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problems of politics, religion, and society. What in some circles is academic is in these pages pragmatic. Men had to make choices, test their assertions, defend their avowals, resolve the conflict between ancient creeds and present circumstances. Some writers no doubt were hacks ready to serve the highest bidder, others were vicars of Bray, but the majority were men of deep conviction, many of first rate ability whose products were not those of overheated imagination but rather perceptive analyses. The scribbler who insisted, "you must not sever church and state; if you not both obey, you both provoke" put the major issue of the day as incisively as did Charles II in his Declaration of October, 1660, and the one who saw that "religion serves but for a strategem" anticipated many a historian's considered appraisal.

As is clear from the selection that follows the very titles reveal not only the subject matter but also the temper and point of view—the battle itself. No official document, however accurate, can catch the contemporary debate so vividly, nor so richly testify to the prevalence of ideas often thought to be the exclusive property of a few individuals supposedly ahead of their time. Pamphlets are often the best evidence we have of the extent to which some major ideas fell on fertile soil. Finally, almost as a footnote, the compilers hope that this exhibition will encourage students of the eighteenth century* to examine their own college libraries for rare pieces. The present writer has himself uncovered valuable ones in unexpected places.

* They have quite arbitrarily defined the century as running from 1660-1830.
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In 1943 the present writer received from Ralph Howey, a Philadelphia bookseller, a typewritten list of 475 17th and 18th century English pamphlets dealing chiefly with the relation of religion and politics. Having recently held a Huntington Library Research Fellowship to explore this very subject and already published several articles with heavy dependence on pamphlet material I was excited by the wealth, rarity, and, not least, low cost of the items. The university librarian, Benjamin Powell, equally impressed, immediately ordered the pamphlets. Before the transaction was completed another attractive list arrived to be followed by a steady succession, with increasing emphasis on the 19th century. The central theme of religion and politics continued to characterize the offerings. Duplicates were eliminated, and in time the collection totalled about 20,000, of which many titles are to be found in no more than two or three libraries in this country. Owing to the circumstances of its origin this rich and important scholarly resource has been called the Howey collection.

In illustrating central aspects of religion and politics in this catalogue the compilers have sought to choose examples either extremely rare in the United States or, in some cases, passed over by authors treating the general theme or specific topics embraced here. What is also intended is to exemplify the qualities that prompted two men, utterly diverse in talent and interest, in the golden age of pamphleteering to laud the value of "fugitive pieces." The earlier, Myles Davies, primarily historical in approach, justified his six volume Athenae Britannicæ (1716) on the ground that "from pamphlets may be learned the genius of the age, the debates of the learned, the follies of the
ignorant," and, most appropriately in the present context, the divisions of the zealots. Some thirty years later Dr. Johnson, in his introduction to an edition of the Harleian Miscellany (1744), put the case even more graphically, emphasizing how, among other subjects of inquiry too tedious to enumerate (as Davies had done), the multiplicity of sects and liberty of speech accounted for the unrivalled abundance of pamphlets in England and made them an important part of a library. From them one could learn the progress of every debate and all the attendant artifices, fallacies, and subterfuges as well as how the mind had been opened and error disentangled. He who read only the "larger writers" would see none of the changes which every opinion had passed through; he would indeed be as one who only read of the battle whereas he who traced the disputes in pamphlets would actually witness it. This character underscores Johnson's emphasis on liberty of speech, for despite several obstacles, men voiced and debated major contemporary issues from every standpoint. That their desires were not fully defined in no way detracts from the clues implicit in their articulation.

Generally speaking historians have agreed with seventeenth century satirists in regarding pamphleteers as fueling the "direful flame of civil discord and domestic blows by the incentives of malicious prose" wherein each base malignant pen dared asperse the most deserving men so that neither preferment nor grandeur's height could save them from every "scribler's puny spite." More prosaically but no less wittily the Marquis of Halifax found challenges in every pamphlet, making great noise and painting gruesome images; as the turmoil of the Interregnum in great measure proceeded from the daily publication of seditious and scandalous libels so the heats and animosities of the Restoration, "an age over-run with scribblers as Egypt was with flies and locusts," agitated men's minds, turning coffeehouses into lay conventicles where haberdashers of political small clothes transposed affairs in church and state.

Although as the years went by the sulphurous, often scabrous, character diminished, the vigor, purpose, and value remained. Whatever their intent to inflame or to amuse, whatever their immediacy even triviality, pamphlets were designed to instruct. Consequently they often stated major issues in remarkably apt phrases. Fugitive or not they at once reflected the urgency of a problem and the necessity of a solution. Moreover, having penetrated the verbiage, the reader finds that in assessing the current crisis the writer has often shrewdly assessed the eternal
When, in October, 1660, five months after his return to England, Charles II pronounced, "How much the peace of the state is concerned in the peace of the Church, and how difficult ...it is to preserve order and government in civil, whilst there is no order or government in ecclesiastical affairs," he capsulated the history of England for generations. He also was justifying the generous promises of the Declaration of Breda six months before and of the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion passed by the Convention Parliament shortly after his arrival. Such assertions confirmed the great joy and enthusiasm manifest along the Kentish lanes where maidens in white strewed flowers in the royal path and country gentlewomen lifted up their faces for a royal kiss, and in London where John Evelyn and thousands more blessed God for so bright a day, so bloodless a restoration.

Tragically the promises evaporated and the day of hope turned into a night of disappointment as Charles's diagnosis was repeatedly exemplified. Far from bringing peace and order the subsequent years brought recrimination, disruption, and persecution with no satisfaction to anyone. No one, either in the secular or ecclesiastical realm—king, parliament, or officials, High Church Laudians, Presbyterians, or sectaries—escaped attack. Penal legislation and prospects of indulgence alike inspired a cloud of pamphlets and broadsides, mostly violent in the extreme and not less apt for being violent. Even those most favored in church and state at times had recourse to the witticism that the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion meant indemnity for the rebels and oblivion for the faithful.

To this summary the Dissenters could scarcely subscribe, for many would soon recall with bitter irony the thanksgiving of May 29, 1660, for the restoration of "the public and free profession of true religion and worship." The restoration of Charles II was one thing, that of the Church another. With the election of the "Cavalier Parliament," more royalist than the king, more Laudian than the Church, the promise held out by the Convention Parliament ended abruptly, speeded to some degree by the failure of the Savoy Conference in 1661 to resolve the differences between Anglicans and Presbyterians. The obvious evidence of the change in temper was a series of statutes,
commonly if inaccurately labeled the Clarendon Code, 1661-6, and others less packaged in 1661 such as acts for the preservation of the king and restoring the temporal authority of ecclesiastical persons, acts against tumultuous petitioning, treasonable and seditious practices and attempts, and Quakers, and later on, the Test Acts of 1673 and 1678. Burdensome, persecuting, as these statutes were, they do not tell the whole story. Many penalties earlier imposed on Catholics were applied against Protestant Dissenters, canon law and common law were invoked against them, and such crises as the Fifth Monarchy uprising in 1661, the Dutch war, and even the plague and fire of 1665 and 1666 served to sharpen action. Instead of establishing "perfect union" government policies excited discord and increased disruption. Religious Dissent had become a crime.

This outcome was most clearly promoted by the Corporation Act (1661), the Act of Uniformity (1662), the Conventicle Acts (1664, 1670), the Five Mile Act (1665) and the Test Acts, which by defining the crime facilitated enforcement of penalties. The Corporation Act cut Dissenters out of municipal governments and, though eased in 1718 and 1767, survived until 1828 as one of the twin peaks (the Test Acts were the other) which Dissenters were perpetually seeking, and as perpetually failing, to conquer. What increased its severity was its imposition of a double penalty: not only were Dissenters debarred from office for refusing to subscribe the required oaths but they suffered a second penalty arising from corporation by-laws requiring a nominee to office to stand and an elected person to serve, regardless of his sacramental qualifications, or pay a large fine, running as high as £600. Until a noteworthy decision by Lord Chief Justice Mansfield in 1767 conscientious Dissenters were repeatedly, often deliberately, mulcted of huge sums, £35,000 being collected within a few years from those refusing to take the shrievality of London, and similar penalties were levied elsewhere, a condition that prompted the question, would the court argue that an Englishman might be punished with death and be liable to further punishment for being dead? Had this proceeding occurred in France it would have been labelled "jesuitical."

The Act of Uniformity drove Presbyterians from the church and universities. The Conventicle Acts prevented freedom of worship, and since many people equated conventicles with sedition the burden was intensified. The Five Mile Act (inspired by the plague) provided that all persons in Holy Orders or pretending thereto who had not assented to the Book of Common Prayer and subscribed to the declar-
ation in the Act of Uniformity with reference to taking up arms against the king, or had preached in a conventicle, should not come within five miles of a corporate town or borough. Moreover no such person might teach in a school or take boarders for purposes of instruction, a follow-up of the practice of the 1662 ejected of founding what was generally called Dissenting Academies. Any violation might bring fines and imprisonment. The Test Acts, though ostensibly aimed at Catholics, soon disabled Dissenters from political opportunities and severely limited their right to sue, serve as guardians or executors, and inherit property.

The other statutes referred to were equally stretched as the occasion seemed to warrant. An Anabaptist tract was held a malicious libel on the Common Prayer and its author pilloried, bullied, and imprisoned. A court judged Presbyterian Richard Baxter's paraphrase of the New Testament a seditious libel, fined him £500, and required security of good behavior for seven years. A moderate statement of religious grievances brought indictment for sedition upon author, readers, and the owner of the coffee house where it was circulated. Dissenting ministers and congregations were denied legacies on the ground of superstitious uses and seditious purposes. In one case, perhaps more, a Dissenter was not permitted to farm Church lands. No sect suffered so much as the Quakers, particularly because their refusal to take oaths made it easier to decide against them and because they were the most ardent conventiclers.

Yet although no one knew when hysteria would flare up, where it would strike, or when an order in council or judicial decision would extend the law into spheres unanticipated, the situation was not one of unrelieved persecution. Many men of diverse character and political and religious affiliation preferred oil to vinegar and compromise to persecution. Following the peace talk of 1660-61, when Charles repudiated any desire "to restrain tender consciences," the failure of the Savoy Conference prompted Charles to attempt to force Parliament's hand by a Declaration of Indulgence favorable to the Presbyterians. Unfortunately this group, convinced that comprehension with the Church was at hand, opposed the toleration of other Nonconformists and so found themselves without allies. Yet no sooner had Parliament passed the Uniformity Act than the Lords considered a bill to ease ecclesiastical tension, a policy that was again debated early in 1664. Ironically such proposals, inducing as they did Nonconformist confidence that improvement was at hand, led immediately to additional penal legislation and harsher administration of existing statutes with attendant denunciation of insolence and sedition. Even with the
government blowing hot and cold, with laws unenforced and proclamations disregarded, some irritated conformist or some unduly hopeful Dissenter might set off a court action almost invariably with painful consequences. Moreover throughout the 170 years here covered an explosion against one religious minority often recognized no limits; all others were likely to be penalized.

Yet it must be remembered that however persecuting the statutes and proclamations the provisions were often harsher than the enforcement, however punishing the court decision, its application was likely to be limited and in many instances reversed, however horrifying the definitions of criminality in the textbooks and commentaries, where Non-conformity was variously bracketed with adultery, sodomy, witchcraft, blasphemy, drunkenness, heresy, sorcery, open and notorious lewdness, they had in themselves no coercive authority. The failure of numerous relief measures did not carry with it an increase in legal burdens. After all many members of parliament and justices of the peace—"mongrel" justices—had strong Nonconformist sympathies and Latitudinarian leanings, and several Churchmen feared Rome more than Geneva or even sectarian chapels. Comprehension and toleration as practical programs had strong supporters who recognized how essential such were to the survival of England in the face of foreign rivalries.

