

Northumbria Research Link

Citation: Rutherford, Susan Lesley (2000) Reformation principles : the religious and political ideas of Benjamin Hoadly (1676-1761). Doctoral thesis, University of Northumbria at Newcastle.

This version was downloaded from Northumbria Research Link:
<https://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/id/eprint/15703/>

Northumbria University has developed Northumbria Research Link (NRL) to enable users to access the University's research output. Copyright © and moral rights for items on NRL are retained by the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. Single copies of full items can be reproduced, displayed or performed, and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided the authors, title and full bibliographic details are given, as well as a hyperlink and/or URL to the original metadata page. The content must not be changed in any way. Full items must not be sold commercially in any format or medium without formal permission of the copyright holder. The full policy is available online: <http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/policies.html>

Some theses deposited to NRL up to and including 2006 were digitised by the British Library and made available online through the [EThOS e-thesis online service](#). These records were added to NRL to maintain a central record of the University's research theses, as well as still appearing through the British Library's service. For more information about Northumbria University research theses, please visit [University Library Online](#).



**Northumbria
University**
NEWCASTLE



University**Library**

**REFORMATION PRINCIPLES:
THE RELIGIOUS AND POLITICAL IDEAS OF
BENJAMIN HOADLY (1676-1761)**

SUSAN LESLEY RUTHERFORD

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment
of the requirements of the
University of Northumbria at Newcastle
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

September 2000

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHUMBRIA AT NEWCASTLE	
LIBRARY	
ITEM No.	CLASS No.
2004165502	274.207

Abstract

Benjamin Hoadly (1676-1761), successively Bishop of Bangor (1716), Hereford (1721), Salisbury (1723) and Winchester (1734), was a Latitudinarian divine and one of the foremost Whig propagandists of his generation. Contemporary Nonjuring, High Church and Tory opponents maintained that he was an ambitious, unprincipled opportunist who employed the secular reason of Deists and atheists to foster anarchy in the Church and rebellion in the state. So far, historians have only discussed Hoadly in a number of articles, parts of theses or in a few pages in long histories of the period. Moreover, the work which has been carried out has tended to focus on his political or his religious ideas and has in general reinforced the view presented by contemporary opponents. The purpose of this present study is to give the first comprehensive understanding of Hoadly's religious and political views. Hoadly was a polemicist rather than an abstract philosopher, and a study of six debates during the period 1700-1737 has displayed the dynamics of his thought, as well as casting light on the temper of the age. The findings challenge the traditional interpretation of Hoadly and reveal that the Bishop was not an unprincipled opportunist, but a committed Protestant and a staunch Whig. The work has also found that his intellectual debt to the Christian religion and the early Protestant reformers has been ignored or underestimated. This thesis argues that in religious and political debates, Hoadly continually appealed to what he considered to be the principles and practices of early Christianity and the Reformation. Furthermore, it contends that the Bishop did not aim to destroy but to reform, by challenging superstition and opposing persecution in Church and state, as well as championing individual religious and political liberties.

Contents

Abstract	i
Contents page	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Benjamin Hoadly painted by William Hogarth in 1741	iv
Introduction	1
a) Hoadly and the historians	5
b) Reformation principles	13
c) Hoadly and the eighteenth-century context	16
Chapter 1 - The Occasional Conformity Controversy (1702-1707)	28
Chapter 2 - The Deist Challenge (1702-1713)	56
Chapter 3 - The Allegiance Controversy (1700-1710)	85
Chapter 4 - The Bangorian Controversy (1717-1720)	118
Chapter 5 - The 'Britannicus Letters' (1722-1724/25)	156
Chapter 6 - The debate surrounding the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper (1732-37)	189
Conclusion	222
Appendix I - Brief biographical details of Hoadly	233
Appendix II - List of Hoadly's publications	240
Bibliography	246

Acknowledgements

It is a great pleasure to acknowledge those who have assisted me in this study. My greatest debt is to my supervisor Jeremy Gregory. I am extremely grateful for his comments on numerous drafts, his good humour and encouragement, and the confidence he has given me. I would also like to thank Dr Mike Sutton and Dr Stephen Taylor for reading earlier versions of these chapters and for their helpful suggestions. Most of my research has been undertaken at Palace Green Library and the Cathedral Library at Durham and I will always appreciate the expertise and friendship of the librarians and archivists. They have made this period of my life a particularly happy one. My gratitude extends to all the librarians who have assisted me, including those at the Universities of Northumbria, Newcastle upon Tyne, Cambridge and London; the Bodleian, Christ Church, Oxford, as well as the staff at the Lit and Phil, Newcastle, Newcastle Central Library, Dr Williams' Library and Lambeth Palace Library. I am also obliged to Mrs Anne Kendrick who generously donated her husband's research notes on Hoadly to Cambridge University Library. Professor Kendrick's files proved to be an extremely useful guide to sources. Finally, on a more personal note I want to thank my family and friends for accepting the fact that I spend so much time in the eighteenth-century. Above all, my thanks must go to John who has, with great patience, lived with Hoadly for the past few years. This thesis is dedicated to John.

Benjamin Hoadly painted by William Hogarth in 1741



Courtesy of the Tate Gallery, London

Introduction

Benjamin Hoadly was successively Bishop of Bangor (1716), Hereford (1721), Salisbury (1723) and Winchester (1734).¹ A Latitudinarian divine and Whig propagandist, he was involved in all the major religious and political disputes of his time, including the allegiance controversies during Queen Anne's reign, the Sacheverell affair (1710), the Bangorian controversy (1717-1720), the debates which surrounded the crash of the South Sea Company (1720-1722) and the Atterbury plot (1722-1723). Yet, as John Kenyon has noted, the Bishop, who was the most aggressively Whig Churchman of the century, has "never received his due as the most powerful and effective, if not the most original, Whig propagandist of his generation".²

Until now, Hoadly has only been the main focus of attention in a few articles, parts of theses or an occasional chapter in books. More frequently, he has received a few pages in long histories of the period. The aim of this thesis is to try and meet this deficiency by analysing the religious and political ideas of Benjamin Hoadly and locating them in the context of his time. Hoadly was a vigorous defender of the Whig cause, and certainly one of the most persistent opponents of Tory doctrines, so an examination of his role in the controversies of his day should supplement existing work in the politics of the early-

¹ Hoadly was given the Lambeth degree of Doctor of Divinity on 25 January 1715/16, became a King's chaplain in February and was consecrated Bishop of Bangor in March 1715/16. He was confirmed Bishop of Hereford in November, 1721, Bishop of Salisbury in October, 1723 and Bishop of Winchester in September, 1734. Act Books, Lambeth Palace, VB/1/vi p 201, 209, 382 & 385, viii p 13. The Works of Benjamin Hoadly D D, 3 folio volumes, published by John Hoadly, London, 1773, i, p ix-x. (referred to in this thesis as Works). See also Appendix I of this thesis.

² J P Kenyon, Revolution Principles: The Politics of Party 1689-1720, Cambridge, 1977, p 116. See also H T Dickinson, 'Benjamin Hoadly', in History Today, 25, 1975, p 349 and Reed Browning, Political and Constitutional Ideas of the Court Whigs, London, 1982, p 67.

eighteenth century.³ In so doing, this thesis also hopes to shed more light on the relationship between religion and politics in the period. So far, intellectual historians have tended to show more interest in the secular and classical, rather than the Christian, and specifically Protestant, aspects of Whig ideas.⁴ Moreover, since Hoadly was both a Whig propagandist and a leading Latitudinarian divine, a study of the Bishop's religious ideas should further our knowledge of eighteenth-century Latitudinarianism. Although considerable research has been carried out on seventeenth-century Latitudinarianism,⁵ its eighteenth-century counterpart has been sadly neglected.⁶ According to John

³ Geoffrey Holmes, British Politics in the Age of Anne, London, 1967. Geoffrey Holmes, The Trial of Dr Sacheverell, London, 1973. Geoffrey Holmes, Politics, Religion and Society in England 1679-1742, London, 1986. W A Speck, Tory and Whig - The Struggle in the Constituencies 1701-1715, London, 1970. J G A Pocock, The Machiavellian Moment, Princeton, 1975. Kenyon, Revolution Principles. H T Dickinson, Liberty and Property: Political Ideology in Eighteenth Century Britain, London, 1977. Browning, Court Whigs. J A W Gunn, Beyond Liberty and Property, Kingston, 1983. Marie P McMahon, The Radical Whigs, John Trenchard and Thomas Gordon, London, 1990. Jeremy Black, Robert Walpole and the Nature of Politics in Early Eighteenth Century Britain, London, 1990.

⁴ For classical ideas in the period see Pocock, Machiavellian. Browning, Court Whigs. Peter N Miller, Defining the Common Good, Cambridge, 1994. For the importance of the ancient constitution, experience and history in Whig ideology see Dickinson, Liberty and Property and Kenyon, Revolution Principles. For the influence of religion see Jeremy Gregory, 'Anglicanism and the arts: religion, culture and politics in the eighteenth-century' in Culture, Politics and Society in Britain, 1660-1800, edited by Jeremy Black and Jeremy Gregory, Manchester, 1991, p 82.

⁵ Edward Angus George, Seventeenth Century Men of Latitude, London, 1908. Barbara J Shapiro, John Wilkins 1614-1672, London, 1969. Barbara J Shapiro, Probability and Certainty in Seventeenth Century England, Princeton, 1983. John Marshall, 'The Ecclesiology of the Latitude-men 1660-89 Stillingfleet, Tillotson and "Hobbism"', Journal of Ecclesiastical History, xxxvi, 1985. Gerald Reedy, The Bible and Reason - Anglicans and Scripture in late Seventeenth Century England, Philadelphia, 1985. John Spurr, The Restoration Church of England 1646-1689, London, 1991. Richard Kroll, Richard Ashcraft, Perez Zagorin, editors, Philosophy, Science and Religion in England 1640-1700, Cambridge, 1992. M I J Griffin, Latitudinarianism in the Seventeenth-Century Church of England, Leiden, 1992. W M Spellman, The Latitudinarians and the Church of England 1660-1700, London, 1993.

⁶ However see John Gascoigne, Cambridge in the Age of Enlightenment, Cambridge, 1989. John Gascoigne, 'Anglican Latitudinarianism and Political Radicalism in the late eighteenth century' in History, 71, 1986. Martin Greig, 'The Thought and Polemic of Gilbert Burnet 1673-1705', unpublished PhD, Cambridge, 1991. Martin Fitzpatrick, 'Latitudinarianism at the parting of the ways: a suggestion', in The Church of England c.1689 - c.1833, edited by John Walsh, Colin Haydon, Stephen Taylor, Cambridge, 1993. Martin Greig, 'Heresy Hunt: Gilbert Burnet and the Convocation Controversy of 1701' in The Historical Journal, 37, 3, 1994. Tony Claydon, William III and the Godly Revolution, Cambridge, 1996. Rebecca Louise Warner, 'Early Eighteenth Century Low Churchmanship: The Glorious Revolution to the Bangorian Controversy'. Unpublished PhD, Reading, 1999.

Walsh and Stephen Taylor, "It is Latitudinarianism which is most often seen as the characteristic mode of Anglican piety in the eighteenth-century. Curiously, it is here that most work needs to be done".⁷

In view of the available sources, it really is surprising that a full scale study of Hoadly's religious and political ideas has not been carried out earlier. The Bishop was a prodigious writer and his output was quite staggering. Most of his writings have been printed and are included in the three folio volumes of his Works.⁸ These were published in 1773 by his son John Hoadly who was Chancellor of the Diocese of Winchester.⁹ Early editions of the Bishop's tracts and books have been compared with the 1773 compilation and the Works have been found to be a reliable source. However, the reader does need to be aware that, in order to take account of the contemporary debate, the Bishop occasionally altered the prefaces to his individual writings. As an example The Measures of Submission to the Civil Magistrate considered was published in 1706 but the second edition (1708) included a preface which answered The Plea of Public Good not sufficient to justify the taking up Arms against our Rightful and Lawful Sovereigns (1706). This preface was also sold separately, and was included in the Works.¹⁰

Although many of his tracts and books were published anonymously,

⁷ Walsh and Taylor, 'Introduction' Church of England, p 35.

⁸ John Hoadly, publisher, Works (3 folio volumes), London, 1773. Twelve copies were also printed on very large paper in 1773. For an unpublished piece written by Hoadly see British Library Add Ms 61426 'Narrative Relating to the Duchess of Marlborough', (1715?). See also Frances Harris, 'Accounts of the Conduct of Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, 1704-1742' in The British Library Journal, 8, 1982.

⁹ John Hoadly (1711-1776) was the youngest son of Benjamin Hoadly and his wife Sarah Curtis. He was appointed Chancellor of the Diocese of Winchester on 29 November, 1735. John Hoadly was also a poet and dramatist and mixed in the same circles as Garrick and Hogarth. DNB, ix, p 916.

¹⁰ Works, ii, p 3. The Measures of Submission to the Civil Magistrate considered (second edition), London, 1708.

contemporaries were frequently well aware that they were written by Hoadly. As a bishop of the established Church, he certainly did not acknowledge his contribution to newspaper articles. Hoadly's 'Britannicus Letters' (from The London Journal) can be found in volume iii the Works, pages 3-395.¹¹ The reader should note that, for some unaccountable reason, John Hoadly also included some letters which were not written by his father.¹² The remainder of the 'Britannicus Letters' are, in general, Hoadleian and contain a eulogy of Reformation epistemology, a vigorous defence of the 1688 Revolution and are frequently expressed in the rhetoric of virulent anti-popery.¹³ Other anonymous pamphlets, sometimes attributed to Hoadly but not included in the Works, which lack the Bishop's usual style, content and authorities, have been classified as 'anonymous' in this study.¹⁴ Appendix 2 of this thesis gives the title and date of each known Hoadly publication and the location in the Works.

Sadly, only a small number of Hoadly's manuscripts are in existence. For approximately twenty years (1715-1735), Hoadly corresponded with Charlotte Clayton, Lady Sundon, woman of the bedchamber to Princess/Queen

¹¹ See Simon Targett, 'Sir Robert Walpole's Newspapers 1722-42. Propaganda and Politics in the age of Whig Supremacy', unpublished PhD, Cambridge, 1991. Targett, 'A Pro-Government Newspaper During the Whig Ascendancy: Walpole's London Journal 1722-1738' in Journal of History and Politics, vii, 1989 and also his 'Government and Ideology during the Age of Whig Supremacy: The Political Argument of Sir Robert Walpole's Newspaper Propagandists' in The Historical Journal, 37, 2, 1994. Browning, Court Whigs.

¹² Works, iii, p 330 - According to John Hoadly the Bishop only wrote one letter (1 August, 1724) between May and November, 1724.

¹³ Works, iii, p 35, 223. Reformation epistemology - iii, p 232-248 Archbishop of Cambray & Fiddes' History of Cardinal Wolsey - iii, p 383-389. Revolution - iii, p 219-226. Toleration - Massacres at Thorn in 1724, iii, p 370-371 & 390-395.

¹⁴ For example - Anon, A Defence of the Plain Account, London, 1735. Anon, A Farther Defence of the Plain Account, London, 1735. Anon, An Apologetical Defence ... of ... A Plain Account, London, 1735.

Caroline.¹⁵ As the letters were written frankly, the Bishop tried to recover them in case they fell into the wrong hands.¹⁶ It is not known whether or not the sensitive material was deliberately destroyed but little of the correspondence survived. A small number of these letters were published in the Works and forty are now in the care of the Beinecke Library, Yale.¹⁷ The British Library hold the largest collection of Hoadly manuscripts. The Bodleian, Cambridge University Library and Lambeth Palace Library also have some letters by or referring to him. Unfortunately, Bangor, Hereford, Salisbury and Winchester Cathedrals and record offices do not have any of the Bishop's personal papers.

a) Benjamin Hoadly and the historians

Before attempting to provide the first comprehensive analysis of Hoadly's religious and political ideas, it is important to consider how previous writers and historians have depicted Hoadly. Although it would be incorrect to suggest that Hoadly has not had some sympathetic interpreters, it is fair to say that in general the Bishop has had a very bad press.¹⁸ He has frequently been portrayed as unprincipled and self-seeking, a shallow Christian and a bishop

¹⁵ For Lady Sundon see Mrs Anthony Thompson, Memoirs of the Viscountess Sundon, 2 vols, London, 1847. Stephen Taylor, 'Queen Caroline and the Church of England' in Hanoverian Britain and Empire, edited by Stephen Taylor, Richard Connors and Clyve Jones, Woodbridge, 1998, p 86 & 87.

¹⁶ John Hoadly, 'Hoadly', in Works, i, p v & vi.

¹⁷ Works, i, p xli-iv. Lady Sundon's Letter book (Osborn Mss fc.110), Beinecke Library, Yale.

¹⁸ Much has been made of the belief that Hoadly never visited Bangor or Hereford. Hoadly attended the House of Lords when it was in session and spent most of his time in London. Crippled, he was unable to make the journey through the mountainous terrain of Wales but did attempt, unsuccessfully because of dangerous seas, to visit Bangor - Norman Sykes, Church and State in England in the Eighteenth Century, Cambridge, 1934, p 63, 102, 135/136, 362. As Bishop of Hereford he frequently ordained at King's Street chapel in London and contrary to popular belief did visit Hereford where he conferred orders in the cathedral on 1 July, 1722 and held four other ordination ceremonies. - William M Marshall, 'Episcopal Activities in the Hereford and Oxford Dioceses 1660-1760', Midland History, viii, 1983, p 107, 114.

who undermined the very foundations of his own Church.¹⁹

Let us look a little more closely at the way in which writers have described the Bishop's religious ideas. It should be noted that during the nineteenth-century, histories of the Church were often written by Churchmen who were unsympathetic to Latitudinarianism. The Reverend George Perry (1864) maintained Latitudinarian divines were totally unprincipled; "they accepted Creeds and Articles themselves" and then held "that it was a matter of indifference whether they were accepted or not".²⁰ Moreover, Perry contended that the "writings of Hoadly gave a system to Latitudinarianism and established it in a position of favour".²¹ Indeed, he went on to suggest that "Latitudinarianism in all its forms owed its audacity and the prominence which it soon reached to the publications of Hoadly".²²

The Reverend John Hunt (1873) did acknowledge that Hoadly was "always genuine" but in his view the Bishop's Latitudinarian writings lacked "deep religious feeling".²³ Charles Abbey (1887), who was Rector of Checkenson censured the Bishop for his "excess of latitudinarianism".²⁴ "Most English Churchmen", Abbey continued,

will agree that his faults as a theologian were very great ... His opinions were grievously deficient in all that gives to worship fire, life, and unction ... his

¹⁹ George G Perry, The History of the Church of England, 3 vols, London, 1864, iii, p 285. G R Cragg, 'The Churchman' in Man versus Society in Eighteenth-Century Britain, edited by James L Clifford, Cambridge, 1968, p 59. Christopher J Cocksworth, Evangelical Eucharistic Thought in the Church of England, Cambridge, 1993, p 61. Stephen Hyde Cassan, Lives and Memoirs of the Bishops of Sherborne and Salisbury from 105-1824, Salisbury, 1824, p 210.

²⁰ Perry, History, iii, p 285.

²¹ Perry, History, iii, p 285.

²² Perry, History, iii, p 286.

²³ John Hunt, Religious Thought in England from the Reformation to the end of the last century, 3 vols, London, 1870-73, iii, p 30 & 32-48.

²⁴ C J Abbey, The English Church and Its Bishops 1700-1800, 2 vols, London, 1887, ii, p 5.

opinions, as they gained strength in the Church, had a depressing and even a deadening effect upon it ... The calm and dispassionate view of religion, however suitable it may be for philosophy is too sluggish a thing to contend with powers of sin and cope with spiritual corruption.²⁵

Writing at the turn of the century, Canon J H Overton and the Reverend F Relton (1906) saw Hoadly as an ambitious man with a keen intellect and “one of the ablest in an age of able writers”, but, they claimed, he employed these abilities against his own Church.²⁶ Convinced that the Hanoverian period was one of falling moral and spiritual standards within the Church, they declared that it “was not a good omen for the future when almost the first bishop consecrated under the new dynasty was Benjamin Hoadly”.²⁷

Perhaps Leslie Stephen discouraged further, possibly less biased research, when he called Hoadly’s writings “slovenly, awkward ... often indistinct and apparently at least evasive” and informed his readers that the Bishop’s Works were a “dreary wilderness of profitless discussion”.²⁸ Whatever the reason, twentieth-century writers appear to have virtually ignored Hoadly’s writings. Moreover, the research which has been carried out has tended to focus on the Bishop’s role in the Bangorian controversy. Writing in 1928, Norman Sykes was convinced that Hoadly’s arguments in Bangorian sermon undermined all Church organisation and would eventually lead to the disestablishment of the Church of England.²⁹ In contrast, Henry Rack (1975) complained that

²⁵ Abbey, English Church, ii, p 5 & 6.

²⁶ J H Overton and F Relton, A History of the Church from the Accession of George 1 to the end of the Eighteenth Century 1714-1800, London, 1906, p 14.

²⁷ Overton & Relton, History, p 14.

²⁸ Leslie Stephen, History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century, 2 vols, London, (1876) 1962, vol ii, p 129.

²⁹ Norman Sykes, ‘Benjamin Hoadly, Bishop of Bangor’, in Social and Political Ideas of Some English Thinkers of the Augustan Age 1650-1750, edited by F J C Hearnshaw, London, 1928, p 146, 147. The Bangorian sermon will be discussed in chapter 4 of this thesis.

historians favoured Hoadly's adversary William Law and had not given the Bishop and his Bangorian writings a fair hearing.³⁰ P B Hessert (1951) looked at the Bangorian controversy from a purely religious perspective. The controversy was, in Hessert's view, about conflicting interpretations of the Church and he maintained Hoadly and his supporters considered the ideal Church a spiritual kingdom, whereas their opponents confused the Kingdom of God with nationalism.³¹ Rebecca Warner (1996) regarded Hoadly and his supporters as part of the deep divide within the establishment over the concept of authority.³² Understandably, these studies by Hessert and Warner concentrated on the debate itself and more work remained to be done on the main character in the controversy.³³

As Hoadly advocated the use of human reason in religion, contemporaries and later commentators professed that he employed the secular reason of the Deists rather than the reason of a Christian apologist. Norman Sykes (1928) claimed that the Bishop's ideas were influenced by his deistical outlook.³⁴ H T Dickinson (1975) argued that Hoadly's "theological opinions were not merely Latitudinarian, but came very close to the natural religion of the Deists".³⁵ Other scholars including R E Sullivan (1982) and Gordon Rupp (1986) have also seen a close relationship between the ideas of Hoadly and the Deists

³⁰ Henry D Rack, ' 'Christ's Kingdom not of this World:' The Case of Benjamin Hoadly versus William Law Reconsidered' in Studies in Church History, 12, 1975 p 275, 276. For a discussion on Hoadly's notion of sincerity in the Bangorian controversy and his other writings see D O Thomas 'Benjamin Hoadly: the Ethics of Sincerity', in Enlightenment and Dissent, 15, 1996.

³¹ P B Hessert, 'The Bangorian Controversy', unpublished PhD, Edinburgh, 1951, p 237.

³² Rebecca Louise Warner, 'The Bangorian Controversy: The Problem of Ecclesiastical Authority', unpublished MA dissertation, University of Reading, 1996, p 75.

³³ Rebecca Warner discussed some aspects of Hoadly's religious thought in more depth in her PhD thesis, 'Low Churchmanship'.

³⁴ Sykes, 'Hoadly', p 148, 150. Sykes, Church and State, p 348.

³⁵ Dickinson, 'Hoadly', p 349.

John Toland and Matthew Tindal.³⁶

In a lively article written in History Today (1975) H T Dickinson wrote that Hoadly was a “Bishop who held many liberal views, much disliked by his brethren” and did not have any body of support within the Church. It is however important to appreciate, as Caroline Robbins (1959), John Gascoigne (1989) and Rebecca Warner (1999) have done, that the Bishop was part of a small group of like-minded thinkers. These included Benjamin Hoadly’s brother John (who became Archbishop of Armagh), Arthur Ashley Sykes (Rector of Dry Drayton), John Jackson (Rector of Rossington), Thomas Pyle (minister of St Nicholas’s chapel, Lynn), Daniel Whitby (Chantor of Salisbury) as well as Thomas Herne (tutor to the Duchess of Bedford’s family).³⁷ .

After discussing the manner in which historians have treated Hoadly’s religious ideas perhaps we can now consider some of the ways in which his political writings have been interpreted. So far, surprisingly little work has focused on the Bishop’s political propaganda and consequently it has not yet been possible to recognise the full extent of Hoadly’s contribution to the Whig cause.

Undoubtedly the most quoted work on Hoadly’s political views remains the chapter by Norman Sykes in Social and Political Ideas of Some English Thinkers of the Augustan Age (1928). Sykes described the Bishop as a natural

³⁶ R E Sullivan, John Toland - The Deist Controversy - A Study in Adaptations, Cambridge, Mass, 1982, p 35, 259, 269. Gordon Rupp, Religion in England 1688-1791, Oxford, 1986, p 263. Dickinson, ‘Hoadly’, p 349.

³⁷ Caroline Robbins, The Eighteenth Century Commonwealthman, (1959), New York, 1968, p 295 ff. Gascoigne, Cambridge. Warner, ‘Low Churchmanship’, Appendix.

political combatant.³⁸ Few men, he wrote, “have been called more appropriately after the youngest son of the patriarch Jacob, of whom his father testified: ‘Benjamin is a wolf that ravineth: in the morning he shall devour the prey, and at even he shall divide the spoil’”.³⁹ He accepted that Hoadly excelled when composing short political pamphlets but Sykes did not appear to believe that they were based on any firm principles and claimed that they had a transitory and ephemeral quality.⁴⁰ Also, rather than treating Hoadly as a political polemicist in his own right, like Leslie Stephen (1876) and Harold Laski (1920) before him, Sykes compared the Bishop’s writings, somewhat unfavourably it must be said, with those of John Locke.⁴¹ Yet, Hoadly’s contribution was substantial. When Jonathan Mayhew was working on the Discourse Concerning Unlimited Submission (1750), a rationale for resistance to government which, according to Bernard Bailyn, was “the most famous sermon preached in pre-Revolutionary America”, he did not draw on Locke but

³⁸ Sykes, ‘Hoadly’, p 155.

³⁹ Sykes, ‘Hoadly’, p 155.

⁴⁰ Sykes, ‘Hoadly’, p 155.

⁴¹ Works, ii, p 182-284. Sykes, ‘Hoadly’, p 136. Stephen, English Thought, ii, p 129. Harold Laski, Political Thought in England from Locke to Bentham, New York, 1920, p 69. The literature on the authority of Locke in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is enormous. As an example See Richard Ashcraft and M M Goldsmith, ‘Locke, Revolution Principles and the Formation of Whig Ideology’, The Historical Journal, 26, 24, 1983. Martin P Thompson, ‘The Reception of Locke’s Two Treatises of Government 1690-1705’, Political Studies, 24, 1976. Robert Albritton, ‘The Politics of Locke’s Philosophy’, Political Studies, 24, 1976. Kenyon, Revolution Principles, 34-38. John Marshall, John Locke, Resistance, Religion and Responsibility, Cambridge, 1994. Mark Goldie, ‘John Locke, Jonas Proast and religious toleration 1688-1692’ in Walsh et al, Church of England. John Dunn, The Political Thought of John Locke, Cambridge, 1969. However, the aim of this work is to try to understand Hoadly’s ideas and a detailed comparison of Locke and Hoadly would not provide any ‘substantial’ benefits and would have restricted research on other aspects of the thesis.

borrowed wholesale from Hoadly's Measures of Submission (1706).⁴²

Edward Bingham's article in Church History (1947) drew attention to Hoadly's lesser known political pamphlets which were written to counteract Tory propaganda in the run up to the English elections in 1710.⁴³ Most important, Bingham appreciated that Hoadly was not merely a political opportunist and that he did not need to distort his theology to make it conform with Whig ideals.⁴⁴ To some extent it was odd that John Kenyon did not consider the 1710 pamphlets in his broad treatment of Revolution Principles The Politics of Party 1689-1720 (1977) but he certainly did acknowledge Hoadly's deep commitment to the Whig cause as well as his vigorous defence of the doctrine of lawful, limited resistance.⁴⁵

Writers have tended to explain Hoadly's reasons for launching into print and indeed the basis of his thought in secular terms. H T Dickinson (1975) and B W Young (1998) have linked Hoadly's political writings with his hopes of preferment.⁴⁶ In addition historians, including G V Bennett (1975), have contrasted Tory divine right theories with Hoadly's appeal to individual reason

⁴² Bernard Bailyn, The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution, Cambridge, Mass, 1967, p 37-38, 45 & 52. The Boston Evening Post recognised that Mayhew had taken his interpretation of Romans xiii, 1-8 from Hoadly's Measures and made a detailed comparison of the texts on 16 and 23 April, 1750. Mayhew did not deny his debt and sent a copy of Discourse to Hoadly because "some here have asserted", he wrote, "that the greatest part of it was stolen from your Lordship's original" - Bernard Bailyn, editor, Pamphlets of the American Revolution 1750-1776, Cambridge, Mass, 1965, p 208, 215, 697. Letter from Mayhew to Hoadly quoted in Alden Bradford, Memoir of the Life and Writings of Reverend Jonathan Mayhew, DD, Boston, 1838, p 96-96 quoted in Bailyn, Pamphlets, p 209.

⁴³ Edwin R Bingham, 'The Political Apprenticeship of Benjamin Hoadly' in Church History, 16, 1947, p 165.

⁴⁴ Bingham, 'Apprenticeship', p 165. For elections in this period see Speck, Tory and Whig.

⁴⁵ Kenyon, Revolution Principles, p 127.

⁴⁶ Dickinson, 'Hoadly', p 352, 354, 355. B W Young, Religion and Enlightenment in Eighteenth-Century England, Oxford, 1998, p 32, 33.

and consent as the origin of government.⁴⁷ Some commentators, including Reed Browning (1982) and Peter Miller (1994), have not only emphasised the secular but more specifically the classical roots of the Bishop's political ideas. Browning was convinced that Hoadly and the Court Whigs were deeply indebted to the ideas of the ancients, and Cicero in particular.⁴⁸ He claimed that Hoadly "shared the Roman's love of disputation and the comforts" and like Cicero was a friend of liberty who defended both private property and the common good.⁴⁹ However, as on so many occasions, the religious component of Hoadly's political ideas has been either underestimated, or completely ignored.

To bring this section to a close, contemporary opponents claimed that Benjamin Hoadly was an ambitious, unprincipled man who used the novel ideas of Deists, Socinians and atheists to promote anarchy in the Church and rebellion in the state.⁵⁰ As we have seen, some later commentators have

⁴⁷ G V Bennett, The Tory Crisis in Church and State 1688-1730: The Career of Francis Atterbury Bishop of Rochester, Oxford, 1975, p 103, 105.

⁴⁸ Browning, Court Whigs, p 256.

⁴⁹ Browning, Court Whigs, p 229, 230 -232, 70.

⁵⁰ According to Alexander Pope, Hoadly was one of "Heaven's Swiss, who fight for any god, or man" who would pay them, quoted in J A Downie, "Walpole, 'the Poet's Foe'" in Britain in the Age of Walpole, edited by Jeremy Black, London, 1984, p 174. Francis Atterbury quoted in Greig, 'Heresy Hunt', p 572. Waterland, A Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist, Cambridge, 1737, p 9, 1 & 13. Thomas Brett, A True Scripture Account of the Nature and Benefits of the Holy Eucharist, in Answer to a Book Intituled A Plain Account, London, 1736, p 5, 125, 169. William Law, A Demonstration of the Gross and Fundamental Errors of a late Book called A Plain Account, London, 1737, p 99, 102, 211. Gloster Ridley, The Christian Passover, 1736, p 4. [Patrick Delany], A Letter to a Lord, in Answer to his late Book entitled, A plain Account of the Nature and End of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper 1736, p 23. Law, The Bishop of Bangor's Late Sermon, and his Letter to Dr Snape in Defence of it, Answer'd, And the Dangerous Nature of some Doctrines in his Preservative set forth in a Letter to his Lordship (4th edition) London, 1717, p 22. Thomas Sherlock, The Condition and Example of our Blessed Saviour Vindicated: In Answer to the Bishop of Bangor's Charge of Calumny Against the Dean of Chichester, London, 1718, p 56. Francis Hare, Church Authority Vindicated, in a Visitation Sermon Preach'd at Putney, May, 1719, London, 1719, p vi. Henry Stebbing, A Defence of the First Head, of the Charge of the Committee of the Lower House of Convocation Against the R R Lord Bishop of Bangor, (2nd edition) London, 1718, p 20. [Francis Atterbury], Some Proceedings in the Convocation, London, 1708, p 35. Anon, St Paul No Mover of Sedition, London, 1706, p 10, 16 & 13.

shown more understanding but others unquestioningly accepted the partisan view of Hoadly as a natural political combatant, who used the methods of the Deists, held lax religious beliefs and undermined the very fabric of the Church of England.⁵¹ Also, apart from brief overviews by Norman Sykes and H T Dickinson, scholars have so far tended to research Hoadly's religious OR his political ideas. Overton, Rack, and Hessert have discussed the Bishop's religion, whereas Bingham, Kenyon and Browning have written about his political views. Such a method has undoubtedly prevented a full appreciation of Hoadly's work.

b) Reformation Principles

This thesis attempts a comprehensive understanding of Hoadly's political and religious ideas. It examines the full range of Hoadly's writings and analyses the relationship between his religious and political views. The Bishop was a prodigious writer and, in a work of this length, it is not possible to discuss every single pamphlet which he produced. He was a polemicist rather than an abstract philosopher, so it is hoped that the study of six debates over four decades will show the dynamics of his thought. It will also reveal the importance of Hoadly in the period, and demonstrate the strength and vitality of his adversaries, as well as casting light on the problems, preoccupations and temper of the age.

This work argues that Hoadly was not a political opportunist who lacked principles, but a staunch Whig who fervently believed that the Protestant

⁵¹ Sykes, 'Hoadly', p 28, 118, 148. Dickinson, 'Hoadly', p 349. Cassan, Salisbury, p 210. Overton & Relton, History, p 14.

Church and state could only be secure under a Whig administration.⁵²

Moreover, Hoadly did not use the secular reason of the Deists but, like the Christian humanists and early Protestant reformers and theologians including Richard Hooker (1554?-1600) and William Chillingworth (1602-1644), the Bishop synthesised classical and Christian methods and concepts.⁵³ Indeed, this research reveals that many of Hoadly's ideas were far from new and that his debt to Christianity and the early Protestant reformers has not been sufficiently recognised.⁵⁴ Christianity, in Hoadly's view, represented freedom of choice, and he was convinced that Protestant reformers aimed to recapture this primitive Christian liberty from the tyranny imposed by the Church of Rome.⁵⁵ As we shall see, the Bishop continually appealed to 'Reformation Principles' and, believing that the Bible was the religion of Protestants, urged all Protestants to make their own sincere inquiries into the meaning of the Gospel, exercise personal judgements in matters of faith and live by them.⁵⁶ Hoadly used this definition with latitude and employed the principles and rhetoric of the Reformation in an effort to unite Whigs and Protestants, promote individual religious and political liberties and prevent bigotry, superstition and persecution in Church and state.

This research suggests that it was not Deism but Christianity, and more

⁵² Works, i, p 601-689, iii, p 264.

⁵³ For Christian Humanism see Margo Todd, Christian Humanism and the Puritan Social Order, Cambridge, 1987.

⁵⁴ Works, ii, p 931, 850, 409, 904, iii, p 894. William Chillingworth, The Religion of Protestants, (1638), New York, 1972, p 375. E G Rupp and Benjamin Drewery, editors, Martin Luther, London, 1970, p 166. W P Stephens, Zwingli, Oxford, 1992, p 99. John Hales, 'A tract on the sacrament of the Lord's Supper; and concerning the church's mistaking itself about fundamentals' in Works of John Hales, edited by David Dalrymple, Lord Hailes, Glasgow, 1765, i, p 62. For the recognition that Hoadly's ideas in the Bangorian controversy were in the Reformation tradition see Hunt, Religious Thought, iii, p 32, 367, 386. Abbey, English Church, i, p 194-196 & ii, p 112.

