

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, THE LAW OF NATIONS, AND THE LEGHORN CHAPLAINCY AFFAIR, 1703–1713

Brent S. Sirota

The sermons Basil Kennett preached during his brief tenure as Anglican chaplain to the British factory in Livorno were suffused with themes of exile. Such motifs, no doubt, came naturally to his pen. Kennett himself was, when not actively fearful for his life and liberty in Italy, perennially homesick or physically unwell in the warm Mediterranean climate. His fledgling congregation was comprised of expatriate merchants and their families, decayed sailors, and the occasional wealthy English traveler, visiting dignitary, or officer from the Mediterranean fleet of the British Royal Navy. In one sermon, he compared his congregants to David in the wilderness, for they “by the milder and more agreeable necessity of business and duty, not of distress and exile, are detained from our Sion.” Some of his itinerant auditors would soon be restored to the consolations of their mother Church, while the rest would have to be content “to keep up some remembrance of Sion, to form some similitude of our great congregation” in England. And yet Kennett could not but lament that even these surrogate devotions remained precarious, “so unassured in tenure, so imperfect in exercise, and so defective in instrument, that it seems too much like the secret and retired worship in a place of captivity.” There was something almost archaic—or not quite Protestant, at any rate—about the way Kennett routinely sacralized *in absentia* the territorial space of England, as if the solemnity of the liturgy and the efficacy of holy offices somehow diminished with distance from the physical parishes and dioceses of the Church of England.¹ In his homilies, Kennett was always careful to evince the most outsized gratitude—to Protestant and papist potentate alike—for the privilege of Anglican worship in a

Brent S. Sirota is an associate professor of history at North Carolina State University. He is the author of *The Christian Monitors: The Church of England and the Age of Benevolence, 1680–1730* (Yale Univ. Press, 2014).

Roman Catholic country. But in more unguarded moments, Kennett despaired that their services were “like the faint and dispirited endeavor of singing the Lord’s song in a strange land.”² Kennett’s lament testified to the contradictions of Anglican ecclesiastical expansion in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Institutionally, the Church of England was acquiring toeholds in America, continental Europe, and Asia, even while its ecclesiology and self-conception remained firmly rooted to the English soil.

The movement to establish an Anglican chaplaincy at the free port of Leghorn (or Livorno) in Tuscany in the first decade of the eighteenth century reveals an established Church of England attempting to accommodate itself, both ideologically and institutionally, to an increasingly expansive commercial society—to a society that was itself, as it were, no longer quite rooted in the English soil.³ Rather than considering the Leghorn chaplaincy affair for ingress into the rich social and religious history of the English factory at Livorno, this article will use this incident to explore the vicissitudes of this accommodation. Such an approach invites a reconsideration of the nature of the metropolitan Church of England, one not oriented around an Anglican establishment construed as a narrowly domestic political and constitutional formation.⁴ The Anglican Establishment was a multidimensional social and political complex, irreducible to its central church-state axis. Beneath and beyond the Anglican “confessional state,” the Church of England was immersed in a dynamic and complex commercial society throughout Britain and its empire, with which it communicated institutional forms, ideals, ideologies, personnel, and material resources. Indeed, the relations between the Church of England and an international host of philanthropists, voluntary associations, ecumenical movements, commercial and financial enterprises, and colonial efforts comprised a veritable “establishment from below” within an increasingly global civil society.⁵ As is rather well known, the august constitutional arrangements of the “confessional state” and the orthodox political theology of which it was the custodian had notoriously limited purchase abroad.⁶ It was, in fact, this secondary social “establishment” that shouldered much of the work of Anglican adaptation to British commercial and geopolitical aggrandizement in the period after the Revolution of 1688–89.⁷ It stood at the vanguard of ecclesiastical expansion in this period, augmenting and overseeing Anglican life where traditional authorities lacked either the capacity or the inclination to do so. Moreover, not only was this sector capable of organizing and articulating its vision independently of the British state, it was occasionally able to enlist a reluctant state in furtherance of its own objectives. The movement to establish and defend the Anglican chaplaincy in Leghorn was one such instance. The Leghorn chaplaincy affair thus provides a case study for understanding the dynamic interplay between Church, state, and civil society throughout Britain and its empire in the period after the Glorious Revolution, one that usefully illustrates the multidimensionality of the early eighteenth-century Anglican establishment.

The Anglican adaptation to British commercial and geopolitical aggrandizement was undertaken as part of the great revival unfolding within the Church of England during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.⁸ The Anglican revival was, in the first place, a movement to renovate and augment the pastoral resources of the established Church, undertaken in hopes of better accommodating an increasingly dynamic, expansive, and religiously pluralistic English society.



Though the instruments of both the state and the traditional disciplinary organs of the Church of England were recruited into the work of religious renewal, the Anglican revival was characterized, above all, by a wave of institutional innovation and experimentation. Indeed, this institutional fecundity yielded some of the most celebrated monuments of Anglican piety and charity: the religious societies, the societies for reformation of manners, the charity schools, Queen Anne's Bounty, the great Anglican Societies for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge (SPCK) and for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts (SPG)—the complex of entities that Basil Kennett's more famous older brother White Kennett, future bishop of Peterborough, hailed as the "many offices of doing good."⁹ The Anglican revival of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries was marked, above all, by the Church's conscious cultivation of the resources of civil society—as opposed to those of the state, or the traditional instruments of ecclesiastical discipline—for the purposes of religious renewal: voluntary associations, joint-stock entities, print culture, colonial ventures, and extensive lobbying on behalf of moral causes all contributed to what historians consider the great "society-making age in religion and philanthropy."¹⁰ The Church of England was by no means immune to the mania for organizational improvisation and development that led Daniel Defoe to brand his era "the projecting age."¹¹ Rarely is the peculiar story of Basil Kennett's embattled chaplaincy placed alongside the great Anglican religious and philanthropic endeavors that defined the era, and yet the Leghorn chapel was of a part with these more renowned efforts, the work of the very same network of prelates, clergy, merchants, and activist laity that animated the SPCK, SPG, and a host of other causes.¹² Church-building efforts in this period, both at home and abroad, must be understood first in light of this current of revivalism.

For the Church of England, the age of projects was very much an age of projection. The Anglican revival was as much a matter of refurbishing the national communion as it was fabricating a global one. Indeed, to the extent that English national life—its people, institutions, armed forces, and geopolitical and economic interests—had outstripped its territorial bounds, these objectives were increasingly conceived as inseparable.¹³ Indeed, Anglican activists of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries were exercised by what they perceived as a contradiction at the heart of the post-Revolutionary English establishment. Although England was the most dynamic power in Europe, possessed of a lucrative overseas empire in North America, the Caribbean, west Africa, and southeast Asia, along with an intensified naval, military, and commercial presence throughout continental Europe and the Mediterranean, its ecclesiastical establishment was positively sedentary. The great maritime power featured the consummate *landeskirche* in post-Reformation Christendom, a communion virtually peculiar to a solitary island nation and a scattering, by no means all, of its dependencies.¹⁴ The naturalized Huguenot Anthony Marie de la Croze, vicar of Old Windsor, complained as much to his metropolitan Thomas Tenison, archbishop of Canterbury and first president of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. "While all other nations are very zealously industrious to spread and fix everywhere their own worship," he lamented, "it will seem very strange that England alone should be contented to see her religion confined to this private corner of the world, as if we were ashamed to show it, or cared not that any besides ourselves should enjoy the benefit of it."¹⁵ The abject parochialism of

the Church of England was not only unbecoming an ascendant global power, it was peculiarly ill-suited to an “empire of the seas.”¹⁶ Worse, the persistent insularity of Anglicanism amounted to a veritable sentence of excommunication for the thousands of Englishmen and their families, whose lives and livelihoods abroad—in trade, in the colonies, at sea or at war—left them quite beyond the holy offices of the national Church.¹⁷ These were the souls mourned in William III’s 1701 charter to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, “wholly destitute and unprovided of a maintenance for ministers and the public worship of God.”¹⁸

Within territories possessed by or owing allegiance to the English crown, such provisions might be established upon a bedrock of Hookerian political ecclesiology, which demanded the identity of English Church and commonwealth as dual aspects of the broader community subsisting respectively under the sacred and civil suzerainty of the monarchy.¹⁹ But late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century advocates of Anglican expansion did not actually consider territoriality the primary precondition for ecclesiality. Anglican expansion was not simply a matter of shadowing English dominion abroad, but was increasingly oriented toward the far more nebulous concept of “interest.”²⁰ The rhetoric of ecclesiastical expansion in this period, though stolidly establishmentarian with respect to overseas colonies, was nevertheless unusually canny in its comprehension of the ever-widening sweep of global English commercial and geopolitical interests abroad—whether within or without English dominions.²¹ The mere presence abroad of English merchants, soldiers, seamen, captives, even vulnerable foreign Protestant populations seeking the penumbra of English concern and custody was sufficient to attract the sustained attention and engagement of Anglican activists in the metropole. The Anglican revival was no doubt instrumental in catalyzing ecclesiastical expansion within the territorial empire, but its cognizance of extraterritoriality was arguably even more remarkable. The projection of the Church of England beyond the territorial jurisdiction of the English state and its overseas possessions effectively divested that Church of what had long been its most reliable bolster, English sovereignty.

Such was the case in Italy. At the British factory in Leghorn, the Church found itself performing, as it were, without a net. The absence of English sovereignty (or, in the eyes of English contemporaries, any recognizably modern conception of sovereignty) in Tuscany presented both British state and civil society with a conceptual vacuum. By what right might Anglican clergy perform and British merchants enjoy the offices of the Church of England in the heart of Roman Catholic Europe? British merchants, activists and diplomats ultimately came to justify such ecclesiastical provisions by the *law of nations*, presumed to be subsisting between sovereign states. Their deployment of this discourse would only underscore the ways in which religion in this period, even when advocated by a complex international civil society of merchants and Protestant activists, could not yet be fully disentangled from the sovereignty of states and could not yet penetrate into foreign states with the same ease as people and commodities. The Leghorn chaplaincy affair would thus reveal the precociousness of the Anglican revival of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, which had grown quite expansive in reckoning Anglican communion beyond the territorial demarcations of the British state, but remained as yet unable to sustain such claims without the assurances of British sovereignty.