Notwithstanding the validity of these assertions any rumor of conspiracy, no matter how unfounded, served to identify Nonconformity with treason and to classify conventicles as seditious with consequent denunciation and persecution. Similarly any rumor of forthcoming indulgence encouraged Dissenters to meet openly and voice their grievances violently to the terror of conformists who expected "nightly to have their throats cut" by the "diabolical rabble" and who thereupon applauded penalties against Quaker "cattle," Baptist "vermin," and even quite respectable Presbyterians. They wondered why,

"...can't you Nonconformists be content
Sermons to make, except you preach them too,"
for 'twas they
"Who taught the pulpit and the press
To mask rebellion in a gospel dress."

Denied the supposedly traditional rights of Englishmen in this environment Dissenters protested, petitioned, lobbied, went to court, and even turned the other cheek; above all they pamphleteered in prose and verse. Yet for years no tactic brought substantial relief. The union of
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throne and altar with its corollary ideals of political and ecclesiastical orthodoxy erected a barrier against which private judgment in religion and independence in politics could only butt in vain. For many of the lately disinherited, the ship of state "after a leap toward shipwreck on the seas" of anarchy was now righted and protected by God himself and they would do everything in their power to keep it so. Indeed had it not been for a popish king, a political revolution, and the overweening power of France even the mild relief given Dissenters might have been furthur delayed. Nevertheless as it turned out, once the kingdom had measurably settled on a steady course with popery no longer a critical threat and Louis XIV repeatedly defeated, Tories and Churchmen frequently sought to overturn or weaken earlier concessions and even threaten harsher penalties.

With all the talk about indulgences that occasionally led to mild concessions, not formally defined—and fear of both—Parliament subscribed to the conviction that the king could not dispense with a man to be a papist or Nonconformist. Such declarations as that of Charles in 1672 inspired the warning couplet to Nonconformists:

"Wherefore to Lull'em, do their hopes fulfill
With liberty: they're halter'd at your will."

Or as the latitudinarian Marquis of Halifax, who opposed the Conventicle Acts, stood for comprehension and toleration, and was the major voice in rejecting the exclusion of James, Duke of York, from the succession, and throughout these hectic years saw far too much hatred on all sides, put it, "men who are sore run to the nearest remedy with too much haste to consider the consequences." In particular he warned Dissenters against James' 1687 Declaration of Indulgence: "the other day you were Sons of Belial: now, you are Angels of Light"; recently the Quakers declared non-Christians are now favorites. Considering the maxim, that still had many believers, "It is impossible for a Dissenter not to be a Rebel," Dissenters should think twice before giving up rights in the law for a promised liberty; before rejoicing in the end they should look to the means. Would they justify the dispensing power with all its consequences, reject what parliament might offer, and sacrifice real freedom for pretended liberty?

As events turned out James II won few friends and little support among Dissenters to whom Parliament offered some relief, more perhaps in the promise than in the actuality. The Toleration Act (1689) materially
improved the religious position of Trinitarian Dissenters but did not remove the burdens imposed by the Corporation and Test Acts, nor did it include Unitarians among the beneficiaries. Moreover, it created, unintentionally, new burdens, first that it could not prevail against the common law, secondly, the presumption that it had conceded all that Dissenters deserved and therefore they should be content. Would they never be satisfied? So it was that the act’s chief supporters were not Dissenters but stalwart upholders of political and ecclesiastical orthodoxy, not all of whom to be sure accepted it. In 1699 stalwart Dean Prideaux denounced liberty of conscience as the mother of confusion: it would extinguish true religion by tolerating Quakers who were not Christians. The Indemnity Act (1718) and passed regularly from 1727 on, partially freeing Dissenters from the penalties of the Corporation Act, only insulted conscientious Dissenters who continued to seek, as principle and expediency alike, the complete repeal of the penal laws.

Three relief drives occurred in 1732, 1736, 1739. The first did not go beyond agitation which excited several warnings and denunciations. The second and third took the form of parliamentary bills which, however, failed by huge margins. Contemporaneously the Quakers moved for relief from tithes but though the bill passed the Commons it failed in the Lords. Thereafter no concerted effort for relief took place until the 1770s. Then, perhaps prompted by some notable litigious triumphs reducing criminality, Dissenters again sought statutory relief only to fail as they did repeatedly in the 1780s and 1790s. Not only did they fail in Parliament, despite brilliant advocacy and organized pamphleteering, but ironically litigation sometimes led to penalties hitherto unapplied. No wonder that one pamphleteer in 1789 exclaimed, "You hang a sword, suspended by a thread, over the heads of Dissenters, and assure them that you will not break the thread, if that is your real intention, is it not as easy, and much better, to remove the sword?"

Refusal to remove the sword stemmed from a variety of causes. The last quarter of the century was a time of stress in numerous areas, notably revolutions in America and France, in both of which instances Dissenters were defenders of revolution which, especially in the case of the French Revolution, revived the ancient charges of immorality, atheism, and treason. The throne and the altar were crumbling in France. Why not in England? Aggravating the situation was a campaign within the Establishment to relax subscription to the 39 Articles, the failure of which drove several of the spokesmen into Unitarian ranks where
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Still the Dragon's Chaplains were
More moderate than their bigotry,
For they fear Amuse were glad to cheat.
they were joined by numerous Dissenters. Indeed the phrase of St. Jerome hits off a large section of English Protestantism at this period: it "awoke and groaned to find itself Arian." John Newton, formerly a slave trader and now a stalwart evangelical, lamented that even the Methodist revival did not balance the defection of Dissenters; the Presbyterians, he wrote, permitted the most contemptuous and malignant opposition to the gospel and the Independents were on tiptoes to follow them. The whole campaign excited an intense pamphlet war with the petitioners for relaxation denounced as atheists and hypocrites who would leave the Church naked and defenseless. So fearful indeed were the opponents of relaxation that they transferred their hostility from the pope to Voltaire, from Romanism to rationalism.

In such an environment private citizens, justices, mobs, and courts were quick to attack all Dissenters but especially Unitarians and Quakers. This state of affairs continued until 1812-13 when one relief bill led to the repeal of the Conventicle and Five Mile Acts, the broadening of the Toleration Act, the removal of the sting of excommunication, and the extension of the Toleration Act to Unitarians. Following these concessions the courts changed their temper, even though Dissenters did not invariably win all their suits. For instance certain charities, especially those involving Unitarians, were disallowed. Less important but still indicative was the denial of the benefit of the Turnpike Act, which exempted worshippers from tolls, to a Dissenter who lived in one parish and attended chapel some distance away.

After 1820 Jacobinism, within and without, ceased to excite fear; reform was becoming respectable and internal rumblings unsettled the Establishment. For a time the Catholics received more attention than Protestant Dissenters, though such issues as permission to celebrate their own marriages were debated in Parliament invariably to the disadvantage of Dissenters, especially to the Unitarians who were repeatedly denounced as non-Christians, worse in this respect than Jews or Mahometans. Contemporaneously, as had often been the case, the political-religious atmosphere was more and more favorable to relief. Yet when the repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts was actually proposed, bitter opposition developed, partly because of fear that concession to Dissenters must lead to concessions to Catholics, partly because repeal meant tamely surrendering to the flame of disaffection, rationalism, licentiousness, chaos, and even democracy. Both in and out of Parliament arguments, pro and con, reflected every sentiment of the preceding 170 years.
On the one side repeal would destroy both Church and State; repeal was desirable but the right was not ripe and the grievances were trivial. On the other repeal would not endanger established institutions: it was no more than recognition of the rights of Englishmen. The offending Acts profaned religion and imposed obligations repugnant to conscience.

Despite numerous efforts to amend the repeal bill out of beneficial existence it passed both Houses by substantial margins, a Whig measure in a Tory legislature. Consequently, six weeks later, at six o'clock in the evening of June 18, 1828, the anniversary of Waterloo, a notable company of four hundred people—Dissenters, Catholics, Anglicans—with the Duke of Sussex in the chair and the galleries filled with ladies, celebrated the victory. Before their final toast, "a long pull, a strong pull, and a pull all together." at half-past one, they had toasted "every man's right and every nation's best interest—liberty of conscience," with speedy relief to all suffering disabilities. They had toasted the persons instrumental in the repeal, the memory of earlier adherents, education without subscription, and freedom of the press. Each toast inspired the most noble sentiments, the most hopeful predictions. On every side speakers denounced intolerance and all its agents and applauded this evidence of religious freedom. Well may these men have celebrated. Repeal was a triumph of no mean proportions. What was more, though perhaps few realized it, Catholic emancipation, the Reform Act, municipal reform, less publicized but pertinent statutes concerning charities and oaths, and beneficial court decisions would soon give far greater meaning to the victory they were toasting with one long pull after another.

Central as repeal was it by no means embraced everything in Charles's Declaration of 1660; peace and order in Church and State had numerous facets, not one to be separated from the others. Toleration had ramifications that repeatedly illustrated the extent to which an understanding of the relationship of religion and politics, whatever the particular manifestation, is essential to an understanding of English social evolution. If some topics now seem remote, even irrelevant and trivial, "the strangest consequence from the remotest cause," historians readily appreciate that between 1660 and 1828 they rippled the conscience and shaped the opinions of many men.

Although the Revolution of 1688 has had a bizarre variety of labels (in capitals no less)—Glorious, Bloodless, Respectable, Moral, Palace, none specifically religious—religion supplied a powerful impetus in the preliminaries and no less powerfully permeated the aftermath. If popery was the more
immediate threat Dissent suffered enormously during the hysteria of the 1680s when many Anglicans, lay and clerical alike, linked the two in what they felt was a wholesale campaign to destroy the Church, which in the words of a contemporary ballad, lay panting for its very life, and also, from the opposite extremes of divine right and republicanism, the state. What increased the frenzy with its violent denunciations and stifled penalties was the parallel conviction that rationalism, latitudinarianism, even atheism were the allies, in some instances the outgrowth, of popery and, more especially, Dissent. What these Anglicans did not appreciate, religion, exploited even by them to political ends, had a diminishing role in English life, the more that Nonconformists, debarred from political and ecclesiastical opportunities, had turned to commerce and science. The attempts to halt separation of Church and state had actually accelerated it.

Notwithstanding this outcome, a series of tragic events, spanning the decade 1678-88, vastly modified, not always for the worse, the position of Dissenters. The assurance of a Catholic successor prompted the unsuccessful campaign to exclude him from the throne. This in turn led men to accept Titus Oates's yarn about a popish plot (portrayed with explicit verisimilitude in one piece as a ship's mutiny), then, in partial revulsion, to belief in the Rye House or Presbyterian plot (1683), and finally to the Monmouth uprising (1685), each, the last most of all, with bloody consequences. Not least among the consequences was the mounting conviction that James did indeed intend to return England to Rome.

He himself nourished this belief with his Declarations of Indulgence (1687, 1688) which, in words recalling the Declarations of Charles II, suspended all laws penalizing religious Nonconformity. Disturbing as was the first Declaration, the second, followed by an Order in Council commanding its reading in churches, precipitated immediate action. Both Declarations produced innumerable pamphlets supporting or denouncing the royal program, with Dissenters drawn into the controversy scarcely less than Catholics. London Presbyterians issued an Address of Thanks to the King; William Penn actively supported him. On the other side the Marquis of Halifax, as already noted, bade Dissenters to consider the end as well as the means. On the whole they practiced that preaching and in consequence benefited first by the act exempting them from the penalties of certain laws, conveniently but mistakenly known as the Toleration Act (1689) and secondly by the act allowing Quakers to affirm rather than swear in civil cases (1696). Another measure that did not pass, a Comprehension Bill, like predecessors in 1663, 1667, 1668, 1680, was intended to replace uniformity with comprehension and pave the way for uniting
Presbyterians to the Church of England. Though the same objective was occasionally voiced in after years it drew no support. Failure in 1689 was highly significant in that it drove Presbyterians into alliance with the sectaries and so gave greater weight to the campaign for toleration.