⁵⁵ Works, i, p 596-597 ; ii, p 122, 581.

⁵⁶ Works; ii, p 427, 451, 559, 570-572, 579, 891.

specifically the Reformation, which determined Hoadly's religious and political outlook. The thesis has been divided into six chapters (a conclusion and two appendices). Chapter 1 considers the relationship between Hoadly and the Nonconformists. Although contemporaries and later commentators have seen a strong similarity between the ideas of Hoadly and the Nonconformists this chapter argues that there were important differences between Hoadly's Latitudinarian Churchmanship and even the moderate nonconformity of Edmund Calamy. The chapter discusses the arguments which the Bishop used to try to encourage the Dissenters to return and carry on the Reformation within the established Church.

Contemporaries and later historians frequently asserted that the Bishop and the Deists used the same novel methodology. However, chapter 2 demonstrates that their approaches were significantly different. Hoadly wrote from the standpoint of a Christian apologist and he was convinced that the "pretended scholarship" of the Deists endangered individual liberty of religious inquiry which had been regained at the Reformation. Chapter 3 compares and contrasts theories of political allegiance. Tories, High Churchmen and Nonjurors held that resistance to a magistrate was sinful and adhered to the doctrines of passive obedience and non resistance. Pushed to their logical conclusions, Hoadly was convinced that these views undermined the 1688 Revolution. He used the authority of the Protestant divine Richard Hooker (1554?-1600) to support ascending political authority, natural equality, government by consent, the rule of law and lawful resistance. The Bishop tried to persuade his audience that lawful resistance was not sinful and was a principle of Christianity, the Reformation and the Revolution of 1688. Chapter 4 investigates the issues and ideas involved in the Bangorian controversy.

Hoadly was sure that many Churchmen were abandoning the principles of the Reformation and he believed that the Church of England was becoming almost indistinguishable from the Roman Church. The ideas of William Chillingworth (1602-1644) and others reminiscent of Martin Luther (1483-1546) were used to defend his view of the Church and the manner in which it should be supported. Chapter 5 considers Hoadly's role as a journalist. From September 1722 until March 1724/5, as author of the 'Britannicus Letters' in the The London Journal, the Bishop vigorously defended the Walpole administration from Tories and opposition Whigs alike. The arguments focused on nature and qualities of patriotism and Hoadly contended that the ministry and their supporters were the 'true' patriots because they defended the Protestant Church and state from popery. Totally against the practice of using the sacrament as a political test, Hoadly was also extremely concerned that some Churchmen were adopting eucharistic doctrines which had been rejected at the Reformation. So, chapter 6 explains how the sacramental theology of Huldreich Zwingli (1484-1531), later adopted by John Hales (1584-1656), was used by the Bishop to support the view that the eucharist was a remembrance of Christ's sacrifice and a religious rite designed to unite all Christians. Chapter 6 is followed by a conclusion. Appendix 1 gives brief biographical details of Hoadly and Appendix 2 lists his numerous works.

(c) Hoadly and the eighteenth-century context

Before focusing on Hoadly's writings it may be useful to review briefly the context within which they were written, and the way in which the period has been interpreted by historians. The first part of the eighteenth-century was undoubtedly a time of conflict and uneasy tension when religion continued to

play a crucial part in the politics of the day. There were disagreements over fundamental issues such as the succession to the throne and the doctrine and status of the Church of England; Jacobites, Nonjurors, Nonconformists and Deists challenged the political and religious establishment. As a Whig propagandist and one of the leading Latitudinarian divines Hoadly was frequently to be found in the midst of these potentially volatile situations.

The possibility of a Stuart restoration during the first part of the eighteenth century was, in Hoadly's view, a very real fear. Like other Whig Churchmen, including White Kennett, Hoadly was convinced that a Catholic, Stuart monarch would have overturned limited government and the balanced constitution, and deprived the population of both their civil and religious liberties.⁵⁷ Hoadly and many of his contemporaries were undoubtedly genuinely alarmed by the thought of a Stuart restoration and we must take their fears very seriously. The real extent of the support for the Stuarts has caused considerable disagreement among historians. Jacobites have frequently been discussed as unsuccessful extremists on the fringe of political and religious society. G P Insh described Scottish Jacobites as defenders of the doomed pre-capitalist social order and G V Bennett believed that Jacobitism had no real chance of success.⁵⁸ However, the Jacobite threat has been taken far more seriously in the work of Eveline Cruickshanks, Daniel

⁵⁷ Works, iii, p 41-43, & 48. White Kennett, A Compassionate Enquiry into the Causes of the Civil War, London, 1704, p 25, 26. See also Colin Haydon, Anti-Catholicism in eighteenth-century England c 1714-80, Manchester, 1993.

⁵⁸ G P Insh, The Scottish Jacobite Movement, Edinburgh, 1952 quoted in Monod, Jacobitism, p 2. See also Bennett, Tory Crisis & his 'English Jacobitism, 1710-1715: Myth & Reality' in Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 32, London, 1982.

Szechi, Jeremy Black, J C D Clark and Paul Monod.⁵⁹ As Monod and Black have observed, the threat of a restoration remained real as long as there was a Stuart candidate and a foreign power (especially England's most powerful enemy France) to advance the claim.⁶⁰ Moreover, five rebellions, six near invasions and numerous scares undoubtedly had an impact on British institutions and society.⁶¹

Nonjurors presented a further problem for Hoadly and the establishment. In an age when oaths were taken very seriously, Nonjurors adhered to the strictest interpretation. They believed in the sacred inviolability of their oaths to James II and refused to swear allegiance to William and Mary or take the Oaths of Abjuration in 1702 and 1715.⁶² The clergy were the most significant group of Nonjurors and were subsequently deprived of their livings. One of the most brilliant Nonjuring polemicists Charles Leslie published his political and religious views in numerous pamphlets and tracts and The Rehearsal newspaper.⁶³ Convinced that Leslie was a Jacobite, intent on destroying the Protestant Church and state, Hoadly worked hard to counter Leslie's subversive arguments.⁶⁴ J H Overton, H Broxhap and Mark Goldie have tried to separate Nonjuring ideas from Jacobitism and contended that they were not

⁵⁹ Eveline Cruickshanks, Political Untouchables: The Tories and the '45, London, 1979. Eveline Cruickshanks & Jeremy Black, editors, The Jacobite Challenge, Edinburgh, 1988. Daniel Szechi, Jacobitism and Tory Politics, 1710-14, Edinburgh, 1984. Geoffrey Holmes and Daniel Szechi, The Age of Oligarchy - Pre-Industrial Britain 1722-1783, London, 1993, p 97. J C D Clark, 'On Moving the Middle Ground: The Significance of Jacobitism in Historical Studies' in Jacobite Challenge. Paul Kleber Monod, Jacobitism and the English people, 1688-1788, Cambridge, 1989.

⁶⁰ Monod, Jacobitism, p 12. Black, 'Introduction: an Age of Political Stability?' in Age of Walpole, p 2.

⁶¹ Szechi, Jacobitism, p 2.

⁶² John C Findon, 'The Nonjurors and the Church of England 1689-1716, unpublished DPhil, Oxford, 1978, p 184. L M Hawkins, Allegiance in Church and State, London, 1928, p 107.

⁶³ [Charles Leslie], A View of the Times, London, 1708/9 (The Rehearsal in book form).

⁶⁴ Works, i, p 632, 636.

inter-changeable terms.⁶⁵ Nevertheless, as Paul Monod has argued, although not all Nonjurors were active Jacobite agents, they did pose a threat because by refusing to swear oaths to the ruling monarchs they explicitly rejected the legitimacy of the new regime.⁶⁶ John Findon has produced the most thorough study of the Nonjurors and the Church of England. He came to the conclusion that although the number of Nonjuring clergy was relatively small they could not be ignored because they included experienced scholars and polemicists who occupied a great deal of the time and attention of the swearers.⁶⁷

Preaching divine hereditary right, they rejected the Revolution settlement of 1688-9 and the 1701 Act of Succession.⁶⁸ Furthermore, they gradually developed a distinctive theology which influenced High Churchmen within the established Church.⁶⁹ Propagating ideas which asserted the dignity of the priesthood and the independence of ecclesiastical authority they undoubtedly challenged the erastianism of the English Reformation.⁷⁰

Hoadly was convinced that the doctrines of patriarchalism and passive obedience preached by the Tories undermined the Protestant succession and therefore benefited the exiled Stuarts.⁷¹ Consequently, he portrayed all Tories as Jacobites or potential Jacobites.⁷² Research into Tory

⁶⁵ J H Overton, The Nonjurors: Their Lives, Principles and Writings, London, 1902, p 14 & 417 quoted in Monod, Jacobitism, p 139. H Broxhap, 'Jacobites and Non-Jurors' in Social and Political Ideas of Some English Thinkers of the Augustan Age 1650-1750, edited by F J C Hearnshaw, London, 1928, p 99. Mark Adrian Goldie, 'Tory Political Thought', unpublished PhD, Cambridge, 1977, p 134, particularly chapter 6 of his thesis. See also his 'The Nonjurors, Episcopacy, and the Origins of the Convocation Controversy' in Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism 1689-1759, edited by Eveline Cruickshanks, Edinburgh, 1982.

⁶⁶ Monod, Jacobitism, p 139.

⁶⁷ Findon, 'Nonjurors', p 1 & 185. See also Goldie, 'Tory', p 130.

⁶⁸ Findon, 'Nonjurors', p 146. Hawkins, Sovereignty, p 58.

⁶⁹ Hawkins, Sovereignty, p 111. Findon, 'Nonjurors', p 151.

⁷⁰ Findon, 'Nonjurors', p 97.

⁷¹ Works, i, p 678, 679.

⁷² Works, i, p 677.

political thought and organisation has certainly revealed its tenacity during the period between 1689 and 1760. Mark Goldie has demonstrated the very deep ideological commitment of the Tories to the doctrine of non-resistance during the period 1689-1714 and Gordon Schochet has emphasised the continued appeal of patriarchal power amongst many Tories.⁷³ Even when it was assumed to be in decline (1714-60), Linda Colley has contended that the Tory party retained its ideological identity, together with its economic power and capacity for political action.⁷⁴ To date, a consensus has not been reached over the balance between Hanoverian and Jacobite Tories. Eveline Cruickshanks appeared to believe that Toryism and Jacobitism were synonymous after the death of Queen Anne.⁷⁵ However, Linda Colley concluded that Jacobitism was never more than a tactical side show for the vast majority of Tory MPs and peers, and although some leaders corresponded with Jacobite agents it did not prove that the bulk of the Tory party either knew of these, or endorsed them.⁷⁶

Hoadly was a committed Whig and vigorous opponent of the Tories but he was also member of the clerical profession. After a period of neglect by historians, there has been a revived interest in the history of the Church of England. J C D Clark's English Society 1688-1830 (1985) reasserted the importance of the Church in the long eighteenth-century and John Walsh and Stephen Taylor's introduction to The Church of England c.1689-c.1833 (1993) provides the most comprehensive overview to date. It has long been recognised that within the Church there were different schools or approaches,

⁷³ Goldie, 'Tory', p 24, 78 & chapter 10 for patriarchalism. Gordon J Schochet, Patriarchalism in Political Thought Oxford, 1975, p 221.

⁷⁴ Linda Colley, In Defiance of Oligarchy - The Tory Party 1714-60, Cambridge, 1982, p 7,

⁷⁵ Cruickshanks, Untouchables, p 3 & 6. For the tenacity of Jacobite ideas see also J C D Clark, 'Moving', p 177 and his Samuel Johnson, Cambridge, 1994.

⁷⁶ Colley, Defiance, p 36.

sometimes labelled “high” and “low” but it is important to remember that these were not rigid categories - there were different types of “high” and “low” Churchmen and very many between. Nevertheless, a brief discussion of the more extreme positions may give some idea of the variety of the thought and the potential for conflict which existed within the Church.

As a Latitudinarian, Hoadly frequently opposed the ideas of his High Church brethren. The term “High Church” appears to have been first coined by Richard Baxter in the 1650s but only gained common currency in the 1690s and 1700s.⁷⁷ Peter Nockles has provided a very useful summary of some High Church positions before the Tractarian era in his historiographical introduction to The Oxford Movement in Context (1994).⁷⁸ High Churchmen upheld the doctrine of apostolical succession and would not accept reformed churches which had abandoned episcopacy.⁷⁹ Although they acknowledged the supremacy of Scripture, High Churchmen also valued the writings of the early fathers as interpreters of Scriptural truth.⁸⁰ They placed great emphasis on the doctrine of sacramental grace and the mysterious quality of the Christian religion.⁸¹ Continually stressing the divine, rather than the popular basis of political allegiance and obedience, High Churchmen upheld the importance of an independent religious establishment. Nevertheless, they also insisted that, as a divinely ordained body, it was the duty of the state to

⁷⁷ Peter B Nockles, The Oxford Movement in Context - Anglican High Churchmanship 1760-1857, Cambridge, 1994, p 27.

⁷⁸ See also George Every, The High Church Party, London, 1956. G V Bennett, ‘Conflict in Church and State’ in Britain After the Glorious Revolution, edited by G Holmes, London, 1969. Bennett, Tory Crisis.

⁷⁹ Nockles, Oxford, p 25 & 26.

⁸⁰ Nockles, Oxford, p 26.

⁸¹ Nockles, Oxford, p 26. F C Mather, High Church Prophet. Bishop Samuel Horsley (1733-1806) and the Caroline Tradition in the Later Georgian Church, Oxford, 1992, p 204.

protect and promote the interests of the Church.⁸²

Hoadly has often been described as a Low Churchman and one of the leading Latitudinarian divines.⁸³ But what was Latitudinarianism, and to what extent did it cause friction within the Church? Latitudinarianism was a name of reproach which critics associated with broad or low religious beliefs, lack of principle, self interest and religious heterodoxy.⁸⁴ A term of abuse, it was first used against Churchmen who had taken posts under the Republic and subsequently returned to the Anglican fold at the Restoration.⁸⁵ The word was first seen in print in 1662 when S P (commonly thought to be Simon Patrick) produced a 24 page tract A Brief Account of the New Sect of Latitude-men.⁸⁶ The author of A Brief Account gave a vague description of the general attitudes of a number of Cambridge divines who, it was said, tried to cultivate ecclesiastical, social and epistemological moderation but wanted to preserve the structure of the Church of England.⁸⁷ However, like Patrick's tract, the term Latitudinarian remains vague and historians have not been able to agree on its precise meaning.⁸⁸

Opinion certainly remains divided over the distinctiveness of Latitudinarians within the Church. Donald Greene did not believe that the term Latitudinarian

⁸² Nockles, Oxford, p 26.

⁸³ Anon, Pulpit-War, London, 1710, p 1. Nathaniel Whaley, The Graduation of Sin both in Principles and Practice, London, 1710, p 16.

⁸⁴ Spellman, Latitudinarians, p 11 & 12. George, Men of Latitude.

⁸⁵ Anthony Michael Claydon, 'Courtly Reformation: Williamite Propaganda after the Glorious Revolution in England', PhD, London, 1993, p 197. See Claydon, William, p 159-160 for the argument that although Latitudinarianism was frequently seen as 'whiggish', William's propagandists used a rhetoric of reformation to pursue ecclesiological compromise between Whig and Tory.

⁸⁶ Kroll, 'Introduction' to Philosophy, p 1.

⁸⁷ Kroll, 'Introduction', p 1.

⁸⁸ Kroll, 'Introduction', p 2.

had any doctrinal significance at all.⁸⁹ In his view, what it did signify was the desire of many Anglicans to broaden the terms of adherence to the Church of England and to comprehend as many Protestants as possible.⁹⁰ G Cragg thought that Latitudinarianism was a state of mind, a temper rather than a creed.⁹¹ When John Spurr examined the views of leading seventeenth-century Latitudinarians he found that they were not rationalists or proto-tolerationists but a group of like minded pastors opposed to puritan theology who had much in common with others in the Anglican ministry.⁹²

Barbara Shapiro has emphasised a distinctive Latitudinarian epistemology and their acceptance of probable rather than certain knowledge.⁹³ Martin Greig also came to the conclusion that an epistemology, inherited from the Cambridge Platonists, provided the basis for Gilbert Burnet's Latitudinarianism.⁹⁴ Brian Young preferred the term "anti-dogmatic" to Latitudinarian but he did believe that there was a recognisable anti-dogmatic tradition in the writings of Richard Hooker, William Chillingworth, John Locke, John Tillotson and Gilbert Burnet.⁹⁵ When discussing the period after 1689 Rebecca Warner (1999) employed the term "Low-Church" rather than Latitudinarian, although she acknowledged that Hoadly was sometimes

⁸⁹ Donald Greene, 'The Via Media in an Age of Revolution: Anglicanism in the Eighteenth Century' in The Varied Pattern: Studies in Eighteenth Century, edited by P Hughes and D Williams, Toronto, 1971, p 312.

⁹⁰ Greene, 'Via Media', p 313.

⁹¹ G Cragg, From Puritanism to the Age of Reason, Cambridge, 1950, p 81.

⁹² John Spurr, 'Latitudinarianism and the Restoration Church' in The Historical Journal, 31, 1, 1988, p 77 & 82.

⁹³ Shapiro, Probability, p 80. See also her John Wilkins. For the plain language of the Latitudinarians see both Shapiro and Isabel Rivers, Reason, Grace and Sentiment, i, Cambridge, 1991.

⁹⁴ Martin Greig, 'The Thought and Polemic of Gilbert Burnet 1673-1705', published PhD, Cambridge, 1991, p 10, 12, 284.

⁹⁵ B W Young, Religion and Enlightenment in Eighteenth-Century England, Oxford, 1998, p 11, 22, 28, 59.

referred to as a Latitudinarian.⁹⁶ Low-Churchmen were not, she argued, bound by theology or politics but by their distinctive approach towards events and problems of the period; this included their defence of the 1688 Revolution and rejection of the Nonjuring schism together with vigorous anti-popery and commitment to toleration for Protestant Dissenters.⁹⁷

My thesis will reveal that Hoadly's Latitudinarian Churchmanship was based on his Reformation principles and epistemology. The Bishop employed ideas reminiscent of Martin Luther, Huldreich Zwingli, John Hales and William Chillingworth and, like the early Protestant reformers, he continually encouraged individual Christians to turn to the Gospel for the tenets of their faith.⁹⁸ He was sure that the essentials necessary for salvation were plain for all to understand.⁹⁹ However, acknowledging the fallibility of man, he believed that inessentials, (including obscure parts of Scripture and Church subscriptions which were not required for salvation), should be interpreted with as much breadth and latitude as possible.¹⁰⁰ It is important to appreciate that Hoadly viewed this as a charitable Christian, Reformation stance.¹⁰¹ Moreover, he was convinced that a tolerant established Church which could comprehend as many Protestants as possible was the best protection against popery and atheism.¹⁰²

As well as conflicts between Low and High clerics within the establishment, all

⁹⁶ Warner, 'Low Churchmanship', p 13, 28, 33.

⁹⁷ Warner, 'Low Churchmanship', p 434.

⁹⁸ Works, ii, p 407-400, 850, 904; iii, p 894. Chillingworth, Protestants, p 375. Rupp & Drewery, Luther, p 166. Stephens, Zwingli, p 99. Hare, 'Sacrament' in Hales Works, i, p 62.

⁹⁹ Works, i, p 167.

¹⁰⁰ Works, i, p 197, 226-227; ii, p 574.

¹⁰¹ Works, ii, p 617-618.

¹⁰² Works, i, p 20, 30, 265, 316.

Churchmen feared that Christianity and the Church were threatened by Deists and atheists. Contemporary critics maintained that the ideas of Hoadly and the Latitudinarians were stepping stones to Deism but, as chapter two will demonstrate, there were substantial differences between their methods and ideas.¹⁰³ Like Latitudinarian, Deist was a term of abuse and, as Richard Popkin's writing shows, there is still a great deal of disagreement over the meaning of the word.¹⁰⁴ At its simplest, Deists emphasised reason and, according to Roger Emerson, believed that men could understand all the necessary theological propositions by rational methods alone.¹⁰⁵ More pertinent, as J A I Champion has recently observed, the Deists challenged the Church of England's monopoly as the custodian of truth.¹⁰⁶ English Deists used a language of derision and mockery against the established Church and their anti-clerical wit, banter and cajolery pervaded broadsheets and eighteenth-century coffee houses. It was, in John Redwood's view, "ridicule, not reason, that endangered the Church".¹⁰⁷

The existence of Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists and indeed all who dissented from the established Church also created political and religious tensions within Church and state. As Michael Watts has noted Separatist, Dissenter and Nonconformist were all negative terms which emphasised

¹⁰³ Francis Atterbury, Letter to a convocation man, 1697, p 6 quoted in Martin Greig, 'Heresy Hunt: Gilbert Burnet and the Convocation Controversy of 1701', The Historical Journal, 37, 3, 1994, p 572. For a comparison of seventeenth century Latitudinarians and Deists see Spellman, Latitudinarians.

¹⁰⁴ Richard H Popkin, 'The Deist Challenge' in From Persecution to Toleration, edited by Ole Peter Grell, Jonathan I Israel and Nicholas Tyacke, Oxford, 1991, p 196. See also Roger D Lund, editor, The Margins of Orthodoxy, Cambridge, 1995.

¹⁰⁵ Roger L Emerson, 'Deism' in Dictionary of History of Ideas, p 646.

¹⁰⁶ J A I Champion, The Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken, Cambridge, 1992, p 10.

¹⁰⁷ John Redwood, Reason, Ridicule and Religion: The Age of Enlightenment in England 1660-1750, London, 1976, chapter 8, p 196.

deviation from the accepted norm.¹⁰⁸ The creation of this second class citizenship has been analysed by both Watts and James Bradley.¹⁰⁹ Briefly, the 1662 Act of Uniformity ejected all clergymen, schoolmasters and university fellows who would not accept the Book of Common Prayer and episcopal ordination and the Corporation Act (1661) and Test Act (1673) attempted to restrict political office to those who adhered to the established Church.¹¹⁰ The 1689 Toleration Act did permit Dissenters freedom to worship under certain conditions but it never allowed any church to become a serious rival to the established Church.¹¹¹ Tories and High Churchmen, who had not willingly accepted toleration outside the Church of England, took every opportunity to exploit the ambiguities in the Toleration Act and coerce uniformity by both legislative and judicial action.¹¹² They were convinced that the Nonconformists, like their Puritan forefathers, wanted reforms which would remove episcopacy and destroy the Church in a wave of anti-clericalism and erastianism.¹¹³

Hoadly supported political rights for Protestant Dissenters but, as discussed in the next chapter, he also tried to encourage moderate Nonconformists to return to the established Church.¹¹⁴ Along with many other Whigs, he believed that Protestant unity was the best protection against a Catholic, Stuart restoration.¹¹⁵ Moreover, comprehension within the established Church would

¹⁰⁸ Michael R Watts, The Dissenters, Oxford, 1978, p 2.

¹⁰⁹ James E Bradley, Religion, Revolution and English Radicalism, Cambridge, 1990.

¹¹⁰ Bradley, Religion, p 49-51.

¹¹¹ Bradley, Religion, p 52.

¹¹² James Travis Spivey, 'Middle Way Men, Edmund Calamy, and the Crisis of Moderate Non-Conformity (1688-1732)', unpublished DPhil, Oxford, 1986, p 307. Geoffrey Holmes, The Trial of Dr Sacheverell, London, 1973, p 35.

¹¹³ Spivey, 'Middle Way', p 316.

¹¹⁴ Works, ii, p 522-524, & i, p 30.

¹¹⁵ Works, i, p 20.

have given the Whigs greater political security. Most Dissenters supported the Whig policies and opposed Jacobitism and popery.¹¹⁶ Yet, as Spivey's work has shown, Whigs were frequently in a difficult position because they could not afford to be associated with those who advocated policies damaging to the Church.¹¹⁷ Politics and religion were inextricably mixed and in Anne's reign Tories ran "Church in Danger" campaigns (1704-5, 1709-10), designed to defeat Whigs and Dissenters.¹¹⁸ When Tory High Churchman Henry Sacheverell accused Dissenters and their Low Church friends of being traitors, a contemporary pamphlet declared that it was not the Dissenter that they wanted to convert but the Whig.¹¹⁹

As outlined in this brief introduction, the early eighteenth-century was a period of tension in both Church and state. The legality of oaths to the new Protestant monarchs had been challenged by Nonjurors, and there was just no way of assessing the support for the Jacobite cause. Tory doctrines of passive obedience and non-resistance appeared to permeate society. Moreover, the Whigs did not present a united front but frequently quarrelled amongst themselves. In addition, Churchmen held different ideas on the very nature of the Church. Also, many within the Church of England were convinced that the establishment was under attack from Nonconformists, Deists and atheists. Hoadly, as we shall see, was usually at the very centre of these pamphlet wars.

¹¹⁶ Spivey, 'Middle Way', p 165.

¹¹⁷ Spivey, 'Middle Way', p 197.

¹¹⁸ Spivey, 'Middle Way', p 166.

¹¹⁹ Spivey, 'Middle Way', p 85.

Chapter 1 - The Occasional Conformity Controversy (1702-1707)

During the first decade of the eighteenth-century a Tory print accused Hoadly of supporting Protestant Dissenters and the practice of occasional conformity as well as destroying the episcopal Church.¹ However, many years later some commentators still accepted the view that Hoadly, in league with dissent, damaged the very fabric of the Church and state.² Even Caroline Robbins, who was more sympathetic to Hoadly's views, found it difficult to understand why 'Hoadlyites' remained inside the established Church when they appeared to have so much in common with the Nonconformists.³ The purpose of this chapter is to explore the relationship between Hoadly and the moderate Nonconformists or 'Middle Way Men' as they frequently called themselves.⁴ It will focus on the period 1702-1707, the occasional conformity controversy, and the dispute between Hoadly and Edmund Calamy the acknowledged leader of the moderate Nonconformists. The chapter will demonstrate that although Hoadly and Calamy were both Whigs and committed Protestants, there were important differences between Calamy's moderate Nonconformity and Hoadly's Latitudinarian Churchmanship.⁵

Before focusing on Hoadly's ideas let us use the next few pages to look more

¹ For copy of a print showing this see Dickinson, 'Hoadly', p 350. Works, i, p 24.

² Cassan, Salisbury, p 210. Overton and Relton, p 14 & 15.

³ Robbins, Commonweathman, p 295, 296. See also H S Skeats and C S Miall, History of the Free Churches of England 1688-1891, London, 1891, p 182.

⁴ See James Travis Spivey, 'Middle Way Men, Edmund Calamy, and the Crisis of Moderate Non-Conformity (1688-1732)', unpublished D Phil, Oxford, 1986. Works, i, p 295. Edmund Calamy, An Abridgment of Mr Baxter's History of His Life and Times, London, 1702, p 498, 569. Edmund Calamy, A Defence of Moderate Nonconformity, part III, London, 1705, p iv & 272. [James Owen], Moderation a Virtue, London, 1703, frontispiece & p 5.

⁵ Works, i, p 26. Spivey, 'Calamy', p 164-165 & 200. Hoadly and Calamy were both Whigs who rejected the notions of passive obedience and non-resistance - Hoadly's ideas on this will be discussed in chapter 3, for Calamy and the moderate Nonconformists see Calamy, Abridgment, p 498, A G Matthews, Calamy Revised, London, 1934, p xii.

generally at the issue of moderate dissent and the practice of occasional conformity . John Flaningam's article in the Journal of British Studies (1977/78) undoubtedly remains the most useful piece on occasional conformity to date.⁶ Occasional conformity was a practice whereby moderate Nonconformists, who worshipped in their own chapels, attended communion occasionally in the established Church. "Limited" or "catholic communion" had been going on since 1660. Many Presbyterians who had left the Church with reluctance after the Act of Uniformity (1662) wanted to demonstrate their Christian charity and show that they were not guilty of schism. In addition, some members of the establishment encouraged the practice because they still hoped that eventually most Protestants could be comprehended within a broad-based Church of England.⁷

As well as a religious dimension there was also a political aspect to occasional communion.⁸ In an effort to ensure that those who held public office were loyal to the established Church, the Corporation Act (1661) and Test Act (1673)⁹ stipulated that public officials were required to take the

⁶ John Flaningam, 'The Occasional Conformity Controversy: Ideology and Party Politics, 1697-1711' in Journal of British Studies, 17, 1977/78. See also George Every, The High Church Party, London, 1956, chapter 6. Greig, 'Burnet', chapter 6. Holmes, Age of Anne, p 99-103. [Abel Boyer], The History of the Reign of Queen Anne, Digested into Annals, London, 1704, II, p 171-189. Patricia Margaret Scholes, 'Parliament and the Protestant Dissenters 1702-1719', MA dissertation, University of London, 1962, chapter 1.

⁷ Flaningam, 'Occasional Conformity', p 39 & 40.

⁸ Flaningam, 'Occasional Conformity', p 40. Greig, 'Burnet', p 205, 251.

⁹ The Test Act of 1678 required a Member of Parliament to take an oath of allegiance and supremacy, declare against transubstantiation and adoration of the virgin Mary and make this without any dispensation granted by the pope.

sacrament in accordance with the rites of the Church of England.¹⁰

Consequently, some Dissenters did take communion in the established Church in order to qualify for political office. The most notorious example was Sir Humphrey Edwin. In 1697, as Lord Mayor of London, Edwin rode in state to Church on the morning of his inauguration and then attended his Dissenting chapel in the afternoon.¹¹ It is however, impossible to assess the number who conformed for purely political purposes.¹²

It is important to appreciate that not all Dissenters agreed with the practice of occasional conformity. The Friends, Baptists and a large proportion of the Congregationalists judged communion with the Church of England both unlawful and unscriptural.¹³ As a professional journalist the Dissenter Daniel Defoe's writings should be treated with some caution. Nevertheless, in An Enquiry into Occasional Conformity (1702) he declared his support for the Whig party which, he argued, upheld liberty and property against absolute authority but he censured "state dissenters" and "politic dissenters" who betrayed their religious principles in order to qualify for political office.¹⁴ "As to those among us who can conform to your church for a place, for a salary", he declared, "you are also welcome to take them among you".¹⁵ An Enquiry was

¹⁰ Hoadly did not specifically discuss the Test and Corporation Acts in this debate. However, his writings in the Bangorian controversy and the debate surrounding the Lord's Supper demonstrated that the Bishop totally disapproved the sacramental test. Indeed the Bangorian sermon can in part be viewed as support for the removal of civil disabilities from Dissenters. It was, he believed, inappropriate to use the sacrament as a political test. In addition, he maintained that to deprive individuals of their civil rights because they did not conform to the established Church amounted to political persecution. See chapter 4 pages 152-154 of this thesis, and also chapter 5.

¹¹ Greig, 'Burnet', p 252.

¹² Flaningam, 'Occasional Conformity', p 42.

¹³ Skeats, Free Churches, p 177.

¹⁴ [Daniel Defoe], An Enquiry into Occasional Conformity, 1702, in G M Trevelyan, editor, Select Documents for Queen Anne's Reign, London, 1929, p 49 & p 45.

¹⁵ [Defoe], An Enquiry in Trevelyan, Documents, p 47.

given a very cool reception in Presbyterian circles, particularly when Tory High Churchmen used Defoe's arguments against them.¹⁶ Purporting to be a High Church attack on dissent Defoe's The Shortest-Way with the Dissenters (1702) was frequently taken for the real thing and Defoe was forced to publish an explanation.¹⁷

The most persistent critics of dissent and the practice of occasional conformity were, however, primarily Nonjurors, High Churchmen and also Tory country squires who were frequently jealous of the wealth and political influence of Dissenters in the City of London. The historian George Every regarded the occasional conformity debate as "no more than a single recurrent move in a long struggle for political power".¹⁸ It was certainly about political power - the occasional conformists were Dissenters who supported the Whig 'party' so the Tories wanted the practice abolished. However as John Flaningam and Mark Goldie have shown there were also important ideological aspects to the debate.¹⁹ According to Mark Goldie, Tory High Church doctrines drew on the Calvinist theocratic doctrine in its Laudian guise.²⁰ It assumed an inter-dependence of Church and state and maintained that the welfare of one was vital to the other.²¹ So although the Toleration Act (1689) had given legal protection to Trinitarian Protestants who worshipped in their own chapels, Tories interpreted the act very narrowly and continued to call it an indulgence.²² Tories and High Churchman recalled the civil war and were convinced that freedom of conscience, demanded by the Dissenters, would

¹⁶ Flaningam, 'Occasional Conformity', p 44.

¹⁷ Trevelyan, Documents, p 55 & 56.

¹⁸ Every, High Church Party, p 108.

¹⁹ Flaningam, 'Occasional Conformity', p 46.

²⁰ Mark Adrian Goldie, 'Tory Political Thought', unpublished PhD, Cambridge, 1977, p 152.

²¹ Goldie, 'Tory Political Thought', p 164. Flaningam, 'Occasional Conformity', p 56.

²² Flaningam, 'Occasional Conformity', p 53.

once again undermine all religious and civil authority.²³

Whigs viewed occasional conformity as an aspect of religious toleration.²⁴ As Dissenters tended to vote Whig, the practice also improved the electoral performance of that party.²⁵ Nevertheless, occasional conformity was sometimes a mixed blessing because the Tories used it as a weapon and continually cried that the Church was in danger from occasional conformists and also Low Church Whigs such as Hoadly who defended them. The Nonjuror Charles Leslie asserted that “low” signified “indifferent” Churchmen.²⁶ Nonjurors and High Churchmen viewed ‘moderate’ as a name of reproach. Indeed, Latitudinarians or moderate men of “Comprehensive Charity” who wanted to reclaim the Dissenters in a comprehensive national Church were in Leslie’s view wolves in shepherd’s clothing who despised and trampled on all Church authority.²⁷ The anonymous tract Some Necessary Considerations (1702) described Latitudinarians as moderates or trimmers, a “sort of mungrel-Churchgoers, whose Conformity was not the result of Principle, but of a lukewarm Compliance with the Humour of the Times”.²⁸ They were in Henry Sacheverell’s famous Political Union (1702) discourse “False and Perfidious Members, who under the Pretence and Hypocritical Disguise of

²³ Flaningam, ‘Occasional Conformity’, p 57.

²⁴ Gilbert Burnet was particularly concerned that the second bill against occasional conformity did not even have a preamble defending the principle of religious toleration. The Bishop of Salisbury’s Speech in the House of Lords upon the Bill against Occasional Conformity, London, 1704, p 7.

²⁵ Flaningam, ‘Occasional Conformity’, p 62.

²⁶ [Charles Leslie], The Wolf Stript of His Shepherd’s Clothing. In Answer to a Late Celebrated Book Intituled Moderation a Vertue, London, 1704, p 4.

²⁷ [Leslie], Wolf, p 80.

²⁸ Anon, Some Necessary Considerations Relating to all future Elections of Members to Serve in Parliament, (2nd edition), London, 1702, p 4.

Charity and Moderation, would have Taken down ... [the Church's] Fence".²⁹ The "Shuffling, Treacherous Latitudinarians", he declared, "ought to be Stigmatized and Treated Equally as Dangerous Enemies to the Government, as well as the Church".³⁰ In The Memorial of the Church of England (1705) James Drake warned that there was a "Heretick Feavour lurking in the very Bowels" of the Church and that if it was not cured it would "Infect all the Humours, and at length Destroy the very Being of it".³¹ In his view, the Church was "too Strong to be Shaken, but thro the Treachery or Supine Negligence of its own Members, or at least that pretend[ed] to be such".³²

Tory High Churchmen had not been able to do much about Latitudinarians, Dissenters or the issue of occasional conformity during the reign of a Calvinist king.³³ It was only during the last years of William's reign, when the King was losing popularity, that unsuccessful efforts were made to stamp out the practice.³⁴ With the accession of the devoutly Anglican Queen Anne in 1702, together with Tory electoral gains, a full scale assault was made on occasional conformity.³⁵ Initially the Queen gave her blessing to the proposed legislation but withdrew her support when she realised that the political disruption would

²⁹ Sacheverell, The Political Union. A Discourse Shewing the Dependance of Government on Religion in General and of the English Monarchy on the Church of England in Particular, Oxford, 1702, p 48/49.

