.E.J., Gough, H., and Pittion, J.P., eds., *The Huguenots and Ireland: anatomy of an emigration*, Dublin, 1987.
Canny, N., 'The Formation of the Irish Mind: Religion, Politics and Gaelic Irish Literature', *Past and Present*, 95, 1982, pp.91-116.
Capern, A.L., 'The Caroline Church: James Ussher and the Irish Dimension', in *The Historical Journal*, 39, 1996, pp.57-85.
Carpenter, A.I., 'William King and the Threats to the Church of Ireland during the reign of James II', *IHS*, 18, 1972, pp.22-28.
Carpenter, E., *Thomas Tennison*, London, 1948.
Clark, J.C.D., *English Society 1688-1832: Ideology, Social Structure and Political Practice during the Ancien Régime*, Cambridge, 1985.
Clarke, A., *The old English in Ireland, 1625-1642*, London, 1966.
Connolly, S.J., *Religion, Law and Power: The making of Protestant Ireland, 1660-1760*, Oxford, 1992,
Connolly, S.J., 'The Church of Ireland: a critical bibliography, 1690-1800', *IHS*, 28, 1993, p.362-9.

Connolly, S.J., 'Reformers and Highfliers: the post-Revolution church', in Ford, McGuire and Milne, eds., *As by Law Established*, pp.152-65.
Connolly, S.J., 'Religion and History', *Irish Economic and Social History*, 10, 1983, pp.66-80.
Corish, P.J., *The Catholic Community in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, Dublin, 1981.
Cotton, T., *Fasti Ecclesiae Hibernicae: the succession of the prelates and members of the cathedral bodies of Ireland*, Dublin, 1847.
Cowan, I.B., 'Church and State Reformed? The Revolution of 1688-9 in Scotland', in J.I. Israel, ed., *The Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its World Impact*, Cambridge, 1991, pp.163-83.
Craig, M., *Dublin, 1660-1860: A Social and Architectural History*, Dublin, 1969.
Craven, K., '*A Tale of a Tub* and the 1697 Dublin Controversy', in *Eighteenth-Century Ireland*, 1, 1986, pp.97-110.
Cullen, L.M., 'Catholics under the Penal Laws', *Eighteenth-Century Ireland*, 1, 1986, pp.23-36.
Cullen, L.M., *Anglo-Irish Trade, 1660-1800*, Manchester, 1968.
Cullen, L.M., *The Emergence of Modern Ireland, 1600-1900*, London, 1981.
Cullen, L.M., *An Economic History of Ireland since 1660*, London, 1972.
Cullen, L.M., 'Population Trends in Seventeenth-Century Ireland', *Economic and Social Review*, 6, 1975, pp.149-165.
Cullen, L.M., 'Catholics under the Penal Laws', *Eighteenth-Century Ireland*, 1, 1986, pp.23-36.
D'Alton, J., *History of the Archbishops of Dublin*, Dublin, 1838.
Davies, G., 'Swift's The Story of an Injured Lady', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 6, 1943, pp.473-489.
Dickson, D., *New Foundations: Ireland 1660-1800*, Dublin, 1987.
Dickson, D., *The gorgeous mask: Dublin 1700-1850*, Dublin, 1987.
Dix, E.R. McC., *Catalogue of early Dublin-printed books*, 4 parts and supplement in 3 vols., Dublin, 1898-1912.
Dralle, L.A., 'Kingdom in Reversion: The Irish Viceroyalty of the Earl of Wharton, 1708-1710', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 15, 1951-2, pp.393-431.
Edwards, R.D., Introduction, *Analecta Hibernica*, 8, 1938, pp.5-14.
Ehrenpreis, I., *Swift: the man, his works and the age*, 3 vols, London, 1962, 1967, 1983.
Fagan, P., *Dublin's Turbulent Priest: Cornelius Nary (1685-1738)*, Dublin, 1991.
Fagan, P., 'The Dublin Catholic Mob (1700-1750), *Eighteenth-Century Ireland*, 4, 1989, pp.133-142.
Falvey, J., 'The Church of Ireland episcopate in the eighteenth century: an overview', in *Eighteenth Century Ireland*, 8, 1993, pp.103-114.
Ferguson,O.W., *Jonathan Swift and Ireland*, Urbana, 1962.
Figgis, J.N., *The Theory of the Divine Right of Kings*, Cambridge, 1896.