That alliance in particular hastened widespread surfacing of organized Dissent in meeting houses and academies, so greatly to the alarm of Anglicans that the repeal of the Toleration Act was by no means improbable. What did come about was renewed parliamentary persecution. In 1698 the Blasphemy Act disabled anti-Trinitarians—atheists in many eyes—on first conviction from holding an office, on second conviction, from the right to sue or be a guardian of any child, penalties with extensive application and only removed in part in 1813. Two years later, owing in part to concern with the succession, an act sought to prevent the growth of popery, related to which was a diverting satire, delightful in a day of bitter epithets and malicious charges, namely "A List of Severall Acts to be Pass'd next Sessions" of Parliament. The first, setting the tone, would preserve the Protestant Religion at home and abroad by turning the administration of affairs to those who love the French, that is, the Jacobites; others amplified the way that should be done. In 1705, much more characteristically, the Lords were insisting, with the threat of penal legislation, that because danger abroad required unity at home no Dissenter should hold responsible office; yet as often happened, the same body shortly afterward was describing Dissenters as too divided to threaten Church or state: toleration made converts and foreign danger as well as trade prescribed leniency.

Once the Tories returned to power, as they did by 1710, this temper was reversed. The Occasional Conformity Act (1711), a measure actually proposed in 1701, dealing with a grievance of long standing, but especially since the Toleration Act, fined officials for attending conventicles once they had taken the Anglican sacrament. The Schism Act (1713) required conformity of schoolmasters, an attack on Dissenting Academies. Less precisely in 1711 Dissenters were threatened with banishment from London, and in 1722, when toleration seemed well established, perhaps too well, with more punishment than they had ever known. As usual all policies and threats excited storms of pamphlets for and against, and litigation applied or mitigated the burdens. As also might be expected, relief accompanied persecution, with the repeal of the Occasional Conformity and Schism Acts, the passage of an Act of Indemnity for Dissenters holding municipal office, and the promise of still broader benefits, all in 1718.
Understandably all this backing and filling was closely related to crises within the Church during the years after 1688. The bishops who were tried (and acquitted) for refusing to order the reading of the 1688 Declaration of Indulgence and then refused to accept the Revolution settlement initiated by their words and actions controversies varied in character and of long, if diminishing, significance. Over 400 clerics, including five bishops, refused to swear allegiance to William and Mary and continued to pray in church for James. Some fiercely adhered to their original stand and sought variously to heal the schism and of course failed, to the derision alike of stanch Jacobites and "jolly swearers." Twenty-seven non-juring bishops were consecrated between 1694, when one of the original five died, and 1795; a few recruits joined the movement at times when the Stuart prospects seem brighter but on balance more left, and the scattered congregations steadily diminished in number, size, and wealth. Paradoxically, however, the non-jurors seemed to have an influence out of proportion to their numbers.

Although they did survive, often quite vocally, for well over a century and were at once the heirs of the Laudian tradition of spiritual authority and, in some degree, the progenitors both of Tractarianism and the Scottish Disruption (1843) they were only one of several interrelated manifestations of persisting Church-state problems, all of which stimulated pamphleteers and poetizers to characterically pertinent or merely malevolent expression. Turbulence was the order—or disorder—of the day, and no man knew what issue, large or small, actual or threatening, might set a veritable prairie fire of dispute.

The overweening problem of oaths of allegiance to William and Mary immediately inspired questions concerning divine right, non-resistance, and church-state relations. These questions in turn found specific and dramatic expression in the Convocation furor, Sacheverell trial, and Bangorian controversy which, exciting in themselves, had greater importance as reflections of the growth, and fear too, of Erastianism, Latitudinarianism, anti-Trinitarianism, and political democracy. Not the least revealing aspect of this situation is the degree to which extremists, High Church and Dissent for example, agreed on the priority of traditional belief. Equally necessary to observe is the extent to which the most dedicated adherents of certain doctrines could pass over, even deny, the implications of their argument.

How could non-jurors maintain that theirs was the national church when the king to whom they swore allegiance and for whom they prayed was attempting to destroy both the Church and the
government? Were not oaths to James nullified when he broke the law? Government in their view came from God; the people could not supersede Him. Not tyranny but order was their ideal, yet they readily swore allegiance to a tyrant who had in fact abdicated and in law absolved them from continuing to recognize him as the ruler.

To a large extent non-jurors dramatized the pervasive problem of oaths of allegiance, a problem long amply and acrimoniously debated and now as between Jacobites and Williamites in no way academic. The choice was forcefully articulated. Failure to swear allegiance to William and Mary by August 1, 1689, carried suspension from office, civil and ecclesiastical. Full deprivation followed on February 1, 1690. Pamphlets thereupon flooded as men had to face the choice of loyalty to an unworthy deserter but nonetheless in the eyes of many, including many Williamites, de jure prince or to de facto rulers whose succession ran counter to divine law. Sharpening the debate was the plain fact that no one knew how long the de facto rulers would survive and the practical matter of holding on to one's office and maintaining a livelihood, for, as many non-jurors soon learned poverty was their lot. Whatever the particulars the issue soon ran beyond the immediate decision to the nature and end of government—the security of the community, the king's two bodies (crown and person), and a dozen other pertinent issues in the day of choice.

Although many participants are unidentified, William Sherlock, later Dean of St. Paul's, became, because of his eminence and behavior, the center of a controversy all his own, the more that he reflected the dilemma of those who could not for reasons, practical or moral, make up their minds. He refused to meet either of the aforesaid deadlines for taking the oaths. When he did subscribe in August, 1690, a year late, he did so by his own admission on the basis of a passage in Bishop John Overall's Convocation Book (compiled about 1606, published in 1690 through the agency of Archbishop Sancroft, the leading non-juror, for the purpose of persuading men to remain loyal to James II). The key passage declared that a government, when "thoroughly settled" should be obeyed. In defending his action Sherlock argued that a de facto ruler once established—"thoroughly settled"—must be acknowledged. Thereupon pamphleteers of every persuasion rather greedily recalled that although when Master of the Temple in 1684, he had affirmed the doctrines of divine right and passive obedience, he had in 1687 refused to read the Declaration. Many charged him not only with inconsistency but with elevating expediency and the public good above divine law, a course which must lead to anarchy since minorities of every sort would claim the public good as justification for their every
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act, including rebellion: *vox populi*, his bitterest critics reminded him, was not *vox Dei*. When furthermore, he was appointed Dean of St. Paul's early in 1691 Jacobite attacks became even more merciless, as derision entirely replaced argument: he looked one way and rowed the other. No pamphleteer credited him with having reached his decision after great anguish or considered that incalculable numbers had similarly suffered.

However bitter the controversy, the case of Sherlock versus Sherlock by 1692 merged into the larger, more general issue of Convocation versus Erastianism. By accepting expediency as the standard, the Church, according to many, was betraying its principles and nourishing both Deism and Dissent. Thereupon Francis Atterbury, High Church Bishop of Rochester, sought to revive the dormant Convocation as the instrument of Church independence, this in opposition to many of his fellow bishops, and so inaugurated an acrimonious controversy that like so many others here discussed or adverted to extended into areas not originally thought of. One of these, important almost entirely for its reflection of contemporary passions, was the case of the utterly trivial fireeating Henry Sacheverell who in August, 1709, preached one sermon, afterwards published, and on November 5, 1709, at St. Paul's of all places, preached a second, also published, traducing the Revolution and at the same time quite contradictorily inciting rebellion. In his St. Paul's sermon among other charges Sacheverell maintained that the Toleration Act was without warrant, that anyone defending it and liberty of conscience was a "false brother," and that the Church was because of these opinions in great peril. Though impeached for high crimes and misdemeanors in 1710 he got off lightly, despite the supposed Whig control of the Lords, owing to the contemporary political situation, including the return of the Tories to power; in addition there was shortly an attempt to make him a bishop. Trivial in itself the whole incident did have a massive impact. Mobs, turned Tory and preaching passive obedience, tore down Dissenting meeting houses and threatened worse violence; parliament enacted the Occasional Conformity and Schism Acts; and, as mentioned earlier, men talked freely of further steps to exalt the authority of the Church and reduce Dissent.

For all the seeming Tory triumph neither Whigs nor Dissenters remained long in eclipse. Within a few years the definition of church-state relations found a far more important expression in the Bangorian controversy, no less because of the distinction of the participants than of the fundamental issues raised, combining them as it did with a specific incident whereon participants readily stated their views in meaningful terms. Although the controversy took its name from a
sermon in 1717 by Benjamin Hoadly, Bishop of Bangor and rapidly translated to Hereford, Sarum, and Winchester for political value to the Hanoverians, expressing the extreme Latitudinarian view of the Church, The Nature of the Kingdom, or Church of Christ, Hoadly had for a decade been in the public eye. Even while the Sacheverell case was capturing attention he was denying claims of divine right and non-resistance and asserting popular right in an exchange with the Bishop of Exeter to the derision of the anonymous authors of "Leviathan or a Hymn to Poor Brother Ben" and "The Old Pack," this last inspired by the Sacheverell trial. In 1716 he attacked the non-jurors' contention that theirs was the only true Church, completely independent of the state, in A Preservative Against the Principles and Practices of the Non-Jurors. When this pamphlet was followed by his even more extreme sermon the High Church Lower House of Convocation resolved against their "several dangerous positions and doctrines" and the likely consequences.

The issue by no means stopped there as the highly esteemed non-juror, William Law, replied to Hoadly with Three Letters (1717), insisting on the necessity of an outward privileged Church and apostolical succession of authorized ordainers. Nearly twenty years later the controversy between the two continued with Hoadly's Latitudinarian Plain Account of the Nature and End of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper (1735) to which Law responded with A Demonstration of [its] Gross and Fundamental Errors (1737), especially addressed to all younger clergy. To stress the debate between the two is not to discount innumerable contributors to the whole controversy or to neglect its broader implications. Hoadly was a redoubtable ally of Dissenters and of toleration generally, even if he did attack non-jurors, the more that he considered toleration and Latitudinarianism defences against Deism. It is not too much to claim that the friendly atmosphere which made possible important litigious concession to Dissenters and, no less, encouraged successive efforts at parliamentary relief and the many restrained pleas for toleration during the quarter-century prior to the outbreak of the French Revolution owed much to him.

A major force in these pleas and arguments was clearly the denial to anti-Trinitarians rights granted to Trinitarian Dissenters by the Toleration Act and extended by subsequent litigation. Virtually every advocate of toleration, especially after the mid-eighteenth century, whatever his professed sectarian allegiance, at least adverted to their misfortunes. Without attempting a complete calendar of these advocates a few of the more substantial may properly be summarized. Among them the eminent Joseph Priestley, scientist, educator,
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and political theorist, anti-Trinitarian as well, was equally quick to deplore the legal burdens on Dissenters and to emphasize the lack of unanimity among Anglicans; and well he might since even the Anglican bishops were by no means of one mind as regards doctrine. He condemned Blackstone's classifying Dissent as a crime and particularly resented the insinuation that the principles and practices of Dissenters were not calculated to make them good subjects. To this latter he responded that they were always happy to render unto Caesar the things that were Caesar's while rendering unto God the things that were God's. Neither hostility to the ecclesiastical hierarchy nor disbelief in the Trinity made them bad citizens. They were not republicans but supporters of limited monarchy. For all his emphasis on the value and need of toleration he allowed one unfortunate possibility: Dissenters fully tolerated might lose their zeal.

No less upset by Blackstone and motivated by Mansfield's recent decision ending double penalties for violation of the Corporation Act, Philip Furneaux, a highly regarded Independent minister, anxious to set forth the actual limits of contemporary toleration, reminded his readers of surviving penalties which might be applied at any time. Dissenters suffered more from ignorance than from aversion. He too insisted on their good citizenship and upon the benefits of toleration to the whole community, especially when it extended beyond freedom of thought to freedom of action. Without the latter the former was futile.