³⁰ Sacheverell, Political Union, p 49.

³¹ [James Drake], The Memorial of the Church of England, Humbly Offer'd to the Consideration of all True Lovers of our Church and Constitution, London, 1705, p 3.

³² [Drake], Memorial, p 4.

³³ Flaningam, 'Occasional Conformity', p 43.

³⁴ Holmes, Age of Anne, p 100.

³⁵ Flaningam, 'Occasional Conformity', p 43.

adversely affect the war against France.³⁶ The ministry, in particular Godolphin and Marlborough, did not want to come out in open opposition to the Tories but they realised that if they alienated the Whigs and Dissenters they would not have been able to finance the war.³⁷ Godolphin possibly encouraged the Whig Charles D'Avenant to publish his essays against party faction in the interests of peace at home and war abroad.³⁸ At the same time, he left the Whigs to defeat the bill in the House of Lords.³⁹ However, Whig Latitudinarian bishops who made tactical amendments so that the bills against occasional conformity were rejected were strongly criticised by Tories and High Churchmen. It was said that the bishops were "cold and slack in the concerns of the church" and that they condoned the improper use of the sacrament.⁴⁰

As a clergyman in the capital, Hoadly was in a prime location to become involved in the religious and political debates of the period. He had taken orders as a priest in 1700 and by 1701 had been appointed lecturer at St Mildred's in the Poultry. In 1704 Hoadly became rector of St Peter le Poor.⁴¹

³⁶ A S Turberville has provided a detailed account of how the 1702, 1703 and 1704 bills against occasional conformity were wrecked in the Lords. A S Turberville, The House of Lords in the Eighteenth Century, Oxford, 1927, p 52-58. See also Thomas Burnet, editor, Burnet's History of His Own Time, Oxford, 1833, vol v, p 49-54. Greig, 'Burnet', chapter 6. Edmund Calamy, An Historical Account of My Own Life, edited by John Towell Rutt, 2 vols, London, 1829, i, p 464-466 & ii, p 15-28. According to Geoffrey Holmes, the issue of occasional conformity was strongly governed by party loyalty until it was proposed to tack the bill onto a revenue bill to ensure its passage through the Lords. At this stage Tory unity cracked and Speaker Harley and his friends joined Marlborough and Godolphin and urged moderate Tories to vote against the procedure. - Age of Anne, p 103. Henry L Snyder, 'The Defeat of the Occasional Conformity Bill and the Tack' in Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, 41, 1968, p 172-192. 173 & 180. Scholes, 'Protestant Dissenters', p 39.

³⁷ Snyder, 'Tack', p 173 & 180.

³⁸ Charles D'Avenant, Essays upon Peace at Home and War Abroad, London, 1704, preface A3-4.

³⁹ Snyder, 'Tack', p 173.

⁴⁰ Burnet, Own Time, v, p 54.

⁴¹ John Hoadly, 'Hoadly' in Works, i, p, viii.

A Letter to a Clergyman in the Country (dated November 1703 and published anonymously 1704) was one of Hoadly's earliest contributions to the occasional conformity debate.⁴² As we have seen Tories had argued that Whigs and Latitudinarians, in this particular case Latitudinarian bishops, were in league with dissent to undermine the established Church. Rather than a pamphlet encouraging the practice of occasional conformity, A Letter was primarily a tract vindicating the Whig bishops and at the same time supporting Protestant unity against the danger of popery.⁴³

Colin Haydon's research has shown that anti-Catholic feeling operated at all levels of eighteenth-century society.⁴⁴ The spectre of popery was, as this thesis will demonstrate, a constant theme throughout Hoadly's work. The Tories and Hoadly both agreed that the Church was in danger. However, along with Archbishop Tenison and Bishop Burnet, Hoadly was convinced that it was in danger from popery, rather than from Protestant Dissenters.⁴⁵

Legislation against occasional conformity would, he maintained, have divided Protestants at home and made the Church and state far more vulnerable to the popish Pretender and the power of France.⁴⁶ In his view, this would have resulted in arbitrary government, together with the loss of both political and

⁴² The ideas in Hoadly's Reasonableness of Conformity to the Church of England and Serious Admonition to Mr Calamy (1703) will be analysed later in this chapter. A Letter was known to be written by Hoadly, see Calamy, Life, 1829, ii, p 4. Works, i p 19-32. Note A Vindication of Dr Sherlock, Dean of St Paul's - In Answer to Mr Nathaniel Taylor's late Treatise, London, 1702 which urged Dissenters to conform to the established Church has sometimes been attributed to Hoadly; it was not included in the Works and according to the ESTC was possibly by William Sherlock himself.

⁴³ Works, i, p 19 & 20, 27.

⁴⁴ Colin Haydon, Anti-Catholicism in eighteenth-century England, c1714-80, Manchester, 1993.

⁴⁵ Works, i, p 23. Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury's Speech ...on Occasional Conformity, p 7. Burnet, Own Time, v, p 51 & 52. Gilbert Burnet, History of the Reformation, second part, London, 1681, preface. Claydon, William, p 45. Calamy's Life, ii, p 27 & 28.

⁴⁶ Works, i, p 20 & 21.

religious liberties.⁴⁷ “To say, that we are in no danger from Popery, whilst we have such an Enemy to contend with” was he declared “to blind our Eyes, and tell us, that the Sun don’t shine”.⁴⁸ Hoadly praised the bishops; they had destroyed the divisive legislation which had failed to differentiate between moderate and extreme Nonconformists.⁴⁹ Furthermore, they had supported occasional communion with the aim of encouraging Dissenters to become constant communicants in the established Church.⁵⁰ Most important, the bishops worked towards Protestant unity which, he contended, was the best protection against popery.⁵¹

At the same time, moderate Nonconformists responded to Tory High Church attacks. They had some talented writers who justified their separation from the established Church and to a lesser extent defended the practice of occasional conformity. The most important contribution was undoubtedly Edmund Calamy’s Abridgment of Mr Baxter’s History of His Life (1702). Calamy wrote to Ralph Thoresby that he had been forced to work “night and day, to get it finished by the rising of Parliament” in May 1702.⁵² A G Matthews has noted that High Churchmen such as John Walker were furious because chapter 9 of the Abridgment had exaggerated the number of ejected ministers but had

⁴⁷ Works, i, p 21.

⁴⁸ Works, i, p 23.

⁴⁹ A bill preventing occasional conformity was passed in 1711. On 13 December, 1718 Hoadly spoke in the House of Lords in favour of repeal of the Act against Occasional Conformity and the Schism Acts. William Cobbett, Parliamentary History of England, London, 1811, vol 12, p 572. See also chapter 4 p 123-125 of this thesis.

⁵⁰ Works, i, p 29, 23, 28.

⁵¹ Works, i, p 29,30.

⁵² Edmund Calamy to Ralph Thoresby, 2 June, 1702 in Letters of Eminent Men, addressed to Ralph Thoresby, edited by J Hunter, London, 1832, I, p 417-418 quoted in David Wykes, ‘To Revive the Memory of Some Excellent Men’: Edmund Calamy and the Early Historians of Nonconformity’, Fiftieth Lecture, Dr Williams’s Trust, 1997, p 7.

ignored the sufferings of the Anglican clergy during the inter-regnum.⁵³

However, Matthews neglected to mention that High Church Tories were not the only ones who were annoyed by the publication. Latitudinarians including John Ollyffe, rector of Dunton, and Benjamin Hoadly who hoped to encourage Protestant unity and comprehend as many Protestants as possible in a broad-based national Church were also offended by the Abridgment.⁵⁴ These men could not understand why the moderate Nonconformists would not interpret subscriptions with latitude and conform to the established Church.⁵⁵

Furthermore, they were convinced that chapter 10 of Calamy's Abridgment had made the situation worse because it had, in their view, misrepresented the terms of conformity and had actually encouraged division.⁵⁶

It may be useful to outline briefly the chronology of this long drawn out dispute between Hoadly and Calamy, before analysing Hoadly's ideas in this controversy. Hoadly entered the debate with Calamy when he published The Reasonableness of Conformity to the Church of England, represented to the dissenting ministers. In answer to the tenth chapter of Mr Calamy's Abridgment of Mr Baxter's History of his Life and Times, 1703.⁵⁷ Calamy retaliated in Defence of Moderate Non-Conformity part 1 - 1703, part 2 - 1704 and part 3 - 1705 against Ollyffe and Hoadly. Hoadly responded to Calamy in

⁵³ For an account of Walker see Dr Walker and the Sufferings of the Clergy quoted in Matthews, Calamy, p xx.

⁵⁴ Hoadly, The Reasonableness of Conformity to the Church of England, 1703, in Works, i, p 183, 184, 187. John Ollyffe, (1647-1717) A Defence of Ministerial Conformity to the Church of England. In Answer to the Misrepresentations of the Terms thereof By Mr Calamy in the Tenth Chapter of his Abridgment, London, 1702. A Second Defence of Ministerial Conformity, 1705 and A Third Defence of Ministerial Conformity, 1706. Ollyffe maintained that although he did not agree in every detail he concurred with Hoadly on all the "material points", Defence, II, p 27.

⁵⁵ Works, i, p 215, 228, 295-296. Ollyffe, Defence, p A, 18, 119.

⁵⁶ Works, i, 184, 254, 303. Ollyffe, Defence, p A, 25.

⁵⁷ Chapter 10 of the Abridgment summarised Baxter's English Non-Conformity ... stated and argued (1689)

a series of publications A Serious Admonition to Mr Calamy, occasioned by the First Part of his Defense of moderate Nonconformity (1703), A Persuasive to Lay-Conformity (1704), A Defense of the Reasonableness of Conformity to the Church of England (1705), A Brief Defense of Episcopal Ordination. To which are added, A reply to the Introduction to the Second part of Mr Calamy's Defense of Moderate Non-Conformity and Postscript relating to the Third Part of Mr Calamy's Defense of Moderate Non-Conformity (1707)

Edmund Calamy (1671-1732) was the son and grandson of Puritans.⁵⁸ In an effort to defend the principles of moderate Nonconformists he provided biographical details of 2,000 ministers who were ejected from the established Church because they would not conform to the requirements of the 1662 Act of Uniformity.⁵⁹ Although Calamy styled himself a historian, it is important to appreciate, as A G Matthews has commented, that the Abridgment was a highly partisan account of the previous hundred years of Church history.⁶⁰ N H Keeble, editor of Richard Baxter's autobiography and David Wykes who studied Edmund Calamy have both acknowledged that he made significant changes to Baxter's texts.⁶¹ In general, Calamy omitted the more rebellious, radical aspects of seventeenth-century dissent and portrayed the ejected ministers as moderate, principled, learned men who had suffered at the hands of the establishment.⁶² James Spivey's unpublished research has argued that Calamy was in the moderate Presbyterian, Bartholomean tradition and that he

⁵⁸ Spivey, 'Calamy', p 110.

⁵⁹ Wykes, 'Calamy', p 7. See also Calamy, Abridgment.

⁶⁰ Matthews, Calamy, p xvii, xviii. Wykes, 'Calamy', p 19.

⁶¹ N H Keeble, editor, The Autobiography of Richard Baxter, London, 1931, p v . Wykes, 'Calamy', p 19.

⁶² Calamy, Abridgment, p 498. Wykes, 'Calamy', p 19.

perpetuated Puritanism in an age of uncertain toleration.⁶³ Calamy encouraged his readers to believe that eighteenth-century Middle Way Men were like the early Puritans, and Richard Baxter. They wanted a “farther Reformation” by removing the vestiges of popery and improving the government and discipline of the national Church in accordance with Scripture in “Opposition to those who reckon’d the Church so Perfect as to need no Amendments”.⁶⁴

Throughout this debate, and indeed throughout his life, Hoadly tried to persuade the moderate Nonconformists to return and continue the Reformation within the established Church.⁶⁵ The grandson of a Puritan, but the son of a conformist, Hoadly attempted to undermine Calamy’s claim that it was necessary to separate in order to reform the Church.⁶⁶ Hoadly implied that the Puritan tradition was part of the Anglican tradition.⁶⁷ Indeed, along with Tenison and Ollyffe, he argued very forcibly that the Puritans were against a separation as long as there was any hope of reforming the Church from within.⁶⁸ The Puritans, he insisted, had realised that all Christians were under an obligation to preserve the peace and unity of the Church.⁶⁹ Perhaps, Hoadly did have a point; Professor Collinson’s work on Elizabethan Puritans has revealed that the Godly only rarely separated and that a quality of early

⁶³ Ministers who were ejected from the Church of England on St Bartholomew’s day 24 Aug 1662 because they would not accept the terms of the 1662 Act of Uniformity. Spivey, ‘Calamy’, p 1 & 4. Calamy, Abridgment, p 549.

⁶⁴ Calamy, Abridgment, p 546.

⁶⁵ Works, i, p 260, 261. Bangorian controversy - Works, ii, p 614-616.

⁶⁶ John Hoadly, ‘Hoadly’, Works, i, p vi.

⁶⁷ Works, i, p 265, 266, 273.

⁶⁸ Works, i, 265, 374. [Thomas Tenison], An Argument for Union, p 41, Ollyffe, Defence, II, p 12.

⁶⁹ Works, i, 265.

Puritanism was that it concealed many diverse tendencies.⁷⁰

One of Hoadly's main polemical tactics was to appropriate and reinterpret the authority of his opponents. In this case, Hoadly was determined to demonstrate that Calamy's main authority, Richard Baxter, had a good deal in common with the national Church, especially in his appeals for peace and unity.⁷¹ As Keeble has shown, frequently classed as a Presbyterian, Baxter did not conform to any of the parties and sought to combine the best features of each in a system of modified episcopacy.⁷² Baxter did not comply with the 1662 Act of Uniformity but he did take communion in the parish Church. Moreover, Hoadly made the most of the fact that Baxter wrote against "the evil of schism and of the separating humour".⁷³ In Baxter's words, anyone who was "not a son of Peace" was "not a son of God. All other sins destroy[ed] the Church consequentially; but Division and Separation demolish[ed] it directly".⁷⁴ Hoadly maintained that if Calamy and the moderate Nonconformists had abandoned these peaceful, reconciling principles, they could not claim to be followers of the early Puritans or Richard Baxter.⁷⁵

Calamy and the Middle Way Men insisted that their separation was justified and founded on the same arguments as the early Protestants had used when they separated from Rome.⁷⁶ But Hoadly could not agree - the most important difference was that moderate Nonconformists did not consider the Church of

⁷⁰ Patrick Collinson, The English Puritan Movement, London, 1967, p 26.

⁷¹ Although Ollyffe discussed Baxter's ideas he was not as forceful as Hoadly in trying to appropriate the authority of Baxter for the Church.

⁷² Keeble, Baxter, p xvii.

⁷³ Martin Hugh, Puritanism and Richard Baxter, London, 1954, p 187.

⁷⁴ Baxter, quoted in Keeble, Baxter, p xxiii.

⁷⁵ Works, i, 374, 375.

⁷⁶ Calamy, Abridgment, p 558. Calamy, Defence, I, p 59.

England sinful because they communicated with it occasionally.⁷⁷ If they did not consider the Church of England sinful it was, in Hoadly's view, their Christian and civic duty to support the settled Church.⁷⁸ This would have united Protestants against their enemies at home and abroad.⁷⁹ He tried to convince them that separation was not "an innocent, and harmless thing".⁸⁰ In words which could easily have come from a High Churchman, he declared that the consequences of separation were not imaginary.⁸¹ They were

not light and inconsiderable, but of the highest Importance, as being utterly inconsistent with the Unity and Peace of Christians and the Happiness of Humane Society. Division and Subdivision without end, Confusion and Disorder, Indecency in the Worship of God, Irregularity, Strife and Emulation, Heat, and Passion, Ill-will, and Malice, are the unavoidable Consequences of such a Separation as you have given a general Encouragement to.⁸²

The "Effects and Consequences of Separation" were "dismal, horrible; the Effects of Unity and Conformity, Blessed and Glorious".⁸³ Constant conformity to the Church of England, he urged, would be to the "universal Advantage of the Protestant Church, and English Nation".⁸⁴

⁷⁷ Works, i, p 298.

⁷⁸ Works, i, p 325.

⁷⁹ Works, i, p 275.

⁸⁰ Works, i, p 263.

⁸¹ Works, i, p 264.

⁸² Works, i, p 264.

⁸³ Works, i, p 283, 284.

⁸⁴ Works, i, p 275. In this debate with Calamy Hoadly urged constant conformity to the established Church. In 1717 Andrew Snape complained that these comments were inconsistent with Hoadly's sermon and writings in the Bangorian controversy. Hoadly believed that his own work was completely consistent and retorted that he had always worked for a union of Protestants but had never believed that the magistrate had the power to force religious conformity. Andrew Snape, A Letter to the Bishop of Bangor, London, 1717, p 29, 30, 38-39. Snape, A Second Letter to the Lord Bishop of Bangor, London, 1717, p 65, Snape, A Vindication of a Passage in Dr Snape's Second Letter to the Lord Bishop of Bangor Relating to Mr Pillonniere, London, 1717, p 58. Hoadly's reply, Works, ii, p 614-616. For the Bangorian controversy see chapter 4 of this thesis.

As the moderate Nonconformists considered the Church of England lawful and as they supported the concept of a national church, Hoadly argued that it was totally unreasonable to separate in order to improve the Church.⁸⁵ Indeed, he recommended a list of authors including Hooker, Ball, Bradshaw and Stillingfleet who had written against the unreasonableness of separation.⁸⁶ There was, according to Hoadly, “nothing plainer, than that it ... [was] unaccountable, and inconsistent, to separate from an imperfect Church, in order to impress a farther Reformation”.⁸⁷ Even after separation the Dissenters had not achieved perfection in their own churches.⁸⁸ In words reminiscent of William Chillingworth, he ridiculed those who thought that they would achieve perfect church government, discipline and worship.⁸⁹ It was not possible, Hoadly contended, for “Perfection” to “be obtained in any Establishment” because as long as “Imperfection” belonged to the nature of man “it would also belong to any Constitutions that depend[ed] upon the Prudence, and Wisdom of Man”.⁹⁰ Although he did not give specific details, Hoadly declared that he wanted further reformation in the Church but it would only be done by a yielding spirit and mutual concessions.⁹¹ Moreover, he held that it was quite consistent to be a constant communicant of the Church of England and at the same time work to reform it.⁹²

⁸⁵ Works, i, p 259, 262, 319, 320.

⁸⁶ Works, i, p 186. Richard Hooker, Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity (1593-1662), John Ball, Friendly Tryal of the Grounds of Separation (1640), William Bradshaw, Unreasonableness of Separation (1640), Edward Stillingfleet, Unreasonableness of Separation (1680).

⁸⁷ Works, i, p 262.

⁸⁸ Works, i, p 296.

⁸⁹ Works, i, p 271. Chillingworth, Protestants, p 52.

⁹⁰ Works, i, p 271.

⁹¹ Works, i, p 266, 269. The only details which he gave were that he would have preferred the 'damnatory' sentence removed from the Athanasian creed and he was willing to alter the burial service to indicate that it was merely a hope rather than a certainty that all who were buried would be saved. -Works, i, p 312.

⁹² Works, i, p 260, 261.

Although Calamy was confident when he described the reasons for separation, he appeared far less secure when defending the practice of occasional conformity. In the Abridgment and Defence part I Calamy's position appeared to be that as Church of England worship contained non-Scriptural "super-added formalities" constant conformity was "evil" or "sinful".⁹³ However, by part II he was claiming that total compliance was not sinful but inexpedient.⁹⁴ Defence part III contained Calamy's longest statement on the issue. In this book he stressed that sinfulness and lawfulness depended upon the circumstances.⁹⁵ He was convinced that not even the most moderate Dissenters would join constantly with a worship which they considered merely lawful and at the same time exclude a purer form of worship which they preferred.⁹⁶ In Calamy's view, the practice of occasional conformity demonstrated that the Nonconformists were charitable.⁹⁷ The concept of charity was particularly important because it was necessary for the Nonconformists to show that they were not schismatics. According to Calamy, schism in Scripture was represented "not so much in variety of Opinions, or different Practices, Modes or Forms, or different Places of Worship, as in a want of true Love and Charity".⁹⁸ Consequently, as long as they showed charity and communed occasionally the Middle Way Men did not believe that they were guilty of the sin of schism.⁹⁹

In Religion, Revolution and English Radicalism (1990) James Bradley

⁹³ Calamy, Abridgment, p 561.

⁹⁴ Calamy, Defence, II, p 82.

⁹⁵ Calamy, Defence, III, p 218.

⁹⁶ Calamy, Defence, III, p 243, 274.

⁹⁷ Calamy, Abridgment, p 561.

⁹⁸ Calamy, Abridgment, p 554.

⁹⁹ Calamy, Abridgment, p 555, Defence, I, p 226; II, p 82.

maintains that Hoadly defended the practice of occasional conformity.¹⁰⁰ As we have already seen, Hoadly did vindicate the Whig bishops who obstructed the bills against occasional conformity. However, this was only half the story because in debates with Calamy and the moderate Nonconformists he continually urged them to become constant conformists. In a very carefully worded passage he declared that all Christians agreed that causeless divisions were to be avoided. The point was not therefore “How the word Schism” was “used in Scripture” or what the “Fathers” had said on the “Nature of Schism” but whether their separation from the Church of England was “necessary or not”. If it was not, then according to their own principles it was schism.¹⁰¹

Hoadly believed that Calamy had confused his followers with his ideas on occasional communion.¹⁰² Calamy had tried to persuade moderate Nonconformists that constant communion was a sin, but that occasional communion was a duty.¹⁰³ Although Dissenters insisted that they practised communion occasionally for Christian charity, Hoadly was convinced that sometimes it was done for qualification purposes.¹⁰⁴ Calamy had written a great deal about liberty but, in Hoadly’s view, it was not merely a question of individual liberty, it was also necessary for all Christians to consider the good of the Church and the peace of society.¹⁰⁵ In an attempt to appeal directly to the Nonconformist laity he tried to convince them that the Gospel and the law of nature obliged them to consider the “Good of their Neighbour” and the

¹⁰⁰ James E Bradley, Religion, Revolution and English Radicalism, Cambridge, 1990, p 70.

¹⁰¹ Works, i, p 297.

¹⁰² Works, i, p 194.

¹⁰³ Works, i, p 194.

¹⁰⁴ Works, i, p 284.

¹⁰⁵ Works, i, p 512. See also [Tenison], Union, p 42.

“Happiness of that Society” to which they belonged.¹⁰⁶

The dispute between Hoadly and Calamy went further than the issue of occasional conformity. Much of the debate revolved around the question of episcopacy and ordination. Although the arguments over episcopacy and presbytery had continued since the sixteenth-century they had wide ranging implications at the beginning of the eighteenth-century. During the winter of 1702-1703 when English and Scottish commissioners were discussing the union of the two parliaments, George Every's work has shown that the Scots had only entered into negotiations on condition that Presbyterian church government was secured to them.¹⁰⁷ At the same time in England, the High Church movement including Grabe and others wanted to introduce episcopacy in Presbyterian churches in Prussia, Switzerland and Scotland.¹⁰⁸ Scottish Presbyterians were naturally alarmed and for more than a year the union appeared doomed.¹⁰⁹

According to Spivey's research the Middle Way Men did not oppose moderate episcopacy, but they did oppose a theory of episcopacy which made bishops distinctive in office and the sole ordaining authority.¹¹⁰ Nonconformists looked to Scripture for the origins and practices of church government and found that the offices of presbyter and bishop were identical and concluded that both were authorized to ordain.¹¹¹ Furthermore, they claimed that Scripture prohibited double ordination.¹¹² Anglican hierarchy and ordination was,

¹⁰⁶ Works, i, p 317, 318.

¹⁰⁷ Every, High Church Party, p 112.

¹⁰⁸ Every, High Church Party, p 116, 124.

¹⁰⁹ Every, High Church Party, p 116, 113.

¹¹⁰ Spivey, 'Calamy', p 148. Calamy, Defence, I, p 57.

¹¹¹ Spivey, 'Calamy', p 142. Calamy, Defence, I, p 87.

¹¹² Calamy, Defence, I, p 43.

Calamy asserted, defective and based on the “meer Authority” of the Church Fathers.¹¹³ Many of these ancient writings could not be trusted and some were possibly forged.¹¹⁴ The acknowledged leader of the Middle Way Men spent most of part I of Defence arguing for the superiority of Presbyterian ordination.¹¹⁵ As he contended in the Abridgment, if the moderate Nonconformists did not believe that their orders were genuine it had wide ranging consequences for the welfare of their people - it put baptisms into question and undermined their credit with Presbyterian churches abroad.¹¹⁶

As contemporary and later commentators have maintained that Hoadly undermined the fabric of the Church of England it is important to appreciate that in this debate he gave a very sound defence of episcopacy.¹¹⁷ In line with other conformists, Hoadly turned to Scripture for spiritual guidance rather than a blue print for Church government, but he did follow his opponent through the New Testament and could not find anything to support Calamy's case for primitive parity or the right of presbyters to ordain.¹¹⁸ Historians have also argued that Hoadly rejected Church tradition and the Church fathers.¹¹⁹ As we shall see later in the thesis, this was sometimes the case, especially when he believed that High Churchmen were imposing new religious doctrines.¹²⁰ Nevertheless, in this dispute over Church government he defended both tradition and the authority of the fathers. Hoadly realised that Christianity was

¹¹³ Calamy, Defence, I, p 125, 148; part II p 371.

¹¹⁴ Calamy, Defence, I, p 132, 145.

¹¹⁵ Calamy, Defence, I, p 58-148.

¹¹⁶ Calamy, Defence, I, p 225, Abridgment, p 499. For pastoral problems see Spurr, Restoration Church, p 159.

¹¹⁷ Works, i, p 407

¹¹⁸ Works, i, p 453.

¹¹⁹ H R McAdoo, The Spirit of Anglicanism, London, 1965, p 348, 349, 394, 399.

¹²⁰ See Bangorian controversy, chapter 4 of this thesis.

a historical religion and believed that Calamy was challenging all history and Scripture and therefore playing into the hands of the Deists.¹²¹ It was, he claimed, unreasonable to rely on the evidence of the Church fathers for the canon of the New Testament and then reject it when they supported episcopacy.¹²² Historical inquiry was defended because he was sure that it was possible to overcome some of the methodological problems connected with it.¹²³ Even though the ancients spoke figuratively and obscurely this did not, in his view, prevent a true understanding.¹²⁴ Calamy had, he maintained, treated the Church fathers unjustly for although their accounts sometimes varied they did all appear to agree that episcopacy was apostolic and many of them were eyewitnesses.¹²⁵

Let us use our own Understandings in Points in which we are capable of judging as well as they. Let us never depend on any of them in Matters of which they are not competent Judges But let us not, under pretense of Freedom and Impartiality cast off their universal concurrent Testimony about a Matter of Fact, of which they are the only proper Judges, lest we destroy all Historical Certainty, and forfeit the Credit even of the most Sacred Writings now extant.¹²⁶

It is however important to appreciate that Hoadly never supported episcopacy because he thought that it was divine but because it was traditional. He declared that he could not “argue that Episcopacy ... [was] essential to a Christian Church because it ... [was] of Apostolical Institution”.¹²⁷

Nevertheless, he did believe that the apostles instituted it as a “Matter of

¹²¹ Works, i, p 401-403.

¹²² Works, i, p 407.

¹²³ Works, i, p 405.

¹²⁴ Works, i, p 406.

¹²⁵ Works, i, p 411 & 412.

¹²⁶ Works, i, p 413.

¹²⁷ Works, i, p 477.

Order” and argued that later generations were obliged to conform unless “Imitation” was “unpracticable”.¹²⁸ It is possible to detect at least two longstanding traditions relating to episcopacy in the established Church. Peter Lake’s research has shown that since the 1590s some conformists had developed Scriptural *iure divino* arguments for episcopacy and these could be seen in Laudian and later in Nonjuror and High Church ideas at the end of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth-century.¹²⁹ Running concurrently was another more moderate conformist tradition which looked to tradition, rather than a Scriptural defence of episcopacy. Lake’s work has revealed that in the sixteenth-century Archbishop John Whitgift denied that the practice of the apostles were binding and contended that there was no one form of government laid down in Scripture.¹³⁰ Whitgift, like Hoadly 150 years later, supported episcopacy because it was ancient, settled and best suited to the English Church. Both men denied that episcopacy was popish, yet also refused to criticise non-episcopal foreign reformed churches.¹³¹

Again Hoadly used the authority of Richard Baxter, on this occasion to try to encourage Calamy and the Nonconformists to accept episcopal ordination. Baxter had acknowledged “that Episcopal ordination ... [was] the regular, orderly Ordination settled in the Church of Christ”.¹³² He also used Baxter to support his own view that “the necessity” answered “for the irregularity” but only where the necessity lasted.¹³³ Although, as we have seen, Calamy was convinced that re-ordination was unscriptural, Ollyffe responded by defending

¹²⁸ Works, i, p 477.

¹²⁹ Peter Lake, Anglicans and Puritans?, London, 1988, p 91-96.

¹³⁰ Lake, Anglicans, p 16 & 13.

¹³¹ Lake, Anglicans, p 88 & 89. Works, i, p 189, 480, 479.

¹³² Works, i, p 188.

¹³³ Works, i, p 191.

the lawfulness of the practice.¹³⁴ In contrast, Hoadly argued that the issue was frequently one of ordination because the dissenting clergymen had never been properly ordained in the first place.¹³⁵ Presbyterian ordination was, in Hoadly's view, valid during the inter-regnum when there were no bishops, but he complained that many Nonconformists had brought problems on themselves because they had taken Presbyterian orders after the Restoration, when regular ordination was available.¹³⁶ Along with other Churchmen Hoadly stressed the need for regularity and order.¹³⁷ Dissenters claimed that a "blessing from Heaven" attended their ministries but Hoadly retorted that "Ignorant Mechanics" could have pretended to have an "inward call", even though there was no proof that it was genuine¹³⁸

Although episcopacy and ordination were important areas of dispute there were 'less important' matters which prevented the constant communion of these moderate Nonconformists. These can not be dismissed because, as Professor Collinson has maintained, the question of what constituted inessentials was "where the geological fault line between Anglicanism and Nonconformity began".¹³⁹ Indeed, both Hoadly and Calamy realised that they were frequently repeating unresolved disputes of the previous centuries.¹⁴⁰ Calamy and the Middle Way Men reiterated their old complaints that they

¹³⁴ Calamy, Defence, I, p 43. Ollyffe, Defence, II, p 27.

¹³⁵ Works, i, p 193.

¹³⁶ Works, i, p 188.

¹³⁷ Works, i, p 189, 193.

¹³⁸ Works, i, p 191. Calamy did not reply to Hoadly's Defense of Episcopal Ordination (1707) so "that I might not give him disturbance in the pursuit of his political contest, in which he was so happily engaged, and so much to the satisfaction of the true lovers of his country". - Calamy Own Life, ii, p 79. After Hoadly's sermon against non resistance preached before the Lord Mayor in September 1705 Hoadly had become embroiled in a dispute with Atterbury and other Tories and Nonjurors. Calamy's comment seems to suggest that it was primarily political, rather than religious ideas which Hoadly and Calamy held in common.

¹³⁹ Patrick Collinson, English Puritanism, London, 1987, p 16.

¹⁴⁰ Works, i, p 186. Calamy, Defence, I, p ix.

could not conform because Anglicans had not eradicated popery and still employed the liturgy, used the surplice, nominated godparents, used the sign of the cross at baptism and received communion in a kneeling position.¹⁴¹ Since the Reformation there had been two very different approaches to the popish threat. For Thomas Cartwright and also for later Presbyterians like Calamy, popery was the product of human invention and superstition and they maintained that this could easily return if popish elements were not entirely eliminated.¹⁴² The Anglican conformists, including John Whitgift, realised that the Roman Church was mistaken when it encouraged the laity to believe that rites and ceremonies affected salvation, but this did not mean that all their customs were unsuitable.¹⁴³ Like Whitgift, Hoadly and Ollyffe defended Church of England practices they were not popish and they believed that it was “more reasonable to insist upon an innocent use of some things they have abused rather than neglect useful things without any reason”.¹⁴⁴ They urged Church governors to be tolerant and alleged that they went “beyond their Authority when they introduce[d] vain, senseless, indecent ceremonies”.¹⁴⁵ Nevertheless, in general Hoadly and Ollyffe considered that ceremonies were aids to order, although they did not have a religious role and did not affect salvation.¹⁴⁶ Furthermore, Hoadly did not suppose there would have been one serious consequence even if everyone in the land found godparents or “Sponsors for their children” and had “their Children signed with the Sign of the Cross” at baptism and kneeled at communion.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴¹ Calamy, Abridgment, p 507, 511, 513, Defence, II, p 15. Works, i, p 210.

¹⁴² Lake, Anglicans, p 44-45.

¹⁴³ Lake, Anglicans, p 19 & 43.

¹⁴⁴ Works, i, p 205. Ollyffe, Defence, II, p 56 & 61.

¹⁴⁵ Works, i, p 210. Ollyffe, Defence, II, p 61.

¹⁴⁶ Works, i, p 205, 210. Ollyffe, Defence, II, p 61.

¹⁴⁷ Works, i, p 209.

For Churchmen, the most disturbing feature of Nonconformity was the degree of spontaneity in the religious ceremonies of some Dissenters. All Churchmen, including Latitudinarians, defended tradition and formality in worship.¹⁴⁸ So, when Calamy criticised the performance of Anglican clergymen, Hoadly replied that, although they were not perfect, at least they had the benefit of a settled liturgy to support them. On this occasion, perhaps rather unfairly, he linked the moderate Nonconformists with the extreme separatists who filled their prayers with “Carnal Passions, Selfishness, Faction, Disorder, Vain Repetitions, unsound and loathsome Expressions; and their Doctrine with Errors and Confusion”.¹⁴⁹ In contrast, John Spurr has observed that Nonconformists frequently attacked the poor standard of preaching and declared the need for greater “edification” in the Anglican Church.¹⁵⁰ But, in Hoadly’s view, the Church of England was a Church in which there was “excellent Provision” for “Edification, and increase in all truly Christian Graces”.¹⁵¹ However, like other Churchmen he wanted to encourage personal amendment and declared that in the end “the Care of Your Souls lyes chiefly upon yourselves”.¹⁵²

Although Hoadly and Calamy both hoped for a “Coalition of the more moderate of all sorts” in a reformed national Church - it is clear that their approaches and indeed their idea of moderation were very different.¹⁵³ It was,

¹⁴⁸ Kroll, ‘Introduction’ to Philosophy, p 20.

¹⁴⁹ Works, i, p 243, 245.

¹⁵⁰ J Spurr, ‘Schism and the Restoration Church’ in Journal of Ecclesiastical History, vol 41, 3, July, 1990, p 421.

¹⁵¹ Works, i, p 238.

¹⁵² Works, i, p 238. One of the main attractions of dissent had been the promotion of individual piety and Hoadly believed that this could be developed within the established Church. John Spurr’s work supports this view, “The moral message of the Restoration church was essentially what it had been in the 1650s a message of personal piety”. Spurr, Restoration Church, p 246.

¹⁵³ Works, i, p 326. Calamy, Abridgment, p 567. By 1704 Calamy was writing that he preferred independent churches to a national Church. - Defence, II, p 90.