Fitzpatrick, B., *Seventeenth-Century Ireland: The War of Religions*, Dublin, 1988.
Flaherty, M.S., 'The Empire Strikes Back: Annesley v Sherlock and the Triumph of Imperial Parliamentary Supremacy', *Columbia Law Review*, 87, 1987, pp.593-622.
Ford, A., 'The Origins of Irish Dissent', in K. Herlihy, ed., *The Religion of Irish Dissent, 1650-1800*, pp.9-30.
Ford, A., J.I. McGuire and K. Milne, eds., *As by Law Established: The Church of Ireland since the Reformation*, Dublin, 1995.
Foster, R.F., *Modern Ireland, 1600-1972*, London, 1988.
Froude, J.A., *The English in Ireland in the Eighteenth century*, 3 vols., London, 1872-1881.
Gilbert, G.T., *An Account of the Parliament House, Dublin, with notice of parliaments held there, 1661-1800*, Dublin, 1986.

Gillespie, R., 'The Irish Protestants and James II, 1688-90', *IHS*, 27, 1992, pp.124-33.
Gillespie, R., "Into another intensity', Prayer in Irish Nonconformity, 1650-1700', in K. Herlihy, ed., *The Religion of Irish Dissent, 1650-1800*, pp.31-47.
Goldie, M., 'The Political Thought of the Anglican Revolution', in R. Beddard, ed., *The Revolutions of 1688*, Oxford, 1991, pp.126-33.
Goodwin, A., 'Wood's Halfpence', *English Historical Review*, 51, 1936, pp.647-674.
Greaves, R.L., "That's no good religion that disturbs government': the Church of Ireland and the non-conformist challenge, 1660-1688', in Ford, McGuire and Milne eds., *As by Law Established*, pp.120-135.
Gregg, E., *Queen Anne*, London, 1984.
Hall. F.G., *The Bank of Ireland 1783-1946*, Dublin, 1949.
Harris, T., *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England*, Oxford, 1990.
Hayton, D.W., 'Constitutional experiments and political expediency, 1689-1725', in S. Ellis and S. Barber, eds., *Conquest and Union: Fashioning a British State, 1485-1725*, London, 1995, pp.276-305.
Hayton, D.W., 'From Barbarian to Burlesque: English Images of the Irish *c.* 1660-1750', *Irish Economic and Social History*, 15, 1988, pp.5-31.
Hayton, D.W., 'The beginnings of the 'Undertaker System", in T. Bartlett and D. Hayton, eds., *Penal Era and Golden Age: Essays in Irish History 1690-1800*, Belfast, 1979, pp.32-54.
Hayton, D.W., 'The Crisis in Ireland and the disintegration of Queen Anne's last ministry', *IHS*, 22, 1981, pp.193-215,
Hayton, D.W., 'An Irish Parliamentary Diary from the reign of Queen Anne', *Analecta Hibernica*, 30, 1982, pp.97-149.
Hayton, D.W., 'Did Protestantism fail in early eighteenth century Ireland? Charity Schools and the enterprise of religious and social reformation, *c.*1690-1730', in Ford, McGuire and Milne, eds, *As by Law Established*, pp.166-186.
Hayton, D.W., 'A Debate in the Irish House of Commons in 1703: A Whiff of Tory Grapeshot', *Parliamentary History*, 10, 1991, pp.151-63.
Hayton, D.W., 'The Williamite Revolution in Ireland, 1688-91', in J.I. Israel, ed., *The Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its World Impact*, Cambridge, 1991, pp.185-212.
Hayton, D., 'Anglo-Irish Attitudes: Changing Perceptions of National Identity among the Protestant Ascendancy in Ireland *ca.* 1690-1750', *Eighteenth Century Culture*, 17, 1987, pp.145-157.
Herlihy, K., ed., *The Religion of Irish Dissent 1650-1800*, Dublin, 1996.
Hick, V., 'The Palatine Settlement in Ireland: The Early Years', *Eighteenth-Century Ireland*, 4, 1989, pp.113-31.
Hill, C., *The English Bible and the Seventeenth-Century Revolution*, London, 1993.
Hill, J.R., 'Popery and Protestantism, Civil and Religious Liberty: The Disputed Lessons of Irish History 1690-1812', *Past and Present*, 118, 1988, pp.96-129.