Other essayists, moved by the claim that the Toleration Act gave Dissenters complete freedom of conscience, that even their violations of the penal code were not punished, and that therefore they had no real grievance, maintained that such was not the case; the Act needed to be amended and extended, in effect to be brought up to date. For instance, David Williams, another Independent minister and anti-Trinitarian, who professed vigorously that opinions must be free and only actions limited (not an altogether helpful profession), was by no means unique in opposing tests of any kind as leading to intolerance and deriding those whose mental reservations in fact refuted their complaints about tests. As one fellow advocate emphasized the 39 Articles meant little when the Church in fact comprehended Deism, Socinianism, and Calvinism. To command subscription and a sacramental test as requisite for civil office profaned the solemn ordinances of Christianity. Such arguments pervaded uncounted pamphlets and sermons where toleration was not the avowed theme and found notable expression in the publications of men who suffered no particular burden, as for instance Richard Price, the "torchbearer of freedom," who like those specified here and
more unspecified defended the American colonists and later welcomed the French Revolution, unhappily to the Dissenters' great disadvantage in seeking relief.

Although far from escaping attention during the century 1661-1766 anti-Trinitarianism—whether labelled Socinianism, Arianism, or, later, Unitarianism—came, as just emphasized, to the fore after 1770. Earlier pamphleteers of various persuasions had tended to tie it to the spread of Deism and Latitudinarianism in general, or to such specific works as Samuel Clarke's *Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity* (1712) and Hoadly's *Bangorian sermon* (1717). Contemporaneously several less dramatic circumstances—the growth of Arianism at Cambridge, manifest in Newton and William Whiston, and pervasive popular defence of it—testified to growing rationalism with which varied forms of anti-Trinitarianism could be identified. This in turn inspired pamphlets, conferences, resolutions, pro and con, supporting what some regarded as a happy development and damning what others felt to be a menace.

The issue became much more specific following Anglican Archdeacon Blackburne's *Confessional* (1766) with its plea for relaxation of subscription to the 39 Articles and the Feather's Tavern parliamentary petition to the same end in 1772. This last was rejected by a huge majority with Edmund Burke, a great professor of toleration, often with some such proviso as that the time is not ripe, leading the attack. Defeat in no sense halted the effort which numbered among its supporters bishops as well as lesser Anglicans. Neither did defeat discourage the growth of Socinianism. Not only were there conspicuous converts like Theophilus Lindsay, who resigned his preferment and founded the first Unitarian Sunday School, and John Jebb, the stalwart promoter of parliamentary reform, but there is the vivid testimony of Evangelical John Newton already cited. In this context it may be recalled again that though positive relief was not forthcoming until 1813 and then only in part, sundry illegal practices escaped penalty.

Among the points emphasized in these pages is the interrelationship of the topics chosen for special attention. Persecution or toleration in one area had consequences in another; controversy over one issue penetrated others; personalities prominent in a particular movement influenced the outcome of others. Nowhere is this better illustrated than in the birth and rise of Methodism, yet however commonly the authorities designated the Methodists as Dissenters, especially in the early decades, and applied the same penalties from time to time and however commonly Methodists classed themselves as Nonconformists after the death of John Wesley, their history and status prescribe a different approach. Compared to many
sects, indeed all the major ones, they came late upon the scene and had little or no history of extremism in politics or religion. Not surprisingly then they had powerful allies among the upper classes who may well have seen in them a desirable conservative force especially in the turbulent decades after 1760 when they were generally hostile to the American and French Revolutions and to rationalism.

To characterize the Methodists in these terms alone suggests that they were standpatters. This was far from the case whether we look at their religious procedures or their social philosophy. In these respects they reflected the outlook of their founder, John Wesley, who, after years in a wilderness of theological cross-currents wherein he was influenced by Law, Hoadly, Atterbury, and many other Anglicans, found his doctrine—salvation and justification by faith—in 1738 in a Moravian chapel. Soon after he discovered first his role as a field preacher and then the proper organization of his followers. Convinced that they were totally unsatisfied with Anglican and Dissenting preaching and practice he not only preached morality, public and private, but founded a loan society, a home for widows, a school for poor children, and a dispensary. For him poverty was a social problem, one to be alleviated by Christian practice.

By 1749 he had resolved his concept of true Christianity and how to attain it: orthodoxy had but a slender part, for religion did not consist of negatives or externals; avoid narrowness of spirit; form weekly classes where believers could comfort one another, clear up misunderstandings and quarrels; practice frugality, be diligent. Admittedly, however convinced he was of the advantages of Methodist worship, neither giddy nor formal and with plenty of lusty singing, not all to whom Wesley and his fellows preached were sympathetic to the conditions and practices he imposed; not all were concerned with fleeing from the wrath to come in the path he prescribed. Consequently he found it necessary to expel backsliders, and on occasion to suffer violent hostility, verbal and physical. "Be not righteous overmuch" summed up the attitude of many Anglican and old dissenting clergy; and whilst some bade their fellows imitate the good and avoid the bad in Methodism others were repelled by the emotionalism and what they considered over-emphasis on justification by faith.

Perhaps, even allowing for civil and related penalties, such as expulsion from the universities, and the assorted expressions of ecclesiastical or mob hostility, the chief threat to Methodism was theological opposition to "Pope John."
Here his chief opponent was a fellow member of the Christ Church, Oxford, Holy Club, George Whitefield, the most redoubtable of all field preachers, strict Calvinist in contrast to Wesley's Arminianism, and the beneficiary of the Countess of Huntington's patronage. Her "connexion" soon formed a separate body, attracting a number of eloquent preachers, including the author of that resounding hymn, "Rock of Ages" (though be it recalled that John's brother Charles was the supreme hymnist of Methodism.) Important as this split was, Wesley's organizational genius with its creation of "classes" and then "circuits" and use of lay preachers, his broad social philosophy coupled with essential conservatism led to a far stronger Nonconformist body, even though he himself never left the Anglican Church and throughout his life constantly insisted that Methodists receive the Anglican sacrament every fourth Sunday as members of the Church of England. The formal break came with his death.

In concluding this rapid survey of diverse topics, all illustrated by the accompanying exhibit, one must again emphasize that no religious issue, institutional or theological, in these years was unrelated to Dissent, and that many political issues sooner or later excited references to it. Moreover, it is scarcely necessary to add, other topics might properly have been included. Consequently simple assertions "won't do," as the Edinburgh Review would put it. De jure was one thing, de facto another, owing to time, place, and circumstance. Toleration, the persistent, ramifying theme, is especially difficult to assess. Was it the product of indifference, interest, or conviction? Toleration of whom, what, when, where, and by whom? In times of crisis, genuine or contrived, little points of difference in religion begot great estrangements, bitter, even malicious, accusations, fearful policies. Who would have thought that so innocent an objective as liberty of conscience would be designated the mother of confusion and extinction of true religion or be opposed as the open door to anarchy of every sort, political as well as religious. Never then should it be treated in vacuo. And although no other issue adverted to here infiltrates so many areas the same caution applies to all.
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The pre-eminent role of the Calamy family in the history of Dissent has been well documented. Edmund (1600-1666) was ejected from the parish church of St. Mary Aldermanbury because he could not subscribe to the provisions of the Uniformity Act of 1662. His son Edmund (1635?-1685) was also ejected from his parish church because of the Act. The Dissenting community is indebted to the third Edmund Calamy (1671-1732) as the historian of Dissent.

The family was not united, however, on the issue of Dissent versus the established church. Benjamin, son of the elder Calamy and half-brother of Edmund II pledged support to the crown and subsequently was appointed to the church from which his father had been ejected, an appointment secured for him by the infamous Chief Justice George Jeffries, a parish-
ioner of St. Mary Aldermanbury, later to become known for his ruthlessness in trying the principals in the "bloody" assizes of 1685 and the popish plot of 1678.

The sermon, A Discourse About a Scrupulous Conscience, dedicated to Lord Jeffries, and preached twice before publication was apparently calculated to stir the Dissenters. Benjamin Calamy characterizes the scrupulous conscience as "doubting and fearing where no fear is," "starts and boggles, where there is no real Evil or Mischief," "transforms every object into a Monster or Gyant." He further says that "this needless scrupling of lawful things hath done unspeakable Mischief to the Church of Christ, especially to the Reformed Church of England." (Calamy, B. p. 12).

A response to this tract by Thomas Delaune caused him to be imprisoned and executed, one of many severe persecuting acts of the Restoration period.

The tract by Edmund Calamy is an example of his life-long work to record the condition of the Dissenters at the time of the harsh, discriminating laws. The Church and the Dissenters Compar'd, As to Persecution is a response to John Walker's An Attempt Towards Recovering an Account of the Numbers and Sufferings of the Clergy of the Church of England, Heads of Colleges, Fellows, Scholars, &c Who Were Sequestered, Harras'd &c in the Late Time of the Grand Rebellion. Occasion'd by the Ninth Chapter (Now the Second Volume) of Dr. Calamy's Abridgment of the Life of Mr. Baxter. (1714) Walker wrote this tract to discredit Calamy and minimize the sufferings of the Nonconformists as described in Calamy's Abridgment of the Life of Mr. Baxter.

A postscript announces a forthcoming continuation of Calamy's tract to further vindicate his earlier work and refute Walker's attack. His A Continuation of the Account... did not appear until 1727, however. The Church and the Dissenters Compar'd, As to Persecution is reprinted in the 1727 work. The first edition of the tract is very scarce.
By 1730, toleration had lulled the Dissenters into a threatening complacency. Contempt and disinterest in religion were prevalent, even in the established church. Chapels were closing because of lack of support, many Nonconformists returned to the national church; some fifty Dissenting ministers had conformed. An anonymous pamphlet, later attributed to Strickland Gough, An Enquiry into the Causes of the Decay of the Dissenting Interest focused the Dissenting community upon their diminishing influence. Philip Doddridge in his work here displayed defends the Dissenters saying they are "persons of serious piety, having been deeply impres'd with the peculiarities of the gospel-scheme. They have felt the divine energy of those important doctrines, to awaken, and revive, and enlarge the soul." (Doddridge, p. 19).

Doddridge says Gough is more interested in status than sincerity when Gough claims that many left the Dissenting communion because they were "asham'd of our interest." He further says if Gough's suggestions are followed "our common interest as Dissenters would moulder and crumble away, by our frequent divisions and animosities. And we, who by our contempt of the people... shall have the great pleasure of being entertain'd with the echo of our own voices." (Doddridge, p. 12).

Doddridge, an eminent Congregationalist and educator in the Dissenting Academies, had been nurtured in the faith by Samuel Clarke and was an intimate of Isaac Watts.
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The Toleration Act of 1689 brought relief from a series of oppressive regulations, but elements of discrimination remained. Dissenters were tolerated, but were by no means free.

Agitation for relief from the portion of the law requiring ministers to subscribe to the thirty-nine Articles of Faith merged in the House of Commons as the Feather's Tavern Petition. Philip Furneaux's Essay on Toleration was written in support of the second attempt to pass this legislation; the first attempt had failed in 1772. The new law was ultimately passed in 1779 requiring subscription to the Holy Scriptures instead of to the Articles of Faith.

Furneaux quotes from Lord Mansfield's speech in the House of Lords six years earlier supporting Nonconformity in the case of some sheriffs who resisted the compulsory oath-taking. Mansfield had said, "Conscience is not controllable by human law, nor amenable to human tribunals. Persecution or attempts to force conscience, will never produce conviction; and are only calculated to make hypocrites, or martyrs." (Furneaux, p. 8).

Furneaux's best known work was Letters to Blackstone, a plea to Dissenters to seek repeal of the persecuting laws especially those that require tribute to the Trinitarian philosophy.
PRICE, RICHARD, 1723-1791.
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8° 2 p.l., 35 p.
Signatures: [A]² B-E⁴ F²

Though he was better known for his secular studies than his theological works, Richard Price was one of the most important advocates of the Dissenting interests in the later years of the century.


