

Responses in London and the Home Counties to the Jacobite Rebellion of 1745

Jonathan Oates

In early November 1745 the Hanoverian throne was threatened by the march southwards into England of the Jacobite forces under Charles Edward Stuart. This threat was compounded by the plans being made in France for an invasion fleet to attack the southern counties. At this time of heightened security, there was also alarm at the apparent willingness of some Englishmen to assist either of these forces in deposing George II and his government and replacing them with a regime headed by James Francis Stuart, which was more sympathetic to France and at home favourably inclined towards the Tories and Catholics. Furthermore these threats were associated with earlier Jacobite plotting in 1743-44 amongst some Essex nobility and gentry, intent on inviting a French invasion force, while the advancing Scottish army was similarly dependent on English and French support.¹

Previous studies of the Forty Five have concentrated more on the military campaign rather than on the impact of the Jacobite threat on the localities. The few cases that have been considered centre on the north of England and through their focus on the Jacobites themselves, they have tended to give the impression that there was widespread support for the movement while sympathy for the status quo was often lukewarm. This article intends to challenge this assumption through examining the responses to the Jacobite threat in Middlesex, Hertfordshire, Essex, Surrey and Kent. Hitherto these counties have been regarded as only having marginal significance in the course of these events, a contemporary historian, John Marchant, only noted that Kent and Essex were possible places for the French to disembark. The sole exception to this is the recognition of the threat posed to the capital when the rebels contemplated marching south from Derby.² Until recently the significance of the response to the Jacobite threat has received little attention in histories of south east England,³ with the

notable exception of London itself.⁴

After an initial discussion of the activities of the known Jacobites in southern England and their reaction to the events of 1745, this article will focus on the response of the county officialdom – lords lieutenant, JPs and parish officers – who reacted to the real and perceived threats from Scotland and France. The work of these officers, together with churchmen and others, orchestrated and demonstrated both verbally and practically their loyalty to the government at this time of crisis. This article therefore draws upon a range of primary material to consider the response to the Jacobite threat in the southeastern counties. These include letters amongst the State Papers in the National Archives, which were written to and from magnates in the shires and London, to the Duke of Newcastle, George II's premier Secretary of State and the man responsible for masterminding action taken against the rebellion. There is further correspondence in the county record offices, which also hold quarter session and parish archives that provide another perspective on local responses to the rebellion. These can also be supplemented with published sources such as newspapers and sermons.

In the years before the Forty Five, there had already been plotting amongst disaffected sections of the elite. In 1743 a small number of Tory MPs, including Sir Robert Abdy, an Essex MP, had sent a message to the French government, calling for their aid towards a Stuart restoration. A number of other Tory MPs were also involved, to a lesser degree, including Thomas Bramston, Essex's other MP, as well as the members for Colchester, Charles Gray and Samuel Smith. Jacob Houblon, a Hertfordshire MP, might also have been engaged in this affair (Abdy was his son's proxy godfather). Jacobite agents concluded that 38 Tories and dissident Whigs in the Home Counties would be sympathetic to a Jacobite coup aided by the French but such schemes came to naught after the failed invasion attempt early in 1744.⁵

Although several recent historians have remarked on the support for Jacobitism in London, they disagree on its extent and the situation certainly was complex.⁶ It was true that there was considerable opposition in the capital to Sir Robert Walpole and his successors, and that Jacobite agents equated this with Jacobitism while worried ministers also thought that anti-Hanoverianism was a sign of Jacobitism.⁷ Tory aldermen drank the Pretender's health.⁸ Members of the Common Council of London were thought by the Jacobites to be their allies, but they usually failed to live up to expectations.⁹ Of course, had the military situation turned decisively in the Jacobites' favour, it was possible that these sympathisers would have declared themselves.

Certainly the Jacobites hoped for a great deal of support from London. The Chevalier de Johnstone, remarked 'It was even said in London that fifty thousand men had actually left that city to meet the Prince and join his army'.¹⁰ Charles Haydon, a London Jacobite, claimed thousands in the capital would join the Pretender 'as soon as he came to London'.¹¹ Towards the end of September, there was a run on the Bank of England. According to the Rev. Thomas Birch, 'some persons have been silently disengaging themselves from the Funds'.¹² Two weeks later, he wrote that the 'ill-affected' had been crowding the Bank.¹³ According to Lady Hardwicke, wife of the Lord Chancellor, the panic was begun by two Scottish bankers.¹⁴ It was also thought, in August 1746, that Londoners, 'several of them persons of note' had sent £400,000 to aid the rebellion.¹⁵ Afterwards, John Murray of Broughton, secretary to Charles Stuart, claimed, 'Dr Barry, a physician in London was employed as an agent: that there were many Persons in the city well affected to the Prince'.¹⁶ Yet this evidence needs to be countered: no one marched out to join the rebels and according to Murray 'to the best of his knowledge there was never any money remitted from England to the Prince since his landing in Scotland'.¹⁷

There were certainly a number of rumours and false alarms; most of which were anti-Catholic in tone. Birch claimed there were 150,000 Catholics in London 'much more formidable than what I could have imagined'.¹⁸ There was a report of a *Te deum* being sung at a Catholic chapel in Hampstead shortly after Pretender's victory at Prestonpans.¹⁹ A house at Cheam belonging to a Catholic noblewoman, Lady Petre, was searched in December because of 'the great uneasiness of the inhabitants of all the adjacent villages; who firmly believed that great numbers of men, horse and arms, were concealed in subterranean passages'.²⁰ Similarly, Thorndon Hall, near Brentwood, a house also in Lady Petre's possession, was suspected of being a store house of arms and horses. Wagons allegedly laden with arms had arrived there at night. Given that the house was supposedly uninhabited, the wagoners thought this strange.²¹ Searches of these houses found nothing suspicious. Similarly in Hertfordshire, a school for Catholics run by the Rev. John Stirling at Great Gaddesden was the centre of the fears of a fellow Hertfordshire clergyman, the Rev. Johnson.²²

Irishmen on their way to London the previous year were thought to have been in league with London Catholics in the support of an invasion and there were suspicious drinking dens in London, such as the Hole in the Wall in Panton Street.²³ Yet the official Catholic response, as espoused by the Duke of Norfolk, was loyalist. He told Newcastle that 'the only proof they [the Catholics] can give of their loyalty is their

peaceable behaviour...I doubt not but your grace is satisfied of my honest and peaceable dispositions'.²⁴ Another Catholic courtier, Lord Fauconberg, subscribed £200 to the loyalist Yorkshire Association. Sir Dudley Ryder, attorney general, admitted in 1746 that 'the papists have in all appearance behav'd'.²⁵ Some Catholics had Jacobite sympathies, but others sought to demonstrate their loyalty to George II, whilst others probably sought to avoid controversy.

More concrete forms of sedition were evident, however, with a number of people being accused of disloyal language between October 1745 and October 1746. Although this has been noted before, its true extent and significance is only evident if the Assize records are considered together with the quarter sessions.²⁶ Nonetheless this unrest should not be exaggerated as one study of disaffected Londoners only identified 97 individuals, mostly Catholics and Irishmen, leading to the conclusion that 'London Jacobitism was a minority movement'. If 97 sounds a lot, it should be recalled, with London's estimated population of 675,000 (in 1750), the number is a lower proportion than in Leeds, where there were three recorded Jacobites out of a population of about 10,000.²⁷

Some of those indicted in London for sedition included men and women who drank the Pretender's health, cursed King George, offered to join the rebels and distributed the Pretender's proclamations.²⁸ Very few were accused of sedition elsewhere in the south east, only ten in Kent, four in Essex and two in Hertfordshire (assuming all those indicted in Surrey and Middlesex were from London proper). Most of those accused made remarks against King George, though one claimed he would join the rebels and another that he would blow up the magazine at Woolwich. In general these cases relate to lone individuals rather than to groups of men and women.²⁹ Potentially more dangerous was one Thomas Mayott, a Catholic tenant farmer of Essex, who was sent to London from Chelmsford by the Earl Fitzwalter, the county's Lord Lieutenant, on 7 April 1746, though even here, the evidence is ambiguous. He was accused of seditious words and that he had often been at Rochford where he 'displayed his Parts and his Politicks'. Nonetheless he stressed his loyalty and claimed he was 'in drink' when he made the remarks he was accused of.³⁰

There was only one recorded instance of communal Jacobitism in this region, in marked contrast to the number of mass Jacobite public disturbances in 1715.³¹ This was at the George Inn, Cuddicott, Hertfordshire, shortly after Prestonpans. Treasonable healths were drunk and the landlord, John Black, was 'particularly active and sung a Scotch ballad to the company, "wha comes here? Tis the Lord of all the clans whom we

love so dear". There were not only common people present, but also a Mr Lindsey, a non juring clergyman from London, Edward Green and Curate Fynn Dove, both of Walkern, and George Byse, son of Dr Byse. However Byse did not drink any healths, returned home early and regretted his presence there. Thomas Smallcross, JP, who investigated the matter, surmised that it might only be 'a very treasonable drunken bout without any further scheme'.³²

The Jacobite presence in the southeastern counties was therefore ill-defined and those who supported their cause can not easily be distinguished from more general political discontent and the unease felt towards Catholic neighbours in the period. There is no evidence of widespread public disturbances, although sedition was vocalised in the treasonable healths and words.