Hill, S., *The Catholic Balance*, London, 1687.
Holmes, G., *British Politics in the Age of Anne*, revised edition, London, 1987.
Hoppen, K.T., *The Common Scientist in the Seventeenth Century: a study of the Dublin Philosophical Society*, London, 1970.
Hoppen, K.T., 'The Dublin Philosophical Society and the new learning in Ireland', *IHS*, 14, 1964, pp.99-119.
Hylton, R.P., 'The Less-favoured Refuge: Ireland's Nonconformist Huguenots at the Turn of the Eighteenth Century', in K. Herlihy, ed., *The Religion of Irish Dissent, 1650-1800*, pp.83-99.
Innes, J., 'Jonathan Clark, Social History and England's "Ancien Régime"', *Past and Present*, 115, 1987, pp.165-200.
James, F.G., *Ireland in the Empire, 1688-1770: a history of Ireland from the Williamite wars to the eve of the American Revolution*, Massachusetts, 1973.

James, F.G., 'The Irish lobby in the early eighteenth century', *English Historical Review*, 81, 1966, pp.543-7.
James, F.G., 'The active Irish peers of the early eighteenth century', *Journal of British Studies*, 18, 1979, pp.52-69.
James, F.G., 'The Church of Ireland in the early Eighteenth Century', in *The Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, 48, 1979, pp.433-451.
James, F.G., *North Country Bishop: a biography of Bishop William Nicolson*, Yale University Press, 1956.
Johnston, E.M., *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, Dublin, 1974.
Jones, J.R., *Country and Court, England 1658-1714*, London, 1978,
Kearney, H.F., 'The Political Background to English Mercantilism 1695-1700', in *Economic History Review*, 2nd Series, 11, 1959, pp.484-496.
Kelly, J., 'The Glorious and Immortal Memory', Commemoration and Protestant Identity in Ireland, 1660-1800', *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy*, 94c, 1994, pp.25-52.
Kelly, J., 'Jonathan Swift and the Irish Economy in the 1720's', *Eighteenth-Century Ireland*, 6, 1991, pp.7-36.
Kelly, J., 'The origins of the act of union: an examination of unionist opinion in Britain and Ireland, 1650-1800', in *IHS*, 25, 1987, pp.236-263.
Kelly, J., 'Harvests and hardship; famine and scarcity in the late 1720s', *Studia Hibernica*, 26, 1991-2, pp.65-103.
Kelly, P., 'The Irish Woollen Export Prohibition Act of 1699: Kearney re-visisted', in *Irish Economic and Social History*, 7, 1980, p.22-44.
Kelly, P., 'A Pamphlet attributed to John Toland and an Unpublished Reply by Archbishop William King', *Topoi*, 4, 1985, pp.81-90.
Kelly, P., 'Lord Galway and the Penal Laws', in Caldicott *et al.*, eds, *The Huguenots and Ireland*, pp.239-254.
Kelly, P., 'Ireland and the Glorious Revolution, from Kingdom to Colony', R. Beddard, ed., *The Revolution of 1688*, Oxford, 1991, pp.163-190.
Kelly, P., 'Archbishop William King (1650-1729) and colonial nationalism', in C. Brady ed., *Worsted in the game: losers in Irish History*, Dublin, 1989, pp.85-94.
Kelly, P., 'William Molyneux and the Spirit of Liberty in Eighteenth Century Ireland', *Eighteenth Century Ireland*, 3, 1988, pp.133-48.
Kenyon, J.P., *The Stuart Constitution, 1603-1688*, Cambridge, 1966.
Kenyon, J.P., *Revolution Principles: the politics of party, 1689-1720*, Cambridge, 1978.
Killen, W.D., *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland*, 2 vols., London, 1875.
Kilroy, P., *Protestant Dissent and Controversy in Ireland*, Cork, 1994.
Landa, L., *Swift and the Church of Ireland*, Oxford, 1954.
Lawlor, H.J., *The Fasti of St Patrick's*, 1930.
Lecky, W.E.H., *A History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, 5 vols., London, 1888-1892.
Leerson, J.Th., 'Anglo-Irish Patriotism and its European Context: Notes Towards a reassessment', *Eighteenth Century Ireland*, 3, 1988, pp.7-24.
Leighton, C., *Catholicism in a Protestant Kingdom: A Study of the Irish Ancien Régime*, Dublin, 1994.