Anglican expansion in the early eighteenth century traced very closely the map of British commercial and strategic concerns, particularly during the War of the Spanish Succession. This was certainly the case with the Protestant churches of the Swiss cantons, which began actively seeking the patronage and protection of both English Church and state at the commencement of hostilities, initiating a flurry of theological engagement between the SPCK and the Swiss Protestants.²² The Anglican Church erected at Rotterdam was overwhelmingly funded by contributions from the military and its trustees touted the particular benevolence of John Churchill, Duke of Marlborough and captain-general of the armies.²³ After the cession of Spanish territory to Britain in the Treaty of Utrecht, the SPCK worked tirelessly for what it described as “the more effectual establishment of the Protestant interest in Minorca.”²⁴ Thus, it is not entirely surprising that Anglican interest in the British factory at Leghorn developed not long after the appearance of Sir Cloudesley Shovell’s Mediterranean fleet there in late 1703.²⁵ A long-simmering dispute between the British Crown and Cosimo III, Grand Duke of Tuscany, over the arrest and prosecution of the English privateer William Plowman at the port came to a very public head shortly thereafter in 1704, when the British factory actively sided with the Grand Duke. In April 1704, in recognition of the enormous commercial and strategic importance of Leghorn in a Mediterranean theater still dominated by the Bourbon and its allies, the Crown began to back down from its demands for compensation for Plowman.²⁶ That November, as a signal of a more conciliatory policy, the ministry recalled Sir Lambert Blackwell, English envoy to Tuscany, whose vigorous defense of Plowman had alienated both the Grand Duke and the merchant community at Leghorn.²⁷

The genesis of the Leghorn chaplaincy affair lies with the appointment of Blackwell’s replacement, Henry Newton, as envoy extraordinary to Genoa and Tuscany. Newton, a learned civil lawyer and client of the Junto whig Lord John Somers, had deep ties to the London Anglicanism that had stood at the vanguard of the Anglican revival since the late Restoration.²⁸ Newton had acted as counsel to Henry Compton, bishop of London, before James II’s ecclesiastical commission in 1686. For this service, he was named chancellor of the diocese of London at the consummation of the Glorious Revolution in early 1689. He appears to have been on close terms with Thomas Tenison, another stalwart of late Restoration London Anglicanism, who had been elevated to primacy in 1695.²⁹ At the conclusion of his service in Italy, Newton was named master of the royal hospital at St. Katherine’s by the Tower in London.³⁰ Newton decamped for Italy in late 1704 fired by the expansionist zeal of the Anglican revival in the metropolis.³¹ A mere week after his arrival in Florence in May 1705, Newton conveyed his hope to Secretary of State Charles Hedges “that my Lord of Canterbury be assured that out of the great respect I have for himself, the public and the Church of England, I shall use all the endeavors I can that she may be set at liberty.”³²

Even before visiting Leghorn, Newton was well aware of the hornet’s nest of confessional strife subsisting in Tuscany. Newton immediately made note of the Grand Duke’s baroque religiosity, observing that “his desire to make converts is too prevailing on him . . . devotion being his prevailing affection.” Moreover, Newton had to address a series of incidents in which Protestant English families had been targeted for Catholic proselytization. William Healy, a merchant of a

“not a very extraordinary character,” had petitioned for the restoration of his children, whom he had apparently abandoned without settling their maintenance or education and who were thus subsequently removed into Catholic schools.³³ A more serious case was that of the niece of the merchant Gilbert Searle, whom, it was charged “was taken away in a clandestine manner out of her uncle’s house in the dead of the night” and entered into a nunnery in Pisa—a plot apparently contrived by the Leghorn priest Belisario Benvenuti working in concert with two female servants in Searle’s household. Newton visited several times with the young lady in Pisa, to convey her uncle’s blandishments of a substantial dowry and good match in England. Searle’s niece obstinately “stuck to her first principle not to go for England, that is, not to leave the nunnery, till the priests thought convenient.” By early 1706, she was resolved to become a nun, insisting that “she would not leave the cloister to be made a queen.” Newton sighed that, “it may be care was not enough taken of her education as to matters of religion.” The whole incident, Newton warned Hedges, “is of very dangerous consequence to all the English who have families in this country, and either settle or travel here.”³⁴ Newton tirelessly lobbied the court of the Grand Duke to procure a directive for the Catholic priests “not to intermeddle for the future, in the conversion of the English, who are settled at Leghorn.” That such a point was eventually gained, “which could never be obtained before at this court,” gave the English some hopes of a religious détente in Tuscany.³⁵

The want of an Anglican clergyman had been a longstanding grievance of the British merchant community at Leghorn throughout the seventeenth century. Previous attempts at procuring the services of a Protestant minister had been, on the whole, spectacularly unsuccessful—the last one being the ministry of a Presbyterian preacher named Inghlis in the fall of 1685.³⁶ But the early eighteenth century attempt to establish a chaplain at the port stands apart from these, not only because it was ultimately successful, but also because the impetus seems to have come from London rather than Leghorn. Newton, for one, routinely credited the project to Archbishop Tenison, referring to it as “the archbishop’s desire about a chaplain for the factory” or “his Grace of Canterbury’s desire.”³⁷ Moreover, Newton only began to write about the chaplaincy project openly in his correspondence with Hedges after the matter had been discussed at a 18 June 1705 committee meeting of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, of which Tenison was president.³⁸ When Newton mentioned the design to his patron Bishop Compton in mid-1706, he once again described it as “my Lord Archbishop’s desire, signified to me by Dr. Gee,” that is, the London clergyman Edward Gee, a veteran like Compton and Tenison of the London opposition to James II in the 1680s and a member of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel.³⁹ After Newton finally brought the matter before the Leghorn merchants in September 1705, he informed Secretary Hedges of “their ready compliance with his Grace of Canterbury’s desires about a chaplain for the factory.”⁴⁰ When the leading merchants of the factory formally committed themselves to maintaining a minister at a salary of two hundred pounds *per annum*, they continued to describe the position as the “chaplain that his Grace of Canterbury has proposed to live amongst us.”⁴¹ This is by no means to discount the genuine and abiding desire for a Protestant minister among the merchants themselves, but clearly the initiative for this renewed attempt in the early eighteenth

century lay with Lambeth Palace and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, which was then acting as an ersatz cathedral chapter for the Church of England abroad. Previous attempts, it must be remembered, proceeded without the support of the infrastructure of religious lobbying, promotion, and correspondence that comprised the Anglican revival.

Given the prominence of the London Anglicans in the conception and proposal of the Leghorn chaplaincy, the choice of candidate for the position is not entirely surprising. After committing to fund the chaplain, the Leghorn merchants left the actual appointment to Archbishop Tenison, requesting only that he be a “person of worth, not married and an Englishman,” rather than a French Protestant, “which would not in any ways please the factory here.”⁴² Tenison then consulted with White Kennett, rector of the large London parish of St. Botolph, Aldgate. Kennett was not only (along with London clergyman Edmund Gibson, rector of Lambeth) one of the archbishop’s two lieutenants in the lower house of convocation, he had been a stalwart member of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel since its second meeting in July 1701, even serving as the society’s first historian.⁴³ After unsuccessfully soliciting some alternative candidates, Kennett ultimately recommended his younger brother, the classicist Basil Kennett, fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, around June 1706, so confident of his favor with the archbishop, he wrote, “that I made my brother in a manner depend on that employment to which his own inclination led him.”⁴⁴ Upon accepting the appointment, Basil Kennett was promptly whisked to London to be feted by the merchants and “great persons” to whom he owed his new station.⁴⁵ The Anglican philanthropic circles in which White Kennett travelled closely followed the unfolding project. The pious layman Robert Nelson, a founding member of the SPG, wrote rapturously of the design to fellow society member Samuel Brewster, White Kennett’s patron at St. Botolph, Aldgate. Nelson, the son of a wealthy Levant merchant, had no illusions about the enormity of the task ahead of the younger Kennett. “He will have work enough,” Nelson told Brewster, “to bring that factory to a serious sense of religion.” The prevailing Roman Catholicism in Tuscany might prove as much of a stumbling block to Kennett as the irreligion of the English, Nelson noted ominously: “It will be necessary he should be as careful to conceal his character in Italy, as a popish priest is to conceal his in England . . . for the prejudices there are as strong against us as they are against them here.”⁴⁶

Elation in London at the prospect of enlarging the Church of England’s footprint on the continent rapidly gave way to anxiety at the daunting challenge of establishing a Protestant chaplaincy where it had so long been forbidden. By late July 1706, Basil Kennett was eager to learn “what measures are taken for his being protected from the Inquisition” in Italy. In both London and Tuscany, there was a strong desire to proceed with as little public notice as possible. Secretary of State Hedges did not think there was cause “to give the grand duke any formal notice of it.”⁴⁷ As Newton had little prospect of procuring the formal consent of ecclesiastical authorities, he rather hoped that Kennett might be established in Leghorn before word of his presence reached either the courts of Florence or Rome, for “they may probably submit to a thing when done, which before hand they would never yield to.” Though secrecy proved impossible and “the news was carried to the court [of the Grand Duke] and Rome,” Newton was heartened that fears “were greater



of the management of the person . . . than the objections against the thing itself.” Newton remained convinced of an ongoing thaw in confessional hostilities. “Both here and at Rome,” he noted, “they have now other thoughts of the Church of England than formerly, and the differences at present is more upon schism than heresy,” the situation of the latter being closer to that of the tolerated “Greek Church” than the intolerable contagion of the northern heresy. Newton suggested that a personal notice from Queen Anne to the Grand Duke might go some length toward allaying lingering concerns in Florence.⁴⁸ Hedges responded that a missive directly from the queen was deemed unnecessary and that Newton might merely recommend Basil Kennett to the Grand Duke as serving “by her Majesty’s commands.”⁴⁹ The British court took the absence of any overt refusal of the chaplaincy as tacit consent and failed to secure any formal allowance from the court of the Grand Duke. In early September, Kennett was equipped with a commission from the queen “to perform divine service there [in Leghorn] after the usage and manner of the Church of England,” recommending him to the countenance and protection of both the envoy at the court of the Grand Duke, Henry Newton, and the British consul at Leghorn, Christopher Crow.⁵⁰