Traditionally, non-Jacobite responses the Scottish advance southward and the threat of French invasion have been variously described as being met with either apathy or panic. The latter is especially true when historians discuss the attitudes of Londoners. According to F.J. McLynn 'there was considerable Jacobite support in London' and 'The panic both of the authorities in London and of their field commanders is too well documented to be shrugged off lightly'.³³ According to Johnstone, who was at Derby at the time:

Our arrival at Derby was known at London on the fifth of December, and the following Monday, called by the English Black Monday, the intelligence was known throughout the whole city, which was filled with terror and consternation. Many of the inhabitants fled to the country with their most precious effects, and all the shops were shut. People thronged to the Bank to obtain payment of its notes.³⁴

Johnstone adds that Newcastle shut himself up in order to decide which course of action he should take and that George II was ready to flee.³⁵

In fact every assertion made by Johnstone is incorrect, though many historians seem to accept his 'evidence' uncritically. According to Nicolas Rogers, the populace, inculcated with a sense of militant libertarian values, were fiercely opposed to the rebellion, there being 'a fusion of loyalist and libertarian sentiment, a effervescence of anti-Catholicism in particular, manipulated from above and yet genuinely popular'.³⁶

Responses in the capital varied throughout the period of the rebellion, and are somewhat more complex than has sometimes been suggested. At the beginning of September, there was certainly concern. The Lord Chancellor, Hardwicke, wrote to Thomas Herring, Archbishop of York,

on 31 August 'There seems to be a certain indifference and deadness amongst many and the Spirit of the Nation wants to be roused and animated'.³⁷ Horace Walpole, man of letters and son of the late premier, wrote six days later thus 'The Confusion I have found and the danger we are in, prevent me talking of anything else'.³⁸ On 7 September he reported a sense of apathy 'I have found everyone in – I was going to say confusion – but I can't say that...everyone seems as much unconcerned as if it was only some Indian king brought over by Oglethorpe'.³⁹

There was panic amongst the lower orders. According to Lady Hardwicke, the rebels alleged that Newcastle and his brother, Henry Pelham, had fled to join the Jacobites and 'as ridiculous and false as these reports may seem, they gain'd an universal run, and were propagated with uncommon address'. Only when Newcastle showed himself to the crowd did such fears dissipate.⁴⁰ Such attitudes can be partly explained by the fact that there were few troops in England until late September and because many equated opposition towards the government with Jacobitism. As Newcastle wrote to the Duke of Cumberland, 'For, had not the reinforcement [ten battalions] providentially arrived, the day before the news of Sir John Cope's defeat [at Prestonpans] the confusion in the city of London would not have been to be described'.⁴¹

Attitudes changed, however, as action against the rebels began to be formulated and troops arrived. One T. Leonard Barrett of Bellhouse in Essex wrote in October 'We have been very much alarmed upon Cope's defeat, but now begin to recover our spirits again...in this time of danger, when it behoves everybody to be on their guard and to do their utmost to keep out Popery and Slavery'.⁴² On 4 October, Walpole could confidently write, 'The good people of England have at last rubbed their eyes and looked about them, a wonderful spirit is risen in all counties among all sorts of people'.⁴³ John Tucker, a Dorset MP, noted 'There seems to be a generall spirit all over the Nation to rise against this Pretender and I hope it will encrease to such a Degree as to frighten him back'.⁴⁴

When the Jacobites reached Derby on 4 December, there was a mixture of consternation and steadfastness among Londoners. Hardwicke feared that a strong body of regular troops was needed to defend the capital 'to procure some Quiet to the Minds of the people here and prevent that prodigious harm and confusion, which otherwise would distract this capital and affect all commerce and credit'.⁴⁵ Joseph Yorke, wrote 'The motion of the rebels to Derby threw us into no small panic here'.⁴⁶ On 14 December, Tucker reflected 'this good city was in the utmost consternation from the apprehension of the arrival of the Highland army'.⁴⁷ Walpole's assessment was mixed, observing that the rebels put 'the town

into great consternation', but he added 'in London the aversion to them is amazing'.⁴⁸ Sir More Molyneux of Losley, Surrey, expressed his thoughts in a letter to Richard Wyatt of Cheam on 9 December:

I cant say yt I am so afraid at this critical time as a great many are, for I go upon ye reason of things, & I cant see, morally speaking, how the rebels can get to London, as the King's and the Duke's troops are situated. Without fighting & then we have great reason to think they will be beat...tis plain they won't stand a battle, till they are forc'd wch I hope will be soon.⁴⁹

Tucker was also confident:

There are very strange notions prevail of their reaching even the capital without opposition. This is only the pure effect of panic and want of judgement for the knowing pretend today they must inevitably fall before our two armys that have in a manner hemmed them in between them. We expect hourly to hear of an action between them and the Duke if they stand, pray God they may.⁵⁰

When the Jacobites retreated from Derby, new fears arose, because of the possibility of a French invasion. According to Pelham 'the apprehensions the King is under from a new embarkation said to be carrying on at Dunkirk; and I can assure you giving perpetual alarms to His Majesty's faithful subjects'.⁵¹ Yet the invasion never occurred, and as time passed, fears subsided. Walpole wrote at the end of December 'I can't believe they will attempt to come hither'.⁵² By 11 January, the Earl of Chesterfield was so confident that he thought 'As for the French invasion, I own I have as little apprehension of one'.⁵³

The government took steps to deal with both of these dangers. The Duke of Richmond wrote to Newcastle on 5 December, suggesting that 'a camp to be formed immediately upon Barnet or Finchley Common or somewhere thereabouts and immediately else you will be too late'.⁵⁴ However, Newcastle (like Molyneux and Tucker) was confident that Cumberland would stop the rebels before they reached the capital. This might have proved a very optimistic assessment as it seems very unlikely that the slower moving regulars could have out marched the Jacobites.⁵⁵ Forces were mustered at or near Finchley Common, mostly regular troops; the Guards, perhaps eight battalions of Foot, possibly six regiments of cavalry and 33 guns, led by George II in person. This contradicts Johnstone's remark that the King was ready to flee; after all, as recently as 1743, the King had led his troops at Dettingen. The only county contribution to this force was two battalions of trained bands.⁵⁶ The King's behaviour during the crisis probably helped calm nerves; when worried ministers approached him, he famously remarked. 'Pho!

Don't talk to me of that stuff!⁵⁷

In addition to the advance from Scotland, there was also the threat of a French invasion. On 10 December, there was a rumour that a force of 10-12,000 French was to arrive in Kent. Although 400 volunteers rushed to man the defences at Dover, most of the forces that were expected to deal with this were the regulars, on land and sea: 7000 Foot and 2500 Horse were sent to the coastal counties of Essex, Suffolk, Kent and Sussex. Admiral Vernon commanded a naval force in the Channel. Fortunately, these forces were not put to the test, since they were scattered and, even combined, would have faced a numerically stronger army.⁵⁸

Although there was an immediate attempt to counter the threat posed to the capital by the Scottish advance and threat from France, the efforts undertaken by the authorities in the counties around London to stem the Jacobite threat have largely been overlooked and will be the focus for the remainder of this article. On 5 September, the Privy Council ordered the lords lieutenants to implement the recusancy laws, which stated that Catholics must make various oaths and if they refused, might have their property searched, with the risk of having their weaponry and horses confiscated, and their movements restricted.⁵⁹ In Kent and Middlesex there were orders passed by the JPs for such laws to be enforced. Within the Hundred of Blackheath, a nil return of Catholics was initially made. The constables of one of the parishes within the Hundred, Lewisham, claimed ten shillings in expenses for searching for Catholics. Yet the JPs urged the constables of the parishes within the Hundred to make further searches, and ordered more in December, too.⁶⁰ Earl Cowper, Lord Lieutenant of Hertfordshire, received his instructions on 11 September and sent copies to the county's JPs and deputy lieutenants.⁶¹ However, there is little evidence to show whether they were implemented in Hertfordshire, Essex or Surrey, although several priests were arrested in the latter county. But Arthur Onslow, Lord Lieutenant of Surrey certainly did send out instructions to those beneath him – such a letter was kept by Molyneux.⁶²