This fast day sermon displayed is prefaced with a note from Price saying that it is the "first time in which he has entered into politics in the pulpit, and, perhaps, it may be the last." Alluding to the fate of Lot and Sodom, he says that it is to the righteous men in the kingdom that the state owes its preservation (Price, page 14) and later in the sermon (Price, page 21) "the sovereignty in every country belongs to the people; and that a righteous man is the best member of every community, the best friend to his species, by being the most irreconcilable to slavery, the most sensible to every encroachment on the rights of mankind, the most zealous for equal and universal liberty."
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Joseph Priestley has been described as "a universal genius, the Leonardo da Vinci of Dissent." As a Dissenting minister, his effectiveness was not in the dispatch of his pastoral duties, but in the catechetical instruction given and other intellectual stimulus he provided to his congregation and to others.

The subject of this letter to Pitt, the Test and Corporation Acts, had restricted government appointments to supporters of the Church of England for over one hundred years. Periodic efforts to have the acts repealed had been unsuccessful. The campaign of 1787 was no exception. The Dissenters support of the repeal of the acts and their sympathy with the French cause aroused suspicion and fear. Many recalled the role of the Dissenters in the execution of Charles I and the fate of the conforming clergy.

The Priestley letter tries to assuage Pitt's fears that a take-over of all offices would result if the acts were repealed. He concedes that if repealed the Dissenters would press for other freedoms long denied them, but that the freedoms will be gained by persuasion, not force for "the gun-powder which we are so assiduously laying grain by grain under the old building of error and superstition, in which the highest regions of which they inhabit, is not composed of saltpetre, charcoal and sulphur, but consists of arguments; and if we lay mine with such materials as these, let them countermine us in the same way." (Priestley, pp. 21-22).
Priestley emigrated to the United States in 1794 after experiencing violent mob reaction to his ideas of liberty in France and liberty for Dissenters. Coleridge aptly describes the indignation and contempt felt by most Dissenters at the unwarranted torrent of wrath aimed at Priestley:

Lo! Priestley there, Patriot, and saint, and sage,
Him full of years from his native land,
Statesmen, blood-stained, and priests, idolatrous,
By dark lies maddening the blind multitude
Drove with vain hate. Calm, pitying, he retired,
And mus'd expectant on these promised years.⁴
DISSENT AND THE LAW
One of the first acts of Convocation after the Restoration was the revision of the Book of Common Prayer (1661), followed shortly by the Acts of Uniformity of Public Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments (1662); the Acts of Uniformity being the first in a series of legal controls to Nonconformity. The other laws enacted, commonly called the Clarendon Code, were Corporation Act, 1661; Conventicle Act, 1664; Five Mile Act, 1665; and the Test Act, 1673.

The Act of Uniformity was offensive to most Dissenters because it imposed the revised Book of Common Prayer upon all. The provision that only episcopal ordination was valid rendered void many of the Dissenters' ordinations and, in effect, decreed their years of ministry as naught.

Richard Baxter, a devout Presbyterian, played a prominent role in the Savoy conference to revise the liturgy, but his proposals were not adopted. Remaining true to the dictates of his conscience, Baxter chose, along with hundreds of others, to be ejected from the Church rather than abide by the provisions of the Act. Some of the ablest of divines and educators were lost to the Church through this act.

Two Papers of Proposals was prepared as part of the Savoy proceedings and is one of Baxter's lesser known works. His numerous works were widely read; the best known titles are Saints Everlasting Rest (1649) and A Call to the Unconverted (1658).

Baxter, along with George Fox, John Bunyan, Edmund Calamy, William Penn and others bear testimony of the deep personal religion of many Nonconformists in the face of these and earlier persecuting laws.
The Declaration of Indulgence, designed to grant liberty to imprisoned Dissenters and toleration to others, was enacted early in James II's reign. The declaration was in violation of the constitution of England, but few Dissenters, in their gratefulness for a more tolerant attitude, initially recognized this illegality or the motives behind the tolerance.

Halifax, in acknowledging that the Dissenters will not be happy to be told of the duplicity of the king early in the new freedom says, "It is like telling Lovers, in the beginning of their Joys, that they will in a little time have an end." (Halifax, p. 2) A warning, nonetheless follows that the motivation behind the declaration was not solely out of good will to the Nonconformist, but primarily to promote the king's church. Halifax says, "You are therefore hugged now, onely that you may be the better squeezed at another time." (Halifax, p. 3)

One year later the declaration was renewed accompanied by an order that the declaration be read in all churches. Seven bishops refused and were summarily committed to the Tower.

Halifax became prominent during the exclusion crisis and continued his opposition to James II by masterminding his downfall and the ascendancy of William and Mary to the throne.
A PARAPHRASE ON THE CLERGIES ADDRESS
TO THE KING, UPON OCCASION OF HIS ORDER IN COUNCIL FOR READING HIS LATE DECLARATION FOR LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE IN ALL CHURCHES.

The Text.

WE are not averse to the Publishing of the Declaration, for want of due Tenderness towards Dissenters, with relation to whom we shall be willing to come to such a Temper as shall be thought fit, when the matter comes to be considered, and settled in Parliament and Convocation.

But the Declaration being founded upon such a Dispensation Power, as may at pleasure set aside all Laws Ecclesiastical and Civil, appears to us illegal, and did so to the Parliament in 1672. And it is a Point of such great Consequence, that we cannot make our selves Parties to it, so far as the reading of it in the Church in the time of Divine Service will amount to.

The Paraphrase.

WE, who without any Bowels of tenderness, have hitherto exercised many inhuman Cruelties upon Dissenters, observing the favorable regard that the Government has now toward them, do promise, that we will hereafter come to such a Temper in those matters, as shall be settled by our Selves in Convocation, and by a Parliament of our own Party.

But tho we suppose the Kings Declaration for Liberty of Conscience to be founded upon that Arbitrary Power which we have vigorously endeavor'd to advance above all Law, when it could be straining to the Oppression of Dissenters, and to the Establishment of our own Greatness; yet finding it to be now calculated, for a more Equal and Impartial end, and defitute of those private Considerations which have formerly animat'd us, We are desirous in this Conjunction (as we were formerly, in the year 1672) that those Laws for Persecution, by which our Ecclesiastical Empire has been maintained should retain their Force, and do by no means think fit to countenance the dispensing with them, upon that single Motive of General Good which the Declaration carries along with it.
"I am convinced that the Interest of this Nation, as well as the Laws of Christianity, requires an Absolute, Universal, Equal, and Inviolable Liberty of Conscience," (Penn, p.5-6) was a guiding principle of William Penn, the Quaker leader. But he further says if absolute liberty promoted a power that in turn takes liberty from others, it is to be opposed, "for I would by no means that a specious hope of Christian Liberty should betray the Nation into a New Unchristian Slavery." (Penn, p. 6).

While it has been documented that Penn was favored by the crown, it has also been shown that Penn was no friend of the king's Catholicism; he remained a faithful advocate of religious liberty. The most notable example of his advocacy of religious equality was his work in the American colonies and the constitutional freedoms provided the colonists of Pennsylvania.
While the object of earlier laws was to abolish Dissent, the Act for Exempting Their Majesties Protestant Subjects Dissenting from the Church of England the Penalties of Certain Laws, commonly called the Toleration Act of 1689, established and legalized Dissent. Dissent became an acknowledged, if not totally accepted, way of life.

The act did not repeal the earlier laws, but it did exempt Dissenters from the old laws if they met the conditions of the act. They still were required to take the oath of supremacy and declare against transubstantiation. Ministers also had to subscribe to most of the 39 Articles, but were free to serve Dissenting churches provided that the places of worship had been certified.

Dissenters, in general, were grateful for the new leniency, however, not all were in accord. An outspoken critic was John Locke, author of A Letter Concerning Toleration written anonymously in Latin and translated into English soon after the Act passed. The rights of individuals as conceived by the Toleration Act and the rights conceived in Locke's classic statement were poles apart. Locke asserts that there is but one way to salvation; thus one true religion and this salvation/religion should be instilled in others through study and reasoning, never by force.

A work opposing Locke, The Argument of the Letter Concerning Toleration was attributed to Jonas Proast in Anthony Wood's Athenae Oxonienses. Proast, Chaplain of All Saints College and an adversary of Locke, says that without some force or compulsion, heretics will not be led to the true religion. The compulsion Proast recommends is that of civil magistrates. An exchange of letters between Locke and Proast ensued.
A best seller by all standards, *The Case of Allegiance Due to Soveraign Powers*, was sold out by noon on the day of publication; a second edition was on sale that afternoon and three or four more editions were printed while the type was still standing. The Revolution settlement required that all divines pledge an oath of allegiance to William and Mary or face ejection from their offices. William Sherlock relates in the preface to this pamphlet the events that caused his great turnabout from an able spokesman for the opposition to the oath to a loyal oath-taking subject of the king and queen. He says that he refused to take the oath not out of loyalty to King James or malice toward William and Mary, but out of faithfulness to his earlier oaths. Doubts (and perhaps expediency) overwhelmed him and he took the oath; the pamphlet here displayed was immediately published in justification of his action. He had been influenced by John Overall's *Convocation Book* which said that a government that had been "settled," even though it was established through rebellion must be considered a government sanctioned by God and thus should be obeyed. It convinced him that he could support the crown as de facto king, but it would not require allegiance to a de jure king. The *Convocation Book* had been surreptitiously printed at Archbishop Sancroft's request just prior to Sancroft's suspension for failure to take the oath. That it would be used to support the royal position was unexpected.

Outside of the fold of the Church of England by virtue of their refusal to pledge the allegiance required, the non-jurors have been criticized for what they believed, but have been lauded for their absolute devotion to their belief, Sherlock excepted.
The reaction to Sherlock's defection precipitated a pamphlet war of then unequalled proportions. Jeremy Collier's attack on Sherlock's two works defending his position on oath-taking is only one of many. Unlike many of the pamphlets that appeared, Collier's pamphlet is a reasoned, unemotional step-by-step refutation of Sherlock's arguments. Macauley describes Collier as "a man of eminent abilities, a great master of sarcasm, a great master of rhetoric."7

Collier's belief that William and Mary were usurpers remained unshaken despite imprisonment in Newgate and being outlawed because of his defence of two individuals involved in an assassination plot.

The situation of the non-juror engaged the attention of the literary world as well as the ecclesiastical and political world. Most notable is Colley Cibber's The Non-Juror, based on Moliere's Tartuffe. Cibber exaggerates the position of the non-jurors. J.H. Overton suggests in his book entitled The Non-Jurors that perhaps Cibber never forgot the attacks made on him by Collier in his Short View of the Immorality and Profaneness of the English Stage, Collier's most well-known work.8
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The Occasional Conformity Act was first introduced in the House of Commons in 1702, but was not enacted until 1711. The act was designed to prevent the receiving of the sacraments of the Church of England in order to qualify for an elected office, while otherwise being faithful to Nonconformist principles. The provisions intended to suppress Nonconformity by controlling attendance at meetings/services and imposing a fine and loss of office. It rendered the Toleration Act of 1689 void of power.

James Owen, a Presbyterian minister, defends occasional conformity from the charge of hypocrisy and laxity of conscience and justifies it by citing Biblical examples: John the Baptist, the Apostles, Paul and Jesus Himself, all of whom
occasionally participated in Temple feasts, but were usually out of the mainstream of organized religion. He cites numerous examples of Dissenters from all the established religions who have held public offices. His ecumenical view was that moderate Dissenters believe that the Church of England is a true church and its ministers true ministers, thus it was not wrong to accept their communion on occasions.

Charles Leslie, anonymously wrote *The Wolf Stript of His Sheperd's Cloathing* in support of the Occasional Conformity Bill and in answer to Owen's tract. Leslie infers that Owen's praise of occasional conformity is merely an opportunity to harangue the discipline, ceremonies and liturgy of the established church.