Calamy acknowledged, strange that the Middle Way Men and “those of Latitude” within the Church, who had a reputation for moderation, were disputing between themselves.¹⁵⁴ Reflecting on his childhood Calamy maintained that he “had moderation instilled into” him from his “very cradle”.¹⁵⁵ According to Spivey, Calamy had tried to steer a middle course based on intellectual responsibility and had abandoned extreme Calvinist dogma.¹⁵⁶ Nevertheless, as we have seen, Calamy’s moderate Calvinism was still assertive and independent.¹⁵⁷ His literal approach to both Scripture and subscriptions undoubtedly left little room for compromise. To give an example, Calamy and the moderate Nonconformists claimed that the terms of communion were not lawful unless they were expressly warranted by the word of God.¹⁵⁸ Hoadly, and indeed other Churchmen, could be far more flexible because they held that worship was lawful as long as it did not include anything which was not forbidden in Scripture.¹⁵⁹ Moderation was, Hoadly contended, a “Temper of Mind” which disposed Christians to “Peace and Concord”.¹⁶⁰ In his view, it should have taught the Nonconformists to give up their lesser concerns, their rigidity and even sometimes their rights for the good of the Protestant Church and state.¹⁶¹ A few examples taken from the subscription disputes will demonstrate their different approaches and show what Hoadly meant by moderation.

The 1662 Act required all ministers to assent and consent to the Prayer Book.

¹⁵⁴ Calamy, Defence, III, preface p iv & p 272.

¹⁵⁵ Calamy, Life, i, p 72 quoted in Matthews, Calamy, p xix.

¹⁵⁶ Spivey, ‘Calamy’, p 52 & 53.

¹⁵⁷ Spivey, ‘Calamy’, p 71.

¹⁵⁸ Calamy, Defence, III, p 270.

¹⁵⁹ Calamy, Defence, III, p 270. Works, i, p 198.

¹⁶⁰ Works, i, p 326.

¹⁶¹ Works, i, p 326 & 327.

However, Calamy and the moderate Nonconformists were convinced that the Church had made an “idol” of this “imperfect” book and they refused to consent to everything in it.¹⁶² Hoadly thought it a “piece of public Disservice, to deal very hardly with Declarations and Subscriptions; to stretch them beyond the original Design of them ... in order to make them appear as rigid and unreasonable as possible”.¹⁶³ Along with moderate seventeenth-century Churchmen, including John Gauden (1605-1662), Hoadly and Ollyffe argued that it was only necessary to use the book, not agree with every proposition in it.¹⁶⁴

The 1662 Act also required all clergymen to give an oath of canonical obedience. Calamy and the moderate Nonconformists would not conform to the established Church because they believed that this restricted a clergyman’s liberty and they also argued that the oath needed to be limited to lawful things.¹⁶⁵ Again, Hoadly complained that Calamy read the oath with rigidity and “put a sense upon it which neither the words, nor design” admitted.¹⁶⁶ The oath, Hoadly and Ollyffe explained, did not refer to absolute obedience, clergymen were merely required to obey a particular “Bishop in all lawful and honest things”.¹⁶⁷ Moreover, Hoadly made it plain that the individual was the judge of what was lawful and honest.¹⁶⁸ The oath was, Hoadly contended, expressed in words which gave “as much Latitude, and as much Liberty to them who take it, as the most conscientious Persons upon

¹⁶² Calamy, Abridgment, p 503 & 504.

¹⁶³ Works, i, p 198.

¹⁶⁴ Works, i, p 197. Ollyffe, Defence, II, p 103. John Spurr, ‘The Church of England, Comprehension and the Toleration Act of 1689’ in English Historical Review, 1989, p 930.

¹⁶⁵ Calamy, Abridgment, p 523.

¹⁶⁶ Works, i, p 228.

¹⁶⁷ Works, i, p 227.

¹⁶⁸ Works, i, p 226.

Earth could desire".¹⁶⁹

Calamy remained unconvinced that unity could take place on these terms. He realised that these Latitudinarian attitudes were "obnoxious" to some inside the Church.¹⁷⁰ Moreover, from his own standpoint, he argued that purity was far more important than the peace and unity that Hoadly desired.¹⁷¹ In his view, it was a public disservice to tempt people to accept subscriptions with a tacit reserve.¹⁷² He found it difficult to understand how people "when bound by their Solemn Engagements, which were design'd to secure Uniformity, could justify their Latitude, in altering, omitting, etc even as if they were Free, and matters were left to their Discretion".¹⁷³ Perhaps most important, he recognised that although Hoadly gave "fair words" and made persuasive sounds he was still a Churchman who defended many of the Church's rules and regulations.¹⁷⁴

In conclusion, contemporary Tory High Churchmen and Nonjurors were convinced that there was a conspiracy among moderate men to undermine the established Church.¹⁷⁵ Furthermore, some later historians have seen strong links between Latitudinarians and moderate Nonconformists.¹⁷⁶ However, this research on the occasional conformity controversy and the debate with Calamy (1702-1707) has revealed that there were significant differences

¹⁶⁹ Works, i, p 227.

¹⁷⁰ Calamy, Defence, I, p 13.

¹⁷¹ Calamy, Defence, II, p 73.

¹⁷² Calamy, Defence, II, p 106.

¹⁷³ Calamy, Defence, I, p 11.

¹⁷⁴ Calamy, Defence, I, p 15.

¹⁷⁵ [Leslie], Wolf, p 80. Sacheverell, Political Union, p 48 & 49.

¹⁷⁶ Robbins, Commonwealthman, p 295 & 296.

between Hoadly's Latitudinarian Churchmanship and Edmund Calamy's moderate Nonconformity. In an effort to promote peace and unity among Whigs and Protestants Hoadly attempted to persuade the moderate Nonconformists to become constant conformists and carry on the Reformation within the established Church.¹⁷⁷ As we have seen, Hoadly was in the tradition of many Churchmen since the Reformation when he vindicated the authority of the Church fathers, supported episcopacy on pragmatic grounds and defended Church ceremonies as aids to order.¹⁷⁸ The establishment was not perfect, but he truly believed "that the public Worship established in the Church of England" was "in itself preferable to any whatever that hath yet been set up in Opposition to it".¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁷ Works, i, p 260. 262.

¹⁷⁸ Works, i, p 407, 477, 205, 210.

¹⁷⁹ Works, i, p 285.

Chapter 2 - The Deist Challenge (1702-1713)¹

Hoadly was, as discussed in the last chapter, frequently linked with the Nonconformists. However, in addition, High Churchmen often accused Hoadly and other Latitudinarians of sharing the same epistemology of the Deists and freethinkers who employed secular reason and rejected revelation.² Later writers have also associated Hoadly with the methodology and ideas of the Deists. For example, as they both employed the language of reason, Leslie Stephen concluded that Hoadly and the Deists had much in common.³ Due to Hoadly's appeals to nature, Norman Sykes considered that the basis of his thought was deistic.⁴ Furthermore, in an article in History Today, H T Dickinson remarked that Hoadly caused great offence to the clergy because of his unorthodox theological opinions which were not merely Latitudinarian but came very close to the natural religion of the Deists.⁵

The purpose of this chapter is, therefore, to compare Hoadly's ideas and method of religious inquiry with those of the Deists and freethinkers in the

¹ Dates of Hoadly's contribution to these debates.

² For the association of Latitudinarians and Deists in High Church polemic see - [Francis Atterbury], A Letter to a Convocation-Man, London, 1697, p 6 & 7. Hoadly charged with deism and atheism see - Francis Atterbury, Fourteen Sermons Preach'd on Several Occasions. Together with a Large Vindication of the Doctrine contain'd in the Sermon preach'd at the Funeral of Mr Thomas Bennet, London, 1708, preface lxviii, lxix. Works, i, p 69, 96 & 97. An anonymous opponent in the Bangorian controversy also contended that Hoadly received support from "Deists, Atheists, Arians, Freethinkers, Blasphemers, Church-Levellers, Town Bully's, Ballad-Makers, etc". - Curate of Middlesex, A Muster-Roll of the B of B-----ngr's Seconds, title page, London, 1720. For differing views on the definition of deism see Richard H Popkin, 'The Deist Challenge' in From Persecution to Toleration, edited by Ole Peter Grell, Jonathan I Israel and Nicholas Tyacke, Oxford, 1991, p 196. Roger L Emerson, 'Deism' in Dictionary of History of Ideas, edited by Philip P Weiner, New York, 1968, p 646. For the epistemology of deism see Emerson, 'Latitudinarianism and the English Deists' in Deism, Masonry, and the Enlightenment, edited by J A Lemay, Newark and London, 1987.

³ Stephen, English Thought, ii, p 131.

⁴ Sykes, 'Hoadly', p 148-150.

⁵ Dickinson, 'Hoadly', p 349.

context of contemporary debates in the period before the Bangorian controversy.⁶ The chapter will highlight major areas of difference between Hoadly and deistical writers, differences which have been marginalised by both contemporary and later commentators. This work will demonstrate that Hoadly was not a Deist who used secular reason to undermine Christian revelation. Indeed, it will be argued here that Hoadly was a Christian apologist who employed God-given reason to support Scripture and fend-off the assaults of the Deists. Moreover, Hoadly was also a Churchman and the final part of the chapter will reveal how he used Church tradition to defend the Church of England from the threat posed by the freethinkers.

Throughout his writings Hoadly always associated primitive Christianity with individual freedom and liberty of inquiry.⁷ But he was convinced that this early Christian freedom had gradually been eroded by the excessive authority and man-made rules and regulations of the Catholic Church.⁸ During the fifteenth-century the spirit of religious inquiry had been revived by the Christian humanists of northern Europe who used individual reason, so applauded by the ancients, to examine Scriptural texts.⁹ This individual liberty of religious inquiry was, however, a principle which Hoadly firmly associated with early Christianity and the Reformation.¹⁰ Hoadly eulogised what he considered to be the Reformation epistemology of the Protestant theologian William

⁶ The Bangorian controversy will be discussed in chapter 4 of this thesis.

⁷ Works, i, p 153, 159.

⁸ Works, i, p 149, 159-160, 178.

⁹ Todd, Christian Humanism, p 23-27. Bernard Reardon, Religious Thought in the Reformation, London, 1981, p 14-15, 17, 23.

¹⁰ Works, i, p 159-160, 175-178.

Chillingworth (1602-1644).¹¹ Chillingworth rejected excessive religious authority and argued that it was the duty of all Christians to use their own judgement and search Scriptures for the tenets of their faith.¹² In some instances Hoadly quoted from The Religion of Protestants (1638) but even when he did not mention the great man by name, Chillingworth's ideas permeated all of Hoadly's works.¹³ It is however, important to appreciate that Hoadly, like Chillingworth before him, was not an independent researcher but a Christian/Protestant apologist.¹⁴ Hoadly employed what he considered to be Reformation methodology, that is a combination of Scripture supported by reason to defend Christianity from the Deists.¹⁵ Let us now look more closely at the very different ways in which Hoadly and the Deists used Scripture and reason.

Scripture

An examination of books and tracts written by Deists and freethinkers reveals that they frequently claimed to be unbiased scholars who searched Scripture in an attempt to eliminate the abuses of religion.¹⁶ They maintained that, like other books, Scripture required an independent critical approach.¹⁷ Some

¹¹ Works, i, p 149, 159, 174-175, 178. Works, ii, p 903, 621. Robert R Orr, Reason and Authority. The Thought of William Chillingworth, Oxford, 1967, p 161.

¹² Chillingworth, Protestants, p 114, 115, 333, 375. The book was stamped with the imprimatur of Laud's censors in March 1637.- Orr, Reason, p 43.

¹³ Works, ii, p 451. This will be discussed in more detail in chapter 4 of this thesis.

¹⁴ Works, i, 154-156. Chillingworth, Protestants, p 114-115, 375.

¹⁵ Works, i, p 160, 163-165.

¹⁶ Works, i, p 6. [Anthony Collins], A Discourse of Free-Thinking, London, 1713, p 5. Matthew Tindal, A Defence of the Rights of the Christian Church, 1707, p 6 in Richard Ashcraft, 'Anticlericalism and authority' in Roger D Lund, The Margins of Orthodoxy, Cambridge, 1995, p 85, 86.

¹⁷ John Toland, Christianity not Mysterious, second edition enlarged, London, 1696, p 47. For Toland see Sullivan, Toland.

historians including Henning Graf Reventlow have seen this commitment to independent rational biblical inquiry as the intellectual and methodological foundation for later German biblical criticism.¹⁸ However, as J A I Champion has shown, Deists and freethinkers including Charles Blount, John Toland, Anthony Ashley Cooper, Anthony Collins and Matthew Tindal undoubtedly undermined the veneration given to the Gospel, as well as challenging the authority of the scholars and clerics who interpreted it.¹⁹

To combat the contemporary charge that freethinking led to atheism, the freethinker Anthony Collins asserted in A Discourse of Free-Thinking (published anonymously in 1713), that “Ignorance” was “the foundation of Atheism, and Freethinking the Cure of it”.²⁰ He declared that it was a person’s duty to think “on the Nature and Attributes of the Eternal Being or God, and the Truth and Authority of Books esteem’d Sacred, and of the Sense and Meaning of these Books”.²¹ But at the same time, Collins cast great doubt on the authenticity of the canon of Scripture. Always extremely anticlerical, he maintained that “Frauds” were very common in all Books which were “published by Priests or Priestly Men”.²² Collins claimed that no book had

¹⁸ Henning Graf Reventlow quoted in James Herrick, The Radical Rhetoric of the English Deists, Columbia, 1997 p 39, 40.

¹⁹ J A I Champion, Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken - The Church of England and its Enemies 1660-1730, Cambridge, 1992, p 10. According to Swift’s ironic work - “The Priests tell me I am to believe the Bible, but Free-thinking tells me otherwise in many Particulars”. “Another Trick of the Priests, is to charge all Men with Atheism, who have more Wit than themselves”. [Jonathan Swift], Mr C-----n’s Discourse of Free-Thinking, Put into plain English by way of Abstract, for the Use of the Poor, London, 1713 p 7 & 15. ,

²⁰ [Collins], Free-Thinking p 105. Anthony Collins (1676-1729) was educated at Eton and King’s College, Cambridge. He was a disciple of Locke who observed that Collins had “an estate in the country, a library in town, and friends everywhere”. Collins was bitterly attacked for his deist writings but never his character. DNB, iv, p 819, 820. John Leland, A View of the Principal Deistic Writers, London, 1754, p 98 ff.

²¹ [Collins], Free-Thinking, p 32.

²² [Collins], Free-Thinking, p 96.

suffered so much as the New Testament had done and he maintained that there were over 30,000 different readings.²³ With more than a touch of ridicule, he explained that Catholic priests believed the text of Scripture so corrupted that they claimed it was necessary to depend entirely upon the authority of their Church.²⁴ Even Protestants, he asserted, could not even agree on the fundamentals of Scripture.²⁵

There were numerous replies to A Discourse of Free-Thinking including those by Jonathan Swift, Richard Bentley and Hoadly himself.²⁶ Hoadly considered that Collins' book was a collective enterprise and he replied to it anonymously in Queries recommended to the Authors of the late Discourse of Free-Thinking (1713). Hoadly was a committed Christian, who approached Scripture with reverence and humility because he believed that it was, in essence, the word of God.²⁷ Collins had drawn attention to inconsistencies in Scripture, but as far as Hoadly was concerned it did not matter whether or not there were anomalies in the text.²⁸ It was, Hoadly believed, only necessary to have a reliable record of the central aspects of Christ's teaching, to appreciate "the principal Points, and the Main Matters, recommended to the World in these Books".²⁹

Hoadly and Bentley certainly did not believe that the radicals used

²³ [Collins], Free-Thinking, p 88.

²⁴ [Collins], Free-Thinking, p 55.

²⁵ [Collins], Free-Thinking, p 88, 63.

²⁶ [Swift], Mr C-----n's Discourse. [Richard Bentley], Remarks upon a Late Discourse of Free-Thinking, London, 1713. Richard Bentley (1662-1742) was a scholar and critic. He became a Boyle lecturer in 1692, royal librarian in 1694, king's chaplain in 1695 and Master of Trinity College, Cambridge in 1700.

²⁷ Works, i, p 122. [Bentley], Remarks, p 6.

²⁸ Works, i, p 145.

²⁹ Works, i, p 145.

Chillingworth's legitimate Christian methods of religious inquiry to examine the Christian religion.³⁰ In their view, the Deists and freethinkers were inadequate scholars who did not translate their sources properly.³¹ More pertinent, they were prejudiced thinkers who manipulated the material with the aim of undermining the authority of Scripture.³² Hoadly complained that the authors of A Discourse did not have a "favourable Word" to say about the Gospel.³³ He believed that they had produced various readings of the New Testament manuscripts "with a manifest Design of bringing a Disreputation upon the Gospel itself".³⁴ Not only did they represent Scripture in "the worst Dress of its worst interpreters" but, as Hoadly noted, they also made sly insinuations against it.³⁵

Writing by insinuation was certainly a useful technique for Collins and other freethinkers and it has made interpreting their works particularly difficult. For example James O'Higgins (1970) considered that Collins was a Deist who shared the ideas of the Low Churchmen.³⁶ In contrast, David Berman (1988) has adopted Hoadly's position that Collins was probably an atheist who disguised his beliefs for prudential reasons.³⁷ It is worth remembering that although the Blasphemy Act of 1697 did not actually mention atheism or make

³⁰ [Collins], Free-Thinking, p 34, 85, 171, 170, 135, 129. Works, i, p 149, 167. [Bentley], Remarks, p 4, 48.

³¹ Works, i, p, 144. [Bentley], Remarks, p 11.

³² Works, i, p 143-144, 147, 150. [Bentley], Remarks, p 6, 10-11, 35.

³³ Works, i, p 150.

³⁴ Works, i, p 145.

³⁵ Works, i, p 144. The anonymous author of A Vindication of the Church of England from the Aspersions of a late Libel Intituled, Priestcraft in Perfection, London, 1710 also complained that Collins made sly insinuations against the Christian religion, p 209.

³⁶ David Berman, A History of Atheism in Britain, London, 1988, p 70. See also David Berman, 'Disclaimers as Offence Mechanisms in Charles Blount and John Toland' in Atheism from the Reformation to the Enlightenment, Oxford, 1992.

³⁷ Berman, History, p 75.

it a criminal offence it was implicit in the Act.³⁸ Consequently, as late as 1729 the freethinker Thomas Woolston was sentenced to prison for alleged blasphemy in his Discourses on the miracles of our saviour (1727-29).³⁹ As Toland remarked, considering how dangerous it was to tell the truth, it was difficult to know when any man declared “his real sentiments of things”.⁴⁰ The reader certainly does get the impression that Collins, Toland and other “minute philosophers”, as Berkeley called them, meant much more than they actually wrote.⁴¹

However, on one particular aspect of religious inquiry the Deists and freethinkers were very clear, they would not accept that Scripture miracles provided facts or independent evidence that Jesus came from God.⁴² Like all rationalists they saw perfection in regularity and maintained that miracles violated the laws of nature. This view was put forward by Spinoza in his Tractatus, which was translated into English by Charles Blount in 1680.⁴³ Moreover, the Deists contended that miracles only provided evidence to people who were believers and already convinced that the doctrine came from God.⁴⁴ It was this aspect which led to the accusation that appeals to miracles as evidence was circular.⁴⁵

³⁸ Berman, History, p 48, 36.

³⁹ Berman, History, p 76.

⁴⁰ John Toland, Tetradymus, London, 1720, p 95 quoted in Berman, Atheism p 76.

⁴¹ [George Berkeley], Alciphron: or, The Minute Philosopher, Dublin, 1732, p 4. According to Berkeley the modern freethinkers were like the people who Cicero called minute philosophers because they diminished all the most valuable things. - p 20, 21.

⁴² R M Burns, The Great Debate on Miracles, London, 1981, p 70.

⁴³ Burns, Debate, p 86, 88.

⁴⁴ Burns, Debate, p 97.

⁴⁵ Burns, Debate, p 97.

Churchmen replied to this dangerous challenge to Scripture miracles in two very different ways. In an effort to strengthen the proof of Christianity from miracles, William Fleetwood (1656-1723) argued that as only God could work miracles, this proved that Jesus must have had the power of God.⁴⁶ Fleetwood admitted that this view was a complete break with Christian tradition because in biblical accounts some miracles were performed by evil agents.⁴⁷ However, the most extreme example of this evidentialism was delivered by Samuel Clarke (1675-1729) in the Boyle Lectures of 1704-5.⁴⁸ In a series of eight lectures, Concerning the Unchangeable Obligations of Natural Religion, and the Truth and Certainty of the Christian Revelation, he put great stress on miracles and maintained that the “positive and direct proof” of Christ’s divine commission was “the Miracles which he worked for that purpose”.⁴⁹

Hoadly also defended Scripture miracles. However, compared to Fleetwood and Clarke, Hoadly provided a more moderate, orthodox, empirical defence of miracles in the tradition of Joseph Glanvill, Robert Boyle and John Locke.⁵⁰ In A Letter to the Reverend Mr Fleetwood, occasioned by his late Essay on

⁴⁶ William Fleetwood was a Whig and Rector of St Austin’s, London and later Bishop of St Asaph (1708) and Ely (1714). A Complete Collection of the Sermons, Tracts and Pieces of all kinds that were written by the R R Dr William Fleetwood, London, 1737, p 128. (editor/publisher unknown). Burns, Debate, p 97.

⁴⁷ Burns, Debate, p 46.

⁴⁸ The Works of Samuel Clarke, 4 volumes, London, 1738, ii, p 521 ff. Introduction - An Account of the Life, Writings and Character of Dr Samuel Clarke by Benjamin Hoadly.in Works, iii, p 455 ff. Clarke was educated at Cambridge and was an exponent of Newtonian philosophy. Became rector of Drayton and in 1709 rector of St James’s, Westminster. He argued against the views of Spinoza, Hobbes and Leibnitz and in Hoadly’s view demonstrated beyond all reasonable doubt the freedom of action in man. Hoadly hoped that he would be “spoken of, in Ages to come, under the Character of The FRIEND of Dr Clarke”. Works, iii, p 458, 463, 469. See also J P Ferguson, An Eighteenth Century Heretic, Dr Samuel Clarke, Kington, 1976.

⁴⁹ Boyle Lectures in Clarke, Works ii, p 696. Burns, Debate, p 99-100.

⁵⁰ Works, i, p 14 & 17. Joseph Glanvill, Sadducismus Triumphatus, 1681, enlarged 1689 - see Burns, Debate, p 56. Locke, chapters 15 & 16 of book 4 of An Essay concerning Human Understanding, also the posthumously published A Discourse of Miracles, see Burns, Debate, chapter 3.

Miracles, (published anonymously in 1702) Hoadly believed that God could have allowed wicked spirits to work miracles, but was convinced that he would also have provided a good deal of evidence to demonstrate when a miracle was truly divine.⁵¹ He insisted that it was necessary to consider the type and number of miracles. Some miracles, Hoadly claimed, required much greater power than others. As an example, raising a person from the dead was a far more important miracle than turning water into wine.⁵² If a person performed a great number of miracles it also indicated that it was not merely luck, but an indication of an extensive power.⁵³ Hoadly concluded that it was obvious that Christ was sent from God because of the “long uninterrupted Series of great Miracles” which he performed.⁵⁴ It is, however, essential to appreciate that, for Hoadly, miracles alone were not sufficient to establish a true religion. He was convinced that Jesus was the son of God, because he performed miracles, fulfilled former prophecies, taught an excellent doctrine, and was so good and holy in himself.⁵⁵

Although Hoadly and other English Protestants believed in Scripture miracles, most of them rejected the miracles of other religions or modern miracles. Indeed, Deists frequently taunted their opponents and suggested that they employed double standards when they accepted Gospel miracles as evidence but dismissed the stories of miracles performed by Apollonius of Tyana,

⁵¹ Works, i, p 7. These ideas were similar to the Manichaeian doctrine which placed great importance on the concept of dualism of good and evil. Evil could not be denied but only defeated by knowledge, The Encyclopaedia of Religion, edited by Mircea Eliade, New York and London, 1987, ix, p 162, 163.

⁵² Works, i, p 9, 10.

⁵³ Works, i, p 7-11, 14.

⁵⁴ Works, i, p 14.

⁵⁵ Works, i, p 14.

mediaeval saints and those of the modern day Camisards.⁵⁶ The Camisards were an itinerant band of French Protestants (Huguenots) who claimed to perform miracles and broadcasted news of the Lord's second coming when they arrived in London in the autumn of 1706.⁵⁷ Hoadly and many other English Protestants, including Edmund Calamy, were extremely concerned about the growing popularity of the Camisards.⁵⁸ They certainly managed to seduce some prominent individuals and benefactors and a number of scientists, including Isaac Newton's close friend Nicholas Fatio, became involved in the group.⁵⁹ Only death, it has been said, prevented Sir Richard Bulkeley (1644-1710), 'scientist' and member of the Royal Society, from giving all his estates to the French prophets.⁶⁰ The male and female French prophets may also have posed a threat to the male dominated hierarchical structure of the English Church.⁶¹ However, far more worrying, the miracles claimed by these millennarian Protestants were not supported by any rational proof and therefore threatened the very basis of rational Christianity.⁶²

Hoadly wrote his Brief Vindication of the Ancient Prophets in 1709 to counter Sir Richard Bulkeley's An Answer to Several Treatises lately published on the subject of the Prophets (part 1, 1708). It was obvious from the outset that Hoadly wanted to defend rational Christianity from the religious enthusiasm of

⁵⁶ Charles Blount, translator, Life of Apollonius of Tyana, London, 1680. The alleged miracles of the Camisards was discussed by Thomas Chubb, in his Discourse on Miracles, London, 1741, p 89. See Burns, Debate, p 72-74

⁵⁷ Hillel Schwartz, The French Prophets, London, 1980, p 72 , 90, 106.

⁵⁸ Edmund Calamy, Sir Richard Bulkeley's Remarks on the Caveat against New Prophets Consider'd, London, 1708, and his A Caveat against New Prophets, in two Sermons, London, 1708.

⁵⁹ Frank E Manuel, The Religion of Isaac Newton, London, 1974, p 120. Schwartz, Prophets, p 237.

⁶⁰ DNB, iii, p 233.

⁶¹ Schwartz, Prophets, p 232, p 291.

⁶² Schwartz, Prophets, p 92-93, Calamy, Caveat, p 49.

the Camisards (French Prophets), and what he believed were the unchristian methods of inquiry of the Deists and freethinkers.⁶³ Indeed, he was convinced that the pretended miracles of the Camisards provided the Deists with ammunition to ridicule Christ's miracles.⁶⁴ Bulkeley had attempted to defend the French Prophets by comparing their physical agitations with Scripture accounts of the Old Testament prophets.⁶⁵ But Hoadly was absolutely convinced that God created order not confusion. He maintained that the holy men in the Old Testament needed to be in full command of their bodies so that they could regulate and teach their assemblies.⁶⁶ Moreover, Hoadly could not understand why Bulkeley compared the Camisards with the Old Testament prophets when they claimed to be in the Christian tradition.⁶⁷ Bulkeley should, he suggested, have turned to the New Testament where there he would not have found any evidence to indicate that God had promised to send any prophets after Christ.⁶⁸ Furthermore, it would have demonstrated to Bulkeley, and also to Deists and freethinkers, that these false prophets did not resemble the gentle, plain and simple methods of Christ who left accounts of his miracles AND his rational doctrine which was open for ALL to inspect.⁶⁹

As well as the debate over miracles, Deists and freethinkers frequently used the writings of the ancients to try to undermine the Scripture doctrine of a future life. In Anima Mundi (1679) and Oracles of Reason (1693) Charles Blount used the authority of Seneca and Pliny to attack the notion of the immortality of

⁶³ Works, i, p 107, 126,

⁶⁴ Works, i, p 107, 108, 141, 155.

⁶⁵ Schwartz, Prophets, p 74.

⁶⁶ Works, i, p 120, 126.

⁶⁷ Works, i, p 110.

⁶⁸ Works, i, p 111.

⁶⁹ Works, i, p 110, 111, 122, 126.

the soul.⁷⁰ In Letters to Serena (1704) John Toland claimed that the doctrine had developed from the funeral rights of Egyptian kings and maintained that subjects merely accepted it on trust from their superiors.⁷¹ Like Blount, Toland quoted Pliny and Seneca to champion, what was obviously, his own belief that nothing followed death and that heaven and hell were “only senseless Tales and empty words, A Fable like unto a frightful Dream”.⁷²

The extreme High Churchman Francis Atterbury alleged that Hoadly’s writings, like those of the Deists, supported the mortality of the soul and therefore undermined one of the greatest articles of the Christian faith.⁷³ Hoadly certainly rejected the mystical powers claimed by some of the clergy, so totally dismissed the Nonjuror Henry Dodwell’s view that the soul was naturally mortal and that immortality was conferred at baptism through the hands of regularly ordained priests.⁷⁴ But it is also important to appreciate that Hoadly upheld the traditional Christian doctrine of the immortality of the soul. Indeed, in his debate with Atterbury (1707-8) Hoadly declared that Christ had removed the dread of death by giving assurances of a future state where righteousness would be rewarded.⁷⁵ He expressed confidence in “the Truth of the Christian Religion; and the plain Revelation in it of a Future State, in which Good men ... [would] ... be rewarded and the wicked punished”.⁷⁶

⁷⁰ Charles Blount, Anima Mundi: or, An Historical Narration of the Opinions of the Ancients concerning Man’s Soul After this Life, London, 1679, p 63. The Oracles of Reason, London, 1693, p 117, 121.

⁷¹ Toland, Letters to Serena, London, 1704, p 45, 54.

⁷² Seneca quoted in Toland, Serena p 59, 60.

⁷³ Hoadly on Atterbury in Works, i, p 96. Atterbury, preface to Fourteen Sermons, p lxviii-lxix.

⁷⁴ Works, iii, p 459.

⁷⁵ Works, i, p 57 & 92.

⁷⁶ Works, i, p 61.

Hoadly also defended the Scripture doctrine of the immortality of the soul against the attacks of Deists. In A Discourse of Free-Thinking (1713) Collins had employed the writings of the ancients to support the idea of the mortality of the soul. But Hoadly made classical and Christian ideas compatible and thought that it was extremely “sly” for the author/s to represent Cicero as an atheist when the Roman “could not bear the thoughts of losing so pleasing a view, as that of the Immortality of the Soul”.⁷⁷ He also complained that Socrates had been treated very badly by these so called scholars. It was, Hoadly declared, very plain, that Socrates believed in God and had “an expectation of a Reward in a Future State” which “supported Him under all the Injuries of his Adversaries”.⁷⁸

Nevertheless, although Hoadly defended the Scripture doctrine of the afterlife, it must be acknowledged that he did spend more time trying to encourage people to practice virtue in this world rather than contemplate the next.⁷⁹ Contemporaries have suggested that, like the Deists, Hoadly severed his morality from Scripture.⁸⁰ This secularisation of morality has also been reflected in modern historical scholarship. Although not specifically directed at Hoadly, Shelley Burtt has argued that the Low Church view of morality had a secular cast.⁸¹ However, unlike the Deists, Hoadly’s idea of virtue and

⁷⁷ Works, i, p 146.

⁷⁸ Works, i, p 147.

⁷⁹ For the importance of personal behaviour in this world in contemporary religious thinking see John Spurr, ‘ ‘ Virtue, Religion and Government’: The Anglican Uses of Providence’ in The Politics of Religion in Restoration England, edited by Tim Harris, Paul Seaward and Mark Goldie, Oxford, 1990, p 29-47.

⁸⁰ Atterbury’s criticism of Hoadly in Works, i, p 93.

⁸¹ Shelley Burtt, Virtue Transformed. Political Argument in England 1688-1740, Cambridge, 1992, p 47. She claimed that many Anglicans held that the standards of morality deserved enforcement, not primarily because they were religious but because they contributed to the maintenance of social stability.

morality were based firmly on Scripture.⁸² He continually tried to promote an active faith and was extremely critical of Christians who thought that they could have faith in Jesus without having to obey, or indeed to apply the moral laws of the Gospel. Furthermore, for Hoadly, as for Gilbert Burnet, the Reformation was not merely an historical event but an ongoing process.⁸³ In a series of sermons Concerning the Terms of Acceptance with God (1711) Hoadly urged people to read the Bible, undertake personal reformation and engage in active divinity.⁸⁴

After discussing Hoadly's approach to the Gospel and comparing it with that of the Deists it may be useful to summarise the discussion so far. It has been argued that Hoadly was a Christian apologist who did not use the epistemology of the Deists but what he considered to be Protestant methods of religious inquiry. This part of the chapter has revealed that he studied Scripture with humility and reverence, defended Gospel miracles, supported the Scripture doctrine of the immortality of the soul and based his morality on the sacred text. The section which follows aims to compare Hoadly's use of reason with that of the Deists.

⁸² Works, i, p 61, 62.

⁸³ Burnet, Reformation, ii, preface.

⁸⁴ Works, iii, p 549. Burnet, Reformation, ii, preface. Spurr, Restoration Church, p 240. There is no evidence to suggest that Hoadly was involved in the Societies for the Reformation of Manners. He may have considered the societies too coercive, in his view forcible methods led to atheism and infidelity. For Reformation of Manners see Shelley Burt, 'The Societies for the Reformation of Manners: between John Locke and the devil in Augustan England' in The Margins of Orthodoxy, edited by Roger D Lund, Cambridge, 1995. Tina Isaacs, 'The Anglican Hierarchy and the Reformation of Manners, 1688-1738' in Journal of Ecclesiastical History, 33, 1982, p 391-411.

Reason

As already noted, Deists and freethinkers continually criticised the authority of Churchmen and replaced this with an appeal to classical texts. As J A I Champion has noted, the works of Cicero, Aristotle, Polybius, Plutarch, Tacitus and Plato, to name but a few, were readily available both in original languages and translations.⁸⁵ Freethinkers did not merely draw on the content of these works. The Deists and freethinkers also employed the secular reason of the ancients in their methods of inquiry. The writings of Cicero were particularly popular. In both De Republica and De Legibus, Cicero had stressed the role of reason and law in directing individuals and the community to virtue and these ideas influenced the work of Blount, Toland and many others.⁸⁶ In Christianity not Mysterious (1696) Toland declared that reason alone was “the only Foundation of all certitude”.⁸⁷ He argued that nothing in the Bible was to be considered above reason.⁸⁸ If the reasons were good then religion was not mysterious and if it was mysterious then he was sure that it was not divinely revealed. There was he declared “No Mystery in Christianity, or the most perfect Religion” for “nothing contradictory or inconceivable” could be contained in the Gospel if it really was the “Word of God”.⁸⁹

Anthony Collins defined his method of inquiry at the beginning of A Discourse of Free-Thinking. It was the use of the understanding to try to find out the

⁸⁵ Champion, Pillars, p 182, 183.

⁸⁶ Champion, Pillars, p 211.

⁸⁷ Toland, Christianity, p 6.

⁸⁸ Toland, Christianity p 42.

⁸⁹ Toland, Christianity, p 170.

meaning of any proposition whatsoever by considering the evidence for or against it.⁹⁰ There was, in Collins' view, "no other way to discover the Truth" in religion or make progress in the arts and sciences.⁹¹ However, the implication was that if individuals employed reason they could dispense with or even reject revelation. Collins cited Justin Martyr to suggest that "Christ" was "nothing else but Reason" so all who lived by reason were Christians, even though they were often considered atheists.⁹² Collins contended that Socrates should be considered a "true Christian" because he had obtained a just notion of the nature and attributes of God by reason rather than revelation.⁹³ Moreover, he applauded Cicero who, he maintained, had used reason to destroy the revealed religion of the Greeks.⁹⁴

It is important to reiterate that, like the Christian humanists and early Protestant reformers Hoadly, synthesised Christian and classical methods and ideas. He was convinced that both Scripture and reason were God-given and therefore totally compatible.⁹⁵ For Hoadly reason was never secular; to follow reason was to imitate God and bring men closer to their creator.⁹⁶ Indeed, the chief happiness of a reasonable creature was, according to Hoadly, to live as reason directed and this would lead to inward peace and harmony.⁹⁷ But even though he described Christianity as "the revival of the great Law of Reason", he was convinced that revelation had "carried Morality to a greater

⁹⁰ [Collins], Free-Thinking, p 5.