Although the Lieutenants and JPs were appointed centrally, their work was largely their own business. One of the first, and the easiest, measures taken was the formulation and despatch of loyal addresses to the court, which were usually initiated by the lord lieutenant of the county or the mayor in the case of a corporation. From the middle of September to the middle of October, loyal addresses were sent from Essex, Middlesex and Kent either on behalf of the county or corporations.⁶³ These addresses were very similar in their aim and character,

being intended to reassure the court of the loyalty to the King of that a particular county or corporation. That of Middlesex was one of the first, dating from 12 September and told of the county's appreciation of the blessings of George II's rule, and stated their resolve against popery and superstition which this attempt to overthrow the status quo in church and state was said to be eager to impose.⁶⁴

Spearheaded by the lords lieutenant, loyal associations were formed in Middlesex, Surrey, Essex and Hertfordshire in October. These were to orchestrate a show of support for the government by raising voluntary subscriptions in order to help recruit men for the government's defence. Subscribers would be asked to promise a certain sum and pay in instalments as required. However, one major difference between these associations and those founded in the north of England, was that apart, from Surrey, they were intended for encouraging men to enlist in the regular forces. Since the conflict would be fought by the regulars, the numbers of the latter should be augmented, rather than the creation of purely local forces which might not be able to fight effectively.

The associations were initiated relatively quickly, mainly throughout October, but there was considerable variation as to when they actually began to function. In Surrey, Arthur Onslow was relatively quick in trying to raise men, beginning at the end of September, according to the press. On 4 October, there had been a meeting of 500 of the county's inhabitants at Kingston Town Hall, where Onslow opened the subscriptions' list.⁶⁵ Essex's association, organised by Fitzwalter, was rather slower. Although there was a meeting at Chelmsford in early October of the gentry and clergy, who decided to enter into an association and to send a loyal address to the court, little more seems to have been done until the following month.⁶⁶ There were further discussions about a subscription to raise money to encourage enlistment into the regular army at meeting held at The Bedford Arms, Covent Garden. Several thousands of pounds was offered and another meeting, this time to be held at The Black Boy, Chelmsford, was arranged for 28 November, so the appointed committee could decide on how best to spend the funds raised.⁶⁷ Hertfordshire's Association was formed on 24 October and the Middlesex and Westminster Association was set up the next day.⁶⁸

Even when the associations were established, a committee appointed and all other preliminary administration had been dealt with, the actual raising of money took even longer. It was not until mid December that the Essex subscribers were asked to begin to make payments, and then, only an initial contribution of ten per cent of the amount promised was called for. The first call for the Surrey subscriptions was not until early February 1746.⁶⁹ Hertfordshire's committee was rather quicker – the first

tenth of the money subscribed was due by 9 November – rather more promptly than in the other associations.⁷⁰

Hertfordshire apart, this was very leisurely progress when compared to associations formed in the northern counties. In Yorkshire, the subscriptions were asked for as soon as they had been promised; some as early as 24 September, and a full quarter was demanded. Perhaps the counties in the south felt themselves to be in less danger and so there was no sense of urgency. Certainly money raised in February was coming in rather late in the campaign to be of any practical use, especially when it is considered that in Yorkshire, there were calls for disbanding of their association in January.

Subscriptions were collected in various ways, at least in Hertfordshire. Some were collected from those who attended the meetings to form associations. The wealthy of the county were approached and asked to subscribe, and there were also announcements made in church. The Rev. Crispin of St Michael's, St Albans referred to a messenger or collectors of the Land Tax who had called when he was absent and so subscribed by post as did others.⁷¹ Some, such as the Rev. John Rooke of Willian, not only gave money personally, but also offered to 'solicit for subscriptions amongst the substantial farmers in my own little parish'.⁷² Pamphlets were distributed 'among ye inferior sort of people', too.⁷³ In Essex the collection appears to have been, in contrast, rather reactive with sums payable to either Messrs. Honeywood and Fuller, bankers of Lombard Street or to any of the ten county treasurers.⁷⁴

Kent did not form an association until November, when its Lord Lieutenant, the Marquis of Rockingham, called a meeting of the county elite at Maidstone to discuss the county's defence. Although a resolution was passed to raise and maintain 2000 men, little happened apart from the signing of the loyal association at Pain's Coffee house.⁷⁵ Rockingham's probable ill health preceding his death in early 1746 caused delays and the call for the militia to be summoned meant that they never would be. In any case, by early December, there were summonses for the county militia and the association seems to have been forgotten.

The subscriptions raised in Essex, Surrey, Middlesex and Hertfordshire aimed to encourage enlistment in the regular army (usually an unpopular as well as a dangerous profession). Adverts appeared in the press to attract volunteers, although it was probably more likely that gentlemen reading the adverts found men they thought were suitable. Certainly this was the case in Hertfordshire, where gentlemen wrote to say they were sending one or more men. Those men wanting to enlist received certain privileges compared to most regular soldiers, and this

seems to have encouraged a rather better class of man to enlist. They were given £4 bounty each on enlistment and only served for six months or until the rebellion was over (service in the regulars was usually for life). Their daily pay was a shilling, compared to sixpence a day for a regular infantryman. They were also told that they would not be called upon to leave the country. However, Essex men wishing to enlist were not called upon to do so until early January, joining up at either The Black Boy in Chelmsford or at other market towns, where JPs would be on hand to receive them.⁷⁶

It is unclear whether these associations encouraged large numbers of men to enlist in the army. Both the Surrey and Hertfordshire associations claimed they planned to raise 1000 men each, but these figures do not seem to have been realised. No numbers are recorded for Middlesex, Surrey or Essex, and in Hertfordshire, only 93 men were enlisted into several different units.⁷⁷ They were mainly craftsmen and labourers. As one of them remarked in May 1746 'most of us left good trades to go and fight if occasioned for King and Country'. They were not, then, the type of men who usually enlisted.⁷⁸ The determination and quality of the men enlisting was variable. Harry Blount, a gentleman, knew of two men who were to enlist, but changed their minds, though another man who he later sent to join up was 'willing to enlist and offered himself to me this day'.⁷⁹ Alexander Drury wrote that one Enoch Long deserted, but the other eight men he sent, 'behave extremely well and I believe may be depended upon'. Some volunteers were refused; one on account of his age, another because he was an Irishman.⁸⁰

The associations did indicate political support for the government at this time of crisis and is evidenced by the large sums of money raised. In Hertfordshire, the subscriptions amounted to £10,194 15s, in Middlesex, £9616 17s and Essex, £8,539 4s, although Fitzwalter claimed it was really about £13,000. However, in Hertfordshire, there was a divergence between those who signed the loyal association and those who subscribed money. While 137 signed both, there were 36 who only signed the association and 267 that only subscribed. Perhaps this was because the association contained such strong language as 'We...do hereby solemnly promise that with our Bodies, Lives and Estates We and every one of us will stand by and assist each other in the Support and Defence of his Majesty's sacred Person and Government ...with force of Arms as well as other lawful Means'.⁸¹

Noblemen paid the most – Rockingham and Fitzwalter subscribing £500 each, Cowper, £200. At the bottom of the scale were those, like Charles Hurrell in Essex, who promised ten shillings and six pence. In Essex there were 269 subscribers, in Hertfordshire, 440 and in Middlesex,

127. These were largely, if not wholly, taken from the ranks of the county elite and from the middling people. There were 38 Hertfordshire and 16 Essex clergymen, though only eighteen women throughout the three counties.⁸² In some places these subscriptions were often communal affairs. The parish of Thaxted in Essex subscribed a total of £108 13s. Sixty two people promised money, of whom six were women. The list of subscribers was headed by Richard Hickford, gentleman, at £15 and under him was the Rev. James Allen, at £5 5s. All the other parishioners who promised money offered lower sums; some £3 or £4, but most between £1 and £2.⁸³

These subscription lists also provide a crude index of loyalty to the Hanoverian state. In Middlesex, Hugh Smithson, a Tory MP, subscribed £300, though the county's other Tory MP, Roger Newdigate, conspicuously did not. Of Hertfordshire's six MPs, five both subscribed and signed the loyal association, and of these, two were Tories; the sixth, an opposition Whig, did not subscribe. It is noteworthy that all four of the Tory MPs and the dissident Whig were regarded by the Jacobites as likely supporters of their cause. In Essex, Lord Waldegrave, a former Catholic and another alleged Jacobite, subscribed but only two of the county's eight MPs subscribed – Charles Grey and Samuel Savill – although their pledge of £50 each does not compare favourably with subscriptions of MPs elsewhere. Although Grey and Savill were both suspected of being Jacobites, the two county MPs, Sir Robert Abdy and Thomas Bramston who were believed to have been implicated in the plot of 1743 did not subscribe at all. More generally, of the 278 names on the Essex Association list, we know how 49 of them voted in the 1734 election, of these almost two thirds (31) voted against the government.⁸⁴ This would suggest that there was both Tory and Whig support for the regime in 1745.