Loupes, P., 'Bishop Dopping's Visitation of the Diocese of Meath 1693', *Studia Hibernica*, 24, 1984-8, pp.127-51.
Luttrell, N., *A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs, 1678-1714*, 6 vols, Oxford, 1857.
McCarthy, M., *All Graduates and Gentlemen: Marsh's Library*, Dublin, 1980.
McGrath, C.I., 'Securing the Protestant Interest: the origins and purpose of the penal laws of 1695', *IHS*, 30, 1996, pp.25-46.

McGuire, J.I., 'The Dublin Convention, the protestant community and the emergence of an ecclesiastical settlement in 1660', in Cosgrave, A and J.I. McGuire, eds., *Parliament and Community: Historical Studies 14*, Belfast, 1983, pp.121-46.
McGuire, J.I., 'Goverment attitudes to religious non-conformity in Ireland, 1660-1719', in Caldicott et al., eds., *The Huguenots and Ireland*, pp.255-284.
McGuire, J.I., 'The Church of Ireland and the "Glorious Revolution" of 1688', in Cosgrove, A and D. McCartney, eds., *Studies in Irish History*, Dublin, 1979, pp.137-149.
McGuire, J.I., 'The Irish Parliament of 1692', in T. Bartlett and D. Hayton, eds., *Penal Era and Golden Age: essays in Irish History 1690-1800*, Belfast, 1979, pp.1-31.
McNally, P., "Irish and English Interests': national conflict within the Church of Ireland episcopate in the reign of George I', *IHS*, 29, 1995, pp.295-331.
McNally, P., 'The Hanoverian Accession and the Tory Party in Ireland', *Parliamentary History*, 14, 1995, pp.263-283.
Macafee,W., and V. Morgan, 'Population in Ulster, 1660-1760', *Plantation to Partition: Essays in Ulster History in honour of J.L. McCracken*, Belfast, 1981, pp.46-63.
Mant, R., *History of the Church of Ireland*, 2 vols., London, 1840-41.
Matteson, R., 'Archbishop William King's Library', *Longroom*, 9, 1974, pp.7-16.
Matteson, R., 'Archbishop William King's Library Catalogue', *Library*, 1981, pp.305-19.
Matteson, R., 'The Early Library of Archbishop William King', *Library*, 1975, pp.303-314.
Maxwell, C., *A History of Trinity College Dublin*, Dublin, 1946.
Maxwell, C., *Dublin under the Georges, 1714-1830*, London, 1937.
Miller, J.,'The Earl of Tyrconnell and James II's Irish Policy, 1685-1688', *The Historical Journal*, 20, 1977, pp.802-823.
Monck-Mason, W., *The History and Antiquities of the Collegiate and Cathedral Church of St. Patrick*, Dublin, 1820.
Moody, T.W. and Vaughan, W.E., *A New History of Ireland, iv, Eighteenth-Century Ireland, 1691-1800*, Oxford, 1986.
Moody, T.W., and J. G. Simms, *The Case of the Bishop of Derry*, Irish Manuscript Commission, 2 vols, Dublin, 1968, 1983.
Neville, J.D., 'Irish Presbyterians under the restored Stuart monarchy', in *Eire-Ireland: A Journal of Irish Studies*, 16, 1981, pp.29-42.
Petrie, Sir. C., *The Jacobite movement: the first phase, 1688-1716*, London, 1948.
Overton, J.M., *The Non-Jurors*, London, 1902.
Phillips, W.A., ed., *The History of the Church of Ireland from the earliest times to the present day*, 3 vols, Oxford, 1933-4.
Pocock, J.G.A., *The ancient constitution and the feudal law*, Cambridge, 1957.
Power, T.P., and Whelan, K., eds., *Endurance and Emergence: Catholics in Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, Dublin, 1990.
Reid, J.S., *The History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland*, ed. W.D. Killen, 3 vols., Belfast, 1867.
Robbins, C., *The Seventeenth Century Commonwealthman*, Massachusetts, 1959.
Roebuck, P., 'Landlord Indebtedness in Ulster in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries', in J.M. Goldstrom and L.A. Clarkson, eds., *Irish Population Economy and Society*, Oxford, 1981, pp.135-54.
Ryder, M., 'The Bank of Ireland 1721: Land, Credit and Dependency', *Historical Journal*, 25, 1982, pp.557-82.