Charles Leslie was a non-juring writer involved in most of the political and ecclesiastical controversies of the time, most notable are his attacks of Socinians, Deists, Jews and Quakers.
We cannot see how it can consist with the law of God, common equity, or the right of any free-born subject, that any one be punished without a crime: if it be a crime not to take the Sacrament according to the usage of the Church of England, every one ought to be punished for it, which nobody affirms; if it be no crime, those who are capable and adjusted fit for employments by the King, ought not to be punished with a law of exclusion for not doing that which it is no crime to forbear.  

_Lords' Protest, March 23, 1688._
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LONDON:

Published for the United Committee for conducting the Application to Parliament, for the Repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts,

BY H. J. HOLDSWORTH, ST. PAUL'S CHURCHYARD; H. HUNTER, ST. PAUL'S CHURCHYARD; AND WIGHTMAN AND CRAMP, PATERNOSTER ROW.

PRICE SIXPENCE.
The Corporation Act was passed in 1661, the Test Act in 1673; the first requiring an oath of loyalty and the taking of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper according to the rites of the established church by all city officials and the other act limiting all civil and military appointments to conformists.

The successes of the American and French Revolutions in the cause of liberty provided incentive for renewed efforts to gain release from the oppression of these acts. After abortive efforts in 1787, 1788, and 1790 to bring about the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, the major bodies of Dissenters organized for action in 1827. To communicate with Dissenters, The Test-Act Reporter was established to be continued as long as deemed necessary. Twelve issues and a supplement appeared in 1828. In 1829, they were reissued with a general title page and preface.

The first issue, January 1828, gives a short history of the united committee that was formed (called The Committee Appointed to Conduct the Application of Parliament for the Repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts) representing the Committee of Deputies, The Protestant Society for the Protection of Religious Liberty, British and Foreign Unitarian Association, the Body of Ministers of the Three Denominations and the Board of Congregational Ministers.

It also includes the resolution of the committee to ask Lord John Russell to present their plea to the House of Commons and the text of his speech to Commons; a history of the Corporation Act; the text of an address to Dissenters by the groups of Dissenting ministers and other resolutions and petitions.

While the Indemnity Act (passed regularly) lessened the penalties for failing to abide by the provisions of the law, the injustices rendered Dissenters should not be minimized.
"WHETHER TRINITY OR UNITY MORE DANGEROUS"
Interest in Socinianism surfaced with the publication of A Brief History of the Unitarians Called Also Socinians in 1687. Surreptitious publishing of pamphlets denouncing the doctrine of the Trinity gained momentum in 1691. Three collections of tracts appeared in 1691 published at the expense of Thomas Firmin, London merchant, philanthropist and Unitarian sympathizer; the first entitled Faith of One God Who Is Only the Father. Subsequent volumes are entitled, The Second (and Third) Collection of Tracts Proving the God and Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Only True God. The pamphlets in these collections are characterized by pages printed in double columns. Opponents of Unitarianism referred to these as "the double-columned prints" and their authors as "double-columned gentlemen." 9

The Unitarians, excluded from the Toleration Act of 1688, were penalized for publishing works contrary to the doctrine of the Trinity, thus all pamphlets in the collections lack authors, printers and place of publication, but most have been identified and authorship has been ascribed to well-known proponents of the several schools acknowledging the supremacy of God the Father. Firmin and colleagues also were endeavoring to carry on a vigorous, though underground propaganda crusade within the Church of England, perhaps, hoping ultimately to establish a recognized Unitarian society within the established church.

Nye played a prominent role in the publication of the collections of tracts. No less than six titles are attributed to him. He is often credited with introducing the word "Unitarian" into English literature. The word actually had been used in 1673. A Brief History of the Unitarian... marks the first time the word was used on a title page in English. 10

First published in 1687, this second edition, is apparently a disbound copy from the first collection, Faith in One God Who...
Is Only the Father. The friend to whom the four letters of the history are written is Thomas Firmin.

A statement, "Whether Trinity or Unity More Dangerous" appears as the final page in an edition of Nye's, Doctor Wallis's Letter Touching the Doctrine of the Blessed Trinity Answer'd by His Friend [1691].
A Vindication of the Unitarians was written to dispute the theses of William Sherlock in *Vindication of the Doctrine of the Holy and Ever Blessed Trinity* (1690). William Freke was only one of many to dispute Sherlock. Trinitarians and Unitarians alike criticized Sherlock's work; Trinitarians claiming that he advocated not the Godhead but Tritheism. It is commonly held that Sherlock's work aided the Unitarians more than it damaged their cause.

A Vindication of the Unitarians was published anonymously in 1690 or 1691 shortly after Sherlock's work. It is not included in the collections of Unitarian Tracts perhaps because Freke's Arian sympathies were despised by Stephen Nye, one of the principals in the Unitarian Tract publishing venture.

Freke's *A Brief and Clear Confutation of the Doctrine of the Trinity* (1693) was burned by hangmen in Westminster. He renounced Arian principles in 1709.

His works on dreams, visions and prophecies prompted his biographer to describe his life as "irregular."
This work was written to refute the theories espoused by Abraham Woodhead in *The Protestants Plea for a Socinian*, published in 1687. Daniel Whitby described Woodhead as "the most ingenious and solid writer of the whole Roman Party." Tenison calls Woodhead the "borrower" of the arguments not the "inventor" since Woodhead relies so heavily on other writers. Tenison also charges that Woodhead has not strictly kept the character of either the Protestant or the Socinian.

Tenison, respected by persons in the established church and by the Dissenters, later succeeded Tillotson as Archbishop of Canterbury. He is known for his active support of the religious societies, especially the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel.
Known variously as Oxford University archivist, cryptologist, royal chaplain, antagonist of Thomas Hobbes, founder of the Royal Society, but primarily as mathematician, Wallis’ Arithmetica Infinitorum (1665) placed him in an influential position in the scientific world, inspired Newton to conceive the binomial theorem and it planted the seeds of differential calculus.  

His works on the Trinity were numerous. His attempt to prove the truth of the Trinitarian philosophy by mathematical demonstrations, understandably, prompted several replies. Reproduced below are the opening paragraphs of his comparison of one infinite cube with three dimensions to one infinite God with three personalities, page eleven of The Doctrine of the Blessed Trinity Briefly Explained.

If I shall spare to instance in many Reflections which have been given long since by Fathers and Schoolmen; or by later Writers. Which, though they are not pretended to be adequately the same with that of the Sacred Trinity; (as neither will any thing else be that we can take from finite Beings;) yet are they sufficient to show that there is no Insufficiency in it. (Which is all that is here incumbent on us to prove.) I shall only name a few.

Suppose we then a Cubical Body, (which what it is, every one knows, that knows a Dy.) In this are Three Dimensions, (Length, Breadth, and Height) and yet but One Cube. Its Length (Suppose between East and West) A B. Its Breadth (Suppose between North and South) C D. Its Height (between Bottom and Top) E F. Here are Three Local Dimensi-
Thomas Emlyn is the first minister who described himself as a Unitarian and one of the most conspicuous leaders of the movement. He entered the ministry as a devout Irish Presbyterian but his reading of Sherlock's *Vindication of the Doctrine of the Holy and Ever Blessed Trinity*, precipitated his change in view about the Trinity. It was during his pastorate in Dublin, having previously been a pastor of a small Dissenting congregation in Lowestoft, that his views became known. His forced resignation prompted, *An Humble Inquiry into the Scripture Account of Jesus Christ*, for which he was charged and found guilty of publishing a blasphemous libel. Persecution followed him to London where he moved when released from prison.

Benjamin Hoadly sarcastically condemns the conformists, the Nonconformists and secular powers alike for Emlyn's persecution:

Sometimes we of the established Church can manage a prosecution (for I must not call it persecution) ourselves, without calling in any other help. But I must do the Dissenting Protestants the justice to say, that they have shown themselves, upon occasion, very ready to assist us in so pious and Christian a work as bringing heretics to their right mind; being themselves but very lately come from experiencing the convincing and enlightening faculty of a dungeon or a fine... The Nonconformists accused him [Emlyn], and Conformists condemned him, the Secular Power was called in, and the cause ended in an imprisonment and a very great fine; two methods of conviction about which the Gospel is silent.
Joseph Boyse, Emlyn's colleague in Dublin, responded to Emlyn's *An Humble Inquiry into the Scripture Account of Jesus Christ with A Vindication of the True Deity of Our Blessed Saviour*. Published anonymously, Emlyn replied with *A Vindication of the Worship of the Lord Jesus on the Unitarian Principles*. Boyse and Emlyn remained friends; Boyse being one of very few of the Dissenting congregation to come to Emlyn's aid during his time of distress in Dublin.

This edition is not listed in the bibliography of Emlyn's works that appears in *Antitrinitarian Biography*. A later (1706) edition, which also contains *An Answer to Dr. Waterland on the Same Head*, is listed.15
James Peirce was the principal victim in the Exeter disputes that culminated in the Salter's Hall Conference in 1719.

Upon a charge by an overseeing lay committee of the city, that Peirce and other Exeter ministers were unorthodox in their subscription to the doctrine of the Trinity, all the ministers in question were required to prepare a declaration of faith in the Trinity. Not satisfied with the answers sent by the ministers, the dispute was referred to a body of London ministers meeting in Salter's Hall, for mediation. However, without waiting for the results of the meeting (the so-called "advices" on both sides of the issue) to be sent to Exeter, the lay committee demanded an avowal of the true divinity of Christ. Peirce said that he "would own that Christ and the Father were one, because He said so." (Peirce, p. 11). When asked if he would declare that Christ and the Father were one God, Peirce that if he could be shown the scriptures that said so, he would declare that also. He refused to subscribe to religious tests that were not prescribed by scriptures. Peirce and one other minister, Joseph Hallett, were excluded from their pastoral charge.

The Case of the Ministers Ejected at Exon is one of several statements Peirce made on his own behalf. This scarce first edition was reprinted in three more editions during 1719.
Whiston and Clarke's position on the Trinity is neither orthodox Christian, Deist or Unitarian. William Whiston is more correctly described as Arian. Samuel Clarke has been called an Arian and a disguised Deist, but, he, in fact, did not subscribe totally to any of these schools in opposition to the doctrine of the Trinity. 16

Whiston was a contemporary of Locke and Newton and was appointed to a prestigious professorship as Newton's successor at Cambridge. However, his views on the Trinity ultimately forced him to sacrifice the professorship. His chief work was *Primitive Christianity Reviv'd* (1711).

Clarke, who became acquainted with Whiston through a mutual interest in Newton's philosophies, is well known for *The Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*, published in 1712, in which Clarke examines all scripture relating to the doctrine of the Trinity and claimed that the doctrine did not derive from scripture, but from tradition and scholarship.

This work was published after Clarke's death in 1729. Whiston says that he "knew Dr. Clarke, his Character, Writings and Conduct, long before Dr. Sykes, and much more authentickaly in many points then either Dr. Sykes, or Bishop Hoadly... [and was] very desirous that a full and faithful account of those transactions concerning true religion...may be faith­fully transmitted to Posterity." (Whiston, pp.4–5). This is reference to Elogium of the Late Truly Learned Samuel Clarke (1729) by Arthur Ashley Sykes and the biographical essay by Benjamin Hoadly that prefaces a compilation of Clarke's ser­mons (1730).
THE SACHEVERELL AFFAIR
The sermon, The Communication of Sin, was one of two sermons that precipitated the dramatic Sacheverell controversy and serves as a prelude to the vitriolic sermon that was to follow in approximately three months.

The brief era of toleration was giving way to the old idea that being traitorous to the state naturally followed Dissent in the Church. Henry Sacheverell was already known as a staunch high churchman and Tory. As early as 1702, his sermons and pamphlets had been attracting wide attention for their abusive attacks on the Dissenters and those that condoned Dissent. It was to those individuals that this sermon was addressed. He cites six ways individuals can partake of the sins of others:

1. Commanding, or commissioning their execution.
2. Conniving at, consenting to, or concealing them.
3. Administering counsel, direction, or assistance towards them.
4. Commending, approving, excusing or defending them.
5. Giving offence, or scandalous example.
6. Authorizing, propagating, or publishing any heresy, false doctrine, schism, faction, irreligion, or immortality.
From the pulpit of St. Paul's cathedral on the anniversary of the Gunpowder Plot, was preached the sermon by Henry Sacheverell that launched a controversy that consumed an entire session of Parliament, provoked frenzy and riots on the part of the citizenry and caused its promoter to be called the scourge of all Dissenters.