Nonetheless not all of those who refused to subscribe were necessarily Jacobites. The Rev. Mark Hildesey, Vicar of Hitchin, complained that in Hertfordshire 'Our Quakers here, some of 'em very wealthy, and ... to my great amazement, have withstood the most pressing solicitations to join in or countenance the present undertaking. Strange return sure for the extraordinary lenity and protection of ye government they live under'.⁸⁵ This was probably because of the Quakers' difficulties with oath taking, not because of any disloyalty towards George II – the London Quakers gave generously towards comforts for the troops. The Rev. William Webster of Ware in the same county reported that 'Mr Lister the dissenting teacher, will joyn with me in the applications' to the parishioners for support for the association. Yet Webster reported resistance among some of them, 'Many of our Church folks had their

excuses, too'.⁸⁶ Some did not subscribe as much as they would have liked because 'the Poverty of the county is so great at present'.⁸⁷

In Hertfordshire, as has been seen the money raised was used to encourage enlistment in the regular army as well as to make bounty payments to the recruits. Due to the lack of surviving accounts it is not possible to identify how the money was disbursed in other counties where subscriptions were taken. Furthermore the formation of these associations and the subscriptions was largely confined to those loyal to the government. Although some money was allegedly collected illegally by a Jacobite meeting in London, there were no known equivalent Jacobite associations formed.

Early in 1746, although in Essex and Surrey subscriptions were only starting to be collected, in Hertfordshire, the committee were already looking forwards to their dissolution. At their meeting on 24 January at The Glove and Dolphin in Hertford, they decided to call a general meeting of all subscribers who cared to attend, to inspect the accounts on 15 February, in order to help decide how to dispose of the remaining funds. Presumably with the rebellion very definitely on the defensive, it was thought by those in England that their money was no longer needed. The Yorkshire association was also being disbanded in February. Yet the money was only disposed of in Hertfordshire in August 1746.⁸⁸

The formation of associations and subscriptions were not the only means used to deal with the threat posed by the Jacobite threat. Magistrates were also fully occupied in organising searches of suspect (usually Catholic) properties. They were planned and executed with great care and attention to the law. Following an instruction on 30 September to search Lord Dillon's house, Highwood Hill House, near Barnet, the two JPs applied to Lord Harrington, one of the Secretaries of State, for the proper order, then they and two special constables went to Barnet. While the magistrates prepared the search warrants that evening, the constables were sent to reconnoitre the house. Next day, the search took place. According to Thomas Du Veil, one of the two JPs 'The search lasted upwards of three hours and a barn of 100 feet long with a great quantity of hay in it was almost emptied out of it in search of arms, but none was found, tho' the whole house from garrett to cellar was strictly examined besides the said barn and the other out houses'.⁸⁹

Elsewhere, the gentlemen of the commission of the peace in Surrey had to partly break into Lady Petre's Cheam house and spent four hours searching it.⁹⁰ When Fitzwalter was told by Newcastle to execute a search of Thorndon Hall, he did so with great speed. However, he took precautions, sending deputy lieutenants with militia officers and having care to

have twenty foot guards on hand.⁹¹ The magistrates seemed especially vigilant in London. There were searches in October and on several other occasions until January 1746.⁹²

The results were generally meagre, although arms and horses were seized from some suspects. Lady Petre's house at Cheam yielded two pairs of pistols, three horses and Morgan Hansby, alias Joseph Morgan, a suspected priest. Hansby was taken to Croydon, where he refused to take the oaths and admitted to being a Catholic but denied being a priest.⁹³ One Gaghan, a Catholic of Southwark, refused to take the oaths as required before the JPs, so had his ten horses confiscated. Edward Donally and James Crane were two Catholic priests committed to gaols in Surrey in early 1746. Whereas Donally was accused of saying mass, Crane's offence was even more serious – he was found with commissions to enlist men into the Pretender's service.⁹⁴ Priests were also arrested in London, in December 1745 and January 1746.⁹⁵ Du Veil and Edward Ashe seized weapons from property in Marylebone parish in October 1745.⁹⁶ Similar searches of Catholic property had been undertaken in the north of England. In Yorkshire, Viscount Irwin, the Lord Lieutenant of the East riding, was zealous in prompting such searches. Lord Fairfax's house at Gilling was searched, as was that of Sir Marmaduke Constable, and that twice. Nothing was found on any of these occasions. In the north riding, Roger Strickland's house was searched, but again, nothing suspicious was located.⁹⁷

The officials in the southern counties were also expected to take on a defensive role, particularly as a result of the invasion scares in December. Newcastle instructed the lieutenancy of the coastal counties in the south east of England to be especially vigilant on 13 December. They were told to have their deputies ensure that the coasts were watched and any relevant information forwarded post haste to London. If the French did land, countrymen were to stop their being supplied with provisions.⁹⁸

Fitzwalter obeyed the order promptly and 'immediately sent proper Directions to my deputy lieutenants, but more especially to those who live nearest to the...coasts.' One of his best men was sent to Rochford as this was most exposed.⁹⁹ Reports from Essex show that his lieutenants were particularly active in response to this threat. At Burnham, 'everybody employed in the King's service is watchful and diligent'. Charles and John Coe watched the mouth of the river for any enemy activity.¹⁰⁰ William Gooch at Creeksea sent news of the French fleets which he had received from a Dutchman.¹⁰¹ Customs men and their employees watched the coasts, as did the men of Rochford. Apparently 500 clergymen, gentlemen, freeholders and farmers in the Hundred met and were 'extremely zealous to serve His Majesty with their lives and

fortunes'. If there was an invasion, they would clear the county of their horses and do 'all other things as they shall have opportunity, in order to distress them'.¹⁰² On 17 December, Fitzwalter boasted, 'There being many people ordered by me to watch and keep a good look out upon the coasts of the county'.¹⁰³ However, in December, the only cause for suspicion was the landing of some Frenchmen from a Dutch vessel. Apparently they had come ashore to buy oysters, but none were reported as being sold.¹⁰⁴ Fitzwalter had three French sailors found near Burnham River committed to Chelmsford Gaol.¹⁰⁵

The vestry of West Thoreck, Essex, received orders from three deputy lieutenants, transmitted through the High Constable, that they should 'keep a Watch Day and Night upon suspicion of an Invasion'. On 27 December, they met and agreed to this measure. They also noted their loyalty 'God preserve his Majesty King George the Duke of Cumberland and all the Royal Family'.¹⁰⁶ As Fitzwalter was aware such vigilance was costly and he asked Newcastle to let him know as soon as the emergency was over so 'that every man may return to his usual business and further expense avoided than what is necessary'.¹⁰⁷ Yet the need for security continued into early January.

The county militia provided a further line of defence and was distinct from the attempts made by the local associations to encourage the enlistment of regulars. Orders were given on 5 December for the counties to summon the militia into being.¹⁰⁸ The results were patchy and no attempt was ever made to raise the militia in Surrey and Hertfordshire. In early December, there was a call for the Essex Militia to meet the invasion threat.¹⁰⁹ It was reported that, 'Upon Rumour of an intended invasion from France, the Labouring people of Essex have begun to arm themselves by fixing their scythes strait on staves about four feet long'.¹¹⁰ Plans were made to summon the militia if an invasion occurred. The people were said to be willing to help if they had gentlemen who would countenance their actions.¹¹¹ On 26 December, 150 chests of arms were sent to Kent and Sussex to arm the inhabitants. Yet it was not until as late as 31 January, that weapons were being sent to Essex, Norfolk and Suffolk.¹¹²

Forces were raised in Kent because there was news that the French were planning to invade there. The deputy lieutenants sent out directions for all those chargeable to the militia to provide men, arms and horses in order to form such a force. A total of 1300 men gathered at Swinfield Minnis, 900 of whom were cavalry. They were armed with swords, guns, pistols and blunderbusses, the Foot's arms were more makeshift. Some had muskets and bayonets; others had fowling pieces, cutlasses and pitchforks. According to the press:

The Readiness and Alarcity which were shewn upon this great occasion cannot be sufficiently commended, or described. All parties and Denominations of Men emulating and vying with each other, who should be first upon the spot, and distinguish themselves the most upon that day.