Kennett arrived in Leghorn in December 1706. Although Henry Newton acknowledged him as his own domestic chaplain, “for his greater security,” Kennett took up residence at the factory in the household of the consul, “as this was the method too where the merchants are settled in other countries.” Kennett was exceedingly well received in the factory; his ministry, Newton reported, “has already had a good effect in reconciling the differences, which prevailed too much before amongst them.”⁵¹ The Roman Catholic ecclesiastical authorities, however, were decidedly less warm in their welcome. Of course, the factory had not anticipated any official sanction from either the courts of Florence or Rome, but even the benign neglect that Newton had expected was not forthcoming. Kennett had not been in Italy a week before Newton received word that the Grand Duke “expresses some dissatisfaction at the coming of the English preacher to Leghorn.”⁵² In mid-January, the Grand Duke’s secretary of state Coriolano Montemagni informed Newton that news of the Protestant clergyman had reached the tribunal of the Inquisition at Rome, which “have the given the most Serene Great Duke my master to understand that they could by no means consent to it.” The Inquisition, Montemagni related, “pressed most earnestly for his being removed, according to what has been formerly practiced as often as such preachers have been brought thither.” To underscore the precedent to Newton, Montemagni included copies of an exchange between their predecessors in which Charles II’s envoy to Tuscany Sir John Finch acceded to the immediate removal of a Protestant clergyman from Leghorn in 1666. Montemagni was confident that Newton would not “suffer during your ministry the introducing of a novelty which has always been opposed and forbid by the Inquisition.”⁵³

The defense of the Leghorn chaplaincy, undertaken by Henry Newton and Queen Anne’s ministers during the early months of 1707, clearly shared in the vision of ecclesiastical expansion that animated the Anglican revival in the metropolis. The Church, they held, must follow British global interests. Queen Anne was reportedly “fully of opinion that wherever English merchants are settled in a foreign port and are desirous of a minister for their instruction in the religion of their country, that they ought to have one.”⁵⁴ This sentiment was a considerable



advance upon the outlook embodied in William's charter for the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel just five years earlier, which pledged ecclesiastical provisions for "our plantations, colonies and factories beyond the seas, belonging to our kingdom of England."⁵⁵ British sovereignty no longer constituted the horizon of Anglican expansion; instead, the settlement of Britons abroad was sufficient to merit ecclesiastical provision. Reconceiving the remit of the established Church beyond British territoriality fundamentally compromised the prevailing rationale of Anglican expansion. What could secure the rights of the Church of England in the absence of British sovereignty?

Henry Newton and the British court he represented believed the Leghorn chaplaincy permissible under the "law of nations," *ius gentium*, a term he left undefined but used generally to invoke the norms and usages regarding intercourse between states where the reciprocal recognition of sovereignty obtained.⁵⁶ With this discourse, Newton in effect lent medieval notions of the hospitality princes accorded merchant strangers in their domains a decidedly post-Westphalian, mercantilist gloss.⁵⁷ He accepted what has come to be understood as the "Westphalian" premise that religion was, in the final analysis, a matter wholly internal to sovereign states and yet he insisted on the overriding consideration of worldly interest in setting religious policies.⁵⁸ Newton expressed no doubt that the sovereign state remained the ultimate guarantor of confessional uniformity within the territory under its jurisdiction; he only insisted that the relaxation of such strictures might be a necessary corollary to political and economic engagement with other polities.⁵⁹ In other words, the sovereignty of states in matters of religion was limited not by any right to the free exercise of religion that inhered in the individual conscience irrespective of jurisdiction or locale, but rather by the mere fact of diplomatic and economic intercourse.⁶⁰ Sovereign states committed or refrained from religious persecution as worldly interest dictated; Newton was optimistic that the trend in the European politics of religion was toward the indulgence that facilitated domestic tranquility and commercial exchange. "Times and occasions alter," the envoy wrote to Montemagni, "and with them the affairs of the world; and what was thought not convenient at one time, proves necessary in another." As evidence, he routinely cited instances of toleration from the Treaty of Munster in Germany through the recent passage of the Registration Act of 1704 in Ireland, which conditionally permitted the offices of the secular Roman Catholic clergy there. "Roman Catholics gain everywhere upon the good usage of Protestants," he noted. As a counterexample, Newton pointed out that the ongoing persecution of Protestants in the Rhineland Palatinate was inciting government harassment of Roman Catholics in Prussia. There should be none, Newton warned, "so unskilled in the history of the world to be ignorant that reprisals are now taken in religion too." Newton's threat to Montemagni was not even veiled; he invited the Tuscan minister to ponder whether Roman Catholic persecution of Kennett in Italy, "might not then probably produce somewhat very inconvenient to those of that religion in England; and whether this may not deserve some consideration as things now go in the world." In retrospect, there seems something strangely transitional about Newton's reasoning, proceeding from a geopolitical moment—"as things now go in the world"—in which the normative value of confessional war had been effectively renounced, but an international right to freedom of conscience had yet to be recognized. In effect, the

sovereign state could make no international claim on behalf of the religion of its subjects; it merely held its own religious minorities and foreign residents hostage in hopes of winning favorable treatment for its subjects abroad.⁶¹

In Newton's vision of the law of nations, the mere fact of ongoing political and commercial engagement implied that such favorable treatment had already been secured.⁶² With respect to Leghorn, he argued that Basil Kennett "comes not as a missionary, or to make converts; not to alarm those of another church," but only to minister to the spiritual needs of an expatriate community—a community, it was emphasized, that the Grand Duke had encouraged to settle in his domains.⁶³ Implied in the Grand Duke's allowance of "subjects of foreign princes and states, of any religion and persuasion, invited to trade and settle in a free port," Newton argued, was the indulgence of their native forms of worship. In permitting foreign merchants to settle in Leghorn with their families, "it must be supposed, that they shall have the free use of their own worship and religion." Newton pointed out that British merchants at Lisbon enjoyed such a privilege, "from a prince and government and amongst a people who as much reverence the pope and Roman Catholic religion as the people of Rome itself." Such a right even obtained beyond Christendom, as British merchants in the Ottoman Empire received the benefit of "the preachers living in consul houses there as domestics." Newton prayed that the courts of Rome and Florence will not "endeavor to break the laws of nations, which prevail even when Christianity itself does not."⁶⁴

The court of Tuscany did not recognize the system of reciprocal sovereignty outlined by the British envoy. "Give me leave to tell you," the Tuscan secretary of state responded, "that in countries where obedience to the pope is professed, the law of nations is not considered in matters of religion." Simply put, the similitude between sovereign territorial states upon which Newton's reasoning proceeded was fundamentally erroneous. Sovereignty in Catholic countries, Montemagni explained, never comprehended religious affairs, which were always subject to ecclesiastical oversight and intervention. The Grand Duke, the Tuscan minister repeatedly pled, had no power to determine a dispute over religion, "this being a matter that does not in the least lie before his Royal Highness and in which he must therefore pay a blind obedience to the commands of the tribunal of the Inquisition at Rome." In the matter of heresy, the Grand Duke like all Catholic potentates was at the disposal of the Holy Church; if Kennett did not speedily retire from Leghorn, Montemagni warned, "the Inquisition will require the assistance of the secular arm, which can not be denied lest we should incur those misfortunes in respect to our consciences which can never be repaired." The problem, insisted Montemagni, was not an intolerant court at Florence, but rather a defective sovereignty in the duchy. Newton had been struggling with this vacuum of authority to regulate religious disputes since his arrival in Tuscany; such trouble was to be expected, he complained to Sunderland, "where the clergy command absolutely and princes acknowledge they ought kindly to obey."⁶⁵

Interestingly, Montemagni repeatedly urged the same resolution to the affair: that Newton should call Kennett to his own house and keep him there as a domestic chaplain. Such an expedient would have effectively remanded the problem of the Leghorn chaplaincy to the long settled protocols of post-Reformation international relations. By the early eighteenth century, the religious immunities of

foreign ambassadors possessed the authority of virtually universal recognition as well as long usage.⁶⁶ For Montemagni, the indulgence of embassy chaplains represented the extent of sovereign immunity the Grand Duke could claim from papal and Inquisitorial intervention. “The Law of Nations,” he told Newton, “cannot extend further than to persons who by reason of their degree and quality carry it with them, among whom cannot be ranked the preacher, the merchants nor the consuls who have no manner of right to lay claim to it.”⁶⁷ As far as the court of Florence was concerned, the law of nations afforded a degree of religious liberty to embassy chapels for the convenience of diplomacy; no such dispensation had been made for the facilitation of commerce.