The doctrines specifically denounced were non-resistance and passive obedience; the false brethren were the Dissenters, the Whigs and all of those who actively or through apathy permitted the toleration Sacheverell felt was so abhorrent. He implied that the Revolution had been unlawful.

The language of the sermon could hardly be more insulting, deprecating, or fanatical. He calls the affairs of church and state a "fatal conspiracy," "most insatiable cruelty," a "diabolical revenge hatch'd in the cabinet-council of Hell..." Those that perpetrated the "conspiracy" were "monsters and vipers," "church devouring malignants" and "miscreants, begot in rebellion, born in sedition and nursed up in faction."

The sermon and it's publication led to the House of Commons order that Sacheverell be impeached for high crimes and misdemeanors.

The sermon immediately appeared in many editions. Forty thousand copies sold in a few months time.
THE HIGH CHURCH CHAMPION
Pleading his own Cause.

The Pope and the Devil Vanquished by a Flute from the Doctor's Pen.

In no such Seconds need to Plead my Cause.
Scorn I contam and trample on Applause.
False Brotherhods the Object of my hate.
Satan the Prince on whom those mumrels waite.
Tim I dismiss to his Dark Region HELL.
With thousands of False Brethren to dwell.
And to the Triple-Crown I'll be as Civil.
And hence I'll kick it headlong to the Devil.
Whilst Wealth and Honour Fame are great renown.
I wish the Queen, the Church, the Imperial Crown.

Verily well the Emblem mind the Matter in't.
And for the Sermons Pray, you ne're buy & Print.

* as Pope and Pen.
White Kennett reluctantly joined a host of divines and others to react in print to Sacheverell's sermon. Most notable are those by Josiah Woodward, Benjamin Hoadly and Isaac Bickerstaff [i.e. Steele]. Kennett says, "the best way of answering Dr. Sacheverell's sermon... was to let it drop into silence and contempt; for that there was not one argument to answer, but a Jumble of words and Periods, that made a Crackling of Thorns, Noise and Flame; and therefore it was better to pity the man, and dispise the stuff." (Kennett, p. 4-5) Nonetheless, he does proceed to discuss at some length the requisites of a minister. These being: Propriety of words. (Sacheverell's sermon contained inaccuracies and mischoices of words). Pertinence to the time. (He deplores the inappropriateness of this sermon to a Deliverance Day address). Veracity. (Examples of false historical and Biblical interpretations are cited). Seriousness. (Banter and blasphemy have no place in a sermon).

He does not attack Sacheverell personally. Nor does he defend passive obedience. He says that no defence is needed because it was "abundantly set right" by the Revolution.

The letter raised a storm of protest, not unexpectedly, since the majority view favored Sacheverell.

Kennett who had long held a moderate view in relation to Dissenters, was severely censured when he would not agree to joining in a congratulatory address to the queen after the Tories regained power due to the Sacheverell incident.
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Examples of the large number of pamphlets that were printed concerning the Sacheverell affair are the ones by Bisset and King.

Bisset was a low churchman and a Whig. Sacheverell's sermon elicited an immediate, negative response by Bisset. The response was followed by another, the pamphlet, The Modern Fanatick. Among the replies to this pamphlet was one by Dr. William King, who supported the high church party by writing several pamphlets. He was assisted by Charles Lambe and probably Sacheverell himself in writing this tract.¹⁷

Bisset's biographer in repeating an opinion that Bisset was almost a madman says "the character of the pamphlets put forth by both sides in this controversy is little proof of the sanity of any of the parties concerned in it." ¹⁸
SACHEVERELL, HENRY, 1674?-1724.

Dr. Sacheverel's Prayers and Meditations on the Day of His Tryal, Being February 27th 1709/10.

London, Printed for George Sawbridge, [1709]
8° 8 p.
Signatures: A<sup>4</sup>
MADAN 67

Opening with the Lord's Prayer and followed by seven prayers and the benediction, the prayers are humble and contrite in tone. He implores God's blessings on the Queen and all the royal family and "those persons appointed to plead my cause." He asks deliverance from his sufferings.

This collection of prayers is an uncommon one. Sacheverell's bibliographer, Falconer Madan, lists the collection, but it is absent from other bibliographies.
SACHEVERELL, HENRY, 1674?-1724.
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In a specially erected court room in Westminster Hall, on February 27, 1710, the Sacheverell trial began. Sacheverell was charged with maintaining that the means by which the revolution was accomplished were "odious and unjustifiable," the toleration that followed was illegal, the queen's administration was poorly conducting the affairs of state and the destruction of the constitution was intended.

Sacheverell's speech in his own defence skillfully states that he only repeated what many of the greatest divines of the Church as well as many statesmen had often said. It is noteworthy that the speech was probably not written by Sacheverell, but by Francis Atterbury, an eminent Tory and one of the ablest of divines.\(^19\)

The ten day trial evoked wide enthusiasm, and Sacheverell, a man who had been scorned even by those who were using him for their own selfish purposes, became a hero. He was convicted and suspended from preaching for three years; the light sentence viewed as an acquittal in most eyes.
Gilbert Burnet, writer, confidant and advisor of William and Mary, Bishop of Salisbury and champion of the doctrine of toleration presented one of the state's arguments in the trial of Sacheverell.

The speech traces the affiliation of church and state throughout history to support the view that Sacheverell's sermon stance condemning all resistance was, in fact, a condemnation of the Revolution.
This satire on the Book of Revelations describes a Quaker's dream in which, upon entering Hell, witnesses "an upright man, cloathed in a Black garment being ascended into a High Place, the Spirit of the Lord decended upon him, and wonderful truths issued out of his mouth, against rotten members." (Aminadab p. 4). The man dressed in black is Sach­everell, the "rotten members" were Sacheverell's opposition, the low church party of Whigs and more specifically is a ref­erence to Benjamin Hoadly.

Other characters in the vision are a many headed beast, (House of Commons) and the Angel of Light (Queen Anne).
Aminadab: OR, THE Quaker's VISION.

In the Year 1710.
THE BANGORIAN CONTROVERSY
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The Bangorian controversy, thus called because it was precipitated by Benjamin Hoadly, Bishop of Bangor from 1715-1721, had its origin in this publication, which was an answer to George Hickes' posthumously published work, The Constitution of the Catholick Church and the Nature and Consequences of Schism (1716). The dispute intensified one year later with the publication of the sermon, The Nature of the Kingdom, or Church of Christ.

In Preservative, Hoadly argues with Hickes on the righteousness of the Protestant succession and the deprivation of the clergy who refused to pledge allegiance to the new government. Hoadly also argues that since nomination of bishops is vested in the crown, by the same authority it can be taken away.

The issues, as introduced in this tract and enlarged upon in the sermon that followed, became digressive and confusing. In fact, almost every issue of the day related to the affairs of church and state surfaced -- the nature of the church and how it related to government, the authority of Convocation, the individual's right to make judgments and sincere inquiries, toleration and the tests. It was a grand time for the controversialists.
HOADLY, BENJAMIN, Bp. of Winchester, 1676-1761.

The Nature of the Kingdom, or Church, of Christ. A Sermon Preach'd Before the King, at the Royal Chapel at St. Jamess's on Sunday March 31, 1717.


Using the text, "My kingdom is not of this world (John 18: 36), this sermon set the Bangorian controversy into feverish motion.

Hoadly says:

As the Church of Christ is the Kingdom of Christ, He himself is King; and in this it is implied, that He is himself the sole Law-giver to his Subjects, and himself the sole Judge of their Behaviour, in the affairs of Conscience and Eternal Salvation. And in this sense therefore, His Kingdom is not of the World; that He hath, in those Points, left behind Him, no visible, humane Authority no Vicegerents, who can be said properly to supply his Place; no Interpreters, upon whom his Subjects are absolutely to depend; no Judges over the Consciences or Religion of his People. (Hoadly, p. 11)

The implications of this sermon to Nonconformists were apparent. Hoadly, while severly criticized (described as the "best-hated clergyman of the century") as a theologian and writer and for negligence in his pastoral duties, was ardent in the cause of liberty; a true friend and champion of tolerance. His view that the Church did not have authority to interpret the teachings of Christ, nor did the Church court have authority in matters of faith, and that reason, scripture and sincerity were the only valid sources of authority, bolstered the cause of Nonconformity. His ideas on reason and sincerity are precursors of ideas the evangelicals were soon to use to stir a lethargic church.

The sermon, reputed to have been written at the direction of the king, was immediately published by his command. It appeared in fifteen London editions and one Dublin edition in 1717.
Andrew Snape's role in the controversy caused him to lose his position as chaplain in ordinary to the king. His first letter to the Bishop of Bangor, published in seventeen editions during its first year, was the first published response to the sermon. A second letter to Hoadly followed. Hoadly's response to Snape's second letter was a call to Snape in the Daily Courant for a "public reparation for so uncommon an injury, or to produce immediately his evidence." Charges were made and answers were given. A summary of the newspaper coverage is A Collection of Papers Scatter'd Lately About the Town in the Daily Courant, St. James's Post &c (1717).

A brief passage in the second letter, "Before you are so free then, in casting Reproaches on others as Popishly affected; you wou'd do well to put away the Jesuit whom you entertain in your family, your intimate Companion and Confident" (Snape, pp. 66-67) spurred a new view of the debate. The Jesuit mentioned was Francis de la Pillonniere who resided in Hoadly's home. From this point, Pillonniere played prominently in the dispute.

London, Printed for James Knapton, 1718.
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Using the pseudonymns Phileleutherus Cantabrigiensis and Philanagnostes Criticus, Thomas Herne participated in the Bangorian controversy in support of Benjamin Hoadly. Herne answers William Law's second letter to Hoadly, one of three letters written by Law to which Hoadly significantly did not respond.

Herne also was the contemporary bibliographer of the controversy issuing first a bibliography of all the pamphlets issued to the end of 1718. It was later extended to include pamphlets published in 1719. The whole was published in 1720 and reprinted in Hoadly's Works in 1773.
Merry-Andrew's

EPISTLE

To his Old Master

BENJAMIN,

A Mountebank at

Bangor-Bridge,

On the River Dee, near Wales.

Pessifero vomnit Colubar Sermone Britannus.
Prosp. de vit. Pelag.

LONDON:
Printed for E. Smith in Cornhill. 1719
Price 6d.
Merry-Andrew's Epistle is a satirical work in which a former Merry-Andrew (Andrew Snape) of mountebank Master Benjamin (Hoadly) recounts how his old master in searching for a new Merry-Andrew, first engaged a Jesuit (Francis de la Pillonniere) "who was a religious mimick by his profession" and "performed so awkwardly, that he rather made folks laugh at his Master than at himself." (Defoe, p. 12) Then Sir Tat. SPEC. (Sir Richard Steele) offered to serve, but fortunately for the mountebank this alliance was not made, for "he wou'd ha' jested away [the] Customers as well as [the] Credit." (Defoe, p. 13)

Merry-Andrew tells how his old master began his medical practice upon a few "schismatick patients" (Dissenters), how he attacked the whole College of Physicians (Convocation) for their laws made to keep out the Quacks (Dissenters) and how Master Benjamin was suspected of being a quack, too. Merry-Andrew warns that if there is a new President of the College, the master will be expelled and his diploma and license will be suspended.

Daniel Defoe, on several occasions, skillfully, though moderately chided Hoadly for his propensity for controversy and urged him to renounce the established church for Nonconformity. Defoe was from a Dissenting family, was educated in a Dissenting Academy and was an outspoken critic of occasional conformity. His best known Nonconformist work is The Shortest-Way With Dissenters (1702).
The ramifications of the two publications that sparked the Bangorian controversy were encompassing. The Revolution of 1689 reintroduced the question of parameters of civil and ecclesiastical authority in matters of religion but it was largely unsettled in most minds. The increasing numbers of Dissenters, the non-juring schism, the ineffectiveness of Convocation are but indications of the unresolved question of authority.