Volunteers from Canterbury also joined the county forces on this occasion. The men did not stay at arms for long being dispersed by the weather. But they were allegedly ready to reassemble once invasion alarms began to ring. At the end of the year they gathered together again, though in greater numbers; 8000 men, both Foot and Horse met at Barham Downs, but the constables had been unable to arm them all.¹¹³

Less successful was the Middlesex militia. Orders were given for their formation in December, but there were doubts that this would be sufficient for the defence of the capital because the deputy lieutenants thought that 'as subscriptions of money have been made in all parishes for inlisting men in His Majesty's Land Forces', there would be little enthusiasm for further expense. It is also likely that since the rebels were retreating, there seemed little reason for effort against a non-existent danger.¹¹⁴

It was not only the county officials and elites that attempted to counter the invasion threat in 1745. The Anglican Church also helped to buttress the status quo, with the Archbishop of Canterbury, John Potter, setting the tone in a letter to his clergy, written on 9 September:

You are heartily desir'd and admonished, agreeably to your known duty, by your Example, by your Exhortations, as well private as public, and by all other Means in your power, to excite the people under your care to exert, on this most important occasion, their utmost zeal for the Preservation of our happy constitution in state and church.

This was published in *The General Advertiser*, as was a similar message, twelve days later, by the Bishop of Rochester.¹¹⁵ Many clergymen responded to this call, such as the Rev. John Thomas, LLD, Vicar of Bletchingley, Surrey, who explained his reasons for doing so.

The following discourse...was drawn up in obedience to those excellent instructions of the Lord Bishop of this Diocese to his Clergy, which were read to you in the Church; and it is now published as well at the request of such as heard it from the pulpit, as for the perusal of those, who by some occasion or other, were hindered from attending.

Thomas hoped that the publication of his sermon would promote piety and loyalty, and that it might help promote the county Association.¹¹⁶

Many of the sermons pursued similar themes, the ones dating from the

onset of the rebellion spoke positively of the virtues of George II and the blessings of his reign. They emphasised the virtues of the status quo, and of its personification in the person of George II. Thomas Wingfield, lecturer at St. Thomas', Southwark remarked that the King stood for liberty and civil and religious rights against the prospect of Popery.¹¹⁷ Nathaniel Ball, curate of Chelmsford made reference to 'our undoubted, rightful sovereign, King George, to whom we ought to shew the most faithful allegiance'. He also likened Britain to Israel, on whom the Lord's bounty had been scattered.¹¹⁸ But preachers also drew attention to the possible outcome of the rebellion, namely the forcible reintroduction of Popery, the loss of liberty and property. Prejudice against the Scots, the Catholics and the French were also encouraged. Some sermons likened Britain's struggle to that of Israel, God's chosen people, against Assyria.

Benjamin Mills preached at Uxbridge on 29 October and was one of many to employ the shibboleth of Catholicism as a threat to liberty. He claimed that the 'Spirit of Popery' meant blind submission, slavery, despotism and a corrupt clergy.¹¹⁹ William Webster's sermon at Ware, Hertfordshire, was intended to 'excite a just Abhorrence of Popery'. As with Mills, he claimed that popery was opposed to both civil and religious liberty.¹²⁰ Thomas Anguish, Rector of St. Nicholas' Deptford, claimed Popery would 'drench our streets in blood'.¹²¹ More subtle was the Rev Dubordieu who preached at Layton, Essex, arguing that Catholics and nonjurors were not on the whole molested in their worship and therefore should not support the rebels. He also argued that Catholicism led to arbitrary rule, violence and foreign councils.¹²² The rule of Catholic monarchs James II and Queen Mary were recalled with horror by several preachers, including Nathaniel Ball, and Samuel Pegge, vicar of Godmersham.¹²³ The rebels and their supporters were attacked. James Bate of St. Paul's Deptford stated 'the Nation is invaded by a desperate Band of hungry popish vagabonds and Cut throats...by the help of France and Spain'. He added that horrors were in the offing because of the 'craving demands of the Pope and the French...the gaping mouths of his hungry and naked Fiends of the north'.¹²⁴

Other clergymen berated their congregations; Richard Coleire for example, called for fasting and prayer in order to plead for God's mercy to a sinful people.¹²⁵ Thomas Delafaye preached at Queensborough to urge his congregation into moral improvement, for only such sorrow and contrition could lead to God's forgiveness and thus victory over the rebels.¹²⁶ Others called for unity among Protestants in the face of their enemies, as did Thomas at the close of his sermon.¹²⁷ Likewise, Thomas Wingfield, told his listeners that this was not a case of 'Preaching up of Politicks and Party Matters'.¹²⁸

Some ministers went even further than sermonising and helped the official forces. In Hertfordshire, clergy passed on information about men they thought to be suspect. The Rev. Rowland Johnson, Vicar of Hemel Hempstead remarked, 'I should be deemed remiss in the Discharge of my Duty as a magistrate or as a good Subject of His Majesty King George, if I did not, in this time of Danger, make known to my superiors every species of Treason or Disaffection which came within my cognizance'.¹²⁹

With the rebellion defeated in 1746, clergymen preached another salvo of sermons pertaining to current affairs, which principally, praised the Duke of Cumberland and the King, and called for both thanks and for a reformation of manners. Repentance was the major theme; John Milner of Peckham, recalled that the rebellion had been a great danger, and divine assistance had been called for, and despite men's sins, had been granted, though mercy had been delayed – the defeat at Prestonpans being evidence of this. 'The hand of God was too visible in this affair to be overlooked'.¹³⁰ Robert Finch, preaching at Greenwich on 4 May 1746, said that, as God had been the cause of their great deliverance, it was men's duty to offer thanks and praise. But he also spoke of the need for them to mend their ways, 'The integrity of our future conduct is the only test of sincere gratitude and unfeigned praise'.¹³¹ Further indulgence in the vices of luxury, pride and profaneness must cease, according to Milner.¹³²

There was also an emphasis was upon the King and the Duke, though the need for repentance was not overlooked. Wingfield praised George II, 'possess'd of all the Royal virtues that can adorn a Crown, the Father and Protector of his people, the Friend of liberty and a lover of our constitution'.¹³³ Ball saw God's hand in the victory of the rebels. Cumberland was seen as the tool of the Almighty. 'But no sooner did he appear at the head of His Majesty's forces, then his very presence struck the Enemy with terror'.¹³⁴

Traditionally the churches rang their bells on loyalist occasions, such as on the anniversary of the King's birthday, 11 October, his coronation (30 October), and on the red letter day for Protestants for their two fold delivery from popery, 5 November. The bells of St. Mary's Acton, St. Mary's Harrow and St. George's, Hanworth all rang on these three occasions. In the following year, bells rang again to mark victory over the rebels of the Forty Five. St. John the Baptist's, Pinner, rang bells on 14 May, presumably to celebrate Cumberland's victory at Culloden four weeks previously. The bells of St. Nicholas' Deptford rang on every conceivable occasion including Cumberland's birthday and on 'receiving the joyfull News of the Duke of Cumberland's overcoming the Rebels'. Chelmsford's bells rang for Cumberland's visit on 26 July 1746.¹³⁵

Besides the Church there was also support in the southern counties from the merchants during the crisis of 1745-46. One commentator noted 'the city is giving great marks of their zeal and loyalty'.¹³⁶ An address of loyalty was conveyed to the King on 11 September by merchants in 160 coaches.¹³⁷ On 26 September, a number of merchants met at Garraway's coffee house to discuss how they might support public credit. They decided that they would not refuse bank notes in payment. At least 1,140 merchants signed up to this scheme. This resulted in stopping the run of creditors on the Bank of England, where the directors had made payments in silver, not gold, in order to delay the running down of specie (historians who have taken Johnstone at his word have therefore been mistaken in thinking the run on the Bank was in early December).¹³⁸ Hardwicke strongly approved, 'Your Grace sees by the printed papers what has been done by the merchants of London to support the Bank and thereby public credit. It is a step that never was taken before, and has had a prodigious effect to stop the run which was begun'.¹³⁹ Later in the year, a great subscription was raised at the Guildhall to buy comforts for the troops, mostly warm clothing for the forthcoming winter campaign.¹⁴⁰ Walpole also noted 'The merchants are very zealous and are opening a great subscription for raising troops'.¹⁴¹ In all, £18,435 was contributed. However, the rebellion did affect financial stability. Tucker observed, just after the news of Prestonpan's had reached the capital 'publick credit is greatly affected, the stocks sink and some people seem to be much dejected'.¹⁴² Yet there was no collapse of financial confidence.