Betraying his mercantilist convictions, Henry Newton routinely collapsed the distinction between the allowances required for diplomacy and those for trade. The modern state, he believed, must accommodate the various modes of international engagement by which its interests were secured. The power to unilaterally make such accommodations for religion was singular, for “a sovereign must be presumed to be a sovereign throughout,” Newton had written upon his first arrival in Italy, “or else how [can he] be really a sovereign, or be looked upon to be so by other princes, especially those out of the communion” of the Roman Catholic Church.⁶⁸ The British envoy could not abide the defective sovereignty by which the Grand Duke seemingly possessed the capacity to permit the settlement of foreign merchants in his own domain, while simultaneously disclaiming any ability to protect those merchants from the predations of foreign powers. The permission to settle constituted a pledge of protection, Newton claimed. A prince or a state may, he explained, submit to the will of a foreign potentate if they so choose, “but the subjects of another prince who are allowed to live in their dominions were never thought to be under that power and think they have a title to be defended by the prince, whilst they are permitted or encouraged to stay within their territories.” Newton was unwilling or unable to rethink the basic premises of a post-Westphalian state system comprised exclusively of discrete, territorial entities possessed each of a sovereign power to regulate its internal affairs free of foreign interference. Roman pressure on the court at Florence to suppress Protestant worship at Leghorn comprised precisely this sort of illegitimate interference. As far as Great Britain was concerned, the pope was “a temporal as well as spiritual prince, and that it will not be always necessary for the future to distinguish betwixt the two capacities.”⁶⁹

In contrast, the court of Tuscany maintained that neither the papacy nor the tribunal of the Inquisition were actually foreign powers on the order of neighboring polities, against whose dictates the Grand Duke might interpose his sovereign authority. On the contrary, the spiritual authorities possessed “an absolute jurisdiction equally over princes and private persons,” a trans-territorial right of intervention in all dominions where Catholicism was professed. The Church, Montemagni insisted, possessed an alternative form of sovereignty—one not limited by territory. And as all sovereigns possess an uncontested power to expel persons from their own dominions, Montemagni explained, “the pope being absolute master in all that concerns religion has therefore most full power and authority wherever the Catholic religion is professed to exclude whatever person displeases him.”⁷⁰ Newton correctly pointed out that the Church’s claims to international competence notwithstanding, the Inquisition had, in fact, repeatedly bowed to

the inviolability of sovereign territories. “It is not even now received in Naples,” Newton explained, “nor if the genius of the people be looked into, will it ever, and yet that kingdom is a fief of the papacy. ‘Tis of no force to do hurt to any in Venice or Genoa because the State interposes there.” Even in France, Newton continued, “the most Christian King, the first son of the Church, never allowed of it in his own kingdoms.” Newton depicted a decidedly post-Westphalian international order in which independent spiritual authority had effectively been extinguished and where religion prospered at the sufferance of sovereign states. Though nearly all of Newton’s professional life had been among the Anglican clergy, he betrayed a waspish, almost Hobbesian, anticlericalism whenever confronted with the prospect of spiritual power undermining the authority of the state. “I wish the clergy at the time of day, which seems not so propitious to them,” he complained to Montemagni, “would not disturb the peace of the world.”⁷¹

Ultimately, the policy of the court of Great Britain with respect to the Leghorn chaplaincy was to enforce upon the Grand Duchy of Tuscany a conception of state sovereignty that it had vigorously disavowed. In early February 1707, the Earl of Sunderland related to Newton the commands of Queen Anne. On behalf of the queen, Newton was ordered to inform the Grand Duke and his minister, “if there be any molestation given to her chaplain, residing at Leghorn, she shall look upon it as an affront done to herself and the nation, a breach of peace, and a violation of the law of nations, and shall by her fleet and armies, which will be all the year in the Mediterranean Seas, not only demand, but take satisfaction for any such injury offered.” Anticipating the Tuscan abnegation of sovereignty, Sunderland added that, “if they talk any more of the pope or court of Rome, you must cut that matter short, by telling them, her Majesty has nothing to do with that court, but shall treat with the Great Duke, as with other independent princes and states.”⁷² This was an extraordinarily audacious response to an international incident that the court of Great Britain found, on some level, conceptually incomprehensible. Where British sovereignty did not obtain to secure Anglican worship, the British state simply conjured up a Tuscan sovereignty—against the protestation of the putative sovereign, no less—that it could then hold responsible by threat of military reprisal for the protection of its clergyman. On behalf the British merchants, Newton explained to Montemagni, the Queen resolved not “to have recourse made to any other power for their enjoying that liberty [of worship] or their security therein than to the sovereign of the country only where her subjects are established.”⁷³ In London, the irony of expanding the Church of England abroad through a dramatic secularization of the geopolitical field, understood now to be immune to spiritual intervention by non-state actors, seems to have gone unnoticed.⁷⁴

As the courts wrangled over the finer points of the *ius gentium*, Basil Kennett and his friends labored under tremendous apprehension. In London, White Kennett fretted over his brother’s safety: “My brother is disturbed at Leghorn by the bigots of the Inquisition, and I doubt must return home if he can escape so.”⁷⁵ For his part, Basil Kennett refused the offered sanctuary of Newton’s household in Florence, fearing that once removed from Leghorn, he and the Church of England would never be suffered to return. While he remained at the port, the factory took extraordinary precautions to protect the clergyman. An armed guard was placed before the stairs to his apartment and two merchants with drawn swords

accompanied him on his evening walks. By February 1707, the vigorous lobbying by Newton (and the professions of relative disinterest in the matter by the court at Florence) seemed to have neutralized the immediate threat from Tuscan authorities. White Kennett informed his friend and fellow SPCK member Samuel Blackwell that his brother was probably safe as far as the civil government was concerned: “they all tell me they cannot hurt his person unless in a Jesuitical way.”⁷⁶ The force of Sunderland’s intervention served effectively to contain the situation and confidence rose among the British with the advent of the summer campaign season.⁷⁷ In July 1707, White Kennett found his brother “well and under no apprehensions of danger while our fleet is in those parts.”⁷⁸ The next month, Newton reported an amicable stalemate to the court at Westminster. “Religion,” he wrote, “is not a thing to be talked of on any side.”⁷⁹ The official indifference that the many boosters of the Anglican chaplaincy in Leghorn had rather naively expected at the outset was finally forthcoming.

Amidst the noise and high diplomatic drama of the Leghorn chaplaincy affair, Basil Kennett evidently fulfilled the expectations of the movement that had pressed so earnestly for the establishment of his ministry abroad. In his very first sermon at the factory, Kennett bid his flock rejoice “that the God of their fathers has blessed them with his ordinances in a strange land.” After the Lord, it was to her Majesty that the Queen that these merchants owed their fledgling congregation, Kennett added, for though her treasures were great and her armies and fleets victorious, “tis not in any of these that she places the glory of her reign: ‘tis in defending the faith which she adorns, in securing it at home and supporting it abroad.”⁸⁰ Such sentiments and a diligent exercise of his pastoral function won Kennett the respect and devotion of the entire community. Newton called Kennett “an ornament to his profession and nation and a great comfort to all the Factory.”⁸¹ As the heat of the affair subsided in the spring and summer of 1707, Kennett boasted of holding “Sunday exercises without disturbance from Easter to Whitsuntide.” On the latter holiday, Kennett joyously reported that his service “had more communicants that could well be expected after so long an interval and disuses.” Merchants whose lives had scarcely been touched by the offices of the Church of England eagerly partook of the sacraments. The merchant Gilbert Searle received Anglican communion for the first time in forty years. Another, Thomas Dorman, having departed England as a child, took his first communion in Basil Kennett’s chapel.⁸² It was not long thereafter that Kennett officiated at Dorman’s funeral.⁸³ The merchants of the factory warmly conveyed their thanks to Archbishop Tenison for his role in establishing the chaplaincy, testifying “of what advantage it is like to prove to themselves and to the public” and affirming “that the factory should always have a minister residing amongst them.”⁸⁴ Even an English Catholic priest residing in Florence noted the devotion of the English merchants to the clergyman they referred to as “their bishop.”⁸⁵ The naturalized Huguenot and Protestant internationalist Anthony Marie de la Croze even made note of Kennett’s extraordinary regard for the Protestant interest elsewhere in Europe, complimenting his “most generous and charitable liberality” in overseeing collections for French Protestant refugees settled in the dominions of the Elector of Hanover.⁸⁶ When the Irish churchman and philosopher George Berkeley passed through Leghorn while serving as chaplain to the Earl of Peterborough, the British

merchants there assured him that Basil Kennett was by Protestant and papist alike “esteemed and called a saint.”⁸⁷ And yet for all the piety and diligence with which it was conducted, Kennett’s ministry in Leghorn always exuded a sense of not just political but ecclesiological precariousness: the worship not of the temple, but of a tabernacle in the wilderness. Notes of displacement and homesickness marked his sermons; he made frequent reference to the impermanence and transience of his congregation. He seemed unable to conceive of its worship as anything other than a transplant from its native soil and climate. Under the aegis of the ascendant British state, the Church of England had taken the first steps toward globalization, but the Church, it seems, was still not quite at home in the world.

The climax of the Leghorn chaplaincy affair reaffirmed the indispensability of the British state to the forward policy of the early eighteenth-century Church of England. The aftermath, however, imparted a somewhat darker lesson: the perils of state dependency. In July 1710, an ailing Basil Kennett, never properly acclimated to the Mediterranean climate, sought to bring his distinguished tenure at the factory to its conclusion.⁸⁸ The British merchants once again entrusted the choice of candidate to Archbishop Tenison, who put forward the name of Nathaniel Taubman, naval chaplain and author of a well-regarded account of military operations in the Mediterranean during the War of the Spanish Succession.⁸⁹ Taubman’s memoir of the 1708–9 campaign—dedicated to the Junto whig Admiral of the Fleet, Edward Russell, Earl of Orford, and his client the naval commander Sir Edward Whitaker—actually contained one of the earliest chronicles of the Leghorn chaplaincy affair, a veritable panegyric to Queen Anne, who proved herself “above the Grand Duke, Pope and Inquisition in all affairs.”⁹⁰ Upon investigation, the Leghorn merchants deemed Taubman “a person fit and worthy to succeed Mr. Kennett as resident chaplain to the said factory.”⁹¹ However, the move to replace Kennett with Taubman at Leghorn coincided with a moment of dramatic political realignment in the second half of 1710. The war ministry of Sidney Godolphin, Duke of Marlborough, and the Junto whigs—including Secretary of State Sunderland, who had been most forward in the defense of the chaplaincy—was collapsing; and the tories were wracking up impregnable majorities in the parliamentary elections that fall. Ironically enough for a party that came to office by exploiting public anxiety over “the Church in danger,” the new tory ministry led by Robert Harley had no stomach for reigniting the dispute with Tuscany over Anglican religious privileges.⁹² The new ministry’s overriding interest in negotiating a peace to end the War of the Spanish Succession was potentially fatal to the chaplaincy that had been established by threat of military reprisal.