The opposition of the clergy to the two works was expected and a censure was called for in the Lower House of Convocation. The committee report condemning Hoadly was referred to the Upper House of Convocation, but the Upper House was not given the opportunity to reply. The government intervened and prorogued Convocation -- for to censure so loyal a support of the ruling house would not be judicious. Thus, a new element of the controversy was introduced. Hoadly was accused of inducing the government to suspend Convocation; a suspension that lasted one hundred thirty-four years.

Hoadly answered the charges of the committee and the charge that he instigated the silencing of Convocation in the long treatise here displayed.
LAW, WILLIAM, 1686-1761.

A Reply to the Bishop of Bangor's Answer to the Representation of the Committee of Convocation. Humbly Address'd to His Lordship.

London, Printed for William and John Innys, 1719.
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The defences, attacks, counter-attacks in this controversy are numerous. A catalogue that appears in the collected works of Hoadly lists sixty-one writers on the issue, with such notables as Thomas Sherlock, Andrew Snape, Arthur Ashley Sykes and William Law writing several responses.

William Law was one of the most effective respondents, first in two letters to the Bishop of Bangor and later in reply to Hoadly's defence before the Committee of Convocation, here displayed. Law was little known at the time of the writing of these tracts, but he soon was to be admired for A Practical Treatise Upon Christian Perfection (1726) and A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life (1729).

Law discussed the nature of the church, the nature of church authority, excommunication, external communion as it related to church authority, sincerity and private judgment.

He was one of the few major disputants to whom Hoadly did not reply, perhaps because Law's logic was difficult to refute.
METHODOISM AND THE EVANGELICAL REVIVAL
John Wesley cannot accurately be called a Nonconformist. Wesley remained loyal to the established church, some say even to the end. At the beginning, the Methodist revival served to increase the number of communicants in the Church of England and Dissenters openly opposed the new sect. The year 1787 is sometimes given for the final and decisive separation of the Methodists from the Church of England. It was at this time that Wesley began ordaining ministers and securing licenses under the Toleration Act.

His theology, simply stated, was, man is in a state of sin, but could be pardoned. Faith in Christ was all that was necessary for salvation and was available to all, not just to a chosen few. Methodists were known for their tolerance of most religious beliefs. Wesley said, "They do not impose any opinions whatever. People might hold particular or general redemption, absolute or conditional decrees. They think and let think."²²

Wesley's personal characteristics of devotion, piety, self-discipline and his genius for organization have been very well documented. He is often compared to George Whitefield. Whitefield appears to have been the better orator, Wesley the greater intellect.

Scriptural Christianity, the last sermon he preached at Oxford, was delivered shortly after the first Methodist conference. He lays the foundation for scriptural Christianity by first identifying the scriptures related to the Holy Spirit, tells how the gifts of the Spirit exists in individuals and spreads to others and closes the sermon with an application for daily living. It is plain and practical, yet forceful in expression.
WESLEY, CHARLES, 1707-1788.

A Sermon Preached on Sunday, April 4, 1742. Before the University of Oxford.
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The major contribution of Charles Wesley to the evangelical movement is the vast number of hymns he wrote. Numbering 6500, several hundred of which are still in use; they are a legacy to all Christianity. "O for a Thousand Tongues to Sing" equals Luther's "A Mighty Fortress" in majesty.

Always overshadowed by his brother John, he was somewhat the pioneer of the movement if not the dominant leader. Charles was the first to be called "methodist," an insulting derogatory title bestowed on him for his observance of rules and methodical study of religious practices; he was the first to experience conversion.

The text of this sermon is Ephesians 5:14, "Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light." It is a fervent invitation and plea to unbelievers. The sermon was preached about two years after he started his itinerant ministry. It was enormously popular, having appeared in more than twenty-five editions by 1782.
A Vindication of the Rev. Mr. Wesley's Last Minutes: occasioned by a Circular, Printed Letter, Inviting Principal Persons, Both Clergy and Laity, As Well As Dissenters As of the Established Church. Who Disapprove of Those Minutes to Oppose Them As a Body... In Five Letters to the Hon. and Rev. Author of the Circular Letter. By a Lover of Quietness and Liberty of Conscience.

Bristol, Printed by W. Pine, 1771
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Signatures: A−H$^6$ I$^7$ (Signature D duplicated)

The minutes of a public conference between John Wesley and others held in London, August 7, 1770 records the concern felt by Wesley that his followers were leaning too much toward Calvinism, especially the doctrine of election and justification. The printed minutes of the conference prompted a circular letter by Walter Shirley inviting those who disagreed with Wesley's "heresies" to congregate at the same time that Wesley's Conference was being held in Bristol. He further proposes that they go in a body and insist on a formal recantation and if they refuse, to publish a protest against them.

The five letters by John William Fletcher in defence of Wesley's conversations were written before the Bristol Conference in 1771 to be publicly read at the time. Delays in printing, however, prevented distribution until after the Conference was held.

This title is one of a number of works printed during the "Calvinistic controversy" resulting in heated disputes over justification by faith alone or by faith and works, the possibility of a state of sinless perfection on earth, the questions of whether God's grace is indefectible, are individuals to work for life or from life and did Christ die for the whole world or just for the elected.

John William Fletcher (De La Flechere), of Swiss birth, was devoted to Wesley and the Methodist cause. He was dedicated to the Madeley parish preferring the parochial life to the itinerant life of most Methodist clergy. He remained with the Madeley parish while superintendent of Countess Huntingdon's connexion in Trevecca. Fletcher was chosen by Wesley to be
his successor, but died six years before Wesley.

The five letters and numerous other letters were republished in the early 1800's under the title *Checks to Anti-nomianism*. Numerous editions of this title followed.
[GREEN, JOHN] Bp. of Lincoln, 1706?-1779.

The Principles and Practices of the Methodists Considered. In Some Letters to the Leaders of That Sect. The First Address to the Reverend Mr. B________E. Wherein Are Some Remarks on His Two Letters to a Clergyman in Nottinghamshire, Lately Published.

London, Printed for W. Bristow, 1760.
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An example of one of numerous works against the growing Methodist sects, this attack by James Green, was written while he served the Lincoln parish, but shortly before he became Bishop of Lincoln. It is a scurrilous denunciation of Methodism and more specifically, John Berridge's *A Fragment of True Religion*. Few paragraphs lack a ridiculing, condescending, or sarcastic reference to them. Green says that their application of scripture is arrogant and presumptuous; it is a fierce assault on divine communication, enthusiasm and the doctrine of justification.

So severe was this work and the second letter addressed to George Whitefield (1761), Green's archbishop prevailed upon him not to publish the third planned letter.²³
WHITEFIELD, GEORGE, 1714-1770.

A Letter to the Right Reverend the Bishop of London, and the Other Right Rev. the Bishops, Concern'd in the Publication of a Pamphlet, Entitled, Observations upon the Conduct and Behaviour of a Certain Sect Usually Distinguished by the Name of Methodists.

London, Printed for J. Robinson and by Mr. John Sims, 1744. 8° 1 p.l., 26 p.
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George Whitefield's career parallels John Wesley's in most respects. A late entrant into the group of Oxford Methodists and initially a follower of Wesley, Whitefield differed with Wesley primarily on the doctrine of predestination. The key element in the dynamics of the Methodist movement was conversion. Organization and methodology were essential. Church life was rejuvenated by the zeal and fervour inspired by Whitefield and Wesley.

Whitefield possessed a charismatic quality and used his significant dramatic power ably. When barred from preaching in the churches, he took to the streets and fields, attracting huge crowds. He is credited with preaching 18,000 sermons, eighty-one of which have been published. Whitefield's movement became known as Calvinistic Methodism and was allied with the Countess of Huntingdon's Connexion.

The subject of this letter to Edmund Gibson, Bishop of London, was the publication entitled Observations Upon the Conduct and Behaviour of a Certain Sect Usually Distinguished by the Name of Methodist, that was anonymously published and circulated in a clandestine manner among selected members of the societies of London and Westminster. Whitefield accuses the Bishop of London along with other bishops of being responsible for its publication.
VENN, HENRY, 1725-1797.

A Token of Respect to the Memory of the Rev. George Whitefield, A.M. Being the Substance of a Sermon Preached on His Death at the Right Hon. the Countess of Huntingdon's Chapel at Bath, the 18th of Nov. 1770.
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This eulogy on the death of George Whitefield was written by one of Whitefield's disciples, Henry Venn, who was converted after taking a preaching tour with Whitefield.

His ministry, primarily as Vicar of Huddlesfield and Chaplain to Lady Huntingdon, was brief but his reputation for piety and devotion to the evangelical cause marked him as one of the prominent leaders of the revival. Innovations in worship (common during the revival period), such as "kitchen meetings" in the parsonage and the formation of a club for evangelical ministers are attributed to Venn.

Venn's best known work was The Complete Duty of Man, a comparison and contrast to the popular book, The Whole Duty of Man. The Whole Duty of Man was highly respected in the established church and held a position just below the Bible and the Book of Common Prayer. It was, however, strongly denounced by leaders of the evangelical movement.

While Venn quotes from the Gospel of John, "Never man spake like this man" in reference to Christ, it is plain to see from the eulogy that follows that Venn could easily have made a similar statement about Whitefield.
HERVEY, JAMES, 1714-1758.

The Ministry of Reconciliation; Representing the Benign Tendency of the Gospel; and that it is the Friendly Office of Ministers, As the Ambassadors of Christ, to Press Men with All Imaginable Tenderness, Humility, and Earnestness, to Accept the Treaty of Reconciliation As Established in Him, and Urged by Him, While on Earth; a Sermon Preached at the Parish-Church of All-Saints in Northampton.
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Hervey was one of the earliest evangelicals. Though he was one of the original group of "methodists," having been a pupil of Wesley at Oxford, his ministry, was not among the Methodists. He was a Calvinist and has been described as "the Evangelical of Evangelicals."

His writings are his legacy; some titles were more admired and widely read than Law's A Serious Call to a Devout Life. John Henry Overton describes his writings as "vapid and turgid declamations" and says "if he had condescended to write plain English many of his descriptions would have been pleasing." This view was apparently not held by the masses that read his works. They were widely reprinted. Meditations and Contemplations was published in more than forty editions.

First published posthumously in 1759, an introductory "advertisement" states that Hervey was urged to print The Ministry of Reconciliation by those who heard the sermon, but out of modesty he declined. Another edition was published in Philadelphia in 1760 and later in London in 1764 and 1774. The text of the sermon is 2 Cor. 5:18, "All things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation."
Hannah More's role in the evangelical revival was significant. Her skilful writing coupled with her intimate friendship with the literati of the period provided a means of reaching persons from diverse backgrounds.

Encouraged by Garrick, she achieved modest success as a dramatist. She was a favorite of Johnson. The channeling of her literary endeavors toward religious writing came after hearing John Newton preach, and becoming a recruit to Wilberforce's cause, the Clapham Sect.

To counteract the enormous influence of Paine's Rights of Man, she began publishing tracts as alternative fare for the working class. With the help of her sister, Sarah, she produced over one hundred tracts. They were called the Cheap Repository Tracts and sold for a half penny or one penny. Circulation, exceeding two million copies, was achieved by every conceivable means, booksellers, pedlars, friends, but largely through bulk purchases and free distribution. The title page reads, "Price one Penny. Great Allowance to Shopkeepers Chapmen and Hawkers."

Though the tracts were anonymous, identification can be made by the signature "Z" at the end of Hannah More's tracts and the signature "S" at the end of Sarah More's tracts. Most of the tracts have a title vignette, many done by John Bewick.

This tract is the second of five parts of the Two Shoemaker series.
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