Humbler bodies also declared their aim to raise money and men for the defence of the capital. Tower Hamlets raised £3000 and Hackney £1500. A subscription was begun at Camberwell and Peckham to maintain 200 armed and uniformed men, paying them one shilling each per day.¹⁴³ A subscription at Rotherhithe promised £1240. Stoke Newington subscribed £700 and the parishes of Tottenham, Edmonton and Enfield almost as much.¹⁴⁴ At Southwark, it was envisaged that 150 grenadiers would be raised for service against the rebellion and a subscription was opened to encourage men to enlist.¹⁴⁵ Sir Abraham Shard raised, clothed and armed fifty men in Southwark, for a period of six months and when Colonel Sowle's forces marched through Southwark in early November, 100 men joined.¹⁴⁶ There were also the six regiments of trained bands, perhaps the least inefficient of these irregular formations. There was also an association of Billingsgate porters, volunteer companies in the City and Westminster, the Tower Hamlets Militia, regiments of lawyers, weavers and actors. Others enlisted in the regulars – 300 from St. Martin's were alleged to have done so. There was

some training provided by the Chelsea pensioners.¹⁴⁷

In particular there were keen efforts taken by ordinary people to defend the capital from the threat of Scottish advance and possible French invasion. James Henshaw claimed 'nine men in ten were resolved to expose themselves to all hazards in opposition to him [the Pretender]'. Newcastle also wrote that 'a considerable number' were eager to serve against the rebels'.¹⁴⁸ How efficient these forces would have been is certainly questionable. The weavers who volunteered were not even armed until 10 December, so could scarcely be proficient in the use of these weapons. Yet the volunteers may have been of use alongside regular troops. They also helped patrol the streets of London. Perhaps their true significance was that they showed that loyalty in London was an important political force, that it far outweighed any Jacobitism there, and that it demonstrated that apathy and panic did not rule.¹⁴⁹ During the moment of greatest crisis, 6 December, Newcastle (again, contrary to Johnstone) instructed Henry Marshall, Lord Mayor of London, to be 'very vigilant in preventing, or suppressing any Disorders or Tumults; and so seize any persons that may be assembled together, in a riotous manner'.¹⁵⁰ Marshall certainly seems to have obeyed Newcastle's orders, for on 7 December there were a number of instructions noted. The Trained Bands were to patrol and guard the city squares and avenues by night as well as by day. Alarm posts were to be placed at strategic points in the suburbs. Entrances to the city were to be obstructed, a return of horses was to be made and marshals were to ensure that the constables obeyed their orders. Signals at the Tower were planned to summon the Trained Bands and Guards to any danger point.¹⁵¹

Some forces were formed in Kent independently of the county lieutenancy, though they all seem to be very geographically limited in their remits. Sir Gregory Page of Blackheath mustered 500 men on the Heath, armed and uniformed, in early October, and planned to augment them to 1,500.¹⁵² The corporation of Feversham formed a militia.¹⁵³ The dockyard workers at Deptford and elsewhere were formed into companies for the security and defence of the ship building yards.¹⁵⁴

The King's birthday provided an opportunity for some to demonstrate their loyalty and support for the crown at this time of crisis. Feversham's mayor and corporation, together with the newly formed militia, celebrated the anniversary and all the town had their windows lit up on the occasion.¹⁵⁵ On the same day 'Being His Majesty's Birthday was observed with extraordinary signs of loyalty throughout the city and suburbs'. Like celebrations occurred in Dover on 5 November.¹⁵⁶ An ode appeared in the press on Kent and Liberty, including lines such as, 'Long life to King George! Great Friend of Liberty/ In thy defence, we, to a

man, will dye'.¹⁵⁷ There was a pope burning ceremony in Deptford on the King's birthday (and another in Tunbridge Wells on 5 November), which stirred up anti-Scots, anti-French and anti-Catholic feelings. Music, fireworks and a rendition of God save the King ended the procession.¹⁵⁸ All these events were published in *The Kentish Post* to give them maximum publicity. There was similar loyalist activity in London; an effigy of the Pretender on a gibbet was marched through the city by butchers to the accompaniment of mock music and at the other end of the social scale there were celebrations in St. James' Park on 5 November attended by nobles and gentry, headed by Newcastle and Pelham. Finally, the first public performance of the National anthem was heard in Drury Lane only a few days after the news of Prestonpans.¹⁵⁹

It is always difficult to know what the common people felt. Yet some of them were certainly eager to collaborate with the authorities against local Jacobites in London. Victuallers, soldiers, tailors, women and others accused others of Jacobite oaths before magistrates. Some men, led by a Catholic gentleman, tracked down Catholic priests. There was certainly a degree of anti-Jacobitism among them, especially when we remember that these people were not paid to spy on others and not all were employees of the state.¹⁶⁰

The news of the defeat of the rebel forces at the battle of Culloden prompted widespread celebrations in southern counties. One of the first took place on 24 April.

Yesterday at noon the guns were fired in the park and at the Tower, on account of the Defeat of the Rebels, immediately after the Bells began to ring; at night there were more illuminations, and greater rejoicings, throughout the cities of London and Westminster and the Borough of Southwark, than has been known in the memory of man.

When the Duke of Cumberland returned, he was presented with the Freedom of the City in a gold box.¹⁶¹ Besides the ringing of bells there were other celebrations marking the victory outside London. Anne Papillion of Lee, Kent, wrote to her brother on 8 May to describe local activity, 'there is very little News here but what relates to ye Dukes Victory we had no Bonfire here but we lighted up our Windows and the soldiers yt were Quarter'd here and some other people came about for something to Drink ye Dukes Health and fired at every door'.¹⁶²

This clear enthusiasm and outpouring of loyalty in 1745-46, was in marked contrast to the events of 1715, when an earlier rebellion had threatened the throne of George I and there had been Jacobite demonstrations on the streets of London. The passage of time probably worked in favour of the status quo as the Hanoverian dynasty had become more

entrenched and the Catholic Stuarts seemed a distant memory. The fact that Britain was at war with France (the War of the Austrian Succession which lasted until 1748) may also have bolstered popular loyalty. The Scottish character of Jacobitism and the anti-Catholicism, encouraged by press and pulpit, may also have played its part in making the movement unpopular. Finally England was in a more stable financial and economic situation in 1745 than in 1715, with higher real wages.

The Jacobite rebellion of 1745 therefore did have an impact on the Home Counties, for while there were some local Jacobite supporters, there was also a concerted effort made by the authorities in the southern counties to anticipate and provide a defence against the very real danger of an invasion. The southern counties also made a concerted attempt to demonstrate their own loyalty towards the status quo at this time of crisis. The lieutenancy raised money and men to swell the ranks of the armed forces, and took steps to defend the coast. They sent pledges of allegiance to the King, as well as taking steps against those who were regarded as suspect, such as arresting the speakers of seditious words and searching certain properties. The Church preached sermons and then published many in order to inculcate the loyalty of their congregations. Elsewhere, individuals and corporations raised forces and demonstrated their loyalty in other ways, especially in the celebration of loyalist anniversaries.

How effective was all this? Militarily and practically it was limited. Few men were raised for service in the army and in many cases the money for such activities did not appear until after the main threats had diminished. The Kent Association was only half born. Makeshift and badly armed militia forces could hardly have held up seasoned French troops up for long. The reasons for the failure of the Forty Five were not the result of the efforts of the county authorities, but rather with the regular forces at the command of central government. What happened in the southern counties belonged to another orbit. Their contribution was to subdue any local Jacobites and to promote loyalty within their jurisdictions. This they managed to accomplish. Local uprisings might have diverted regular troops and, more importantly, given encouragement to the Jacobites and their allies across the Channel. It should be remembered that the French would not invade without open support in England and that one reason for the retreat from Derby was that the support in England, promised by the Pretender, never materialised. It also gave moral encouragement to the government, showing that they did command local support where they expected it, and this included support from some Tories as well as Whigs. Men were prepared to show their allegiance at a time when the outcome of the rebellion was

uncertain. Jacobitism in the Home Counties in 1745 was a relatively weak force.

Responses in and around London were more complex than have often been assumed. There was a measure of panic, there was some support for the rebellion; but there were also many, from the King and Newcastle downwards, who were ready to resist in a variety of ways. The study of England in the Forty Five does traditionally tend to concentrate on the Jacobites themselves, not on the larger number of loyalists. Yet to exclude the latter from the equation as being militarily limited, is to take a dangerously one sided view of the whole affair. Had Jacobitism or apathy been the rule, the rebels would have been greatly encouraged and probably emboldened enough to have marched from Derby to London.