⁹¹ [Collins], Free-Thinking, p 5, 8.

⁹² Works, i, p 124.

⁹³ Works, i, p 123.

⁹⁴ Works, i, p 135-137.

⁹⁵ Works, i, p 164, 165.

⁹⁶ Works, i, p 54-57.

⁹⁷ Works, i, p 55.

Height and Perfection, that unenlightened Reason ever did”.⁹⁸ Revelation was, he believed, “perfectly agreeable to our best and uncorrupted Reason”.⁹⁹

For most medieval theologians reason was essentially passive; they saw the mind as a receptacle where divinely implanted truths could be understood through human reason.¹⁰⁰ For Hoadly, as for William Chillingworth, reason was primarily an active, critical faculty.¹⁰¹ The main purpose of God-given reason was to search Scriptures, examine the evidence and support the Christian faith.¹⁰² However, although Scripture was infallible, Chillingworth and Hoadly were well aware of the fallibility of humans and the inadequacy of their Scriptural interpretations.¹⁰³ Even the best and most sincere inquirers, Hoadly contended, made mistakes.¹⁰⁴ Nevertheless, along with Chillingworth, Hoadly was convinced that God made allowances for his “imperfect creatures” and held that error in an honest mind was not a damnable thing.¹⁰⁵

Henry van Leeuwen and Barbara Shapiro have shown the extent to which there was a gradual movement towards the acceptance of more tentative knowledge during the seventeenth-century.¹⁰⁶ Along with William Chillingworth, John Wilkins (Bishop of Chester) (1614-1672) and Archbishop John Tillotson (1630-1694), Hoadly did not believe that certainty was available

⁹⁸ Works, i, p 156, 57.

⁹⁹ Works, i, p 67.

¹⁰⁰ Orr, Reason, p 156. see also Alexander Murray, Reason and Society in the Middle Ages, Oxford, 1978, p 6, 110 ff.

¹⁰¹ Orr, Reason, p 164. Works, i, p 154.

¹⁰² Works, i, p 150, 154, 157.

¹⁰³ Works, i, p 160, 178. Chillingworth, Protestants, p 327.

¹⁰⁴ Works, i, p 158, 163.

¹⁰⁵ Works, i, p 163. Chillingworth, Protestants, p 376.

¹⁰⁶ Henry G van Leeuwen, The Problem of Certainty in English Thought, Hague, 1963. Shapiro, Probability and Certainty.

to fallible men.¹⁰⁷ Nevertheless, he insisted that the Gospel provided moral evidence (or evidence which was as certain as it could be) for a saving faith.¹⁰⁸ Moreover, in response to the Deists, who ridiculed revelation, Hoadly declared that “the Reasonableness of it” lay in the fact that God could have called upon his reasonable creatures in any way he wanted but it was “not only barely possible, but probable that he would do so” in an extraordinary manner and it was certainly their advantage to listen.¹⁰⁹

Gerard Reedy and John Spurr have noted that Anglicans varied their appeal to reason according to the circumstances.¹¹⁰ This was certainly the case in Hoadly’s polemic. As we have seen, he vigorously attacked Bulkeley and the Camisards who asked people to live by faith alone and abandon their reason.¹¹¹ There were, he accepted, some beliefs which were above reason. In true Christian fashion Hoadly believed that men could not understand all of God’s ways, but that did not mean they should not try.¹¹² Humility and the use of human reason were, he believed, perfectly consistent.¹¹³ After all, God had given evidence so that people could use reason and recognise his true

¹⁰⁷ Works, i, p 158. Chillingworth, Protestants, p 327. van Leeuwen, Certainty, p 48, 59. John Wilkins, Bishop of Chester was a founding member of the Royal Society and a populariser of new science. - see Shapiro, John Wilkins.

¹⁰⁸ Works, i, p 156. Chillingworth, Protestants, p 73. van Leeuwen, Certainty, p 22. Shapiro, Probability and Certainty, p 30.

¹⁰⁹ Works, i, p 154. The “insistence on the reasonableness of Christianity” was, as Gerard Reedy has observed, “an iron grip not on a deistic future but on the traditional past”. Reedy, Bible and Reason, p 12. For Hoadly it was reasonable to inquire into Christian revelation and once the evidence in the Gospel was examined it was, in his view, reasonable to believe that Christ’s doctrine was worthy of God. Works, i, p 154-156. - For reasonableness - see Philip Harth, Contexts of Dryden’s Thought, Chicago, 1968, chapter 4. Robert Greene, ‘Whichcote, Wilkins, “Ingenuity”, and the Reasonableness of Christianity’ in Journal of History of Ideas, 1981, 42.

¹¹⁰ Reedy, Bible and Reason, p 17. John Spurr, ‘Rational Religion in Restoration England’, Journal of History of Ideas, 49, 1988, p 569.

¹¹¹ Works, i, p 126.

¹¹² Works, i, p 110, 126.

¹¹³ Works, i, p 132.

prophets.¹¹⁴ He was convinced that God expected a “rational Trial of his Ways”.¹¹⁵ Like fellow Protestants William Chillingworth and John Tillotson, Hoadly was concerned to show that a faith which was supported by reason was ethically superior to a faith which was the result of submission to revelation.¹¹⁶ In Hoadly’s view a critical, rather than a credulous, faith was a morally responsible one.¹¹⁷ Personal inquiry followed by choice were essential to enable an individual to give “Voluntary Reasonable submission” to religious beliefs.¹¹⁸

Hoadly was, however, critical of the Deists and freethinkers who, he maintained, used unjust reasoning.¹¹⁹ They had, he claimed, collected all the trivial man-made inconsistencies in the Gospel and used them to attack Christianity.¹²⁰ He declared that he was sure that the Deists would have complained, if Christians had collected the absurdities of the classical philosophers and used them unfairly against reason itself.¹²¹ In addition, he censured their elitism and, like Samuel Clarke, contrasted their methods with Christ’s ways which were open and easy for everyone to understand.¹²² As an example, he claimed that some of these pretended reformers and so-called scholars used abstract reasoning without any empirical facts or testimonies.¹²³ This was, Hoadly insisted, a mysterious reasoning which the bulk of the

¹¹⁴ Works, i, p 137.

¹¹⁵ Works, i, p 174, 171.

¹¹⁶ Orr, Reason, p 162. Works, i, p 162.

¹¹⁷ Orr, Reason, p 163. Works, i, p 174, 171.

¹¹⁸ Works, i, p 174.

¹¹⁹ Works, i, p 167.

¹²⁰ Works, i, p 166.

¹²¹ Works, i, p 166.

¹²² Works, i, p 169-171. Clarke, Works of Clarke, ii, p 576.

¹²³ Works, i, p 171.

population could not hope to understand and he accused them of creating these thin and intricate “cobwebs” in order to support “Infidelity”.¹²⁴

Furthermore, although the Deists asserted that they employed rational methods of inquiry, Hoadly, Clarke, Bentley and other contemporaries were well aware that, in reality, the radicals frequently used wit, ridicule and banter rather than rational arguments against their opponents.¹²⁵ John Redwood and James Herrick’s work on the subversive potential of ridicule has undoubtedly shed more light on the so called “Age of Reason”.¹²⁶ In both Letter Concerning Enthusiasm (1708) and Sensus Communis, or an Essay on Wit and Humour (1709) Anthony Ashley Cooper, the First Earl of Shaftesbury, directed his attention towards the critical potential of humour.¹²⁷ As Herrick has noted, his most controversial suggestion was that ridicule could be used as a test of truth.¹²⁸ This “textual tool” of ridicule which was employed by all of the Deists provided a short-cut to long tedious debates. It also appealed to and entertained an emerging reading public.¹²⁹

Faced with such tactics, Hoadly despaired that the “honest enquirer into the Truth had become the greatest Jest imaginable”.¹³⁰ At one extreme lay the “Universal Raillery and Ridicule” of the Deists and freethinkers and at the other

¹²⁴ Works, i, p 171, 145, 150. Jacob, Radical Enlightenment, p 70, 75. Redwood, Reason, 40-41 & chapter 3.

¹²⁵ Works, i, p 144. Clarke, Works of Clarke, ii, p 521, 523, 606. [Bentley], Remarks, p 5 & 6. Oldisworth, Dialogue, dedication.

¹²⁶ Redwood, Reason. Herrick, Rhetoric.

¹²⁷ Herrick, Rhetoric, p 53.

¹²⁸ Herrick, Rhetoric, p 53.

¹²⁹ Herrick, Rhetoric, p 53, 56 & 62.

¹³⁰ Works, i, p 108. See also [Berkeley], Alciphron, p 124.

extreme the irrationalism of religious enthusiasm.¹³¹ It was, in his view,

a melancholy Contemplation to think, how much the Atheism and Profaneness of some ... [tended] to the extreme of Enthusiasm in others; and how reciprocally the Enthusiasm of these others ... [nourished] that Atheism, and Profaneness: Whilst the serious and sedate Religion lying between the two Extremes, [suffered] from both; the profane condemning it with Enthusiasm in the Lump for Madness, and the Enthusiastical representing it as a Dry State, little better than No Religion at all.¹³²

So far we have seen how Hoadly advocated what he considered to be moderate Protestant methods of religious inquiry (Scripture supported by reason), to protect Christianity from those whom he believed were trying to undermine it. However, Hoadly was also a Churchman and I now want to demonstrate how he employed history and Church tradition to defend the Church of England from the challenge posed by the Deists and freethinkers.

History/Church Tradition

Deists and freethinkers accused clergymen of 'priestcraft', in other words of manipulating religion for their own selfish purposes.¹³³ However, rather than directly charging the Church of England clerics with priestcraft, Herbert, Blount, Toland and others frequently provided an historical and psychological analysis of heathen religions and used this information to indict the

¹³¹ Works, i, p 108.

¹³² Works, i, p 108. For writings against enthusiasm during the period see J G A Pocock, 'Enthusiasm: The Antiself of Enlightenment' in Huntington Library Quarterly, vol 60, nos 1 & 2, 1998, p 7-29.

¹³³ Champion, Pillars, p 133.

contemporary Christian religion and Churchmen.¹³⁴ Deists maintained that religion was invented to establish morality and was originally known by individual reason. But realising that people feared the future, they argued that, priests had employed ghosts, goblins and miracles in order to create an empire over the minds of the laity. Just as important, the Deists and freethinkers argued that priests had not restricted their power and influence to religious issues but had extended their tyranny to civil affairs.¹³⁵

Hoadly responded to the radical works of Anthony Collins and Matthew Tindal. So let us look more closely at their notions of priestcraft in order to contrast Hoadly's views with those of the Deists. In both Priestcraft in Perfection (1710) and Discourse of Free-Thinking (1713) Collins attempted to undermine the power of the Church and its clergy.¹³⁶ In the former work he contended that the Church of England had perfected priestcraft and he believed that, by claiming authority in matters of faith, the Church operated against the principles of the Reformation.¹³⁷ According to Collins, Archbishop Laud and other prelates had forged documents and inserted a passive obedience clause into the beginning of the twentieth article of the Church of England and since that time the article had, in his view, merely been accepted by custom.¹³⁸

¹³⁴ Champion, Pillars, p 154. Swift complained, "when he speaks of Priests" [Collins] "desires chiefly to be understood to mean the English Clergy, yet he includes all Priests whatsoever, except the antient (sic) and modern Heathens, the Turks, Quakers, and Socinians". - [Swift], Mr C----n's Discourse, p 5.

¹³⁵ Champion, Pillars, p 136, 154. [Matthew Tindal], The Rights of the Christian Church Asserted, Against the Romish, and all other Priests who claim an Independent Power over it. With a Preface concerning the Government of the Church of England as by Law established, (1706), third edition, London, 1707, p 47.

¹³⁶ [Anthony Collins], Priestcraft in Perfection, London, 1710, p 3, 5, 46. [Collins], Free-Thinking, p 61 ff.

¹³⁷ In response see Anon, A Vindication of the Church of England ... Priestcraft in Perfection, p, ii, 2. [Collins], Priestcraft, p 4, 5, 45.

¹³⁸ [Collins], Priestcraft, p 46, 9, 5.

Matthew Tindal's The Rights of the Christian Church Asserted (1706) was directed against the priestcraft of High Churchmen and Nonjurors such as Henry Dodwell and Charles Leslie.¹³⁹ Once again the principles of the Reformation were invoked. At the Reformation, Tindal explained that the king had been invested with executive power in all spiritual matters.¹⁴⁰ So, he insisted that, in asserting the independent power of the clergy the High Churchmen were acting in opposition to the erastian principles of the Reformation.¹⁴¹ Tindal completely rejected the belief that Church government and authority in matters of faith had been conveyed by divine right from Christ to his apostles and then the bishops.¹⁴² Priests expected spiritual obedience because they claimed that they represented Christ.¹⁴³ But, according to Tindal, this was a tyrannical religious power which frightened men into compliance and at the same time discouraged virtue and morality.¹⁴⁴

Tindal used two types of authority to support government by consent in the Church. First, he believed that as men were naturally free and equal they had a natural right to form societies for worship and to agree on who was to officiate, establish doctrines, preach and administer the sacrament.¹⁴⁵

¹³⁹ [Tindal], Rights, p lxi, lxxv. Matthew Tindal (1657-1733) In 1678 Tindal was elected a law fellow of All Souls', Oxford. He retained his fellowship until his death and spent his time between Oxford and London. For a time he became a Roman Catholic. Best known for Christianity as Old as the Creation, or the Gospel a Republication of the Religion of Nature (1730). He called himself a 'Christian deist'. DNB xix, p 883, 884. Leland, A View, p 148 [Edmund Curll], Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Matthew Tindall (sic), London, 1733. See also [Tindal], A Defence of the Rights and A Second Defence, 1708 & 1709.

¹⁴⁰ [Tindal], Rights, p xxvi.

¹⁴¹ [Tindal], Rights, p A2.

¹⁴² [Tindal], Rights, p 30.

¹⁴³ [Tindal], Rights, p 79.

¹⁴⁴ [Tindal], Rights, p 79, 233-235, 112.

¹⁴⁵ [Tindal], Rights, p 24, 80.

Second, he appealed to historical precedent. Early Christians had, according to his interpretation, been directly involved in organising the primitive church.¹⁴⁶ Indeed, Tindal believed that nothing could be “plainer than that all Ecclesiastical Power ... [had] no other Foundation than the Consent of the Society”.¹⁴⁷ Although Tindal emphasised consent in the early Christian church, the reader is given the impression that Tindal was far less interested in promoting the Christian message than in the political potential of religion. “Religion” was, he declared, “so very necessary for the Support of human Society’s” particularly for “the Awe and Reverence of the Divinity” which made “men more effectually observe those Dutys in which their mutual Happiness ... [consisted], than all the Rods and Axes of the Magistrate”.¹⁴⁸ In short, one of the main purposes of religion, however it was organised, was to support the civil power.¹⁴⁹

There were numerous responses to Rights including those by George Hickes, William Oldisworth and Hoadly.¹⁵⁰ In some respects it is possible to see how contemporaries believed that Hoadly and Tindal shared the same ideas.¹⁵¹ For example, Hoadly never argued against Tindal’s erastianism. As we shall see, in A Preservative against the Principles and Practices of the Nonjurors,

¹⁴⁶ [Tindal], Rights, p 131, 132, 135, 166, 237, 238.

¹⁴⁷ [Tindal], Rights, p 80.

¹⁴⁸ [Tindal], Rights, p 13.

¹⁴⁹ [Tindal], Rights, p 13. See Champion, Pillars, chapter 6.

¹⁵⁰ George Hickes, Three short treatises ... In Defense of the Priesthood, and True Rights of the Church, London, 1709. [William Oldisworth], A Dialogue between Timothy and Philatheus, London, 1709. Benjamin Hoadly, A Brief Defense of Episcopal Ordination, London, 1707 chapter III, in Works, i, p 454 ff. Anon, Spinoza Reviv’d, London, 1709 - in the preface to this work George Hickes argued that Tindal’s Rights was based on Spinoza’s Rights of the Christian Clergy and that both were grounded in atheism.

¹⁵¹ [Curl], Memoirs, p 32. The Nonjuror George Hickes, maintained that “Latitudinarians” who pretended to be Christians supported Tindal’s Rights to free themselves from narrow principles, and beliefs in priesthood and revelation. - Hickes, preface to Spinoza Reviv’d, no pagination.

both in Church and State (1716), which will be discussed in chapter four of this thesis, Hoadly made it very clear that in all temporal (although not spiritual) affairs he supported the supremacy of the king in parliament and totally rejected the independence of the visible Church.¹⁵² However, when Hoadly responded to Tindal's Rights (in chapter three of A Brief Defense of Episcopal Ordination, 1707), it became quite clear that they held substantially different ideas on Church government.¹⁵³

It should be said at the outset that Hoadly always maintained that God preferred sincerity and good behaviour to strict adherence to religious institutions.¹⁵⁴ Nevertheless, Hoadly believed that both should be regarded if they could.¹⁵⁵ Consequently, he defended the hierarchical structure of the Church of England, the power of the bishops and an authorised ministry against the challenge posed by Tindal and other Deists.¹⁵⁶ Hoadly dismissed Tindal's appeal to natural rights to support government by consent in the Church. Tindal's claims could, according to Hoadly, have been supported if the world had been left entirely "to the Light of Nature, and Reason, without any revealed Religion".¹⁵⁷ But, in his view, there had been revelation from God concerning religious rights and institutions and he believed that these had to prevail.¹⁵⁸ Either through the directions of the holy spirit or the results of their own prudence, Hoadly argued that the apostles had established

¹⁵² Works, i, p 557 ff.

¹⁵³ Works, i, p 454 ff.

¹⁵⁴ Works, i, p 483. This will be developed in the Bangorian controversy, chapter 4 of this thesis.

¹⁵⁵ Works, i, p 483.

¹⁵⁶ Works, i, p 454, 483.

¹⁵⁷ Works, i, p 454.

¹⁵⁸ Works, i, p 454.

institutions, made rules and given advice concerning Church government.¹⁵⁹ Episcopacy was, he explained, instituted by the apostles to provide good order in the visible church.¹⁶⁰ As already indicated in chapter one, Hoadly did not consider episcopacy an essential characteristic of the Church.¹⁶¹ As we have seen, he defended moderate episcopacy in England because, he believed, it conformed to the apostolic model and was the traditional organisation of the Church.¹⁶² However, he made it plain that he did not condemn the non-episcopal reformed churches on the continent. They had, in his view, made an error of judgement, but it was certainly not a sin.¹⁶³

Although both Tindal and Hoadly employed the early history of the Church to support their views they came to very different conclusions.¹⁶⁴ Tindal frequently took his examples from the earliest beginnings of the Christian church.¹⁶⁵ Along with other Churchmen, including John Turner, vicar of Greenwich, Hoadly claimed that it was more useful to consider the period when the apostles had begun to lay down procedures and establish order.¹⁶⁶ He was particularly concerned by Tindal's claim that the laity in the early church had the right to choose their own officials. The apostles were witnesses to the resurrection so, Hoadly declared, they could not possibly have been chosen by the people.¹⁶⁷ Also, even though the apostles may have

¹⁵⁹ Works, i, p 454.

¹⁶⁰ Works, i, p 477.

¹⁶¹ Works, i, p 477. This will be discussed in more detail in chapter 4.

¹⁶² Works, i, p 478, 479.

¹⁶³ Works, i, p 480.

¹⁶⁴ For the uses of Church history in contemporary polemic see Champion, Pillars, p 12.

¹⁶⁵ [Tindal], Rights, p 132, 135.

¹⁶⁶ Works, i, p 455, 459. John Turner, A Vindication of the Rights and Privileges of the Christian Church, London, 1707, p 79.

¹⁶⁷ Works, i, p 460, 459.

asked for assistance or given the laity reasons for their actions he did not believe that they were accountable to their congregations.¹⁶⁸ Finally, he was convinced that a regularly ordained ministry which baptised and preached was established in the days of the apostles.¹⁶⁹ Hoadly concluded that he was “as much against Ecclesiastical Tyranny” as Tindal and did not plead for any Exorbitant Powers in Bishops, nor any Authority in any of the Clergy” but what was necessary for “the carrying forward the great Ends of the Gospel, and the better securing the Profession of Christianity in the World”.¹⁷⁰

Conclusion

In the later seventeenth and early eighteenth-centuries Churchmen, and more orthodox members of society, perceived a decline in moral standards which they believed were linked to a proliferation of books and tracts by Deists and freethinkers.¹⁷¹ These publications challenged established values and in many instances appeared to undermine the very basis of the Protestant Church and state.¹⁷² Contemporary High Churchmen, together with later commentators have frequently charged Hoadly with deism.¹⁷³ Even though some of the Deists, like Matthew Tindal, did claim that they were in the Reformation tradition, there were substantial differences between Hoadly's

¹⁶⁸ Works, i, p 464.

¹⁶⁹ Works, i, p 476.

¹⁷⁰ Works, i, p 476.

¹⁷¹ [Atterbury], Convocation-Man, p 2 & 6. Burnet, Reformation, ii, p 1681, preface. See also Isaacs, 'Reformation of Manners'.

¹⁷² Toland, Christianity, p 39. [Collins], Priestcraft, Free-Thinking, p 61, 91. [Tindal], Rights, p 7, 80.

¹⁷³ Atterbury, preface to Fourteen Sermons, p lxxviii-lxix. Atterbury cited by Hoadly in Works, i, p 69, 96 & 97. See also Stephen, English Thought, ii, p 131. Sykes, 'Hoadly', p 148-150. Dickinson, 'Hoadly', p 349.

methods of religious inquiry and those of the radicals.¹⁷⁴ Hoadly and the Deists both maintained that they employed reason and evidence to examine religious issues.¹⁷⁵ Yet, the Deists used ridicule, as well as the secular reason of the ancients, to reject Gospel miracles, the doctrine of the immortality of the soul and undermine Christian revelation.¹⁷⁶

In contrast, Hoadly was a Christian apologist who believed that liberty of inquiry was an essential part of the Christian religion and one of the main principles of the Reformation.¹⁷⁷ This liberty was, in his view, being undermined by atheists, Deists and freethinkers who used unchristian methods for their own worldly ends.¹⁷⁸ Hoadly used what he considered to be legitimate Christian/Reformation methods of religious inquiry.¹⁷⁹ This involved a combination of Scripture and reason and was employed by William Chillingworth and many late seventeenth-century moderate Anglican divines.¹⁸⁰ Like them Hoadly approached Scripture with humility and reverence, defended Gospel miracles, accepted the doctrine of the immortality of the soul and based his morality on Scripture.¹⁸¹ Moreover, he was convinced that Scripture and reason were both God given and therefore totally

¹⁷⁴ [Tindal], Rights, p 414. See also Rosemary O'Day, The Debate on the English Reformation London, 1986. A G Dickens and John Tonkin, The Reformation in Historical Thought, Cambridge, Mass, 1985.

¹⁷⁵ [Collins], Free-Thinking, p 5. Toland, Christianity, p 170-171.

¹⁷⁶ Spinoza, Tractatus in Burns, Debate, p 86, 88. Toland, Christianity, p xxiii, 38, 39. John Redwood, Reason, Ridicule and Religion: The Age of Enlightenment in England 1660-1750, London, (1976), 1996. Herrick, Rhetoric. [Tindal], Rights, p 47. [Collins], Priestcraft, p 46 & Free-Thinking, p 96. Toland, Serena, p 2.

¹⁷⁷ Works, i, p 149-150, 159, 174-5, 178.

¹⁷⁸ Works, i, p 148-150.

¹⁷⁹ Works, i, p 159-160, 164.

¹⁸⁰ Works, i, p 167. Chillingworth, Protestants, p 114, 333. Reedy, Bible and Reason.

¹⁸¹ Works, i, p 122, 14, 57, 92, 61; iii, p 549.

compatible.¹⁸² Human reason was, for Hoadly, an active, critical but fallible faculty used to inquire into the Gospel and defend the truths of Christianity.¹⁸³ His appeal to reason varied according to his opponents. The Camisards and their followers were censured because they failed to use reason to justify their faith.¹⁸⁴ At the same time, he strongly criticised the Deists and freethinkers for their unsound reasoning.¹⁸⁵

As we have seen, Hoadly was also a Churchman who supported moderate episcopacy in the Church of England. Anticlericalism was an important facet of the Reformation and Hoadly made it quite clear that he could not support excessive Church power.¹⁸⁶ Unlike High Churchmen and Nonjurors, who believed that the bishops had inherited mystical powers from the apostles, Hoadly defended episcopacy because he believed that it was a well established means of regulating the visible Church.¹⁸⁷ In addition, he supported an authorised ministry because it promoted Christianity and prevented “a Deist, or Ignorant Mechanic” from preaching merely out of worldly interest.¹⁸⁸

¹⁸² Works, i, p 54-57.

¹⁸³ Works, i, p 154, 163.

¹⁸⁴ Works, i, p 126.

¹⁸⁵ Works, i, p 166.

¹⁸⁶ Works, i, p 476.

¹⁸⁷ Works, i, p 477-479.

¹⁸⁸ Works, i, p 483.

Chapter 3 - The Allegiance Controversy (during the period 1700-1710)

The last two chapters contrasted Hoadly's religious ideas with those of the moderate Nonconformists and Deists. Although it is very difficult to separate religious and political thought during this period, the present chapter turns more specifically to Hoadly's political views and the political problems of the time. In particular, the succession and terms of allegiance to the crown became critical issues after the Glorious Revolution.¹ As we know, Mary (James II's eldest daughter) and her husband William became joint Protestant monarchs in 1689, and after they died without issue the succession passed to Mary's Protestant sister Anne. When Anne came to the throne in 1702 she was in the fortunate position of having both hereditary and parliamentary titles. Consequently, she received allegiance from many Tories who supported divine hereditary monarchy, and from Whigs who defended parliamentary monarchy.² However, as her only surviving child had died in July 1700, parliament passed an act in 1701 which vested the Protestant succession in the Electress Sophia of Hanover and her heirs.³ The Hanoverians were the Queen's closest Protestant blood relatives, but not all Englishmen looked forward with enthusiasm to German monarchs. Indeed, the Protestant succession was never secure as long as even some English subjects and foreign governments (especially the country's most powerful enemy France), viewed the hereditary monarchs, Catholic James II and later his son 'James III', as the legitimate kings of England.⁴

¹ H T Dickinson, 'The Eighteenth-Century Debate on the Glorious Revolution' in History, 61, 1976, p 28-45. For the period 1689-94 see Mark Goldie, 'The Revolution of 1689 and the Structure of Political Argument' in Bulletin of Research in the Humanities, vol 83, 1980, p 473, 564.

² Edward Gregg, Queen Anne, London, 1980, p 1, 4, 69, 70. See Holmes, Age of Anne.

³ Gregg, Queen Anne, p 122.

⁴ Gregg, Queen Anne, p 127, 121.

Since the beginning of the eighteenth-century Nonjurors, especially Charles Leslie, and also Tory High Churchmen, including Francis Atterbury and Henry Sacheverell, had been particularly active. They wrote in support of divine (frequently hereditary) monarchy in the state, and also the divine power of the bishops in the Church.⁵ Moreover, they strenuously defended the doctrines of passive obedience and non-resistance to superiors and the monarch in particular.⁶ These doctrines which, according to the Whigs, favoured the exiled Stuarts had, in Gilbert Burnet's opinion, "a free course for many years" until they were vigorously attacked by Hoadly.⁷

The purpose of this present chapter is, therefore, to examine Hoadly's political writings for the Whig cause during the first decade of the eighteenth-century. Historians have tended to concentrate on the classical roots of Whig ideas, or their appeals to experience and history, but less attention has been devoted to the religious aspects of Whig polemic.⁸ In politics, as in religion, Hoadly synthesised classical and Christian ideas and methods.⁹ As we shall see, he employed classical ideas of natural law and natural rights known by reason.¹⁰

⁵ According to Charles Leslie, "I never yet knew any who were Loose as to the Church, but they were equally Seditious to the State. For who allow no Divine Right in the Church, can never find it in the State". - [Charles Leslie], A View of the Times, London, 1708/9 (The Rehearsal in book form), i, p 246.

⁶ L M Hawkins, Allegiance in Church and State, London, 1928 92 ff. [Leslie], A View, I, p 54. (4-11 August, 1705) [Charles Leslie], The New Association, London, 1702, p 17. Francis Atterbury, A Sermon preach'd before the London clergy at Saint Alphage, May 17, 1709, London, 1710. (Translated from Latin), p 8. For Sacheverell see Holmes, Sacheverell. W A Speck, editor, F F Madan: A Critical Bibliography of Dr Henry Sacheverell, Lawrence, Kansas, 1978.

⁷ Burnet editor, Own Time, v, p 424. For Burnet see Claydon, William.

⁸ For the influence of classical ideas see J G A Pocock, Politics, Language and Time (1971), 1972, especially chapters 3 & 4. Pocock, Machiavellian Moment and Virtue, Commerce and History, Cambridge, 1985. For the influence of experience, history and the ancient constitution in Whig polemic see Kenyon, Revolution Principles, p 2. Dickinson, Liberty and Property, p 11.

⁹ For Christian humanism see Todd, Christian Humanism.

¹⁰ Works, ii, p 168-169, 251-252, 257-258.

But it is also important to appreciate that Hoadly appealed to the principles of Christianity, the Reformation and Church tradition in order to destroy Tory views and promote his Whig vision of society based on natural equality, government by consent and lawful resistance.¹¹

Before focusing on Hoadly's polemic it may be useful to discuss briefly the range of Nonjuring, Tory and High Church propaganda at the beginning of the eighteenth-century. Although there were differences between these groups, Nonjurors, Tories and High Churchmen all shared the belief that Church and state power was divine. As already noted, they were also totally committed to the doctrines of passive obedience and non-resistance. The most extreme version of these teachings was popularised by the brilliant Nonjuring polemicist Charles Leslie, who undoubtedly helped the Tory cause by providing a sustained assault on Whig ideas in Church and state.¹² In The Case of the Regale and Pontificat Stated (1700), Leslie defended the divine power of the bishops and the independent power of the Church against what he considered to be the Whig erastianism of William Wake.¹³ This was swiftly followed by The New Association (1702) in which Leslie and the extreme High Churchman Henry Sacheverell attacked the Whig principle of religious toleration.¹⁴ Differing views of the nature of the Church and its relationship with the state will be discussed more fully in the next chapter of this thesis. At

¹¹ Works, ii, p 54, 89, 122, 138-139.

¹² For Charles Leslie see Hawkins, Allegiance.

¹³ [Charles Leslie], The Case of the Regale and Pontificat Stated, London, (1700), 1702, p 1, 3, & 70. In The Authority of Christian Princes over their Ecclesiastical Synods (1697) Wake spent almost one quarter of the work trying to prove that, from the age of Constantine, Christian rulers had possessed absolute control over church synods. For Wake see Norman Sykes, William Wake - Archbishop of Canterbury 1657-1737, 2 vols, Cambridge, 1957.

¹⁴ [Leslie], New Association, p 1, 2, 5, 17, 20.

this stage, it is merely important to bear in mind that Leslie and Sacheverell, together with other Nonjurors, Tories and High Churchmen, continually questioned the allegiance of Whigs and Latitudinarians to the Church of England.¹⁵

However, the most widespread medium for spreading Nonjuring political ideas was the weekly/twice weekly newspaper The Rehearsal produced by Charles Leslie and his son during the period 1704-1709.¹⁶ From Leslie's point of view, only God granted political power and he believed that it descended through hereditary succession. According to the Nonjuror, whenever this principle was broken it had led to "Murders and Destruction".¹⁷ Leslie praised the Stuarts, but he emphasised allegiance to Anne as a hereditary rather than a constitutional monarch. He wrote that it was

most Apparent that England never saw more Halcyon Days for Peace and Plenty and Prosperity, than in the Reigns of the Stuarts, except when they made themselves Miserable by their Rebellion against King Charles. And ... [under Anne's reign] all the World ... [saw] the Glory of England Rais'd by a Stuart.¹⁸

Like Robert Filmer before him, Leslie turned primarily to Scripture, Genesis in particular, to support the notion of absolute, hereditary monarchy from Adam to the present day.¹⁹ But, as Hoadly commented (and Mark Goldie has noted), Leslie added to and amended Filmer's work. Indeed, he intertwined arguments from Scripture and a conservative interpretation of nature to make

¹⁵ Henry Sacheverell declared that "Latitudinarian, and Republican Notions would bring forth Rebellious, and Pernicious Consequences". The Perils of False Brethren, both in Church, and State: set forth in a Sermon preach'd before the Right Hon Lord Mayor ... at the Cathedral Church of St Paul, 5 November, 1709, London, 1709, p 33.

¹⁶ [Leslie], A View (The Rehearsal in 3 volumes)

¹⁷ [Leslie], A View, i, numbers 56 & 53.

¹⁸ [Leslie], A View, i, number, 123.

¹⁹ Robert Filmer, Patriarcha: or the Natural Power of Kings, London, 1680, p 11-13. [Leslie], A View, i, numbers 55, 56.

his case.²⁰ To give some examples, Leslie argued that God had created one man “And did not Create the Woman at the same time, lest she might have Pleaded Independency, But made her afterwards out of the Man Which shew’d her Dependency upon him”.²¹ After this people came into the world by natural generation so, according to Leslie, “Nature” had “Imprinted nothing more strongly upon all Mankind, than the Duty and Dependence of Children towards their Parents, and the Superiority of Parents over their Children”.²² However, he maintained that God had also added positive commands and quoted Genesis 3.16: “Thy Desire shall be to thy Husband, and he shall Rule over thee”.²³ The fifth commandment had also impressed “the Obedience of Children to their Parents”.²⁴ For Leslie patriarchal and political power were identical. He wanted to emphasise that men were never free but were always under a state of government, subjection and obedience. Leslie’s position was neatly summarised in The Rehearsal of 18-25 August, 1705 when he wrote that

the State of Nature was at the first a State of Government and Subjection no Independency. That Adam had the Government over Eve. And over all their Children. And all this was Founded in very Nature, besides the positive Institution of God to Render all Sure and Certain and cut off all Occasion of Dispute.²⁵

Leslie had used The Rehearsal and also The Best Answer Ever was Made (1709) to challenge the political views expressed by the eminent Protestant divine Richard Hooker (1554-1600), John Locke (1632-1704) and indeed all

²⁰ Works, ii, p 182. Goldie, ‘Tory Political Thought’, p 218, 219.

²¹ [Leslie], A View, i, number 55.

²² [Leslie], A View, i, number 55.

²³ [Leslie], A View, i, number 55.

²⁴ [Leslie], A View, i, number 55.

²⁵ [Leslie], A View, i, number 56.

who believed that political power was located in the people.²⁶ In The Rehearsal of 3 July, 1708 Leslie maintained that by putting the choice of the government in the people “Mr Hooker” had “gone Wrong in this Matter”. Leslie went on to claim that he had “seen the Mischief” it had done because Hooker was “Quoted by Mr Lock, by Observers and Reviews and most of the Republican Writers”.²⁷

Hoadly’s longest political work, The Original and Institution of Civil Government discussed (1710), was a detailed refutation of the patriarchal political scheme put forward by Charles Leslie.²⁸ Norman Sykes and Edward Bingham both believed that Hoadly’s work was a reply to the High Churchman Francis Atterbury.²⁹ However, the preface and indeed the text made it very clear that Of Civil Government was a direct reply to the writings of Leslie, as well as a more general response to the high Tory views expressed by Atterbury and Sacheverell.³⁰ Hoadly’s book was also a vigorous defence of the ideas of Hooker who he called

the Darling of the Old Church of England; the Favourite of Princes; and as great a Lover of Government and Order as could be. [Moreover] His Notions were never esteemed by Churchmen, to have done dishonour to the Church, or by Princes themselves to have done injury to their Real Authority, and Interest.³¹

²⁶ Richard Hooker, The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity, (1593, 1597, 1648, 1662) 2 vols, London, 1907. Peter Lake, Anglicans and Puritans? London, 1988, chapter 4 Richard Hooker. Dunn, John Locke.