The new tory ministry exhibited a peculiar, and to not a few Britons rather shocking, lack of interest in renewing the Leghorn chaplaincy. Although rarely explicit in their motives for abandoning what was already considered one of the singular triumphs of Anglican expansion during Anne’s reign, the ministry was almost certainly motivated by geopolitical considerations.⁹³ Securing the goodwill of the Italian states was instrumental to the ministry’s desire to contain Habsburg power in the peninsula, a policy it believed crucial to facilitating peace with France.⁹⁴ The ministry thus struck a markedly conciliatory tone in its dealings with the court of the Grand Duke of Tuscany. When the British factory submitted a formal petition to the privy council that Nathaniel Taubman be speedily “dispatched to

Leghorn with such commission and letters of protection as the late chaplain Mr. Kennett did obtain from her Ma[jes]ties secretary of state” in September 1710, the new Secretary of State William Legge, Earl of Dartmouth, insisted that any new commission be deferred until the Tuscan court had an opportunity to lodge its objections. Taubman at once suspected mischief in “such an unfortunate dilatory method” of proceeding; if the Tuscan envoy at London, “never puts in his memorial,” he realized, “my affair will be in suspense.”⁹⁵ Such a tactic, it seemed, would at the very least purchase the ministry some time as it attempted to reignite peace negotiations.⁹⁶

The tory ministry’s deferral of the new commission provoked a significant backlash from both the Leghorn merchants and the leading voices within the established Church. Significantly, both constituencies spoke an identical conceptual language in defense of the chaplaincy. In their petition for a renewal of the commission, the merchants insisted that the privilege of the chaplain was theirs by the “law of nations.” Echoing the rhetoric deployed by Henry Newton and the proponents of Anglican expansion, the merchants asserted “that they think it agreeable to all the rules of reason and Christianity and even of nature itself, that where any body of Christian people is allowed to inhabit and trade in any free place, they should not be there confined to live like heathens without the sacraments and other ordinances of religion.” Indeed, they cited identical privileges in Portugal, not to mention Smyrna and Aleppo, lamenting that “their factory in a Christian country should be left in a worser condition than their fellow subjects among unbelievers.” Echoing Newton’s argument from years before, the merchants insisted that the law of nations did not distinguish between chaplains for embassies and those “for a settled factory of her Majesty’s subjects.”⁹⁷

The ministry’s apparent sacrifice of the Leghorn chaplaincy elicited a rare moment of virtual unanimity from the episcopate and leading clergy of a Church otherwise riven by ferocious partisanship.⁹⁸ A significant number of churchmen, once again led by Archbishop Tenison, Bishop Compton, and White Kennett in London, rallied to the defense of the chaplaincy. Over the course of the following year, both Tenison and Kennett personally lobbied Robert Harley to accredit and protect Taubman in the same manner as his predecessor.⁹⁹ Compton repeatedly wrote to Dartmouth not only as a churchman but also as a fellow tory. He warned the secretary that denying the merchants’ petition would further alienate the mercantile interests in the City from the tory ministry.¹⁰⁰ He added that concession to the Grand Duke on this matter would only serve as fodder for whig propaganda that branded their party as “either friends to or more afraid of the papists than we ought to be, or they ever were.”¹⁰¹ John Moore, bishop of Ely, pressed the Queen directly on the matter.¹⁰² Humphrey Humphreys, bishop of Hereford, pledged to speak with Harley in favor the appointment.¹⁰³ The diplomat John Robinson, bishop of Bristol, averred that the privilege was a “right of nations, if enjoyed without disturbance of the peace to the civil government.”¹⁰⁴ John Sharp, archbishop of York, spoke with the Earl of Rochester, Lord President of the Council, on Taubman’s behalf.¹⁰⁵ Harley repeatedly professed his support for the commission, but by July 1711 the sense of the ministry, according to White Kennett, was “that a Protestant chaplain at Leghorn is against the law of nations, and the late ministry could not justify their doings of it.” Even the high church firebrand Francis At-

terbury, the bitter antagonist of both White Kennett and Archbishop Tenison in the controversies then unfolding in convocation, laid aside enmity to campaign for the chaplaincy, informing his friend Harley that Hugo Grotius and others scholars of the *ius gentium* “made such a privilege to be a law of all nations.”¹⁰⁶ Taubman himself was appalled by the abject capitulation on the part of the ministry. The chaplaincy, he explained to Harley—now ennobled as Earl of Oxford—had been established “when we had no footing in the Mediterranean.” Yet now, Taubman noted, “Sardinia, Majorca and Minorca are at present subservient to us, Mediterranean princes controlled by us and our fleets triumphant, yet the support of the privilege costs more trouble than the establishment of it first did.”¹⁰⁷

If the government could not be persuaded to uphold the Church’s interest abroad, perhaps it could be shamed. In September 1711, Abel Roper’s tory newspaper *The Post-Boy* ran an advertisement for a forthcoming pamphlet entitled *The Case of a Chaplain, attending on the British factory at Leghorn*, which asserted the “honor and necessity of maintaining that Law of Nations, and common right of mankind.”¹⁰⁸ A source of some embarrassment to the ministry, Roper was apparently questioned on the provenance of the advertisement, which he claimed “was brought to him by a minister in long [lawn?] sleeves.”¹⁰⁹ The advertisement ran in successive issues of *The Post-Boy* and ultimately succeeded in placing the chaplaincy on the agenda of the Privy Council. A commission for Nathaniel Taubman to serve the British factory at Leghorn, “in such manner and with such circumstances as the Reverend Mr. Basil Kennett” finally proceeded in early October.¹¹⁰

In subsequent decades, English churchmen would recall the establishment of the Anglican chaplaincy at Leghorn with a certain degree of wistfulness. The affair was memorialized as a singular instance of the British state deploying its power and influence in vindication of the Church of England and the Protestant interest—the latter term conveying more than just the secular interests of the Protestant states, but rather the true spiritual interests of the reformed religion abroad.¹¹¹ The memory of the affair became a benchmark by which to measure the de-confessionalization of foreign policy in the Walpolean age and the extent to which, lamentably, religious deprivation abroad no longer elicited the sustained attention of the British state.¹¹² (Unsurprisingly, the tories’ near-abandonment of the chaplaincy in 1710–11 formed no part of this emergent Anglican mythology.) And yet, this commemorative framework in many ways misconstrued the significance of the Leghorn chaplaincy affair. Churchmen celebrated the British state’s momentary relapse into confessional militancy, while the truly extraordinary feature of the affair was the growing complexity and sophistication of British civil society.

A network of commercial interests in London and abroad, Anglican prelates, foreign Protestants, and voluntary associations took cognizance of the spiritual needs of a British expatriate community in Italy and, in the midst of a global war, successfully recruited the machinery of the British state into its agenda of ecclesiastical provision. In defense of this provision, the representatives of the British state not only adopted the metropolitan rhetoric of Anglican expansion, but they also articulated a vision of international relations in which the law of nations comprehended the religious interests of one class of non-governmental actors—foreign merchants—while excluding those of another—the papacy and the Inquisition at Rome. This was an extraordinary step toward relocating religion

within international civil society, conceiving of it as an element of life that moved with peoples and goods, rather than as an aspect of the state that adhered in territory. Ultimately, when changes in military and geopolitical strategy threatened to drive a wedge between the interests of this network of churchmen, activists, and merchants and those of the British state, it was the state that yielded. The Leghorn chaplaincy was thus not the trophy of a confessional foreign policy; it was a sign of the maturation of civil society, characterized not just by material interests, but moral and religious ones as well. The Leghorn chaplaincy affair was not a chapter in the persistence of an Anglican confessional state, but rather another mark of the ascendancy of civil society over the state.¹¹³

Understood in this way, the Leghorn chaplaincy affair has the potential to inform a new agenda for ecclesiastical history in eighteenth-century Britain. Rather than understand the Church of England exclusively through its position in the political order, historians must begin inquiring into its institutional and ideological presence within British civil society. Through voluntary associations, philanthropic projects, imperial missionaries, factory chaplains, and ad hoc religious lobbies such as the campaign to establish the chaplaincy in Leghorn, the Church of England maintained a social presence markedly different from that which constituted its establishment in the English constitution. The erection of the Anglican chaplaincy in Leghorn suggests a capacious ecclesiological vision oriented toward commercial interest and not in any way circumscribed by the ambit of British territorial sovereignty. That the campaign had to avail itself of British sovereignty for success only testifies to the precociousness of this social Anglicanism as well as the immaturity of the international non-governmental infrastructure by which religious and humanitarian causes would subsequently be pressed.¹¹⁴ By investigating the contours of this Anglican presence in civil society, the “establishment from below” both at home and abroad, scholars might glean the ways in which the Church and allied moral and religious activists attempted to influence the policy of a British state that was, in fact, rarely confessional enough. Doing so might ultimately bring to light the established Church of a modern capitalist society, where once was only perceived that of an ancien régime.