- 1 P.K. Monod, *Jacobitism and the English people, 1688-1788*, (Cambridge, 1989); E. Cruickshanks, *Political Untouchables: the Tories and the '45*, (London, 1979), pp.42-3.
- 2 J. Ray, *A Compleat History of the Rebellion*, (Manchester, 1749); J. Marchant, *History of the Present Rebellion*, (London, 1746), p.237; R. Whitworth, *William Augustus: Duke of Cumberland*, (London, 1993); F.J. McLynn, *The Jacobite Army in England: The Final Campaign*, (Edinburgh, 1998); J. Roberts, *The Jacobite Wars*, (Edinburgh, 2002); C. Duffy, *The '45*, (London, 2003).
- 3 *The Victoria History of the County of Middlesex*, edited by J.S. Cockburn, H.P.F. King and K.G.T. McDonnell, (London, 1911-), II, p. 54; C. Radcliffe, *Middlesex*, (London, 1954), p. 33; F.M. Page, *The History of Hertford*, (Hertford, 1993), p. 119; K. Neale, *Essex in History*, (Chichester, 1997), pp. 117-18
- 4 A.A. Mitchell, 'London and the Forty Five', *History Today*, 15 (1965), 719-26; N. Rogers, 'Popular Disaffection in London during the Forty Five', *London Journal*, 1 (1975), 5-27; N. Rogers, 'Resistance to Oligarchy: The City opposition to Walpole and his successors, 1725-1747' in J. Stevenson, (ed.), *London in the Age of Reform*, (Oxford, 1977), pp. 1-29; J.D. Oates, 'Responses to the Jacobite rebellion of 1745 in Deptford and Lewisham', *Archaeologia Cantiana*, 120 (2000), 277-96.
- 5 I.R. Christie, 'The Tory Party, Jacobitism and the '45: A Note', *Historical Journal*, 30 (1987), 922-5; Cruickshanks, *Political Untouchables*, pp.127-35.
- 6 Rogers, 'Resistance to Oligarchy', p. 19; McLynn, *Jacobite Army*, p. 131.
- 7 Rogers, 'Resistance to Oligarchy', pp. 5-9.
- 8 Mitchell, 'London and the Forty Five', 725.
- 9 Rogers, 'Resistance to Oligarchy', p.5-6.
- 10 *The Chevalier de Johnstone: A Memoir of the Forty Five*, edited by B. Rawson, (London, 1958), pp. 62-3.
- 11 The National Archives (hereafter TNA), State Papers (hereafter SP) 44/132, p. 427.
- 12 *The Life and Correspondence of Philip Yorke, Earl of Hardwicke*, edited by P.C. Yorke, (3 vols, Cambridge, 1913), I, p. 451.

- 13 Ibid, p.460.
- 14 Ibid, p.463.
- 15 *The Gentleman's Magazine*, 16 (1746), 438
- 16 TNA, SP36/86, f. 174.
- 17 Ibid., f. 185.
- 18 Yorke, *Hardwicke*, I, p. 460.
- 19 *Penny London Post*, 379 (30 September – 2 October 1745).
- 20 *The London Evening Post*, 2830 (24-26 December 1745).
- 21 TNA, SP36/74, ff. 137-8v.
- 22 Hertfordshire Record Office (hereafter HRO), D/EP F266, Johnson to Cowper, 7 Oct. 1745; TNA, SP36/73, f. 305v.
- 23 TNA, SP36/69, f. 217; SP36/79, f. 120.
- 24 Ibid., SP36/70, f. 329.
- 25 J.D. Oates, 'The Responses in North East England to the Jacobite Rebellions of 1715 and 1745', unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Reading, 2001, pp. 470, 483.
- 26 *Chevalier de Johnstone*, p. 62
- 27 Rogers, 'Resistance to Oligarchy', p. 12; Leeds Archives, LC/QS1/7, pp. 339-50.
- 28 TNA, SP44/133, p. 431; *The General Advertiser*, 3452 (9 November 1745); *The London Evening Post*, 2823 (7-10 December 1745).
- 29 TNA, ASS194/732-3; SP36/73, ff. 125-6, 404; SP36/83, ff. 30r, 34; SP44/134, p. 125; HRO, QSB10, p. 202; *The Kentish Post*, 2915 (12-16 October 1745), 2917 (19-23 October 1745), 2947 (28 December 1745 – 1 January 1746).
- 30 TNA, SP36/83, ff. 30, 34, 200-201.
- 31 *The Flying Post*, 3651 (28-30 May 1715).
- 32 TNA, SP36/73, ff. 125-6; HRO, D/EP F244 Smallcross – Cowper, 29 October 1745; London Metropolitan Archives (hereafter LMA), MJ/CP/P/101-102.
- 33 F.J. McLynn, *Bonnie Prince Charlie*, (Oxford, 1991), p.192.
- 34 *Chevalier de Johnstone*, p. 62.
- 35 Ibid, p. 63.
- 36 Rogers, 'Resistance to Oligarchy', pp. 22-5.
- 37 British Library (hereafter BL), Additional Manuscripts, 35598, f. 38.
- 38 *Correspondence of Horace Walpole*, edited by W.S. Lewis (New Haven, Conn., 1937-), XIX, p.101.
- 39 Ibid, XXX, p. 94.
- 40 Yorke, *Hardwicke*, p.461.
- 41 BL, Additional MSS, 32705, f. 401.
- 42 *An Eighteenth Century Correspondence*, edited by L. Dickins and M. Stanton, (London, 1910), p. 116.
- 43 *Correspondence of Horace Walpole*, XIX, p. 125.
- 44 Bodleian Library (hereafter Bod.Lib.), MSS. Don.c.107/2, f. 133v.
- 45 BL, Additional MSS, 32705, f. 401.
- 46 Yorke, *Hardwicke*, p.477
- 47 Bod.Lib., MSS. Don.c.107/2, f. 184.
- 48 *Correspondence of Horace Walpole*, XIX, p.178.
- 49 Surrey History Centre (hereafter SHC), LM.COR.11, Molyneux -Wyatt, 9 December 1745.

- 50 Bod.Lib., MSS. Don.c.107/2, f. 178.
- 51 Royal Archives, Cumberland Papers, 8/19.
- 52 *Correspondence of Horace Walpole*, XIX, p.187.
- 53 BL, Additional MSS, 32706, f. 36.
- 54 *Ibid.*, 32705, f. 409.
- 55 *Ibid.*, f. 411.
- 56 TNA, War Office (hereafter WO) 5/37, pp. 199-217; *The London Evening Post*, 2823 (7-10 December 1745); *The General Advertiser*, 3463 (6 December 1745) – 3468 (10 December 1745); A. Henderson, *History of the Rebellion, 1745 and 1746*, (Edinburgh, 1748), pp. 88-9.
- 57 C.T. Trench, *George II*, (London, 1973), p. 234.
- 58 *The General Advertiser*, 3479 (13 December 1745), 3481 (23 December 1745).
- 59 TNA, Privy Council (hereafter PC) 2/99, pp. 182-7.
- 60 Lewisham Local Studies Centre, Blackheath Hundred Justices' Minutes, 1743-1747, pp. 35, 40.
- 61 TNA, SP36/67, f. 240.
- 62 SHC, LM.COR.11, Onslow – Molyneux, 14 September 1745.
- 63 *The London Gazette*, 8468 (17-21 September 1745) – 8477 (19-22 October 1745); *The Gentleman's Magazine*, 15 (1745), 478-9.
- 64 LMA, X080/002, ff. 74-5.
- 65 *The London Evening Post*, 2793 (28 September-1 October 1745), 2797 (8-10 October 1745); BL, Additional MSS, 35598, f. 93.
- 66 *The London Evening Post*, 2798 (10-12 October 1745).
- 67 *Ibid.*, 2813 (14-16 November 1745), 2833 (31 December 1745 – 2 January 1746).
- 68 HRO, D/EP F244; Bod.Lib., MS. Eng. Hist., c.105
- 69 *The London Evening Post*, 2833 (31 December 1745 – 2 January 1746), 2852 (13-15 February, 1746).
- 70 HRO, MIL/3/9.
- 71 *Ibid.*, 5.
- 72 *Ibid.*, 25.
- 73 *Ibid.*, 26.
- 74 *The London Evening Post*, 2833 (31 December 1745 – 2 January 1746), 2836 (7-9 January 1746).
- 75 *The General Advertiser*, 5346 (14 November 1745); *The Kentish Post*, 2935 (16-20 November 1745); *The London Evening Post*, 2814 (16-19 November 1745).
- 76 HRO, MIL/3/21; *The London Evening Post*, 2836 (7-9 January 1746).
- 77 *The General Advertiser*, 3412 (12 October 1745), 3416 (19 October 1745); HRO, MIL/4/16.
- 78 HRO, MIL/3/91.
- 79 *Ibid.*, 41
- 80 *Ibid.*, 65.
- 81 ERO, L/S/1/1-2; P.R.O., S.P.36/77, f151; BL, Additional MSS, 3030; Bod.Lib., Ms. Eng. Hist, c501; *Hertfordshire County Records, Notes and Extracts from the Sessions Records*, edited by W. Le Hardy et al., (Hertford, 1905-), VII, pp. 576-83
- 82 *Ibid.*
- 83 Essex Record Office, D/P 16/28/6.