²⁷ [Leslie], A View, iii, number 27. Presumably referring to Leslie’s comment, Hoadly wrote that Hooker had with disrespect been called “the Father of the Whigs and Latitudinarians”. Works, ii, p 253.

²⁸ According to John Hoadly Of Civil Government, was published in 1709 but dated 1710 according to the custom of the printers. It was advertised in The Tatler on 19 January, 1710. The Tatler, edited with an introduction by Donald F Bond, Oxford, 1987, iii, p 416.

²⁹ Sykes, ‘Hoadly’, p 136. Bingham, ‘Apprenticeship’, p 159.

³⁰ Especially The Rehearsal. Works, ii, p 182-184.

³¹ Works, ii, p 250, 251.

During the sixteenth-century Hooker had successfully fused human reason (applauded by Aristotle), with Christian ideas. Peter Lake has argued that Hooker's religious views were particularly influential after 1660 and that to a large extent he 'created' Anglicanism.³² Hoadly certainly followed in Hooker's religious tradition when he rejected excessive religious authority, irrational faith and 'inspired' readings of Scripture.³³ Like Hooker, and indeed Chillingworth, Hoadly viewed God and human nature as rational and encouraged men to apply their God-given reason in an effort to understand the Gospel.³⁴ However, more pertinent to this discussion, Hooker blended Christianity with Aristotle's political ideas.³⁵ For Aristotle, man was a natural political animal who used human reason to establish a constitution, and also a government which made laws for the good of the community.³⁶ As a Christian, Hooker believed that all political power came from God.³⁷ However, by modifying Aristotle's ideas, he concluded that individuals had been granted God-given reason to enable them to decide how this political power was exercised.³⁸ The Protestant divine Richard Hooker was, therefore, quoted by Hoadly, like Locke before him, as the most respected representative of government by consent and the theory of political authority ascending from the

³² Lake, Anglicans, p 230. For Hooker's religious ideas see also Nigel Atkinson, Richard Hooker and the Authority of Scripture, Tradition and Reason, Carlisle, 1997.

³³ Peter Munz, The Place of Hooker in the History of Thought, London, 1952, p 31-32. Works, i, 110, 111; ii, p 561.

³⁴ Munz, Hooker, p 40, 51. Chillingworth, Protestants, p 375. Works, i, p 54-57.

³⁵ For Hooker and Aristotle see chapter 4 of Munz, Hooker.

³⁶ Aristotle discussed different types of constitution but was sympathetic towards the moderating influence of a mixed polity. - Ernest Barker, The Political Thought of Plato and Aristotle, New York, 1959, p 473. The authority of Aristotle was used by all sides; for example Filmer used the authority of Aristotle to defend absolute monarchy whereas the Whigs used his writings to defend a balanced constitution. Mark Goldie, introduction and notes to John Locke's Two Treatises of Government (1689), 1993, p 241. Munz, Hooker, p 127.

³⁷ Munz, Hooker, p 128.

³⁸ Munz, Hooker, 127, 128.

people to the king.³⁹

Charles Leslie certainly believed that Hoadly's ideas were derived from the work of both Richard Hooker and John Locke (1632-1704).⁴⁰ In the period in which Hoadly was writing Locke's Two Treatises of Government (1689) was seen as very philosophical and radical and few late seventeenth and early eighteenth-century Whigs claimed the authority of Locke.⁴¹ Consequently, Harold Laski was convinced that Hoadly actually tried to conceal his debt to Locke.⁴² In contrast, Gordon Schochet has described Hoadly as a "self-proclaimed follower of Locke".⁴³ It is however important to appreciate that Hoadly always claimed that he was defending the political ideas of Hooker, rather than Locke.⁴⁴

At the same time we can not ignore the similarities between Locke's Two Treatises of Government (1689) and Hoadly's Of Civil Government (1710). To give just a few examples, both books were divided into two parts. Locke used the first treatise to attack the patriarchal scheme of government put forward by Sir Robert Filmer in Patriarcha (1680) and chapter one of Hoadly's Of Civil Government was primarily an attempt to demolish Leslie's patriarchalism.⁴⁵ Indeed, Hoadly briefly mentioned "the author" of Two Treatises when he

³⁹ Works, ii, p 184. John Locke, Two Treatises of Government, (1689), edited by Peter Laslett, London, 1960, amended 1963, II, s 5, p 310.

⁴⁰ [Leslie], A View, iii, p 27. [Charles Leslie], The Finishing Stroke, London, 1711, p 33-34. Literature on the authority of Locke in the period is enormous. As an example see Dunn, Locke. Two Treatises, edited by Laslett. Two Treatises, edited by Goldie. Richard Ashcraft, Locke's Two Treatises of Government, London, 1987. Marshall, Resistance. Albritton, 'Locke's Philosophy'. Ashcraft and Goldsmith, 'Revolution Principles'.

⁴¹ Thompson, 'Locke's Two Treatises', p 184, 188. J P Kenyon, 'The Revolution of 1688: Resistance and Contract' in Historical Perspectives, London, 1974, p 57 ff

⁴² Laski, Locke to Bentham, p 69.

⁴³ Gordon J Schochet, Patriarchalism in Political Thought, Oxford, 1975, p 16.

⁴⁴ Works, ii, p 184.

⁴⁵ Laslett edition, Two Treatises, I, s 1. Works, ii, p 184.

rejected the political aspects of patriarchalism and primogeniture.⁴⁶ If we turn to Locke's second treatise and chapter two of Hoadly's book, we find that they both employed their interpretation of Hooker to justify the role of human reason and government by consent.⁴⁷ In addition, they both used the authority of Hooker to defend their belief in the rule of law and the notion that the 'end' or function of government was the common good.⁴⁸ Also, both Locke and Hoadly employed the authority of Hooker and natural rights arguments to defend the lawfulness of resistance to governors in certain extreme circumstances.⁴⁹ However, as Peter Laslett has already mentioned, it is worth noting that, Locke appeared to add quotations from Hooker's work when his own writing was almost complete and they are frequently found in footnotes.⁵⁰ In contrast, Hooker's political views, and perhaps more important the implications drawn from them, form the major part of chapter two of Hoadly's work.⁵¹

Let us now focus more closely on Hoadly's Of Civil Government and examine how he used reason and Scripture to defend the Whig doctrine of natural political equality and promote an ascending view of political authority.⁵² As

⁴⁶ Works, ii, p 190. According to Hoadly some branches of the patriarchal scheme had been examined long ago by the author of Two Treatises (published 1689) "to Him I must in Justice refer the Reader". Also, Works, ii, p 224 - He also referred his readers to the author of Two Treatises to support the view that a right in the eldest child was not of divine institution or a universal rule in civil government.

⁴⁷ Works, ii, p 251. Laslett ed, Two Treatises, II s 91, p 370.

⁴⁸ Works, ii, p 251, 252, 255. Laslett ed, Two Treatises, II; s 94, p 373; s 135, p 403. Hooker, Laws, Book I, p 152, 154, 161, 190-192.

⁴⁹ Laslett ed, Two Treatises, II, s 239, p 475. Works, ii, p 254-256. Peter Lake's work has shown that Hooker was anxious to play down the potential for resistance. Power may have come from the people but Hooker maintained that it could not simply be reclaimed by them. - Lake, Anglicans, p 204. Hoadly's views of resistance will be discussed in more detail on pages 103- p 115.

⁵⁰ Laslett introduction & notes, Two Treatises, p 70, p 70 n 28.

⁵¹ Works, ii, p 182.

⁵² For critical replies see Anon, An Entire Confutation of Mr Hoadly's Book of the Original of Government, taken from the London Gazette, London, 1710. Anon, Obedience to Civil Government Clearly Stated, London, 1711. A R JURA Regiae Majestatis in Anglia, London, 1711.

already mentioned, like Hooker and Locke before him, Hoadly assumed that people were born free and could use God-given reason to establish any form of government which they wished.⁵³ Hooker appeared to acknowledge a double contract, which comprised a “popular contract” to form political society and a “rectoral contract” to establish government.⁵⁴ Although he did differentiate between society and government Hoadly was a little vague on the number of contracts.⁵⁵ He was, however, very sure that it was “Consent” which established “Civil Society, with settled Governours”.⁵⁶ It was, Hoadly explained, a dictate of reason and the voice of God which encouraged people to form a society voluntarily and consent to transfer part of their natural rights of self defence to a civil government.⁵⁷ The aim was to enjoy greater security and live by known laws.⁵⁸ He assumed that assent to the matrimonial contract obliged wives to submit to their husband’s society.⁵⁹ As far as young people were concerned, he declared that when they reached the age of reason they could either tacitly consent and remain in the society or dissent and presumably emigrate.⁶⁰

According to John Kenyon, most Whigs emphasised the historical nature of contractual government.⁶¹ As well as using arguments based on reason, even the radical Whig propagandist Samuel Johnson (1649-1703) used evidence drawn from the past to demonstrate that civil power in England was derived

⁵³ Works, ii, p 254,263. Laslett edit, Two Treatises, II, s 4, p 309; s 132, p 399. Hooker, Laws, Book I, p 192.

⁵⁴ Goldie, ‘The Revolution of 1689’, p 486.

⁵⁵ Works, ii, p 254.

⁵⁶ Works, ii, p 169.

⁵⁷ Works, ii, p 168, 169, 251, 252, 258

⁵⁸ Works, ii, p 252. Laslett, edit, Two Treatises, II, s 124 p 395, 396.

⁵⁹ Works, ii, p 169, 268.

⁶⁰ Works, ii, p 169, 268. Laslett, edit, Two Treatises, II, s 119-123, p 392-395.

⁶¹ Kenyon, Revolution Principles, p 35, 45.

from the community.⁶² Johnson maintained that the original contract was made on the election of the first English king and was continued in the monarch's coronation oath and oath of allegiance.⁶³ It is important to appreciate that Hoadly only very occasionally tried to make contractual government compatible with English history. It is true that he claimed that the parliament which altered the succession had asserted that the original contract between the monarch and people was the foundation of civil authority.⁶⁴ However, in general, Hoadly supported an abstract and rational notion of contract. The "Truth of this Matter" was not "what was actually the Original and Foundation of Government", he declared, as "what ought in Right to have been so".⁶⁵ "The chief Question" was "not whether there was ever such a Contract formally, and actually made: but whether Mankind has not a Right to make it".⁶⁶

However, we should not forget that Hoadly was a Protestant Churchman who used evidence from Scripture to defend the Whig doctrine of natural equality and ascending political authority.⁶⁷ It should be acknowledged that he did use less literal, more flexible interpretations of Scriptural texts than his opponents. Although Scripture spoke in general terms, he complained that Nonjurors and High Churchmen tried to understand them literally. In Hoadly's view, they

⁶² Samuel Johnson, (political divine, domestic chaplain to Lord William Russell) An Argument Proving, That the Abrogation of King James by the People of England from the Regal Throne, and the Promotion of the Prince of Orange, one of the Royal Family, to the Throne of the Kingdom in his stead, was According to the Constitution of the English Government, and Prescribed by it .. (1692), London, 1693 (5th edition) p 54-58.

⁶³ Johnson, Argument Proving, p 58 & 60.

⁶⁴ Works, ii, p 131.

⁶⁵ Works, ii, p 265.

⁶⁶ Works, ii, p 269.

⁶⁷ Quentin Skinner and J G A Pocock have both drawn attention to the dense texture of political discourse and have urged readers to identify the diversity of languages found in texts and to examine these in order to show what authors could/could not say and how they could say it. Quentin Skinner, 'Quentin Skinner on Interpretation' & 'Afterword' in Meaning and Context, edited by James Tully, Cambridge, 1988. Pocock, Virtue, p 6. Pocock, Politics, p 21 & p 25.

searched the Bible for words such as 'obey' and 'subjection' and then they assumed that this meant absolute obedience in all cases.⁶⁸ He accused Leslie and fellow thinkers of plundering the Old Testament in particular to try to prove that there was never a time when men were free.⁶⁹ Leslie had based civil government on the subjection of Eve and their children to Adam. Hoadly, like Locke before him, replied that Adam was only invested with the authority of a father and husband, that this was not civil authority and it was certainly not absolute.⁷⁰ "Dependency or Inferiority of Children" considered in itself, Hoadly remarked, did "not imply in it a Right to Civil Government in those, upon whom they depend[ed] as Children".⁷¹ Along with Locke, Hoadly certainly could not accept that civil authority could have been based on the fifth commandment.⁷² The text commanded obedience to the mother as well as the father and they believed that those who magnified the paternal power perverted the true meaning of the commandment.⁷³

Hoadly was convinced that there was enough Scriptural evidence to support the view that there was equality in biblical times. He argued that Scripture had shown that self-defence had been given by God equally to everyone.⁷⁴ Moreover, as Cain had been afraid of all men, Hoadly contended that it was evident that in those very early days all were equally capable of punishing criminals.⁷⁵ In addition, along with Locke and Defoe, Hoadly maintained that Babel appeared to have been built by voluntary agreement, rather than as a

⁶⁸ Works, ii, p 185, 204, 348.

⁶⁹ Works, ii, p 72.

⁷⁰ Works, ii, p 192, 191, 265. Laslett edit, Two Treatises, I, s 47-49, p 210; I, s 67-76 p 226-234.

⁷¹ Works, ii, p 263.

⁷² Works, ii, p 199. Laslett edit, Two Treatises, I, s 62, p 222.

⁷³ Works, ii, p 199. Laslett edit, Two Treatises, I, s 62, p 222.

⁷⁴ Works, ii, p 261.

⁷⁵ Works, ii, p 261. Laslett edit, Two Treatises, II, s 12, p 315

directive.⁷⁶ Finally, he concluded that there were grounds to suggest that Moses and other Scripture writers lived under elective kingdoms rather than absolute monarchies.⁷⁷

Hoadly was however, undoubtedly most effective when he showed that Leslie had grafted “mere possession” on to the patriarchal scheme.⁷⁸ He held that Leslie’s complicated Scriptural defence was to no avail because in number 66 of The Rehearsal, the Nonjuror had openly admitted that, where there was no claimant who had a better title, the possessor of any throne had a right to all the powers and privileges of the first monarchs.⁷⁹ If there was a dispute over the title, Leslie had acknowledged that, ‘the people’ were to judge.⁸⁰ So, according to Hoadly, Leslie’s version of patriarchal government as a divine institution ended in “mere possession” or approval by the people which made it into an elective kingdom.⁸¹ This was the scheme which professed “to fix Government upon an unmoveable Basis; and to place it out of the reach of Belial, and all his Sons!” then it dissolved into “the most undoubted Title of Mere Possession; and ... [committed] all Disputes about Rightful Possessors, and those nearest in Blood to them, to the People” who Leslie had called “the Mobb”.⁸²

So far we have discussed how Hoadly employed arguments drawn from

⁷⁶ Works, ii, p 262, 263. Laslett, edit, Two Treatises, I, s 145, p 287. Goldie, ‘Tory Political Thought’, p 235. Leslie maintained that Hoadly had borrowed this example from Locke, see Finishing Stroke, London, 1711, p 34.

⁷⁷ Works, ii, p 230, 231, 221.

⁷⁸ Locke ridiculed the supposed certainty of Filmer’s patriarchal political system Laslett edit, Two Treatises, I, s 71-72, p 230-p 231.

⁷⁹ Works, ii, p 235.

⁸⁰ Works, ii, p 237.

⁸¹ Works, ii, p 237, 238. see also Goldie, ‘Tory Political Thought’, p 224.

⁸² Works, ii, p 238.

reason together with evidence from Scripture to support the Whig doctrine of natural equality, government by consent and ascending political authority. We have also seen how Tories, Nonjurors and High Churchmen used the same authorities to champion the notions of divine, descending political authority and natural subjection. It is important to bear in mind that for these latter writers political obligation was also a religious duty. As the doctrine of passive obedience and non-resistance was, as Mark Goldie has demonstrated, the central tenet of Tory party ideology, perhaps we should look at this in some detail.⁸³

Tories, Nonjurors and High Churchmen associated Christianity with obedience, patience and suffering. They reminded their readers that Christ had suffered on the cross and so if Christian subjects were “Persecuted for His sake [then] surely ... Persecution ... [was] not Misery”.⁸⁴ They maintained that good Christian subjects should practice “Patience, Meekness” and “Submission” and were convinced that resistance was a sin.⁸⁵ Without doubt the text most frequently quoted to support these doctrines of passive obedience and non-resistance was St Paul’s Epistle to the Romans, chapter 13, verses 1-5.⁸⁶ As so much of the dispute between Whigs and Tories, in particular Hoadly and his opponents, surrounded the interpretation of this it may be worth quoting in full.

1 Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers.
For there is no power but of God: the powers that be

⁸³ Goldie, ‘Tory Political Thought’, preface, p 5, 10, 12 and chapter 12.

⁸⁴ Anon, An Enquiry into the Nature of the Liberty of the Subject, And of Subjection to the Supreme Powers, London, 1706, p 15.

⁸⁵ [Leslie], A View, i, number 54. Atterbury, Sermon ... May 17, p 6 & 27. I Peter 2 v 18. Offspring Blackall, The Lord Bishop of Exeter’s Answer to Mr Hoadly’s Letter, London, 1709, p 30. Anon, Revolution no Rebellion, 1709, p 30.

⁸⁶ [Leslie], A View, i, number 73. Offspring Blackall, The Divine Institution of Magistracy, and the gracious Design of its Institution, London, 1709, p 3. Atterbury, A Sermon ... May 17, p 3.

are ordained of God.

2 Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.

3 For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of this power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same:

4 For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the Sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil.

5 Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake.⁸⁷

It was not always clear whether Nonjurors and High Churchmen believed that subjection applied only to the supreme magistrate or all those in authority. Charles Leslie and Francis Atterbury appeared to apply it to anyone in power, whereas Offspring Blackall, the Tory Bishop of Exeter, assumed that it was only the supreme power.⁸⁸ In general, Blackall's declarations seemed to have become more extreme over the years. In 1705 he had preached a sermon which acknowledged the human organisation of government.⁸⁹ However, on 8 March, 1708/9, on the anniversary of Anne's accession to the throne, Blackall preached a sermon in front of the Queen which supported The Divine Institution of Magistracy. Based on the text of St Paul's Epistle to the Romans, (chapter 13, verse 4), he maintained that regardless of how a ruler came to

⁸⁷ St Paul's Epistle to the Romans, chapter 13, v 1 - 5, King James version of the Bible, 1611, revised 1881.

⁸⁸ [Leslie], A View, i, number 73. Blackall, Divine Institution, p 7 and Answer, p 6, 7, 10. Atterbury, Sermon ..May, 17, p 6 & 12. Blackall's appointment in 1707 had infuriated the Whigs. Queen Anne had promised the see of Exeter to Blackall without consulting her ministers, see Hoadly, 'Narrative', p 61, 59. Gregg, Queen Anne, chapter 9. See also N Sykes, 'Queen Anne and the Episcopate', English Historical Review, 50, 1935.

⁸⁹ Hoadly, Some Considerations, humbly Offered to the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Exeter: Occasioned by his Lordship's Sermon Preached before her Majesty, March 8, 1708, London, 1709 in Works, ii, p 127. See also Hoadly's An humble Reply to the Right Reverend Bishop of Exeter's Answer, London, 1709.

office he became God's instrument.⁹⁰ He was, according to the Bishop, accountable to God and not the people, and therefore entitled to the active or passive obedience of his subjects.⁹¹ Hoadly was convinced that this merely condoned successful usurpation.⁹² The Bishop who was no match for Hoadly soon bowed out of the ensuing dispute.⁹³ His supporters, who included the Nonjuror Charles Leslie, generated a bitter pamphlet war, in part because Hoadly, who was a lowly cleric and Rector of St Peter le Poor, had dared to challenge the views of a bishop.⁹⁴

Blackall, Atterbury, Leslie and others were all convinced that Scripture taught that both benevolent and wicked rulers were God-given, so that to resist them was to resist God.⁹⁵ "Rebellion was", according to Leslie, "the first Sin of Lucifer and his Rebel Angels, for which no Repentance" was "Granted them".⁹⁶ In a sermon first preached on 29 September 1708, and repeated in Latin on 17 May 1709, Atterbury emphasised that "He that resisteth the Power" of the

⁹⁰ Blackall, Divine Institution, p 7, 8.

⁹¹ Works, ii, p 136. Blackall, Divine Institution, p 6, 7. The same point is made in Atterbury's Sermon ... 17 May, p 16, 17.

⁹² Works, ii, p 137, 138.

⁹³ Blackall, Answer. Richard Steele, Hoadly's friend and political ally parodied Blackall's language in The Tatler. An impersonator of the Bishop was made to say "because being without Books, if I don't show much Learning, it will not be imputed to my having none". Tatler, edited by Bond, i, p 317 & 356. See also Winton Calhoun, 'The Tatler: From Half-sheet to Book' in Prose Studies, 16, April, 1993 p 23-33. Hoadly and Steele were involved in other joint enterprises. Hoadly wrote the anonymous 'Dedication to Pope Clement XI' which was prefixed to Sir Richard Steele's Account of the Roman Catholick Religion throughout the World, London, 1715. Hoadly's satirical 'Dedication' and 'Preface' were addressed to the current Pope in an effort to assure him that popery was alive and well in Great Britain. Works, i, p 554.

⁹⁴ For example see Anon, Tom of Bedlam's Answer to His Brother Ben Hoadly, London, 1709, p 5. The author called Hoadly "a Fellow who hath just Impudence enough to scandalize his superiors, in hopes to become some Body, tho' it be upon the Ruin of others". Anon, A Submissive Answer to Mr Hoadly's Humble Reply to My Lord Bishop of Exeter, London, 1709, p 2. Anon, A Letter to a Noble Lord, London, 1709, p 3. [Charles Leslie], The Best Answer Ever was Made, London, 1709, preface.

⁹⁵ Atterbury, Sermon .. May 17, p 18 & 9. Anon, The Plea of Publick Good, 1706, p 4, 10. Blackall, Answer, p 23 & 24. Anon, St Paul, p 8.

⁹⁶ [Leslie], A View, i, number 92.

Prince “resisteth the Ordinance of God; and they that resist, shall receive to themselves Damnation”.⁹⁷ Moreover, in the famous “Perils of False Brethren” sermon, for which he was later impeached, Sacheverell insisted that resistance was a sin and that “The Grand Security of our Government, and the very Pillar upon which” it stood was “founded upon the steady Belief of the Subject’s Obligation to an Absolute, and Unconditional Obedience to the Supream Power, in All Things Lawful, and the utter Illegality of Resistance upon any Pretence whatsoever”.⁹⁸

According to Tories and High Churchmen passive obedience and non-resistance was not only a primitive Christian principle, it was also a Reformation principle.⁹⁹ Indeed, they appeared to view the Reformation as a restoration of true Christian obedience. In the popular History of Passive Obedience Since the Reformation (1689, republished in 1710 to support Henry Sacheverell), the Nonjuring divine Abednego Seller (1646?-1705) had argued that Luther and Calvin had urged obedience and warned against resistance.¹⁰⁰ Luther certainly preached passive obedience during the 1520s, and until the closing years of Calvin’s life he defended the Pauline doctrine of non-resistance.¹⁰¹ Seller assumed that later generations of Calvinists

⁹⁷ Atterbury, Sermon ... May 17, p 9. See also Blackall, Answer, p 2.

⁹⁸ Sacheverell, Perils, p 19. Sacheverell was tried for high crimes and misdemeanours in February/March, 1710. Articles of impeachment - Article I - Sacheverell had said that the resistance used to bring about the Revolution was odious and unjustifiable. Article II - he had called toleration unreasonable. Article III - he argued that the Church of England was in danger from the Queen’s [Whig] administration and article IV - that the Queen’s men worked towards the destruction of the constitution. He was also charged with perverting texts of Holy Scripture and abusing his holy office to disturb the peace. Holmes, Sacheverell, p 280, 281. Speck, editor, Bibliography of Dr Henry Sacheverell.

⁹⁹ Goldie, ‘Tory Political Thought’, p 25. Anon, Liberty of the Subject, p 7.

¹⁰⁰ [Abednego Seller] (1646?-1705) The History of Passive Obedience Since the Reformation, Amsterdam, 1689, p 126. DNB, xvii, p 1164.

¹⁰¹ Luther made Paul’s Epistle to the Romans, chapter 13, verse 1 one of the most cited texts. Quentin Skinner, The Foundations of Modern Political Thought, Cambridge, 1978, ii, p 15, 17, p 193.

inherited the doctrine to resist and depose kings from agnostics, papists or in some cases “pretended reformers of the Reformation”.¹⁰² There was undoubtedly some truth in this. Quentin Skinner has argued that in order to uphold natural and fundamental liberties of mankind and the doctrine of resistance, Philippe du Plessis Mornay, and other leading Huguenots, drew on the work of earlier radical Catholic scholars.¹⁰³ Finally, Seller claimed that the Reformed Church of England, her divines and homilies had always preached obedience and the sin of resistance.¹⁰⁴

Tories were convinced that the doctrine of resistance which Hoadly and other Whigs had adopted would lead once again to civil war and regicide.¹⁰⁵

Clarendon’s History of the Rebellion, which came to be seen as a Tory version of the seventeenth-century struggle, was published in 1702, 1703 and 1704, and undoubtedly intensified the dispute over the causes of the English Civil War.¹⁰⁶ This, together with the 30 January anniversary sermons, popularised the martyrdom of Charles. Perhaps none were as extreme as William Binckes (1653-1712) who, in a sermon preached to convocation on 30 January 1702, compared Charles favourably to Jesus and drew a parallel between the execution of Charles I and the crucifixion of Christ!¹⁰⁷ Tories, Nonjurors and High Churchman held, that Charles was the “Best of Princes”, a man of piety

¹⁰² [Seller], Passive Obedience, preface. Anon, Liberty of the Subject, p 7. Anon, St Paul, p 9. [Leslie], A View, i, number 86. Goldie, ‘Tory Political Thought’, p 25.

¹⁰³ When Mornay discussed tyranny in his Defence of Liberty against Tyrants (1579) he referred the reader to Aquinas, Bartolus and codifiers of the Roman law and when he considered the right to resist he showed a dependence on conciliarist political thought and referred to the ‘Sorbonnists’, Almain and Mair. Modern Political Thought, ii, p 323, 332, 334, 337.

¹⁰⁴ [Seller], Passive Obedience, preface, 8-10.

¹⁰⁵ [Seller], Passive Obedience, preface. Roger L’Estrange, Two Cases Submitted to Consideration, London, 1709, p 15, 16. Anon, A Layman’s Lamentation on the 30 January for the Horrid, Barbarous, and Never to be Forgotten Murder of Charles the First, London, 1710, p 12.

¹⁰⁶ Goldie, ‘Tory Political Thought’, p 199.

¹⁰⁷ William Binckes became dean of Lichfield in 1703.

and they were convinced that all who supported “the Power of the People, and the Resistance of Kings” were “Guilty of the Blood of that King”.¹⁰⁸

Tories used ‘de facto’ and providential theories to accommodate the Revolution and could never accept that force had been used in 1688, or that active resistance was lawful.¹⁰⁹ The Nonjuror Charles Leslie put forward a conservative and passive view of the events of 1688 and explained that “the Revolution did not proceed upon the Deposing Doctrine, or the Principle of Resistance, but only upon the Vacancy and Abdication” of James II.¹¹⁰ Leslie gave his own definition of Revolution Principles: it was “that Principle upon which the Convention Proceeded at the Revolution. And this was the Vacancy of the Throne, and Abdication. And not the Deposing Doctrine”.¹¹¹ It was, he declared, the Convention which made the Revolution, not, as the Whigs believed, the Revolution which made the Convention.¹¹² Forcefully, he argued that the Whigs wanted to make the deposing doctrine respectable because they aimed to control the Queen and all future monarchs.¹¹³

In contrast, Hoadly and other Whigs insisted that resistance had been used in 1688 and were convinced that the Protestant succession would never be

¹⁰⁸ Anon, Liberty of the Subject, p 14. Anon, Obedience, p 30. [Leslie], The Best Answer, p 3. [Charles Leslie], The Good old Cause, or Lying in Truth, London, 1710, p 15. [Charles Leslie], The Good Old Cause, Further Discuss'd in a Letter to the Author of the Jacobites Hopes Reviv'd, London, 1710, p 27. Thomas Sherlock, Sermon Preach'd before the Queen at St James's, on Monday 31 January, 1703/4, London, 1704, p 20, 26. In contrast Hoadly's anniversary sermons urged moderation and defence of the legal constitution - Works, iii, p 653, 658, 659.

¹⁰⁹ Goldie, 'Tory Political Thought', p 90-107. Straka, 'The Final Phase of Divine Right Theory in England 1688-1702', The English Historical Review, 77, 1962, p 638-658. [Leslie], A View, i, number 85. Anon, Revolution no Rebellion, p 2 & 26.

¹¹⁰ [Leslie], A View, i, number 85. Sacheverell also maintained that the throne became vacant in 1688, see Perils, p 21.

¹¹¹ [Leslie], A View, i, number 86.

¹¹² [Leslie], A View, i, number 90.

¹¹³ [Leslie], A View, i, number 86. Sacheverell expressed the same sentiments in Perils, p 34.

secure unless the population were satisfied “about the Lawfulness of that Resistance” by which the Protestant monarchs William, Mary and Anne had acceded to the throne.¹¹⁴ The remainder of this chapter aims to demonstrate how Hoadly defended the Whig doctrine of the lawfulness of limited resistance with arguments drawn from reason and Scripture. His main points were put forward in a sermon preached before the Lord Mayor and Corporation of London on 29 September 1705 as well as Measures of Submission to the Civil Magistrate considered (1706) which was a long and very substantial defence of that sermon. Hoadly’s dispute with the High Churchman Offspring Blackall (1709), two assize sermons which Hoadly preached at Hertford (March 1707/8 and July 1708) and Of Civil Government (1710) also provided detailed evidence of his position. Finally, twelve election pamphlets published in 1710 demonstrated that even after the Sacheverell affair, when Whigs were particularly unpopular, Hoadly was willing to defend the Whig doctrine of the lawfulness of resistance.¹¹⁵

Perhaps we should first consider how Hoadly employed arguments drawn from reason, natural law and natural rights to support the Whig theory of resistance. As we have already seen, Hoadly held that individuals who were equal transferred their natural right of self-defence to a governor, or governors, so that they could enjoy more security by living according to the rule of law.¹¹⁶ In the tradition of Hooker and also Locke, Hoadly claimed that God had not specified absolute monarchy but had left mankind to organise government

¹¹⁴ Gilbert Burnet, An Enquiry Into the Measures of Submission to the Supream Authority, 1693 edition, p 2. Johnson, An Argument, p 16. Works, ii, p 99. Anon, A Modest Reply, p 22. See also Kenyon, ‘Resistance and Contract’, p 43-69.

¹¹⁵ Works, i, p 601-686, especially i, p 603, 606-10, 615-616, 642, 679. See also Bingham, ‘Apprenticeship’.

¹¹⁶ Works, ii, p 135, 252, 253.

according to the “Dictate of their own Reason”.¹¹⁷ It was, Hoadly believed, God’s will and the voice of reason that the magistrate should have all the authority necessary for his office.¹¹⁸ However, although he accepted that the governor was above every individual, Hoadly made it plain that the magistrate was not above society as a whole.¹¹⁹ The ruler’s power was, he insisted, limited. Firstly, it was limited by the “Laws of Nature and Reason”.¹²⁰ Even the “Law of the Nation” could not, in Hoadly’s view, be valid if it contradicted the “Universal Law of Reason” which was “the Law of the Whole World”.¹²¹ Secondly, he employed the authority of Aristotle, Cicero and Hooker to show that the power of the governor was also limited to promoting the good of society.¹²² Like the Whig divine William Stephens (1647?-1718), Rector of Sutton, Hoadly maintained that a subject’s political allegiance was determined by whether or not the magistrate promoted the welfare and happiness of the society rather than his own selfish interests.¹²³ Individuals may have transferred their natural rights of self defence but never gave them up and always retained the right of defending themselves and the good of their community.¹²⁴ Consequently, Hoadly declared that, “Every Sort, and every Degree of Resistance” which was “inconsistent with the Public Good” he condemned but “Every Sort, and every Degree of Resistance” which was “necessary for the Public Good” he applauded and recommended.¹²⁵

¹¹⁷ Works, ii, p 111. Hooker Laws, II, p 181, 182, 192. Laslett edit, Two Treatises, II, s 74 p 359.

¹¹⁸ Works, ii, p 258.

¹¹⁹ Works, ii, p 255.

¹²⁰ Works, ii, p 22.

¹²¹ Works, ii, p 69.

¹²² Works, ii, p 230.

¹²³ Works, ii, p 10. William Stephens, A Sermon Preach’d Before the Honourable House of Commons, January 30 1699/1700, London, 1700, p 22, 23. DNB, xviii, p 1068.

¹²⁴ Works, ii, p 61, 64, 131, 135.

¹²⁵ Works, ii, p 96.

Hoadly's Nonjuring and Tory High Church adversaries were furious with his declarations. Offspring Blackall and others maintained that the people had already learnt the right of resistance from their own corrupt natures.¹²⁶ Along with Atterbury, they believed that "instead of deterring Men from Vice", Hoadly had instructed them how far they could "approach the Confines of Sin without incurring the guilt".¹²⁷ Atterbury and Leslie and many others accused Hoadly of promoting treason.¹²⁸ They were convinced that no monarchy, aristocracy or government would ever be secure under Hoadly's principles.¹²⁹ The author of The Plea of Publick Good (1706) argued that the true grounds of allegiance was authority, not convenience as, he believed, Hoadly maintained.¹³⁰ If the public good was made the measure or grounds of allegiance, he was sure that it would bring anarchy and confusion and set up "the public Good as expounded by private Fancies against the Laws".¹³¹

Understandably, Tory propaganda claimed that Hoadly actively encouraged individual subjects to resist the single mismanagement of a monarch who respected the law.¹³² But Hoadly always made it clear that he expected subjects and governors to adhere to the rule of law.¹³³ Public interest, he continually repeated, was far more important than private interest and he used

¹²⁶ Blackall, Answer, p 30. Atterbury Sermon, ... May 17, p 25.

¹²⁷ Atterbury, Sermon, ... May 17, p 25. Anon, Obedience, p 3. Blackall, Answer, p 25.

¹²⁸ Atterbury, Sermon, ... May 17, p 25. [Charles Leslie], Best of All, London, 1709, p 30. Anon, St Paul, p 10.

¹²⁹ Anon, A Submissive Answer, p 8. Anon, A Letter to a Noble Lord, London, 1709, p 8. [Charles Leslie], Best Answer, p 5. Anon, A Letter to a Friend Occasion'd by the Contest between the Bishop of Exeter and Mr Hoadly, London, 1709, p 8.

¹³⁰ Anon, Plea of Public Good, p 11.

¹³¹ Anon, Plea, p 11. [Leslie], Best Answer, p 17.

¹³² Anon, Plea, p 11. [Leslie], Best Answer, p 17.