NOTES

Although the author has benefitted from the advice and assistance of many friends and colleagues, he would like to acknowledge the late Dr. Jonathan Ocko of North Carolina State University, who passed away shortly before the publication of this article. A legal historian of modern China, Dr. Ocko’s insight into questions of sovereignty and extraterritoriality were a constant source of illumination during the research and writing of this essay.

1. On the sacralization of territory in early modern England, see Alexandra Walsham, *The Reformation of the Landscape: Religion, Identity, and Memory in Early Modern Britain and Ireland* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2011). The indispensable theoretical treatment of religion and territory remains Jonathan Z. Smith, *To Take Place: Toward Theory in Ritual* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1992).

2. Basil Kennett, *Sermons preached on several occasions, to a society of British merchants in foreign parts* (London, 1715), 364–65.

3. On this religious dimensions of overseas expansion, see Brent S. Sirota, “The Church: Anglicanism and the Nationalization of Maritime Space,” in *Mercantilism Reimagined: Political Economy in Early Modern Britain and its Empire*, ed. Phillip J. Stern and Carl Wennerlind (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2013), 196–217; and J.S. Taylor’s notion of “Christian mercantilism” also remains to be developed



further, see James Stephen Taylor, *Jonas Hanway: Founder of the Marine Society: Charity and Policy in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (London: Scholar, 1985).

4. This is most evident but not limited to the establishmentarian tone set by Jonathan Clark's paradigm of an eighteenth-century Anglican "confessional state" nearly three decades ago; see J.C.D. Clark, *English Society 1688–1832* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1985); William Gibson, *The Achievement of the Anglican Church, 1689–1800: The Confessional State in Eighteenth-Century England* (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen, 1996); William Gibson, *The Church of England, 1688–1832: Unity and Accord* (London: Routledge, 2001); Andrew C. Thompson, "Early eighteenth-century Britain as a confessional state," in *Cultures of Power in Europe during the Long Eighteenth Century*, ed. Hamish Scott and Brendan Simms (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2007), 86–109. For a recent alternative approach that still places church-state relations at its center, see Jacqueline Rose, *Godly Kingship in Restoration England: The Politics of the Royal Supremacy, 1660–1688* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2011).

5. Brent S. Sirota, *The Christian Monitors: The Church of England and the Age of Benevolence, 1680–1730* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 2014)

6. See A. L. Cross, *The Anglican Episcopate and American Colonies* (New York: Longmans, Green, 1902); John Frederick Woolverton, *Colonial Anglicanism in North America* (Detroit: Wayne State Univ. Press, 1984), 107–35; Stephen Taylor, "Whigs, Bishops and America: The Politics of Church Reform in Mid-Eighteenth Century England" *Historical Journal* 36 (1993): 331–56; J.C.D. Clark, *The Language of Liberty 1660–1832: Political Discourse and Social Dynamics in the Anglo-American World* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1994), 141–217; James B. Bell, *The Imperial Origins of the King's Church in America, 1607–1783* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004); Peter M. Doll, *Revolution, Religion and National Identity: Imperial Anglicanism in British North America, 1745–1795* (Teaneck, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson Univ. Press, 2000); Robert Ingram, *Religion, Reform and Modernity in the Eighteenth Century: Thomas Secker and the Church of England* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007), 209–82

7. B. S. Schlenther, "Religious Faith and Commercial Empire," in *The Oxford History of the British Empire, Vol. 2: The Eighteenth Century*, ed. P. J. Marshall (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1998), 128–50; Travis Glasson, *Mastering Christianity: Missionary Anglicanism and Slavery in the Atlantic World* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 2011); Jeremy Gregory, "Transatlantic Anglican Networks, c. 1680–c. 1770: transplanting, translating and transforming the Church of England," in *International Religious Networks*, ed. Jeremy Gregory and Hugh McLeod (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2012), 127–42; Penelope Carson, *The East India Company and Religion, 1698–1858* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2012)

8. For an overview of the Anglican revival, see Garnet V. Portus, *Caritas Anglicana, or, An Historical Inquiry into those Religious and Philanthropic Societies that Flourished in England between the years 1678 and 1740* (London: A.R. Mowbray & Co, Ltd, 1912); Dudley Bahlmann, *The Moral Revolution of 1688* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1957); F.W. Bullock, *Voluntary Religious Societies, 1520–1799* (St. Leonard's on Sea, UK: Budd & Gilatt, 1963); David Owen, *English Philanthropy 1660–1960* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 1964), 11–68; Eamon Duffy, "Primitive Christianity Revived: Religious Renewal in Augustan England," *Studies in Church History* 14 (1977): 287–300; John Spurr, "The Church, the societies and the moral revolution of 1688," in *The Church of England c. 1689–c. 1833: From Toleration to Tractarianism*, ed. J. Walsh, C. Haydon and S. Taylor (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1993), 127–42; Tony Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1996); Craig Rose, *England in the 1690s* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999), 195–209; Sirota, *The Christian Monitors*.

9. White Kennett, *A sermon preach'd at the funeral of the Right Noble William Duke of Devonshire* (London, 1707), 11.

10. Portus, *Caritas Anglicana*, 46.

11. Daniel Defoe, *An Essay upon Projects* (London, 1697), 1–2; and see Maximilian E. Novak, ed. *The Age of Projects* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 2008).

12. A notable exception is James S.M. Anderson, *The History of the Church of England in the Colonies and Foreign Dependencies*, 3 vols. (London, 1856), 3:1172–84.

13. Jonathan Scott, *When the Waves Ruled Britannia: Geography and Political Identities, 1500–1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2011).



14. Of course, this insularity by no means went uncontested in the later seventeenth century; as Tony Claydon has shown, the question of communion with foreign churches comprised one of the major fault-lines of civil and ecclesiastical politics in this period. And yet, “the search for sister Churches abroad” remained for the most part aspirational, comprised of little more than polemical gestures of religious solidarity with either the wider Protestant interest or a Catholic Christianity demarcated by the apostolic episcopate. Tony Claydon, *Europe and the Making of England 1660–1760* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2007), 284–313.

15. Lambeth Palace Library [henceforth cited as LPL] 930, §28. Anthony Marie de la Croze to Archbishop Tenison, 8 Mar. 1715, De La Croze was a member of the SPCK and an ardent Protestant internationalist. For his other efforts, see Bodleian Library [henceforth cited as Bodl.], Ballard MS 26, ff. 97, 100, 105, 110, 112. De La Croze to Arthur Charlett, 1 Jul. 1713, 1 Dec. 1713, 20 Jun. 1716, 23 Jun. 1718, 18 Apr. 1721; British Library [henceforth cited as BL], Lansdowne MS 1024, f. 328. De La Croze to Robert Watts, [Jul. 1711]; Henry Newman Letter Books, III, f. 2. Henry Newman to de la Croze, 30 Dec. 1718, in *S.P.C.K.: Early Eighteenth Century Archives* (London: World Microfilms, Ltd., 1977).

16. Andrew Fletcher, *A Discourse of Government with relation to militias* (Edinburgh, 1698), 63; see David Armitage, “The elephant and the whale: empires of land and sea,” *Journal for Maritime Research* (2007); John Robertson, “Universal monarchy and the liberties of Europe: Hume’s critique of an English Whig doctrines,” in *Political discourse in early modern Britain*, ed. Nicholas Phillipson and Quentin Skinner (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1993), 349–73.

17. Sirota, “Anglicanism and the Nationalization of Maritime Space;” and see Rowan Strong, *Anglicanism and the British Empire c. 1700–1850* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2007), 41–117

18. *William the Third, by the grace of God . . . Whereas we are credibly informed, That in many of Our Plantations, Colonies and Factories beyond the Sea* [13 Jun. 1701] (London, 1701); and see Andrew Porter, *Religion Versus Empire? British Protestant Missionaries and Overseas Expansion, 1700–1914* (Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press, 2004), 17–18.

19. *The Ecclesiastical Polity and other works of Richard Hooker*, 3 vols. (London, 1830), 3:254.

20. On the growing primacy of interest in national identity, see Steve Pincus, “From holy cause to economic interest: the study of population and the invention of the state,” in *A Nation Transformed: England after the Restoration*, ed. Alan Houston and Steve Pincus (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2001), 272–98.

21. See, for instance, Philip J. Stern, *The Company-State: Corporate Sovereignty and the Early Modern Foundations of the British Empire in India* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2011), 100–18.

22. Eamon Duffy, “Correspondence Fraternelle; the SPCK, the SPG and the Churches of Switzerland in the War of the Spanish Succession,” in *Reform and Reformation in England and the Continent, c. 1500–c. 1750*, ed., Derek Baker (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1979), 251–80.

23. BL Add. MS 61300, f. 56. Trustees of the Rotterdam Church to Duke of Marlborough, 6 Feb. 1703/4; BL Add. MS 45512, f. 5. Francis Lee, Notes on Robert Nelson; and see C.F. Secretan, *Memoirs of the Life and Times of the Pious Robert Nelson* (London, 1860) 68. On the Anglican churches in Amsterdam and Rotterdam, see Sugiko Nishikawa, “English Attitudes toward Continental Protestants with Particular Reference to Church Briefs c.1680–1740,” (Ph.D. diss., Univ. of London, 1998), 163–71

24. Henry Newman Letterbooks, Vol. XII, ff. 26–28. Henry Newman to John Robinson, Bishop of London, 23 Jun. 1722.

25. Julian S. Corbett, *England in the Mediterranean*, 2 vols. (New York: Longmans Green and Co., 1904), 236–38; John B. Hattendorf, *England in the War of the Spanish Succession* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1987), 106–9.