- 84 Hertfordshire County Records, VII, pp. 576-83; Cruickshanks, *Political Untouchables*, pp.127-31.
- 85 HRO, MIL/3/4.
- 86 Ibid, 48.
- 87 Ibid, 25.
- 88 Ibid, 85, 94, 96.
- 89 TNA, SP36/69, ff. 299-300v.
- 90 *The London Evening Post*, 2830 (24-26 December 1745); TNA, SP36/78, f. 82.
- 91 TNA, SP36/75, f. 183.
- 92 *The London Evening Post*, 2803 (22-24 October 1745); 2806 (29 October – 1 November 1745).
- 93 Ibid, 2830 (24-26 December 1745).
- 94 Ibid, 2795 (3-5 October 1745); *The Gentleman's Magazine*, 16 (1746), 43, 106.
- 95 *The Gentleman's Magazine*, 15 (1745), 665, 666; *The General Advertiser*, 3509 (24 January 1746).
- 96 *The London Evening Post*, 2806 (29 October – 1 November 1745).
- 97 TNA, SP36/71, ff. 31, 241; SP36/72, f. 1.
- 98 Ibid., SP36/77, f. 10.
- 99 Ibid., f 150.
- 100 Ibid, f. 151.
- 101 Ibid., f. 151v.
- 102 Ibid, f. 151.
- 103 Ibid, f. 185.
- 104 Ibid.
- 105 *The General Advertiser*, 3494 (7 January 1746).
- 106 E.N. Williams, *The Eighteenth Century Constitution*, (Cambridge, 1959), p. 282
- 107 TNA, SP36/77, f. 185.
- 108 TNA, PC2/99, p. 276.
- 109 *The London Evening Press*, 2829 (21-24 December 1745).
- 110 Ibid, 2824 (10-12 December 1745).
- 111 TNA, SP36/80, f. 154.
- 112 *The General Advertiser*, 3484 (26 December 1745), 3492 (4 January 1746).
- 113 *The Kentish Post*, 2945 (21-25 December 1745), 2947 (28 December 1745 – 1 January 1746).
- 114 TNA, SP44/133, p. 38.
- 115 *The General Advertiser*, 3379 (13 September 1745), 3392 (21 September 1745).
- 116 J. Thomas, *The Principles and Practice of a Popish Government Destructive of Civil and Religious Liberty*, (London, 1745), pp. ii-iv.
- 117 T. Wingfield, *The Reasonableness of Necessity of standing fast in Christian and English liberty*, (London, 1745), p. 6.
- 118 N. Ball, *Joshua's Resolution to serve the Lord applied to the Present times* (1745), p.14; S. Pegge, *Popery, an encourager of vice and immorality*, (London, 1746), pp. 15-16.
- 119 B. Mills, *Abuse of Mercies a ground of national judgments. A sermon [on Isai. v. 4-6] preached at Uxbridge ... on occasion of the dangers with which the kingdom is threatened by Foreign and Domestick Enemies*, (London, 1745), p. 4.

- 120 W. Webster, *A Seasonable Antidote against Popery*, (London, 1746), p. 6.
- 121 T. Anguish, *Allegiance and Support: A debt of gratitude to His Majesty*, (London, 1745), p. 13.
- 122 J. Dubordieu, *A sermon [on 2 Sam. xv. 21] preached at Layton in Essex, on the 27th of October, 1745 ... on occasion of the present rebellion*, (London, 1745) pp. 7-8.
- 123 N. Ball, *Joshua's Resolution*, p.22.
- 124 J. Bate, *A Parochial Letter to the Inhabitants of St. Paul's Deptford*, (London, 1745), pp. 3-4, 9.
- 125 R. Coleire, *A Sermon preached at the churches of Richmond...and Isleworth*, (London, 1745), p. 20.
- 126 T. Delafaye, *The Proper Improvement of National Judgements*, (London, 1746), pp. 10-15.
- 127 Thomas, *Principles and Practice*, p. 19.
- 128 Wingfield, *Reasonableness of Necessity*, p.5.
- 129 J.D. Oates, 'Hertfordshire and the Jacobite Rebellions of 1715 and 1745', *Hertfordshire Past and Present*, 3rd series, 3, (2004), 9-10.
- 130 J. Milner, *National Gratitude due for National Mercies*, (London, 1746), p.25.
- 131 R.P. Finch, *A Sermon preach'd in the parish church of Greenwich, in Kent*, (London, 1746), p. 27.
- 132 Milner, *National Gratitude*, p. 36.
- 133 T. Wingfield, *The Lawfulness of Wishing Destruction to the King's Enemies*, (London, 1746), p. 12.
- 134 N. Ball, *A Sermon preach'd in the Parish Church of Chelmsford*, (London, 1746), pp. 23-4.
- 135 LMA., DRO3/B2/1, DRO18/B1/1, DRO8/B1/1, DRO52/134; Ealing Local History Centre, 90/2; Greenwich Local History Library, St. ND, 1A/2/1; ERO, D/P 94/5/2.
- 136 *The Gentleman's Magazine*, 15 (1745), 497.
- 137 *The Grenville Papers*, edited by W.J. Smith, (4 vols, London, 1852-53), I, p. 39.
- 138 *The Gentleman's Magazine*, 15 (1745), 499-500.
- 139 BL, Additional MSS, 35598, f. 77v.
- 140 *The London Evening Post*, 2797 (8-10 October 1745).
- 141 *Correspondence of Horace Walpole*, XIX, p. 106
- 142 *The Gentleman's Magazine*, 16 (1746), 105; Bod.Lib., MSS. Don.c.107/2, f. 129.
- 143 *St. James' Evening Post*, 5561 (5-7 September 1745), 5599 (5-7 December 1745); 5604 (17-20 December 1745).
- 144 *The London Evening Post*, 2797 (8-10 October 1745).
- 145 *Ibid*, 2799 (12-15 October 1745).
- 146 *The General Advertiser*, 3404 (5 October 1745), 3455 (13 November 1745).
- 147 *Ibid.*, 3459 (29 November 1745); *The London Evening Post*, 2797 (8-10 October 1745), 2805 (26-29 October 1745), 2811 (9-12 November 1745), 2823 (7-10 December 1745); *The General Advertiser*, 3397 (28 September 1745), 3455 (13 November 1745); *The Gentleman's Magazine*, 15 (1745), 496.
- 148 *Report on the Manuscripts of Lady Du Cane*, edited by J.K. Laughton, (Historical Manuscripts Commission, 61, 1905), p. 85.
- 149 TNA, SP36/76, f. 197.

- 150 *The London Evening Post*, 2819, (28-30 November 1745); TNA, SP44/133, p. 23.
- 151 TNA, SP36/76, ff. 198, 205.
- 152 Corporation of London Record Office, Repository, 150, pp. 41-7; TNA, SP44/133, pp. 24-5.
- 153 *The London Evening Post*, 2796 (8-10 October 1745); *The General Advertiser*, 3407 (9 October 1745).
- 154 *The Kentish Post*, 2930 (31 October-1 November 1745).
- 155 *The General Advertiser*, 3418 (22 October 1745); *Victoria History of the County of Kent*, edited by W. Page, (London, 1900-), II, p. 371.
- 156 *The Kentish Post*, 2930 (31 October - 2 November 1745).
- 157 *The Gentleman's Magazine*, 15 (1745), 557.
- 158 *The Kentish Post*, 2933 (9-13 November 1745).
- 159 *Ibid.*, 2931 (2-6 November 1745).
- 160 Rogers, 'Resistance to Oligarchy', pp. 19-21.
- 161 *The General Advertiser*, 3586 (25 April 1746); *The Gentleman's Magazine*, 16 (1746), 437.
- 162 Centre for Kentish Studies, V1015, C60/15.