¹³³ Works, ii, p 113, 672; iii, p 679.

the words “the People”, “the Society”, “the Nation” to emphasise that limited resistance to a governor was collective rather than individual.¹³⁴ Although he accepted that “the People” were not infallible, he insisted that they knew when their “Rights and Properties” were invaded.¹³⁵ Even so, he anticipated that collective resistance to a governor would be rare.¹³⁶ Indeed, “the Nation” may have considered it necessary to obey an “oppressive or unjust Act of their Rulers” as long as this obedience was consistent with the Public Good”.¹³⁷ On numerous occasions he assured his audience that resistance to a governor would only be undertaken in very extreme circumstances, as in 1688 when a popish monarch trampled over the rights and liberties of the subjects.¹³⁸

As we have discussed, Hoadly defended resistance by using arguments drawn from natural law and natural rights. However, Nonjurors and High Churchmen claimed that passive obedience was a Christian principle and maintained that resistance was a sin. Throughout his works, Hoadly always associated Christianity with freedom and liberty.¹³⁹ Consequently, he spent most of his time in this debate trying to convince his audience that Christian and Reformation principles and practices supported liberty and the Whig doctrine of lawful resistance. In both his September sermon of 1705 and Measures of Submission (1706) Hoadly reinterpreted St Paul’s Epistle to the Romans, chapter 13 verses 1-5 to suit the Whig cause. “No Passage in the whole New Testament”, he declared, “had been more abused” than verse one.¹⁴⁰ (Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no

¹³⁴ Works, ii, p 37, 68.

¹³⁵ Works, ii, p 61.

¹³⁶ Works, ii, p 32.

¹³⁷ Works, ii, p 32.

¹³⁸ Works, ii, p 37; i, p 608.

¹³⁹ Works, ii, p 122.

¹⁴⁰ Works, ii, p 361.

power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God".) His opponents, he contended, had "put it upon the Rack" and "tortured it into a Confession of Absolute Non Resistance".¹⁴¹ As far as Hoadly was concerned "higher powers" did not mean the divine power of a monarch but public power which needed to be obeyed because it was higher than the power of each individual.¹⁴² "The powers that be are ordained of God" he explained was a Scriptural expression which meant that no one had power except by God's general providence.¹⁴³ He was convinced that this did not confer God's authority on all governors, because some abused their position and he was sure that God would never have been the patron of evil.¹⁴⁴

According to verse two of the epistle, St Paul had declared that "they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation". St Paul had given a general prohibition against resistance but, according to Hoadly, he had not intended it to be interpreted absolutely.¹⁴⁵ In Hoadly's view, Nonjurors and High Churchmen merely 'assumed' that obedience was due to bad as well as good governors and believed that all resistance was a sin.¹⁴⁶ In contrast, Hoadly interpreted verses 3 and 4 "rulers are not a terror to good works for "he is the minister of God to thee for good" to indicate a functional approach to government and political allegiance.¹⁴⁷ Paul had not, Hoadly insisted, used any other arguments to prove that a particular government was from God other

¹⁴¹ Works, ii, p 359.

¹⁴² Works, ii, p 252.

¹⁴³ Works, ii, p 284, 282, 322, 18.

¹⁴⁴ Works, ii, p 80. William Fleetwood also maintained that the magistrate's power was a "Power of doing good". 'A Sermon on the Queen's Accession to the Throne Preach'd at St Austin's, in 1703' printed in Four Sermons, London, 1712, p 119, 121.

¹⁴⁵ Works, ii, p 204.

¹⁴⁶ Works, ii, p 137, 204, 295.

¹⁴⁷ Works, ii, p 33.

than its “usefulness”.¹⁴⁸ Magistrates had been given a limited commission, Hoadly asserted, and that was to promote peace, virtue and happiness in the community and he was convinced that only a government which pursued these ends was “ordained by God”.¹⁴⁹ Political allegiance and submission was, he continually repeated, only due to a governor who promoted the common good.¹⁵⁰

Hoadly used his assize sermon at Hertford, on 26 July 1708, to refute Leslie’s extreme views of absolute monarchy and absolute passive obedience. He demonstrated that St Paul’s behaviour showed that Christianity, natural rights and civil liberties were totally compatible and supported lawful resistance. In two instances, which he cited, Paul had been illegally beaten and imprisoned on the orders of the civil magistrate and in the third the high priest had sanctioned the flogging.¹⁵¹ According to Hoadly, Paul’s behaviour provided useful examples of how Christians should have behaved in society.¹⁵² Unlike some eighteenth-century commentators, Paul did not believe that Christians were to suffer anything that could have been honourably avoided.¹⁵³ Paul was, Hoadly claimed, a Christian who respected authority designed for the good of society but would not quietly submit to oppression.¹⁵⁴ The apostle’s

¹⁴⁸ Works, ii, p 33.

¹⁴⁹ Works, ii, p 126, 18.

¹⁵⁰ Works, ii, p 26.

¹⁵¹ Works, ii, p 119, 120. The same example was given by the anonymous author/s of The Judgement of Whole Kingdoms and Nations, Concerning the Rights, Power, and Prerogative of Kings, and the Rights, Priviledges, (sic) and Properties of the People, London, 1710 p 64. It was a radical Whig tract which expressed views similar to Locke’s. It was first published in 1689-90 as Political Aphorisms but was substantially revised and published in 1709 under the title Vox Populi Vox Dei. Enlarged, it was published again in 1710 as Judgement. See Goldie, ‘Revolution of 1689’, p 553. Ashcraft and Goldsmith ‘Revolution Principles’, p 773-800.

¹⁵² Works, ii, p 120.

¹⁵³ Works, ii, p 119. see John Kettlewell, Christianity a Doctrine of the Cross, 1691, in Hawkins, Allegiance, p 70.

¹⁵⁴ Works, ii, p 121.

Christianity had not made him forget that his privileges as a subject were under the protection of the law.¹⁵⁵ Hoadly declared that some of his own contemporaries maintained that “Rights and Privileges, Property, and the like” were merely words used by the Whigs to “raise the Spirits of the People and to foment Disturbances in Society”, but he claimed that Paul believed that they were things worth fighting for.¹⁵⁶ Paul’s liberty to resist oppression was, Hoadly explained, derived from a number of sources - his Christianity, the law of nature and Roman law. Paul was, he insisted, “standing fast, not only in the Liberty with which Christ had made him free from the Jewish Law of Ceremonies; but also in that Liberty with which the Laws of Nature and the Roman State, had made him free from Oppression and Tyranny”.¹⁵⁷

According to Hoadly, and other Whig writers including Richard West, prebendary of Winchester, lawful resistance was also a Reformation principle.¹⁵⁸ The Reformation was, in Hoadly’s view, a return to primitive Christian freedom and liberty instead of the excessive authority claimed by the Church of Rome.¹⁵⁹ Although Hoadly did not mention specific names, he contended that the doctrine of resistance was taught by the very first Protestant reformers and chief Protestant writers.¹⁶⁰ Certainly, in the 1530s when the armed forces of the Emperor Charles V were about to destroy the Lutheran Church, Luther, Melancthon, Jonas and Spalatin suddenly proclaimed

¹⁵⁵ Works, ii, p 122, 123.

¹⁵⁶ Works, ii, p 122.

¹⁵⁷ Works, ii, p 122.

¹⁵⁸ Works, ii, p 54, 138, 139, Richard West, (born 1671) A Sermon Preached before the Honourable House of Commons, At St Margaret’s, Westminster, on Monday 30 January, 1709/10, London, 1710, p 21. Anon, A Modest Reply to the Unanswerable Answer to Mr Hoadly, London, 1709, p 6. See also W D J Cargill Thompson ‘Luther and the Right of Resistance to the Emperor’ in Studies in the Reformation, edited by C W Dugmore, London, 1980.

¹⁵⁹ Works, ii, p 54, 122, 138-139.

¹⁶⁰ Works, i, p 608.

themselves willing to endorse lawful resistance.¹⁶¹ As well as the passages upholding the duty of non-resistance, Calvin's Institutes of the Christian Religion (1559 edition) also included a clear suggestion that if a ruler went beyond the bounds of his office he ceased to count as a genuine magistrate.¹⁶² Revolutionary protagonists of Calvinism in England and Scotland went much further. John Ponet (1514-56) and Christopher Goodman (1520-1603) maintained that if an elected magistrate did not promote good in the community, then the whole body of the people were entitled to resist him.¹⁶³ John Knox (1505-72) insisted that it was not merely a right, but a duty for individuals to resist a wicked ruler.¹⁶⁴

Hoadly confidently declared that resistance was not a sin at the Reformation when Protestants had separated rather than submit to the tyranny of the Church of Rome.¹⁶⁵ In his view, there was absolutely no reason to consider resistance a sin at the 1688 Revolution when both civil and religious liberties had been endangered by a popish prince.¹⁶⁶ As already noted, his opponents considered resistance a papal doctrine, but Hoadly argued that the pope deposed kings in the interest of his own church not for the good of society.¹⁶⁷ Indeed, Hoadly believed that it was passive obedience which was based on papal doctrines.¹⁶⁸ It was the Church of Rome, he asserted, which declared itself an infallible judge and expected Christians passively to submit to

¹⁶¹ Skinner, Modern Political Thought, ii, p 199.

¹⁶² Skinner, Modern Political Thought, ii p 219.

¹⁶³ Skinner, Modern Political Thought, ii, 221-223.

¹⁶⁴ Skinner, Modern Political Thought, ii, p 236-238.

¹⁶⁵ Works, ii, p 54, 138, 139.

¹⁶⁶ Works, ii, p 138.

¹⁶⁷ Works, ii, p 88.

¹⁶⁸ Works, ii, p 96, 97.

her Scriptural interpretations and ordinances.¹⁶⁹ Liberty of inquiry and liberty of judging were, Hoadly believed, in the Protestant not the papal tradition.¹⁷⁰

As we have seen, Tories and High Churchmen had contended that the doctrine of resistance inevitably resulted in England's Civil War (1642-49) and the sin of regicide. Understandably, Hoadly and other Whigs refuted this charge. White Kennett (1660-1728) (Archdeacon of Huntingdon, minister of Botolph and later Bishop of Peterborough) maintained that the English Civil War was caused by French interest and popery at court as well as fear of oppression in the people.¹⁷¹ Richard West was convinced that those who had flattered Charles I and preached doctrines of absolute passive obedience were partly responsible for the terrible events.¹⁷² The Civil War, Hoadly insisted, resulted from extreme rather than moderate religious ideas, as well as personal hatred and republican schemes. In rather equivocal language he declared that the doctrine of resistance could only be used to defend the murder of King Charles if it could be proved that his life was inconsistent with public security.¹⁷³ Finally, he ventured to suggest that the doctrine of limited resistance was not wrong because some had abused it.¹⁷⁴

Hoadly also tried to assure his audience that the Whig doctrine of limited resistance accorded with the the doctrines of the Reformation Church. The High Church Lower House of Convocation had criticised Hoadly's September

¹⁶⁹ Works, ii, p 97.

¹⁷⁰ Works, ii, p 96, 97.

¹⁷¹ White Kennett, A Compassionate Enquiry into the Causes of the Civil War in a Sermon Preached in the Church of St Botolph, Aldgate January 31, 1703/4, London, 1704, p 7, 11, 16 & 21. For Kennett see G V Bennett, White Kennett 1660-1728 Bishop of Peterborough, London, 1957.

¹⁷² West, Sermon 30 Jan, 1709/10, p 18.

¹⁷³ Works, ii, p 71, 72.

¹⁷⁴ Works, ii, p 72.

1705 sermon which, they asserted, contained “Positions contrary to the Doctrine of the Church, expressed in the first and second parts of the Homily against Disobedience or Wilful Rebellion”.¹⁷⁵ Consequently, he used the preface to the first edition of Measures of Submission to suggest that although the Lower House railed against resistance they held their own sessions in defiance of their Archbishop’s authority.¹⁷⁶ Furthermore, writing in 1710, Hoadly maintained that Atterbury and other High Churchmen had not even considered the homilies when they believed that the rights of the Church were invaded. “Peace” was Hoadly declared “but a Trifling Consideration, when they thought that the Ecclesiastical Administration” was in danger .¹⁷⁷

In any event, in true Latitudinarian tradition Hoadly, and also Gilbert Burnet, claimed that it was only necessary to subscribe to the general tenor or homilies of the Church, not everything prescribed in them.¹⁷⁸ Moreover, Hoadly insisted that his opponents had not differentiated between rebellion and lawful resistance.¹⁷⁹ Rebellion, he agreed, was a sin; it was the act of proud, ambitious subjects who challenged their governors for personal gain.¹⁸⁰ However, he was absolutely convinced that this was not the same as lawful resistance which was sometimes necessary to save a country from ruin.¹⁸¹ There were, at the Revolution, many good Churchmen who had asked

¹⁷⁵ [Atterbury], Some Proceedings, p 35. See also Anon, Liberty of the Subject, p 2, 6.

¹⁷⁶ Hoadly, Measures, preface to the first edition 1706 & Works, ii, p 288. His High Church adversaries were furious and, presumably for tactical reasons, this was omitted from later editions.

¹⁷⁷ Works, ii, p 353.

¹⁷⁸ Works, ii, p 91. Gilbert Burnet, The Bishop of Salisbury. His Speech in the House of Lords on the first article of the Impeachment of Dr Henry Sacheverell, London, 1710, p 4. Hoadly applauded Burnet’s dedication to the cause of liberty and religion - Works, i, p 551 and defended Burnet’s History of the Reformation (1697, 1681, 1714) from critics - Works, iii, p 249, 262.

¹⁷⁹ Works, ii, p 93.

¹⁸⁰ Works, ii, p 93.

¹⁸¹ Works, ii, p 93. see also Burnet, Speech.. on Impeachment, p 9, 16.

the Prince of Orange to defend the nation against King James.¹⁸² These Churchmen, Hoadly was sure, had not imagined that they were acting against the doctrines of the Church of England. Indeed, he went on to argue it was limited resistance in 1688 which had saved the Protestant Church of England from popery.¹⁸³

Nevertheless, Tories and High Churchmen went on to maintain that the doctrine of resistance was contrary to the judgment of Church of England divines.¹⁸⁴ In defence Hoadly, like Locke, claimed that “the great and judicious Mr Hooker” had laid down principles which tended towards resistance.¹⁸⁵ In addition, both Locke and Hoadly argued that even Bishop Bilson, (1547-1616, Bishop of Worcester and Winchester), who was a vigorous assertor of the prerogative of kings, had acknowledged that princes could under certain extreme circumstances forfeit their power and also the obedience of their subjects.¹⁸⁶ Further, several convocations of the Church of England in Queen Elizabeth’s time had granted financial aid to foreign Protestants.¹⁸⁷ These convocations had, in Hoadly’s words, “publicly acknowledged it glorious to assist Subjects in their Resistance to their Sovereigns, and their endeavours to rid themselves of their Tyranny and Oppressions”.¹⁸⁸ Finally, according to Hoadly, William Falkner, who was the author of Christian Loyalty (1679) and one of the most strenuous defenders of non-resistance, had plainly allowed the lawfulness of resistance in some

¹⁸² Works, ii, p 92.

¹⁸³ Works, ii, p 90.

¹⁸⁴ Anon, An Enquiry, p 6-8.

¹⁸⁵ Works, ii, p 89. Laslett edit, Two Treatises, II, s 239, p 475.

¹⁸⁶ Works, ii, p 89. Laslett edit, Two Treatises, II, s 239, p 475. Bilson, The True Difference between Christian Subjection and Unchristian Rebellion (1585) DNB, ii p 505, 506.

¹⁸⁷ Works, ii, p 89.

¹⁸⁸ Works, ii, p 89.

cases.¹⁸⁹

Mark Goldie's research has revealed that most Tories and High Churchmen never believed that obedience was totally unlimited.¹⁹⁰ A careful reading of Tory and High Church pamphlets does show that subjects were actively obliged to perform all just commands of the sovereign, but if the instruction was considered impious or unjust they were urged to passively face the consequences associated with non-compliance.¹⁹¹ Hoadly was well aware that some of the patrons of passive obedience had taught that there were limits to active obedience and that passive obedience itself was indeed a form of resistance.¹⁹² However, he could not understand why Tories and High Churchmen who supported the Protestant regime would not admit that they supported limited, lawful resistance which was, in his view, the very foundation of the Protestant establishment.¹⁹³ Some of these men, he was convinced, unwittingly aided the Jacobite cause.¹⁹⁴ In desperation he exclaimed that if the Tories and High Churchmen used

these Words without telling the World that by unlimited non-resistance they ... [meant] Limited; that by Divine Hereditary Right, they ... [meant] Human Parliamentary Right; ...[was] not the same Mischief done, as if they meant what our Jacobites profess[ed]?¹⁹⁵

¹⁸⁹ Works, ii, p 89. Hawkins, Allegiance, p 28-31.

¹⁹⁰ Goldie, 'Tory Political Thought', p 28.

¹⁹¹ Atterbury, Sermon ... 17 May, p 3, 8, 9. Blackall, Answer, p 25, 26.

¹⁹² Works, ii, p 52, 68,

¹⁹³ Works, ii, p 357.

¹⁹⁴ Works, ii, p 361, i, 658.

¹⁹⁵ Works, i, p 659.

Conclusion

As we have seen, since the beginning of the century there had been an upsurge of Nonjuring, High Church and Tory views. The Nonjuror Charles Leslie was particularly active in promoting the extreme doctrines of hereditary right, absolute monarchy, passive obedience and the sinfulness of resistance. Hoadly maintained that unless the population were convinced about the lawfulness of resistance on which, he believed, the Protestant succession was founded there would have been a feeling of “national guilt”, followed by a “national repentance” and consequently a restoration of the Catholic Stuart monarchs. Hoadly vigorously defended the resistance used in 1688 and made every effort to demonstrate that the natural rights doctrine of resistance was completely compatible with Christian, Reformation principles, the homilies of the Church and ideas of leading Protestant divines since the Reformation.

In 1704 Hoadly was a little known London cleric, but after his defence of the doctrine of resistance he was subjected to a torrent of abuse from Tories, Nonjurors and High Churchmen alike. Indeed, in the period surrounding the Sacheverell trial, Hoadly’s books and effigy were burnt by the Tory mob.¹⁹⁶ By 1710 he was recognised as one of the leading Whig propagandists and praised by influential Whigs including Edmund Calamy and Gilbert Burnet as well as receiving the patronage of Mrs Howland and the Whig Duke of Bedford.¹⁹⁷ Perhaps most important, his considerable work for the Whig cause was acknowledged by the House of Commons. On 14 December, 1709

¹⁹⁶ Homes, Sacheverell, 169, 234-235, 247.

¹⁹⁷ Calamy, Abridgment, p 69, 615, 618 cited in John Hoadly, introduction to the Works, i, p ix. In February, 1710 he was presented with the Rectory of Streatham by Mrs Howland, grandmother to the Duke of Bedford and became chaplain to the Duke. see Works, i, p ix. Burnet, Speech ...on Impeachment, p 15.

Anthony Henley, MP for Weymouth and Sir Joseph Jekyll put forward two pro-Hoadly resolutions which were carried by the Whig House of Commons.¹⁹⁸ It was proposed

1 that the Reverend Mr Benjamin Hoadly, Rector of St Peter's Poor, London, for having often strenuously justified the Principles, on which her Majesty, and the Nation, proceeded in the late happy Revolution, hath justly merited the Favour and Recommendation of this House.

2 That an humble Address be presented to her Majesty, That She would be graciously pleased to bestow some Dignity in the church on Mr Hoadly, for his eminent Services both to Church and State.¹⁹⁹

¹⁹⁸ Holmes, Trial, p 95 - CJ, xvi, p 242. Works, i, p ix. Anthony Henley consistently championed the Whigs and his opponents made every effort to displace him. - DNB, ix, p 413. Sir Joseph Jekyll entered Parliament in 1697. He supported the Whig Junto under Queen Anne and was one of the managers of the Sacheverell impeachment. Romney Sedgwick, History of Parliament - The Commons 1715-1754, London, vii, p 174.

¹⁹⁹ The Queen answered "that she would take a proper Opportunity to comply with their Desires" but she never did so. Works, i, p ix.

Chapter 4 - The Bishop and the Bangorian Controversy (1717-1720)

As we have seen in chapter three, Hoadly had become a tireless campaigner for the Whig cause. Consequently, when the internal divisions of the Tories, together with the accession of the first Hanoverian monarch in 1714 improved the position of the Whigs, he shared in their good fortune. He was awarded a Lambeth Doctor of Divinity in January 1715/16, became a King's chaplain in February, and in March was consecrated Bishop of Bangor.¹ However, in March 1717 Hoadly preached a sermon which caused such a furore that it generated a pamphlet war which continued for the following three years.² A committee of the Lower House of Convocation was established to consider the sermon and his Preservative against the Principles and Practices of the Nonjurors both in Church and State which had been published in 1716.³ It duly charged the Bishop of Bangor with preaching doctrines which tended to subvert all government and discipline in the Church of Christ, by which they meant the Church of England.⁴ The committee was also convinced that Hoadly's principles impeached royal supremacy in ecclesiastical matters and weakened the King's ability to enforce religious obedience by civil

¹ John Hoadly, 'Hoadly', in Works, i p ix. According to Lambeth Act Book VB/I/vi, p 201 William Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury conferred the degree of Doctor of Divinity on Hoadly - the warrant was given on 25 January, 1715/16. Hoadly was confirmed as Bishop of Bangor on 14 March and consecrated at Ely House chapel on 17 March 1715/16 - VB/I/vi, p 209.

² Benjamin Hoadly, The Nature of the Kingdom, or Church of Christ. A Sermon preached before the King, at the Royal Chapel at St James's, On Sunday, March 31, 1717, London, 1717.

³ Benjamin Hoadly, A Preservative against the Principles and Practices of the Nonjurors both in Church and State. Or, An Appeal to the Consciences and Common Sense of the Christian Laity, London, 1716.

⁴ Works, ii, p 452 & 453. A Report of the Committee of the Lower House of Convocation, Appointed to draw up a Representation to be Laid before the Arch-Bishop and Bishops of the Province of Canterbury concerning several Dangerous Positions and Doctrines contained in the Bishop of Bangor's Preservative and his Sermon Preach'd March 31, 1717, (5th edition), London, 1717, p 4.

sanctions.⁵ According to the Nonjuror William Law (1686-1761), there was “not a Libertine or Loose-Thinker in England” who had not imagined that Hoadly intended “to dissolve the Church as a Society”.⁶ Writing many years later, the historian Norman Sykes maintained that it was “evident from the tenor of this sermon” that Hoadly “had reduced the visible church to ruins, and enthroned in its place the principle of unlimited private judgement”.⁷ H T Dickinson also appeared to accept this interpretation in an article published in 1975.⁸ In contrast, John Hunt writing in 1870-73, Paul HSSERT (1951), Gordon Rupp (1986), Stephen Taylor (1987) and Rebecca Warner (1996 and 1999) came to the conclusion that Hoadly had not said anything which denied a visible church.⁹

It must be acknowledged that the Bangorian controversy as it became known was, as Thomas Herne (died 1722) observed at the time, “logged and retarded by Dispute purely personal”.¹⁰ Nevertheless, when scandal, abuse, misrepresentation and numerous digressions are put to one side a study of

⁵ Works, ii, p 499. Report of the Committee p 4. The report was prepared by the committee of the Lower House but was not debated by the full house as Convocation was prorogued. According to Norman Sykes, although Hoadly was blamed for the prorogation, the “real cause of the silencing of the convocation was the open scandal of its own internal dissension”, Church and State, 1934, p 310. For a defence of the committee see [Robert Moss] (1660-1729) The Report Vindicated from Misreports: Being a Defence of my Lords the Bishops, As well as the Clergy of the Lower House of Convocation, London, 1717.

⁶ Law, Bishop of Bangor's Late Sermon, p 2. See also J H Overton, William Law, Nonjuror and Mystic, London, 1881.

⁷ Sykes, Church and State, p 293. Sykes, ‘Hoadly’, p 143. See also Perry, History, iii, p 282.

⁸ Dickinson, ‘Hoadly’, p 351.

⁹ Hunt, Religious Thought, iii, p 386/7. HSSERT, ‘Bangorian Controversy’, p 244. Rupp, Religion in England, p 99. Stephen Taylor, ‘Church and State in England in the Mid-Eighteenth Century - The Newcastle Years 1742-62’, unpublished PhD, Cambridge, 1987, p 48. Warner, ‘Bangorian Controversy’, p 77. Warner, ‘Low Churchmanship’, p 142.

¹⁰ Thomas Herne, ‘An Account of the Pamphlets on either side in the Bangorian Controversy’, in Works, ii, p 397. Like Hoadly, Thomas Herne had the patronage of the Whig Duke of Bedford. A layman, he supported Hoadly in the Bangorian controversy and in 1719 published an account of all the pamphlets issued in the controversy to the end of 1718. DNB, Vol 26, p 250.

the Bangorian controversy is extremely worthwhile. The controversy provides an insight into the most ferocious clash, between Nonjurors, Deists and also between Anglican clerics themselves, over the character of the Church and the relationship between Church and state.¹¹ The purpose of this chapter is to examine Hoadly's ideas on the nature of the Church of England and the manner in which it was supported and contrast this with the views of his opponents.

Before analysing Hoadly's ideas in this controversy, it is important to view the Preservative and the sermon in their political and religious contexts. A Preservative against the Principles and Practices of the Nonjurors both in Church and State (1716) was Hoadly's first contribution to the debate which became known as the Bangorian controversy. As the title suggests, the book was a response to the Nonjurors, particularly a collection of papers written by the late George Hickes, and also Laurence Howell's The Case of Schism in the Church of England truly stated which were both published in 1716.¹² As noted in the introduction, Nonjurors had refused to swear allegiance to the post-Revolution monarchs and had consequently been forced out of their positions. Many, including George Hickes, Laurence Howell and Henry Dodwell were Churchmen who were deprived of their livings. As the work of L M Hawkins and John Findon has shown, the Nonjurors were talented writers who propagated their view of the Church and state.¹³ The Nonjurors asserted

¹¹ These included Nonjuror William Law, Bishop of Bangor's Late Sermon. Deist Thomas Gordon, The Independent Whig, no vii, Wed 2 March, 1720. For Gordon see McMahon, Radical Whigs, p 159. High Churchman Thomas Sherlock, Some Considerations Occasioned by a Postscript from the R R the Lord Bishop of Bangor to the Dean of Chichester, London, 1717. Latitudinarian divine Arthur Ashley Sykes, A Letter to the Reverend Dr Sherlock, London, 1717.

¹² Works, i, p 575, 576. Laurence Howell was arrested, tried and sent to prison for this work. He died in Newgate, 19 July, 1720.

¹³ Hawkins, Allegiance. Findon, 'Nonjurors'.

the independence of the Church and totally rejected lay deprivations.¹⁴ The Church, they maintained, was a spiritual kingdom where Christ was the king and the bishops his vicegerents on earth.¹⁵ After the Revolution the Nonjurors maintained that they were the 'true' Protestant Church of England and accused the established Church of perjury, heresy and schism.¹⁶ Moreover, they told the laity that by communing with a schismatical institution, they could not benefit from God's grace and would consequently be damned.¹⁷

The Whig administration considered these publications incitements to rebellion and a number of writers including White Kennett (1660-1728), William Wake (1657-1737), Thomas Bennet (1673-1728) and Arthur Ashley Sykes (1684/3-1756) tried to combat the Nonjuring propaganda. Nevertheless, according to Thomas Herne, the Whig ministry did not find any of these defences totally satisfactory.¹⁸ This was perhaps understandable, for only Sykes provided a focused response.¹⁹ Kennett's three letters were rather rambling historical accounts.²⁰ William Wake's anonymous tract maintained that the Nonjurors were guilty of heresy and schism, and Bennet became embroiled in whether or not schism amongst bishops, and between bishops

¹⁴ George Hickes, The Constitution of the Catholick Church and the Nature and Consequence of Schism, published by Thomas Deacon, London, 1716 p 26. See also H Broxap, 'Jacobites and Non-Jurors' in Social and Political Ideas, edited by Hearnshaw.

¹⁵ Hickes, Constitution, p 26 & 24.

¹⁶ Hickes, Constitution, p 233, 299, 30, 32, 74. [Laurence Howell] The Case of Schism in the Church of England truly stated. (no date or place of publication) p 1, 32. Herne, 'An Account' in Hoadly, Works, ii, p 381.

¹⁷ Hickes, Constitution, p 74, 28, 33, 72. [Howell], Schism, p 14 & 18.

¹⁸ Herne, 'An Account', in Works, ii p 382.

¹⁹ John Disney, Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Arthur Ashley Sykes, London, 1785. Sykes was appointed Rector of Dry Drayton in 1714 and Rector of Rayleigh in 1718. In December 1718 he became afternoon preacher of King Street Chapel, Westminster, where his friend Dr Samuel Clarke was Rector. In 1740 Bishop Hoadly gave Sykes a prebendal stall at Winchester. DNB, LV, p 255 & 256. [Arthur Ashley Sykes], An Answer to the Nonjurors Charge of Schism upon the Church of England, London, 1716.

²⁰ [White Kennett], Three Letter[s] to the Lord Bishop of Carlisle, London, 1713-1716.

and their flocks was contagious.²¹ It was thus left to Hoadly to take up the challenge.

Hoadly described his Preservative as an “Antidote” to the dangerous ideas of the Nonjurors.²² It was certainly a powerful piece of Whig propaganda. He vigorously defended the 1688/9 Revolution settlement. Most important, Hoadly argued that all the complicated Church principles of the Nonjurors were based on one state principle - they denied the Protestant succession.²³ He was convinced that the Nonjurors were using the Church for their own purposes. They claimed the independence of the Church, spoke of special spiritual powers and asserted the illegality of lay deprivations of clerical appointments with the aim of weakening the civil establishment.²⁴ But, as we shall see in more detail later in this chapter, Hoadly reminded his readers that since the Reformation the “legislative Authority had a Right to Deprive the Bishops and Clergy”.²⁵ This was, he remarked, a civil rather than a spiritual power and was used in order to maintain the security of the state.²⁶

Let us now examine the context within which the Bangorian sermon was written and delivered. As already noted, it was preached before the King, on Sunday 31 March 1717, at the royal chapel of St James’s. The text for the

²¹ [William Wake], A Vindication of the Realm, and the Church of England From the Charge of Perjury, Rebellion and Schism, Unjustly laid upon them by the Non-Jurors, London, 1716, p 4. Thomas Bennet, The Non-Jurors Separation from the Public Assembly’s of the Church of England Examined, And Proved to be Schismatical, upon their own Principles (second edition) London, 1716, p 10 & 17. Bennet became deputy chaplain to Chelsea Hospital and preacher at St Lawrence Jewry. Emlyn praised him for his ‘small respect to decrees of councils or mere church authority’. DNB, ii, p 238/239.

²² Works, i, p 563.

²³ Works, i, p 563.

²⁴ Works, i, p 561, 587, 570.

²⁵ Works, i, p 570.

²⁶ Works, i, p 574, 582.

sermon was John, xviii.³⁶ The Nature of the Kingdom, or Church of Christ. The subject may have been suggested by the King and it was published by royal command.²⁷ The accession of a Lutheran king in 1714 had certainly caused a great deal of uncertainty regarding the future of the Church of England. Indeed, numerous pamphlets had debated the issue. A History of the Lutheran Church (1714) maintained that the Church was quite safe because the religion of King George was perfectly “agreeable to the Tenets of the Church of England”, but in contrast the Nonjuror Thomas Brett’s A Review of Lutheran Principles (1714) argued that Lutheran ideas would contaminate the established Church.²⁸ Clergymen were particularly alarmed in case the German alliance led to plans to reorganise the Church to include Protestant Dissenters and at the same time give unlimited toleration to Unitarians and Deists.²⁹ Although King George always affirmed his support for the established Church it became obvious that he was also determined to help dissenting Protestants.³⁰

The Whig ministry were also ideologically committed to removing the civil disabilities from Protestant Dissenters. At the same time, they undoubtedly hoped to secure the support of Dissenters in subsequent elections.³¹

Consequently, in early March 1717, Lords Stanhope and Sunderland, Lord Chancellor Cowper and Bernstorff agreed in principle to repeal the acts

²⁷ Works, i, p 402. John Hoadly, ‘Supplement’ in Works, i, p x. Rupp, Religion in England, p 91.

²⁸ Anon, A History of the Lutheran Church: or, The Religion of our Present Sovereign King George Agreeable to the Tenets of the Church of England, London, 1714, p 18 & 25. Thomas Brett, A Review of the Lutheran Principles, London, 1714, p 9.

²⁹ Every, High Church Party, p 126.

³⁰ Clyve Jones and Geoffrey Holmes, editors The London Diaries of William Nicolson, Bishop of Carlisle 1702-1718, Oxford, 1985, p 651.

³¹ Jones, Nicolson, p 668/669.

against Occasional Conformity and Schism Acts.³² The Tories maintained that the legislation would seriously weaken the Church and even the Whigs did not give the proposals their unqualified support. William Nicolson (1655-1727) the Whig Bishop of Carlisle organised opposition to the legislation in the spring of 1717 and on the 18th March 1717, told the King that few of the bishops in the House of Lords would support this measure.³³ Consequently on 23rd March, after consulting seven bishops including Hoadly, the Lord Chancellor came to the conclusion that a repeal bill did not have enough support at that time.³⁴ At that point Cowper considered helping the Dissenters by waiving the Sacramental Test or amending the Corporation Act.³⁵

Unlike the Tories and some of his Whig brethren, Hoadly fully supported the removal of civil disabilities from Dissenters and the sermon can be understood as providing support for the policy of the King and the Whig administration.³⁶

³² Jones, Nicolson, p 640/641. Townshend and Walpole did not attend this meeting. By March 1717 the government had split into two irreconcilable camps Stanhope & Sunderland and Townshend and Walpole factions. Townshend and Walpole and the breakaway Whigs supported the acquittal of Oxford to embarrass the government. In the eventual Whig schism later in the year, Hoadly supported the King and Whig ministers against the Prince of Wales and the Townshend faction. Clyve Jones and David Lewis Jones, editors, Peers, Politics and Power 1703-1911, London, 1986, p 185/186 & 194. See also G M Townend, 'Religious Radicalism and Conservatism in the Whig Party under George I: The Repeal of the Occasional Conformity and Schism Acts' in Parliamentary History, 7, pt I, 1988.

³³ Jones, Peers, p 192, p 193 - According to Jones, Nicolson was probably translated to Derry in 1718 for organising opposition to the legislation in 1717 and his later opposition to Hoadly -. Jones, Nicolson, 59 & 641. By the autumn of 1717 Nicolson had come to the conclusion that if some concessions were necessary it was better to repeal the act against Occasional Conformity than suspend the Test. - Sykes, Wake, ii, p 117.

³⁴ Jones, Nicolson, p 651 & 641.

³⁵ Jones, Nicolson, p 668, 641. In a letter dated 22 November, 1717, Gibson informed Wake that the Bishops of Worcester, Gloucester, Norwich, Salisbury, Lichfield as well as Gibson himself would agree to the abolition of the Sacramental Test as far as it concerned corporations. Wake Episc Corresp. vol 20-480.

³⁶ Dean Sherlock was absolutely convinced that Hoadly's Bangorian sermon was designed to make way for the repeal of the Test Act. Thomas Sherlock A Vindication of the Corporation and Test Acts in Answer to the Bishop of Bangor's Reasons for the Repeal of Them, London, 1718, preface. Vindication will be discussed in more detail on pages 151-154 of this thesis.

In contrast to those Churchmen who wanted to continue to protect the legally established Church by legislative means, Hoadly reminded his audience that Christ had never called on the “secular arm” to enforce his religious doctrines or back his spiritual authority.³⁷ The sermon was also a vigorous attack on what Hoadly believed was excessive authority within the Church of England.³⁸ It is important to appreciate that, unlike A Preservative, the Bangorian sermon was not specifically aimed at the Nonjurors. Indeed, it was directed at all those who claimed absolute authority over the faith of others.³⁹ Understandably, Hoadly did not use the sermon to criticise individual Churchmen but presumably he reflected on the harsh manner in which his friend Samuel Clarke (1675-1729) and William Whiston (1667-1752) had been treated by Church governors when they had rejected the traditional interpretation of Scripture.⁴⁰ No doubt Hoadly was also aware of Edmund Gibson’s (1669-1748) proposals for tightening Church discipline which were published in 1717.⁴¹

³⁷ Works, ii, p 407.

³⁸ Works, ii, p 405.