Schochet, G.J., 'John Locke and Religious Toleration', in L.G. Schroerer, ed., *The Revolution of 1688-89*, Cambridge, 1992, pp.147-161.
Shennan, J.H., and M. Shennan, 'The Protestant Succession in English Politics, April 1713 - September 1715', in Hatton, R., and J. S. Bromley, eds., *William III and Louis XIV: Essays 1680-1720*, Liverpool, 1968.

Simms, J.G., *The Williamite Confiscation in Ireland, 1690-1703*, London, 1956,
Simms, J.G., *The Jacobite Parliament of 1689*, Dundalk, 1966.
Simms, J.G., *Jacobite Ireland, 1685-91*, London, 1969.
Simms, J.G., *Colonial Nationalism, 1698-1776*, Cork, 1976.
Simms, J.G., 'John Toland (1670-1722), a Donegal heretic', IHS, 16, 1968-9, pp.304-20.
Simms, J.G., *William Molyneux of Dublin, 1656-1698: a life of the seventeenth century political writer and scientist*, ed. P. Kelly, Dublin, 1982.
Simms, J.G., 'The Case of Ireland Stated', in B. Farrell, ed., *The Irish Parliamentary Tradition*, pp.128-138.
Simms, J.G., *The Treaty of Limerick*, Dundalk, 1961.
Simms, J.G., 'The Making of a Penal Law (2 Anne, c. 6), 1703-4, *IHS*, 12, 1960, pp.105-118.
Simms, J.G., 'Williamite Peace Tactics, 1690-91', *IHS*, 8, 1953, pp.303-323.
Simms, J.G., 'Irish Catholics and the Parliamentary Franchise, 1692-1728, *IHS, 12*, 1960, pp.28-37.
Simms, J.G., 'The Bishops' Banishment Act of 1697 (9 Will. III, c.1), *IHS*, 17, 1970-1, pp.185-99.
Simms, J.G., 'The Irish Parliament of 1713', in G.A. Hayes-McCoy ed., *Historical Studies*, 4, 1963, pp.82-92.
Smyth, J., "Like Amphibious Animals': Irish Protestants, Ancient Britons', *The Historical Journal*, 26, 1993, pp.785-797.
Spurr, J., 'The Church of England, Comprehension and the Toleration Act of 1689', *English Historical Review*, 54, 1989, pp.927-946.
Stewart, M.A., 'John Smith and the Molesworth Circle', *Eighteenth Century Ireland*, 2, 1987, pp.89-102.
Stokes, G.T., *Some Worthies of the Irish Church*, ed. H.J.Lawlor, London, 1900.
Straka, G., 'The final phase of divine right theory in England, 1688-1702', *English Historical Review*, 77, 1962, pp.638-658.
Stubbs, J.W., *The History of The University of Dublin*, Dublin, 1889.
Swift, J., *The Drapier's Letters to the people of Ireland*, ed. H. Davis, Oxford, 1935.
Swift, J., *Irish Tracts and Sermons*, ed. H. Davis, Oxford, 1948.
Swift, J., *Poems*, ed. W. Browning, London, 1910.
Sykes, N., *William Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1657-1737*, 2 vols., Cambridge, 1957.
Thomson, M., 'The Safeguarding of the Protestant Succession, 1702-18', R. Hatton and J. S. Bromley,eds., *William III and Louis XIV - Essays 1680-1720'*, pp.237-251.
Trevelyan, G., *The English Revolution 1688-1689*, London, 1938.
Trevelyan, G., *England under Queen Anne, the Peace and the Protestant Succession*, London, 1934.
Trevor-Roper, H., 'James Ussher, Archbishop of Armagh', H. Trevor-Roper, ed., *Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans*, London, 1987, pp.120-165.
Victory, I.L., 'The Making of the 1720 Declaratory Act', in G. O'Brien, ed., *Parliament, Politics and People: essays in Eighteenth-Century Irish History*, Dublin, 1989, pp.9-29.
Wall, M., *The Penal Laws, 1691-1760: Church and State from the Treaty of Limerick to the Accession of George III*, Dundalk, 1961.
Williams, B., *Carteret and Newcastle: A Contrast in Contemporaries*, Cambridge, 1943.
Winnett, A.R., *Peter Browne: Provost, Bishop, Metaphysician*, London, 1974.