26. See Joseph Addison, *Remarks on several parts of Italy, &c. in the years, 1701, 1702, 1703* (London, 1705), 393–99; for some background on the factory, see Gigliola Pagano De Divitiis, *English Merchants in Seventeenth Century Italy* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1997); Francesca Trivallato, *The Familiarity of Strangers: The Sephardic Diaspora, Livorno and Cross-Cultural Trade in the Early Modern Period* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 2009)

27. On the Plowman case, see Tristan M. Stein, "The Mediterranean and the English Empire of Trade, 1660-1748" (Ph.D. diss., Harvard Univ., 2012), 128–41; and Giacomo Giusti, "Il Granducato di Toscana e il 'caso Plowman': la difesa della neutralità e la crisi con l'Inghilterra (1696–1707)," (Tesi di laurea specialistica, Università di Pisa, 2008); Anne R. to Lambert Blackwell, 24 Nov. 1704, in *HMC Buccleuch and Queensberry*, 2:707–8; National Archives [henceforth cited as NA], SP 98/22. L. Blackwell to Sir Charles Hedges, 6 Jan. 1704/5.

28. On the so-called "small awakening" in late Restoration London, see Gordon Rupp, *Religion in England 1688–1791* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), 51.

29. On Newton, see Stuart Handley, "Newton, Sir Henry (1650–1715)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford Univ. Press, 2004; online edn, Jan. 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com.proxy.uchicago.edu/view/article/20058>, accessed 7 Mar. 2013].

30. BL Add. MS 61612, f. 17. Montague to Earl of Sunderland, 29 Jun. 1709.

31. NA SP 44/353, f.72. "Certificate that Dr Henry Newton, envoy to Tuscany and Genoa, took leave of her majesty on 29 October [1704] last to enter on his employment."

32. NA SP 98/22. Newton to Hedges, 9 May 1705 New Style [NS].

33. NA SP 98/22. Newton to Hedges, 9 May, 16 May, 27 Jun. 1705 NS.

34. L. Blackwell to Count de Lamberg, 25 Jul. 1704, in *HMC Buccleuch and Queensberry*, 2:696; NA SP 98/22. Newton to Hedges, 1 Aug., 29 Aug., 19 Sept., 17 Oct., 6 Dec. 1705 NS, 19 Feb., 28 Aug. 1706 NS; on Searle's case, see Stefano Villani, "Donne inglesi a Livorno nella prima età moderna," in *Sul filo della scrittura. Fonti e temi per la storia delle donne a Livorno*, ed. Lucia Frattarelli and Olimpia Vaccari (Pisa: Plus, 2005), 393–94.

35. NA SP 98/22. Newton to Hedges, 11 Sept. 1706 NS.

36. Stefano Villani, "Religious Pluralism and the Danger of Tolerance: The English Nation in Livorno in the Seventeenth Century," in *Late Medieval and Early Modern Religious Dissents: Conflicts and Plurality in Renaissance Europe*, ed. F. Barbierato and A. Veronese (Pisa: Edizioni Il Campano Arnus Univ. Books, 2012); Stefano Villani, "L'histoire religieuse de la communauté Anglaise de Livourne (XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles)," in *Commerce, voyage et expérience religieuse, xvi-xviii siècles*, ed. Albrecht Burkardt, Gilles Bertrand, and Yves Krumenacker (Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes, 2007), 257–74; Stefano Villani, "Cum scandalo catholicorum . . .": La presenza a Livorno di predicatori protestanti inglesi tra il 1644 e il 1670," *Nuovi Studi Livornesi*, 8 (1999): 9–58.

37. NA SP 98/22. Newton to Hedges, 27 Jun., 11 Sept. 1705 NS.

38. LPL SPG Papers, Vol. I, ff. 58–59. Minutes, 18 Jun. 1705. Curiously, the SPG credited the project to two Swiss affiliates of the SPG, Louis Tronchin and Jean-Alphonse Turretini.

39. Bodl. Rawlinson C 983, ff. 175. Newton to Compton, 8 May 1706 NS.

40. NA SP 98/22. Newton to Hedges, 11 Sept. 1705 NS.

41. NA SP 98/22. Petition of the English nation regarding a salary for the chaplain, 9 Nov. 1705 NS.

42. NA SP 98/22. Newton to Hedges, 11 Nov. 1705 NS.

43. Kennett's name first appeared in the minutes for 8 July 1710; LPL SPG Minutes, Vol. I, f. 3. The materials for Kennett's *Account of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts* (London, 1706) are compiled at BL Lansdowne MS 1032.

44. BL Lansdowne MS 1039, f. 81. White Kennett, memorandum, [1706]; BL Lansdowne MS 1041, f. 40. Archbishop Tenison to White Kennett, 16 May 1706; William Newton, *The Life of the Right Reverend Dr. White Kennett* (London, 1730), 53–54; *Calendar of State Papers Domestic*, Anne, IV, § 965. Hedges to Compton, 13 Jun. 1706.

45. BL Lansdowne MS 1015, f. 8. Basil Kennett to Samuel Blackwell, 16 Jul. 1706.

46. BL Add. MS 45511, f. 79. Robert Nelson to Samuel Brewster, 10 Sept. 1706.

47. *Calendar of State Papers Domestic*, Anne, IV, § 965. Hedges to Compton, 13 Jun. 1706.
48. NA SP 98/22. Newton to Hedges, 31 Jul. 1706 NS.
49. NA SP 98/23. Hedges to Newton, 16 Aug. 1706.
50. For Basil Kennett's commission, see Bodl. Ballard MS 7, f. 151; BL Lansdowne MS 1041, f. 18; and *Calendar of State Papers Domestic*, Anne, IV, §1340.
51. NA SP 98/22. Newton to Hedges, 19 Dec. 1706 NS; BL Add. MS 61518, ff. 23–24. Newton to Earl of Sunderland, 16 Jan. 1707 NS; BL Add. MS 61518, f. 51. Christopher Crow to Newton, 26 Jan. 1707.
52. BL Add. MS 61518, ff. 17, 19. Newton to Hedges, 26 Dec. 1706 NS, 2 Jan. 1707 NS.
53. BL Add. MS 61518, ff. 23–24. Newton to Earl of Sunderland, 16 Jan. 1707 NS; BL Add. MS 61518, ff. 27–28. Montemagni to Newton, 11 Jan. 1707 (transcript); BL Add. MS 61518, f. 31 is enclosure of copy letters from Sir John Finch to Count Bardi, 7 Sept. 1666.
54. BL Add. MS 61518, f. 102. Newton to Montemagni, 12 Mar. 1707 NS.
55. William III, Charter for the SPG, 1.
56. See Archbishop Tenison's position recorded in Newton, *Life of . . . Kennett*, 52: "His Grace readily concurred in the opinion, that such a privilege of the exercise of religion, by a lawful minister of it, was a right of Christians, even by the law of nations, in every country where they were allowed to settle and traffic." See also "The Life of Dr. Basil Kennett," *British biography; or, an accurate and impartial account of the lives and writings of eminent persons, in Great Britain and Ireland*, 10 vols. (London, 1766–77), 7:410; on the law of nations, see Arthur Nussbaum, *A Concise History of the Law of Nations* (New York: Macmillan, 1947); Richard Tuck, *The Rights of War and Peace: Political Thought and International Order from Grotius to Kant* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1999).
57. On the continuing viability of the notion of mercantilism, see Steve Pincus, "Rethinking Mercantilism: Political Economy, the British Empire and the Atlantic World in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series, 69 (2012): 3–34; and the essays in Stern and Wennerlind, eds., *Mercantilism Reimagined*.
58. Daniel Philpott, "The Religious Roots of Modern International Relations," *World Politics* 52 (2000): 206–45; Daniel Philpott, "Religious Freedom and the Undoing of the Westphalian State," *Michigan Journal of International Law* 25 (2004) 981–98; Benjamin Straumann, "The Peace of Westphalia as a Secular Constitution," *Constellations* 15 (2008): 173–88; Malcolm D. Evans, *Religious Liberty and International Law in Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1997), 27–59; Mashood A. Baderin, "Religion and International Law: Friends or Foes?" *European Human Rights Law Review* 5 (2009): 637–58.
59. Newton's argument lends additional support to Pincus's account of the shifting standards for the reckoning of state power in late seventeenth century Europe; see Pincus, "From holy cause to economic interest."
60. For an important recent treatment of the problem of toleration in international law, see Peter D. Danchin, "The Emergence and Structure of Religious Freedom in International Law Reconsidered," *Journal of Law and Religion* 23 (2007–8): 455–534.
61. NA SP 98/23. Sunderland to Newton, 10 Jan. 1707; BL Add. MS 61518, ff. 33–37, 72–76. Newton to Montemagni, 15 Jan., 5 Feb. 1707 NS.
62. Newton routinely conflated the religious indulgence due to foreign merchants with that afforded foreign ambassadors, reminding Montemagni that the emissaries of the Tuscan court already possess "allowance in England for their preachers, though of a religion equally forbidden by the laws of the country." BL Add. MS 61518, f. 37. Newton to Montemagni, 15 Jan. 1707 NS.
63. On the hospitality traditionally accorded foreign merchants, see Georg Cavallar, *The Rights of Strangers: Theories of International Hospitality, the Global Community, and Political Justice since Vitoria* (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2002).
64. BL Add. MS 61518, ff. 33–35, 47. Newton to Montemagni, 15 Jan., 22 Jan. 1707 NS.

65. BL Add. MS 61518 ff. 41, 45. Montemagni to Newton, 19 Jan., 25 Jan. 1707 NS (transcript); BL Add. MS 61518 f. 60. Newton to Sunderland, 23 Jan. 1707 NS.

66. Garrett Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy* (New York: Dover Publications, 1988) 242–44; Walter Grossmann, “Toleration—Exercitum Religionis Privatum,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 40 (1979): 129–34; Benjamin J. Kaplan, *Divided By Faith: Religious Conflict and the Practice of Toleration in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 2007), 187–88.

67. BL Add. MS 61518 f. 60. Montemagni to Newton [25 Jan. 1707 NS] (transcript).

68. NA SP 98/22. Newton to Hedges, 31 Oct. 1705 NS; see also NA SP 98/23. Newton to Earl of Dartmouth, 11 Nov. 1710 NS, in which Newton observes that the power of the Roman Catholic Church is “so great in this country, that their princes are really but half sovereigns.”

69. BL Add. MS 61518 ff. 55, 75–76. Newton to Montemagni, 29 Jan., 5 Feb 1707 NS.

70. BL Add. MS 61518, ff.53–56, 70–71. Montemagni to Newton, [25 Jan.], 2 Feb. 1707 NS (transcript).

71. BL Add. MS 61518 f. 74. Newton to Montemagni, 5 Feb. 1707 NS.

72. NA SP 98/23. Sunderland to Newton, 4 Feb. 1707; this letter is also printed in Newton, *Life of . . . Kennett*, 59.

73. BL Add. MS 61518, f. 102. Newton to Montemagni, 12 Mar. 1707 NS.

74. White Kennett, for instance, had no illusions about the underlying threat of violence by which his brother’s chaplaincy would be sustained: “It is a very singular answer given by the Great Duke, that he cannot protect a man from Inquisition without license from the pope. If our arms succeed well, we shall be able to get a better answer.” BL Lansdowne MS 1039, f. 81. White Kennett, memorandum, [1706].

75. BL Lansdowne MS 1014 f. 69. W. Kennett to Charles Hinde, 15 Feb. 1707.

76. BL Lansdowne MS 1013, f. 95. W. Kennett to S. Blackwell, 13 Feb. 1707.

77. In June 1707, the antiquarian Thomas Hearne was misinformed that “Mr. Basil Kennet is taken into ye Inquisition notwithstanding her Majesty’s letter for preventing it.” He subsequently corrected his error. *Remarks and Collections of Thomas Hearne*, ed. C.E. Doble, et. al., 11 vols. (Oxford, 1886), 2:17.

78. BL Lansdowne MS 1014 f. 73. W. Kennett to Hinde, 26 Jul. 1707.

79. Newton to [unnamed], Aug. 1707, in *Life of . . . Kennett*, 63; BL Lansdowne MS 1041 f. 115. W. Kennett to S. Blackwell, 20 Sept. 1707.

80. B. Kennett, *Sermons preached on several occasions*, 2, 12.

81. BL Add. MS 61518, f. 62. Newton to Sunderland, 6 Feb. 1707 NS.

82. BL Lansdowne MS 1041 f. 107. W. Kennett to S. Blackwell, 5 Jul. 1707.

83. B. Kennett, “Sermon XVII: A Funeral Sermon for Mr. Thomas Dorman, Merchant,” in *Sermons preached on several occasions*, 369–88.

84. BL Add. MS 61518, f. 86. Newton to Sunderland, 20 Feb. 1707 NS.

85. BL Add. MS 28254, f. 20. Letterbook of English Catholic living in Florence, Jun. 1710; see f. 46, in which the English priest subsequently tried to engage Kennett in theological dispute, but without success. On English Catholic evangelization of English seamen in Italy, see NA SP 98/23. Molesworth to Dartmouth, 18 Oct. 1712 NS, 12 Dec. 1713 NS.

86. BL Lansdowne MS 1024, f. 328. Part of a Letter of the Rev. Mons la Croze Vicar of Old Windsor to Mr. Robt Watts upon his enquiry after Charities done to the foreign Protestants, [Jun. 1711].

87. George Berkeley, “A Letter to Sir John James,” *The Works of George Berkeley*, ed. Alexander Campbell Fraser, 4 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1901) 4:529.

88. NA SP 98/23. Newton to Sunderland, 1 Jul. 1710 NS.

89. NA SP 98/23. Thomas Tenison to the British Merchants of London trading to the Port of Leghorn in Italy, 12 Sept. 1710; Tenison to [Dartmouth?], 23 Sept. 1710. Interestingly, a minor dispute between Archbishop Tenison and Bishop Compton of London erupted over the right to nominate the Leghorn chaplain. Both Tenison and Compton selected Taubman as a candidate, yet Compton presumably did so on his customary authority over the Church of England abroad. For his part, Tenison claimed, “I pretend no right as Archb[isho]p but act as a friend to the service.” Meanwhile, the merchants “insist on a right as they themselves have to a free election” of the chaplain.

90. Nathaniel Taubman, *Memoirs of the British Fleets and squadrons in the Mediterranean, Anno 1708 and 1709* (London, 1710), 68–70.

91. BL Lansdowne MS 1041, f. 6. Leghorn Merchants to Tenison [Sept. 1710].

92. On the religious dimensions of the Tory ascendancy, see the essays in Mark Knights, ed. *Faction Displayed: Reconsidering the Impeachment of Dr Henry Sacheverell* (Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell for the Parliamentary History Yearbook Trust, 2012).

93. BL Lansdowne MS 1024, ff. 230–31. W. Kennett to B. Kennett, 1 Dec. 1710; Newton, *Life of . . . Kennett*, 81.

94. Derek McKay, “Bolingbroke, Oxford and the Defence of the Utrecht Settlement in Southern Europe,” *English Historical Review* 339 (1971): 264–84.

95. BL Lansdowne MS 1041, ff. 8–9. To the Right Honourable the Lords and Others of Her Majesties Most Hon. Privy Council, the Humble Representation and Petition of the Merchants in and about London trading to Leghorne, Sept. 1710; BL Lansdowne MS 1024, f. 223. Taubman to W. Kennett, 29 Sept. 1710.

96. Hattendorf, *England in the War of the Spanish Succession*, 232–33; A.D. MacLachlan, “The Road to Peace 1710–13,” in *Britain After the Glorious Revolution 1689–1714*, ed. G. Holmes (London: Macmillan, 1969), 197–215; B.W. Hill, “Oxford, Bolingbroke and the Peace of Utrecht,” *Historical Journal* 16 (1973): 241–63; G.M. Trevelyan, “The ‘Jersey’ Period of the negotiations leading to the Peace of Utrecht,” *English Historical Review* 49 (1934), 100–5.

97. BL Lansdowne MS 1041, ff. 8–9. Petition of the Merchants . . . trading to Leghorne, Sept. 1710.

98. The Scottish episcopal priest James Greenshields expressed his support for the chaplaincy, basing his own case for religious toleration in Scotland partly on the fact “that her Majesty’s subjects were not denied the free exercise of their religion and worship in any of the popish countries.” BL Lansdowne MS 1024, f. 236. W. Kennett, Memorandum.

99. W. Kennett to Robert Harley, 3 Oct. 1710, in *HMC Portland*, 4:606–7; W. Kennett to B. Kennett, 1 Dec. 1710, in Newton, *Life of . . . Kennett*, 81; BL Lansdowne MS 1024, ff. 230–31, 232, 234, 247, 254, 320.

100. B.W. Hill, “The Change of Government and the ‘Loss of the City’ 1710–1711,” *Economic History Review* 23 (1971): 395–413; Bruce G. Carruthers, *City of Capital: Politics and Markets in the English Financial Revolution* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press, 1992); Perry Gauci, “The Clash of Interests: Commerce and the Politics of Trade in the Age of Anne,” in *British Politics in the Age of Holmes*, ed. Clyde Jones (Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell for the Parliamentary History Yearbook Trust, 2009): 115–25.

101. NA SP 34/13, ff. 71, 77. Compton to Dartmouth, 30 Sept. 1710, 15 Jan. 1711; NA SP 34/15, f. 108. Compton to Dartmouth, 23 May 1711.

102. BL Lansdowne MS 1024, f. 254. W. Kennett, Memorandum.

103. Lansdowne MS 1041, f. 188. Humphreys to W. Kennett, 5 May 1711.

104. BL Lansdowne MS 1024, f. 340. W. Kennett, Memorandum.

105. Taubman to W. Kennett, 12 Mar. 1711, in Newton, *Life of . . . Kennett*, 89–90.

106. BL Lansdowne MS 1024, ff. 335, 339. W. Kennett, Memorandum.

107. Taubman to Oxford, 3 July 1711, in *HMC Portland*, 5:29.



108. *Post-Boy*, 18 Sept. 1711; BL Lansdowne MS 1024, ff. 339–40. W. Kennett, Memorandum.
109. Newton, *Life of . . . Kennett*, 95–96.
110. BL Lansdowne MS 1024, f. 341. W. Kennett to B. Kennett, 5 Oct. 1711; BL Lansdowne MS 1024, f. 342. W. Kennett to Crow, 12 Oct. 1711; NA SP 98/23. Commission for Nathaniel Taubman, 1 Oct. 1711; BL Lansdowne MS 1041, f. 10. Dartmouth to B. Kennett, 12 Oct. 1711.
111. BL Lansdowne MS 927, f. 24. W. Kennett, Draft of Speech in the House of Lords, [c. May 1727]; Henry Newman to Bishop Edmund Gibson, 13 Mar. 1729, Henry Newman Letterbooks, XX, ff. 25–26. Newton, *Life of . . . Kennett* covered the incident in extraordinary detail. On the meaning of the term Protestant interest, see Andrew C. Thompson, *Britain, Hanover and the Protestant Interest, 1688–1756* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006), esp. 25–60.
112. Andrew C. Thomson, “After Westphalia: Remodeling a Religious Foreign Policy,” in *War and Religion after Westphalia, 1648–1713*, ed. David Onnekirk (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2009), 47–67; on the recrudescence of confessional rhetoric in British foreign policy during the age of Walpole, see Jeremy Black, “The Catholic Threat and the British Press in the 1720s and 1730s” *Journal of Religious History* 12 (1983): 364–81.
113. Perry Anderson, “Origins of the Present Crisis,” *English Questions* (London: Verso, 1992), 15–47; Ellen Meiksins Wood, *The Pristine Culture of Capitalism* (London: Verso, 1991).
114. Michael Barnett, *Empire of Humanity: A History of Humanitarianism* (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 2011).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.