³⁹ Hoadly, Nature of the Kingdom, ii, p 404- 406.

⁴⁰ Hoadly did not become directly involved in the Trinitarian controversy but he abhorred the treatment given to Whiston and Clarke. Hoadly’s (anonymous) A Letter to A Friend in Lancashire (1714) and his (anonymous) Dedication to Pope Clement XI and Preface which was prefixed to Sir Richard Steele’s Account of the Roman Catholick religion throughout the World (1715) both asserted that religious matters should be decided by an individual appeal to Scripture. He rejected, what he considered to be, the intolerant methods used in the Church of England. Works, i, p 529, i, p 534.

⁴¹ Edmund Gibson, Of Visitations Parochial and General ... To which are added Tracts relating to the Government and Discipline of the Church of England, London, 1717, p vii, x, 108, 112. Gibson became Bishop of Lincoln in 1716 and was translated to London in 1720. For Gibson see N Sykes, Edmund Gibson, Bishop of London (1669-1748), London, 1926. Stephen Taylor, ‘“Dr Codex” and the Whig “Pope”: Edmund Gibson, Bishop of Lincoln and London, 1716-1748’ in Lords of Parliament, Studies 1714-1914, edited by R W Davis, Stanford, 1995. Stephen Taylor, ‘Bishop Edmund Gibson’s proposals for church reform’ in From Cranmer to Davidson, edited by Stephen Taylor, Woodbridge, 1999.

The Bangorian controversy was a conflict over different views of the nature of the Church. Hoadly's opponents, or the Anti-Bangorians as Hessert has called them, emphasised the visible Church and aimed at an ordered, disciplined community of believers.⁴² In contrast, Hoadly and his supporters (the Bangorians) were in many respects in the tradition of Martin Luther (1483-1546), John Hales (1584-1656) and William Chillingworth (1602-1644) when they stressed the individual nature of faith and the spiritual character of the true church.⁴³ The Bangorians and Anti-Bangorians used the same language and often employed similar concepts. Indeed, the conflict between them was sometimes the result of a difference in emphasis. As we shall see, although the Bangorians assumed the need for the visible Church to teach and bring men closer to Christ, they undoubtedly assigned more significance to the invisible Church and the individual nature of salvation.⁴⁴ In contrast, the Anti-Bangorians attached great importance to the visible Church and the communal aspects of religion but they also employed the notion of the invisible church when it suited their purposes.⁴⁵

Let us look at the Anti-Bangorians in a little more detail. One of Hoadly's most persistent critics was the Tory High Churchman Thomas Sherlock (1678-1761) who was Dean of Chichester and chairman of the committee of the Lower

⁴² Hessert used the terms Bangorian and Anti-Bangorian - 'Bangorian Controversy', p 114, 138. Reardon, Reformation, p 197, 198. Alistair E McGrath, Reformation Thought, Oxford, 1988, p 112, 137.

⁴³ For Luther see Reardon, Reformation, p 71, 72. Rupp and Drewery, Luther, p 166, 59, 60. Carl R Trueman, Luther's Legacy, Oxford, 1994, p 60, 62, 75. McGrath, Reformation Thought, p 68, 80, 133-138. Chillingworth, Protestants, p 259, 265, 376-377. John Hales, Golden Remains of the Ever Memorable, Mr John Hales, introduced by John Pearson, second edition, London, 1673. George, Men of Latitude, p 37, 38.

⁴⁴ Works, ii, p 407-408, 473, 477. Arthur Ashley Sykes, The Difference between the Kingdom of Christ, and the Kingdoms of this World, London, 1717, p 4, 5, 18.

⁴⁵ Snape, Letter to the Bishop of Bangor, p 5. Hare, Church-Authority, p 30, 34.

House of Convocation which was established to consider the sermon and Preservative.⁴⁶ It has been suggested that they had been enemies since their student days at Catherine Hall, Cambridge.⁴⁷ Hoadly certainly believed that Sherlock made the conflict in the Bangorian controversy very personal.⁴⁸ Andrew Snape (1675-1742), headmaster of Eton, Francis Hare (1671-1740), Dean of Worcester, and Henry Stebbing (1687-1763), Rector of Rickingham, also launched into print to attack Hoadly's views. The Anti-Bangorians also included Nonjurors such as William Law who held more extreme views than those within the Church.⁴⁹

The Anti-Bangorians viewed the Church primarily as a visible society with governors, rules and regulations.⁵⁰ Most important, they maintained that Christ had given divine authority to his apostles and contended that this authority was passed down to the Church governors who succeeded them.⁵¹ Although they did not claim infallibility they appeared to believe that the holy spirit was guiding them in their decisions.⁵² Consequently, these men maintained that they had an obligation to enforce religious doctrine and practice and assumed that it was the duty of the laity to obey.

⁴⁶ At this time Thomas Sherlock was Dean of Chichester see Edward Carpenter, Thomas Sherlock (1678-1761), London, 1936.

⁴⁷ Add MS 5841 anecdote relating to Hoadly and Sherlock copied from the Cambridge Chronicle of 1 September, 1764.

⁴⁸ Works, ii, p 585.

⁴⁹ For further details see p 18-19 and 144-146 of this thesis.

⁵⁰ Hare, Church-Authority, p 34.

⁵¹ Law, Bishop of Bangor's Late Sermon, p 9-11. John Cockburn, Answers to Queries concerning Some Important Points of Religion, London, 1717, p 30. Robert D Cornwall, 'The Church and Salvation: An Early Eighteenth-Century High Church Anglican Perspective' in Anglican and Episcopal History, 62, 1993.

⁵² William Law, A Second Letter to the Bishop of Bangor; wherein his Lordship's Notions of Benediction, Absolution, and Church-Communion Are prov'd to be Destructive of every Institution of the Christian Religion, London, 1717, p 28.

The Anti-Bangorians were convinced that their view of the Church accorded with the principles of Christianity and the Reformation. For the Anti-Bangorians, Christianity was characterised by the authority of Christ, the apostles and their successors and obedience to their laws.⁵³ The love of God was, they believed, incomplete until it had been proved by a test of obedience.⁵⁴ The Nonjurors as well as the Anti-Bangorians within the Church maintained that their views conformed to the doctrine and practice of the early church before it had been corrupted by the excesses of Rome.⁵⁵

The Anti-Bangorians always stressed the orderly, disciplined nature of the Reformation. According to them the Reformation was carried out in an organised way by the magistrate and the people.⁵⁶ After the break with Rome they insisted that the Protestant reformers recognised the need for religious authority, order and discipline.⁵⁷ The Anti-Bangorians undoubtedly feared the destructive influence of unrestrained religious liberty.⁵⁸ They accepted that individual liberty had played a part in the Reformation but they were convinced that it had to be controlled. In the early days of the Reformation, Thomas Sherlock contended that some had pleaded individual Christian liberty which left no room for Christian discipline.⁵⁹ As far as the Dean was concerned, these were merely a few religious fanatics. However, if the Reformation had

⁵³ Hare, Church-Authority, p 17. Cockburn, Answers, p 30. Joseph Trapp, The Real Nature of the Church or Kingdom of Christ, London, 1717, p 13.

⁵⁴ Snape, Second Letter, p 34.

⁵⁵ [Howell], Schism, p 2. Hickes, Constitution, p 278.

⁵⁶ Sherlock, Vindication, p 31.

⁵⁷ Proculator, Answer, p 29. Sherlock, Vindication, p 31.

⁵⁸ John Cockburn, A Short and Impartial Review of the Lord Bishop of Bangor's Sermon, London, 1718, p 32. Henry Stebbing, Remarks upon a Position of the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Bangor concerning Religious Sincerity, London, 1718, p 11. Stebbing, The True Meaning and Consequences of a Position of the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Bangor concerning Sincerity, London, 1719, p xiv.

⁵⁹ Sherlock, Vindication, p 31.

continued on these lines Sherlock was sure that Christianity would have been lost to individual supremacy, stupidity and ignorance.⁶⁰ It was, he insisted, necessary to preserve authority in Church matters and settle ecclesiastical government for the “better reformation of Religion”.⁶¹

Let us now turn our attention to the Bangorians. Historians have maintained that Hoadly did not have any support within the Church.⁶² It must be acknowledged that, in print at least, Hoadly’s opponents by far outnumbered his supporters. Nevertheless, it is important to appreciate that a small but articulate number of Churchmen did share Hoadly’s views on the nature of the Church. These included Arthur Ashley Sykes (1683/4-1756), Rector of Dry Drayton; John Jackson (1686-1763), Rector of Rossington; Daniel Whitby (1638-1726), Chantor of Salisbury; Thomas Pyle (1674-1756), Minister of St Nicholas’s Chapel, Lynn, and William Fleetwood (1656-1723), Bishop of Ely.

As discussed in chapters two and three of this thesis, Hoadly did not associate Christianity and the Reformation with religious authority but with religious freedom.⁶³ It was, the Bishop warned, “Authority alone” which kept up the “Grossest Errors” and “Authority” which “prevented All Reformation”.⁶⁴ Hoadly and the Bangorians maintained that religious freedom, individual religious inquiry and individual judgement in matters of faith were the basic principles of Christianity and the principles of the Reformation.⁶⁵ Christ had, in their view,

⁶⁰ Sherlock, Vindication, p 31.

⁶¹ Sherlock, Vindication, p 31.

⁶² Dickinson, ‘Hoadly’, p 351.

⁶³ Works, i, p 153, 159; ii, p 122, . 821.

⁶⁴ Works, ii, p 571-572.

⁶⁵ Works, ii, p 615, 744, 746-747. [Thomas Herne], The False Notion of a Christian Priesthood, and the Pretences to Sacerdotal Obligation, ...Being an Answer to Mr Law’s Second Letter to the Bishop of Bangor, London, 1718, 16, 18. Whitby, Sermons, 1720, p xi

liberated people from the excessive religious authority of the Jewish religion.⁶⁶ They believed that the Roman Church had corrupted this primitive Christian faith with man-made rules and regulations.⁶⁷ But the Reformation had, they contended, restored the individual liberty with which Christ had made them free.⁶⁸

Furthermore, unlike the Anti-Bangorians, Hoadly could not accept that the Reformation had proceeded in a peaceful manner.⁶⁹ He reminded his audience that many Protestants had died in support of their religious freedom.⁷⁰ However, the Bishop and his supporters were sure that individual liberty of religious inquiry which they had regained at the Reformation, and which they maintained was the very foundation of the Church of England, was now being eroded.⁷¹ Hoadly accused his adversaries of “Protestant Popery”.⁷² In other words, he maintained that, despite the Reformation many English Protestants continued the practices of oppression and bigotry which he associated with the corrupt Roman Church.⁷³ He argued that for “Decency’s Sake” his Protestant opponents “Acknowledge[d] the Protestant Principles” of liberty of individual religious inquiry and personal judgement in

⁶⁶ Works, ii, p 562. [Herne], False Notion, p 15.

⁶⁷ John Jackson, The Grounds of Civil and Ecclesiastical Government Briefly Consider’d. To which is added, A Defence of the Bishop of Bangor against the Objections of Mr Law, London, 1718, p 43, 45.

⁶⁸ Works, ii, 474, 559. i, p 597 Jackson, Grounds, p 88. Arthur Ashley Sykes, Some Remarks on Mr Marshall’s Defense of our Constitution in Church and State, London, 1717, p 78. Anon, Mr Chillingworth’s Judgement of the Religion of Protestants, London, 1717, p 23.

⁶⁹ Works, ii, p 482, 742, 743.

⁷⁰ Works, ii, p 961.

⁷¹ Works, ii, p 916 [Sykes], Letter to Dr Sherlock, p 17.

⁷² Works, i, p 544.

⁷³ Works, ii, p 916. i, p 544. The best description of Protestant Popery is found in Hoadly’s Dedication to Pope Clement XI (1715).

matters of faith.⁷⁴ However, according to the Bishop, they “stedfastly adhere[d] to the Popish” principles when, like the Roman Church, they gave authoritative interpretations of Scripture and promoted unquestioning faith and religious ignorance.⁷⁵

Hoadly was convinced that the main problem arose because his opponents used the incorrect authority when they considered the nature of the Church. As noted, they regarded the Church primarily as a visible society and like the Roman Church they had, according to Hoadly, applied “Worldly Notions of Order, Decency, Rule and Subordination, Superiority and Inferiority” to it.⁷⁶ In his view this resulted in excessive authority and an over-emphasis on external order in religious affairs. It promoted the introduction of complicated rituals, “the Uniformity of Gestures, Sounds, Cringings, Bowings, Vociferations, Dresses, Ornaments”, indeed everything which suited “the Eye and Ear and dissipate[d] the understanding”.⁷⁷ Like the early Protestant reformers, Hoadly claimed that the only way to understand “the original intention” of words such as “the Church” or “the Nature of the Thing design’d to be signif’d by them” was “to go back to the New Testament itself”.⁷⁸

Accordingly, in the Bangorian sermon Hoadly used the text of St John to remind his audience that Christ had declared that his kingdom or church was “not of this World”.⁷⁹ The Bishop assured his congregation that the order which Christ stressed was not an outward order of ceremony but

⁷⁴ Works, ii, p 916.

⁷⁵ Works, ii, p 916.

⁷⁶ Works, ii, p 404, 559.

⁷⁷ Works, ii, p 561.

⁷⁸ Works, ii, p 404.

⁷⁹ Works, ii, p 404.

an Internal Order. The Government of Mens lives by Faith, working by Love. The Order of Charity and Humility; of Preferring one another in Love; of Forebearing and Forgiving one another; of Making all reasonable Allowances; and compassionating one another's Infirmities.⁸⁰

As true religion was spiritual, so he believed that only Christ could be the lawgiver and judge in the affairs of conscience and salvation.⁸¹ Christ had not, in Hoadly's view, left behind any vicegerents who could "be said properly to supply his Place; no Interpreters upon whom his Subjects ... [were] absolutely to depend".⁸² The true church was, according to the Bishop, the "Universal Invisible Church of Christ", a spiritual community united in the faith of Christ.⁸³ It was he contended a "Number of Men, whether Small or Great, whether Dispersed or United who truly and sincerely are Subjects to Jesus Christ alone, as their Lawgiver and Judge, in matters relating to the Favour of God and their Eternal Salvation".⁸⁴

The sermon which undermined the view of the Church as primarily a visible, hierarchical, disciplined society of believers caused an outcry. An examination of his writings shows that Hoadly consistently argued against absolute authority and authority in matters of faith.⁸⁵ Nevertheless, his opponents including Thomas Sherlock, as well as Henry Stebbing, Francis Hare, John Cockburn, William Law, and many others claimed that Hoadly

⁸⁰ Works, ii, p 561. This is reminiscent of Stillingfleet in his Preface to Irenicum - "The Unity of the Church is a Unity of Love and Affection, and not a bare Uniformity of Practice and Opinion" quoted in Whitby The Protestant Reconciler, 1683, p 238.

⁸¹ Works, ii, p 404.

⁸² Works, ii, p 404.

⁸³ Works, ii, p 406, 477.

⁸⁴ Works, ii, p 406. Chillingworth, Protestants, p 413.

⁸⁵ Works, ii, p 421.

made this limitation unwillingly and in reality attacked all authority and therefore undermined the very foundations of the Church of England and also the state.⁸⁶ As already noted, for the Anti-Bangorians Church authority was based on divine law and a therefore a prerequisite to Christianity.⁸⁷ So, Andrew Snape found it incomprehensible that he was trying to persuade Hoadly, who was “one of the Governors of Christ’s Church, of the highest Order”, that Christ had left the ministry “a power of Governing”.⁸⁸

However, as an advocate of administration policy and a favourite at court, Hoadly was defended by the King and Whig government. Convocation was prorogued to avoid synodical censure and royal chaplains who wrote against the Bishop were dismissed from office.⁸⁹ Hoadly’s sermon caused offence which had cut across political boundaries. It had certainly not helped Church Whigs such as Wake and Gibson who had been trying to convince the clergy that the administration had good intentions towards them.⁹⁰ In a private letter

⁸⁶ Works, ii, 453. Law, Bishop of Bangor’s Late Sermon, p 22. Sherlock, Condition and Example, p 56. Hare, Church-Authority, p 31. Henry Stebbing, A Defence of the First Head of the Charge of the Committee of the Lower House of Convocation Against the R R Lord Bishop of Bangor, (second edition), London, 1718, p 18, 20. Stebbing was a student of Catherine Hall, Cambridge. A divine, he was known among contemporaries as a champion of Church of England orthodoxy. - DNB, Vol. 18, p 1010. In a newspaper debate which took place during the summer of 1717 - Andrew Snape and William Nicolson, Bishop of Carlisle argued that on advice from White Kennett, Dean of Peterborough, Hoadly had inserted the word “absolutely” in the sermon before it was printed. Hoadly consistently maintained that he had never asked advice on either the writing or printing of the Sermon and Preservative. Snape and Nicolson amended or retracted their versions of the events. Nicolson obviously wished that he had not become involved. In a letter to William Wake he wrote “No man living can more heartily bewail his own Rashness and Inadvertency than I have done ... My Original Sin, in this detestable Struggle was my babbling out Mr Dean’s [Kennett’s] Secret, which he avers, never was committed to me”. Wake’s Letters, vol 20-439 & also Add MS. 6116 p 102 (no date). Snape, Second Letter, p 40. Works, ii, p 429-447.

⁸⁷ Warner, ‘Bangorian Controversy’, p 49,50.

⁸⁸ Snape, A Letter to the Bishop of Bangor, p 24.

⁸⁹ Sykes, Wake, ii, p 110. Francis Hare and Thomas Sherlock were dismissed as royal chaplains for their opposition to Hoadly. DNB, viii p 1249 & xviii, p 94.

⁹⁰ Sykes, Wake, ii, p 109.

to William Wake, Edmund Gibson asked the Archbishop to attend court more regularly in an effort to “hinder mischief”.⁹¹ Timothy Godwin, Bishop of Kilmore believed that Hoadly had hurt the Whigs in two ways - it made the Church Whigs dispute with their lay friends who were very fond of Hoadly’s notions and it had given the Tories more occasion to attack the Whig government.⁹² Lay Whigs including Deists John Toland and Thomas Gordon certainly did come to Hoadly’s aid.⁹³ Writing in The Independent Whig, Gordon assured his readers that as Christ’s Kingdom was not of this world Church governors could not have any dominion over faith.⁹⁴ The dissenting Occasional Papers also reiterated the Bishop’s ideas and argued that his opponents had incorrectly failed to distinguish between government in the state and in the Church of Christ.⁹⁵

In appealing to the notion of the universal invisible church of Christ, Hoadly insisted that he merely repeated claims for individual religious liberty which early Protestant reformers had levelled against the excessive authority of the Church of Rome and its forced outward notion of peace.⁹⁶ As mentioned earlier, it is possible that the Bangorian sermon was suggested by King George who was a Lutheran. Although Hoadly did not specifically mention Luther, his ideas on the nature of the Church were certainly reminiscent of Luther’s writings against an over-institutionalized Catholic church.⁹⁷ Luther

⁹¹ Sykes, Wake, ii, p 111.

⁹² Wake Episc Corresp. File 12, number 185 Godwin to Wake, 2 July, 1717.

⁹³ Gordon, Independent Whig, number vii, Wednesday 2 March, 1720, see also number ix 16 March, 1720. McMahon, Radical Whigs, p 158 ff. Toland’s State Anatomy of Great Britain (1717) which advocated the repeal of penal laws against Dissenters - Sullivan, Toland, p 35.

⁹⁴ Gordon, Independent Whig, vii, ix.

⁹⁵ Occasional Papers, Vol. ii, number 8, p 26.

⁹⁶ Works, ii, p 931, 850, 409.

⁹⁷ Rupp and Drewery, editors, Luther, p 166. McGrath, Reformation Thought, p 140.

had encouraged all Christians to turn to Scripture rather than the authoritative interpretations of the Catholic Church for the tenets of their faith.⁹⁸

Furthermore, the church did not in his view merely signify the visible Roman Church. According to Luther the true church was a spiritual community united by faith in Christ.⁹⁹ This idea of individual faith combined with the spiritual unity of the universal Catholic Church was also evident in numerous English writings including The Bishops Book (1537) and Richard Hooker's Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity (1593-1662).¹⁰⁰ William Chillingworth also defended the notion of individual religious inquiry and the belief that membership of the true or pure church could not be judged by human authority because it was only found in the hearts of men.¹⁰¹ To emphasise this latter point Hoadly quoted the Golden Remains of the Ever Memorable, Mr John Hales. Hales had declared that it was "The Glory of the Church ... not to be seen, and the Note of it to be Invisible" for when they called any visible company a Church it was merely out of courtesy in the sense that they hoped men were what they professed to be.¹⁰²

We have seen that the Anti-Bangorians placed great importance on the visible Church. However, as mentioned earlier there was no firm line dividing Bangorians from Anti-Bangorians and their ideas did overlap. The Lutheran idea of the invisible church was undoubtedly common currency among all Anglican divines at the beginning of the eighteenth-century. As an example

⁹⁸ McGrath, Reformation Thought, p 110, 111.

⁹⁹ H F Woodhouse, The Doctrine of the Church in Anglican Theology 1547-1603, London, 1954, p 161. Rupp and Drewery, Luther, p 166.

¹⁰⁰ Philip Hughes, The Reformation in England, London, 1953, p 31 & 32. Hooker, Laws, vol i, book 3, p 284.

¹⁰¹ Chillingworth, Protestants, p 265, 259, 376-377.

¹⁰² Hales quoted in Works, ii, p 857. For Hales see chapter 6 especially p 210 of this thesis.

Thomas Sherlock, Dean of Chichester, was a High-Churchman and one of Hoadly's most severe critics in the Bangorian controversy. Nevertheless, in an anti-papal sermon preached on 5 November, 1712, the Dean used many of the ideas which Hoadly subsequently employed in the Bangorian sermon.¹⁰³ He argued that Rome had used secular punishments in religious matters, but the Dean did not believe that the church should create power where there was none and for those who urged temporal punishments in matters of religion, he said "the Kingdom of Christ ... [was] not of this World; nor ... [was] it to be erected or supported by Worldly Power".¹⁰⁴

Also, on 13 December, 1716, a few months before the Bangorian sermon, Arthur Ashley Sykes, the Latitudinarian Rector of Dry Drayton, preached a sermon which was essentially the same as Hoadly's. Sykes stressed the spiritual nature of the church, or Kingdom of Christ, and insisted that spiritual and earthly kingdoms should not be governed the same way.¹⁰⁵ Gordon Rupp has given a detailed comparison of the two sermons in an effort to demonstrate that Hoadly may have borrowed from Sykes.¹⁰⁶ But it should perhaps be remembered that the Bishop never claimed to be original; he continually maintained that he reiterated views shared by other Protestants.¹⁰⁷ Understandably, Sykes took Hoadly's part in the Bangorian controversy and in three published letters ridiculed Sherlock's attacks on the Bishop.¹⁰⁸ He declared that, although both the Dean and Bishop had used the same ideas and language, by 1717 Sherlock and the committee of the Lower House of

¹⁰³ The anniversary of the gunpowder plot and William's landing at Torbay.

¹⁰⁴ Thomas Sherlock, A Sermon Preach'd ... on November 5th, 1712, London, 1712, p 7/8.

¹⁰⁵ Sykes, Difference, p 2, 5 & 10.

¹⁰⁶ Rupp, Religion in England, p 93.

¹⁰⁷ Works, ii, 857.

¹⁰⁸ Hunt, Religious Thought, iii, p 41.

Convocation had declared Hoadly a professed enemy to the Church.¹⁰⁹ Sykes maintained that it was new party zeal which drove Sherlock to such different conclusions in 1717 and therefore “the Bishop” who was not on the Dean’s “side of the Question in Politicks” was “to be calumnated, abused, censur’d, or even torn to pieces”.¹¹⁰ There was undoubtedly a further explanation. To some extent all Anglicans used these Reformation ideas but in 1712 Sherlock employed them in an obviously anti-Roman sermon whereas Hoadly used this Reformation rhetoric in an attack on fellow Protestants.¹¹¹

Hoadly and his supporters continually emphasised the spiritual nature of the church, but they did not deny the visible Church, despite the claims of their opponents. Perhaps part of the confusion lay in the fact that Hoadly did not openly discuss the Church of England or the sacraments in his Bangorian sermon.¹¹² However, in An Answer to the Representation drawn up by the Committee of the Lower House of Convocation (1717), he made it clear that he saw the need for a visible church with an authorised clergy and a function that was limited to guiding men towards Christ, virtue and happiness.¹¹³ In addition, Hoadly and the Bangorians fully acknowledged the need for limited Church government with human authority to organise external order and maintain decency in Christian assemblies.¹¹⁴ However, as mentioned in chapter one of this thesis, although Hoadly supported episcopacy as a traditional method of governing the Church he could not accept that Christ had

¹⁰⁹ [Sykes], Letter to the Reverend Dr Sherlock, p 8, 6.

¹¹⁰ Sykes, A Third Letter the Reverend Sherlock, p 104. [Sykes], Letter to the Reverend Dr Sherlock, p 8.

¹¹¹ Sherlock, Sermon Preach’d.. on Nov 5th, p 4. Works, ii, p 464, 555.

¹¹² Works, ii, p 402, 409.

¹¹³ Works, ii, p 473. [Sykes], Difference, p 6-9.

¹¹⁴ Works, ii, p 563. Jackson, Grounds, p 79-81.

left divine power and authority to the apostles and their successors.¹¹⁵

The Anti-Bangorians did not present a united front on the issue of apostolic succession. Joseph Trapp (1679-1747), lecturer of St Martin-in-the-Fields, assumed that the ministry of the Church of England had inherited apostolic power despite its break with Rome.¹¹⁶ The more extreme writers, such as the Nonjuror and mystic William Law, appeared to believe that the laity could only receive God's grace through personal faith and uninterrupted apostolic succession.¹¹⁷ Hoadly attacked this line of argument and contended that those who stressed this "right line" of succession undermined the principles of Protestantism because before the Reformation this succession lay with Rome.¹¹⁸

Nonjurors, such as George Hickes, and others within the Church including Francis Hare, Dean of Worcester, used the image of the keys and the power of binding and loosing (Matthew xvi, 19) to try to prove that the apostles had power to retain or absolve sins which they passed on to their successors.¹¹⁹ Hoadly put forward an alternative interpretation of Scripture. The symbol of the keys, according to the Bishop, indicated that as Peter had made an early profession of faith he would open the door of God's kingdom to others.¹²⁰ "Binding and loosing" was, according to Hoadly, a phrase which the ancient

¹¹⁵ Works, ii, p 471, 423.

¹¹⁶ Joseph Trapp, The Real Nature of the Church or Kingdom of Christ, London, p 3.

¹¹⁷ Works, ii, p 884, 485. Law, Bishop of Bangor's Late Sermon, p 13.

¹¹⁸ Works, ii, p 497, 884. Works, ii, p 485. Chillingworth, Protestants, p 356 - "why should I not be made a true and orthodox Christian, by believing all the doctrine of Christ, though I cannot derive my descent from a perpetual Succession that beleev'd it before me?" (sic)

¹¹⁹ Matt. xvi - 19, Works, ii, p 836. Hickes, Constitution, p 147. Hare, Church-Authority, p 26.

¹²⁰ Works, ii, p 836.

Jews had used to lay down duties.¹²¹ Interpreted rationally, he contended that Peter had been given a commission to preach the Gospel.¹²² The Bishop frequently maintained that the apostles did not have any special powers in themselves which they could leave to their successors.¹²³ The apostles were, he argued, “sent, taught, directed, immediately by Christ”.¹²⁴ Hoadly and his supporters insisted that there was absolutely no proof that the image of the keys and of binding and loosing gave divine powers to ecclesiastical governors in all ages to retain or remit sins.¹²⁵ The first Protestant reformers, Hoadly insisted, had nothing to do with such “Absolutions” and “Denunciations” and he was sure that the Church of England needed to resist these papal claims.¹²⁶

As the Anti-Bangorians were convinced that the Church had been granted divine authority they believed that the clergy had an obligation to enforce religious discipline.¹²⁷ The Anti-Bangorians certainly felt that they had a duty to excommunicate wrongdoers and at the same time protect good Churchmen. Excommunication was, however, a contentious issue and all sides used it for their own purposes. Nonjurors, including George Hickes and Laurence Howell, who insisted that they were the ‘true’ Church, claimed that members of the post-Revolution Church of England were excommunicated and damned.¹²⁸ Some Church of England men were equally uncharitable and,

¹²¹ Works, ii, p 837.

¹²² Works, ii, p 837.

¹²³ Works, ii, p 471, 836, 837. For similar sentiments see [Herne], False Notion, p 28.

¹²⁴ Works, ii, p 423.

¹²⁵ Works, ii, p 837, 839, 840. See also Whitby, Sermons, 1720, p xv.

¹²⁶ Works, ii, p 559, 839, 497. [Herne], False Notion, p 26.

¹²⁷ Hickes, Constitution, p 65, Snape, Second Letter, p 34.

¹²⁸ Hickes, Constitution, p 28 & 33. [Howell], Schism, p 4.

according to Hoadly, maintained that Protestants who dissented from the established Church would not receive God's grace.¹²⁹ Francis Hare and others used the authority of St Paul to defend the Church of England's practice of excommunication. Turning to Scripture, Hare declared that Paul had reproved the Corinthian church because it had not excommunicated an incestuous member of its congregation.¹³⁰ St Paul had said, "Who art Thou, that judgeth another Man's Servant ... To his own Master He standeth, or falleth".¹³¹ According to Hoadly, this meant that only Christ, and not the Church, had authority in the affairs of conscience and salvation.¹³² He maintained that all Christians had a right to criticise open and notorious offenders.¹³³ However, the Bishop believed that it was popish and authoritarian to frighten the laity by telling them that these purely human censures affected their chances of salvation.¹³⁴

Hoadly continually reminded his audience that, as the Church of England was a Protestant Church, it needed to operate in accordance with the principles and practices of the Reformation.¹³⁵ He declared that a reformed Church should not resort to the harsh popish practices and excessive discipline of the Roman Church.¹³⁶ Instead, it needed to respect individual religious liberty and adhere to Protestant methods of Scripture and reason and peaceful persuasion.¹³⁷ As mentioned in chapter two of this thesis, it was the approach

¹²⁹ Works, ii, 873.

¹³⁰ Hare, Church-Authority, p 19/20. Works, ii, p 828, 832.

¹³¹ Works, ii, p 466.

¹³² Works, ii, p 467.

¹³³ Works, ii, p 467, 470.

¹³⁴ Works, ii, p 468, 832, 833.

¹³⁵ Works, ii, p 495-496, 555, 558, 566

¹³⁶ Works, ii, p 475, 476.

¹³⁷ Works, ii, p 427, 449, 451, 406.

which Hoadly associated with the Reformation and in particular the seventeenth century divine William Chillingworth. Daniel Whitby called Hoadly one of “the Best Defenders of the Church of England” and “a second Chillingworth against Popery”.¹³⁸ The Bishop certainly eulogised writings of Chillingworth and, when Hoadly claimed that he had not said anything in the controversy which had not already been advanced by Chillingworth, we should take him seriously.¹³⁹ According to Hoadly, Chillingworth’s The Religion of Protestants (1638) was a difficult book to find, so he quoted it liberally and borrowed from it frequently.¹⁴⁰ Chillingworth censured all those who believed that they possessed an infallible interpretation of Scripture which they forced on others.¹⁴¹ The seventeenth-century theologian promoted the right of all Christians to search Scripture and use reason to judge for themselves in religion.¹⁴² As a result he was charged with undermining religious authority and “setting up Reason to encounter with Faith”.¹⁴³ But Hoadly maintained that Chillingworth’s “Sentiments of Church-Power and mutual Toleration, were Noble, and Humane and Christian”.¹⁴⁴ Furthermore, Chillingworth’s “Earnest Contention that the Word of God might be left in its own Generality of Expression” was, in Hoadly’s view, “the only way to put an

¹³⁸ Whitby, Sermons, 1720, p xxiii.

¹³⁹ Works, ii, p 903.

¹⁴⁰ Works, ii, p 621. An edition appeared in 1704, but there were a number in quick succession in 1719, 1722 and 1727. DNB vol 10, p 256. Hoadly and his close friend Samuel Clarke both quoted from Chillingworth’s writings. Hoadly’s supporters also quoted Chillingworth, Whitby, A Defense of the Propositions Contain’d in the Lord Bishop of Bangor’s Sermon p xi to pxvii and also what is said in the Preservative concerning Real Sincerity, London, p 36. [Arthur Ashley Sykes], The External Peace of the Church, London, 1716, p 11. Anon, Farther Remarks on the Reverend Dr Snape’s Second Letter to the R R Lord Bishop of Bangor, London, 1717, p 40, 41.

¹⁴¹ Chillingworth, Protestants, p 115.

¹⁴² Works, ii, p 903. Chillingworth, Protestants, p 114, 333.

¹⁴³ Works, ii, p 621, 618.

¹⁴⁴ Works, ii, p 618.

end to Divisions and Schisms".¹⁴⁵ Like Chillingworth, the Bishop warned that "Exorbitant zeal" was "the same everywhere" and that a "Spirit of Uneasy Censure, in the beginning" ended in "Gibbets and Gallies and Inquisitions".¹⁴⁶

Hoadly realised that his critics acknowledged the Reformation principle of individual religious inquiry but he complained that they still used the oppressive popish methods of the Roman Church.¹⁴⁷ As an example, in 1714 Francis Hare had pleaded the right and duty of Christians to use reason and search Scripture for their faith.¹⁴⁸ In words which could have come from Hoadly himself, Hare declared it "true to the Fundamental Principles of the Reformation" that Scriptures were the "only Rule of Faith" for Protestants, and he urged governors to "remove the great Obstacles that ... [lay] against the Study of them".¹⁴⁹ Hare was convinced that unless people read and understood the Bible for themselves the Protestant religion would relapse into popery.¹⁵⁰ Nevertheless, in 1719, as Dean of Worcester, Hare preached a sermon which lodged the interpretation of Scripture firmly in learned men.¹⁵¹ Hare claimed that patristic writings provided church governors with a safe and a reliable understanding of the Bible.¹⁵² Furthermore, he urged the laity to assume that Church governors were wise and good, and submit to their interpretations, unless there was strong evidence to suggest that they were

¹⁴⁵ Works, ii, p 903. Chillingworth, Protestants, p 198. [Sykes], External Peace, p 22.

¹⁴⁶ Works, ii, p 621. Chillingworth, Protestants, p 198.

¹⁴⁷ Works, ii, p 916.

¹⁴⁸ [Francis Hare], The Difficulties and Discouragements which attend the Study of the Scriptures In the Way of Private Jugement (8th edition), London, 1721, p 30.

¹⁴⁹ [Hare], Difficulties, p 30.

¹⁵⁰ [Hare], Difficulties, p 31, 32.

¹⁵¹ Works, ii, p 865.

¹⁵² Hare, Church-Authority, p 40, 41.

mistaken.¹⁵³

Thomas Sherlock also maintained that the Reformation had asserted the use of Scriptures as the right of every Christian. But he also believed that Church governors “had Sense enough to know, that to leave every Man to make the best use of his Bible, without any farther direction or restraint, would naturally tend to Confusion”.¹⁵⁴ Hoadly complained that Sherlock had openly professed the “Use of Scriptures for All Christians Capable of using them” then reserved “the Judgement of that Capacity” to Church governors.¹⁵⁵ The Church of Rome actually claimed absolute authority in religious affairs but, according to Hoadly, Sherlock’s practices led to it because he merely assumed indisputable Church authority.¹⁵⁶

In an effort to promote the use of Reformation principles in the Church, Hoadly and his supporters returned once again to the writings of William Chillingworth and The Religion of Protestants.¹⁵⁷ As we have seen, Chillingworth had urged all Christians to examine Scripture. He believed in sincere endeavour to find the will of God and, just as important in the innocence of error in honest inquirers.¹⁵⁸ Hoadly was convinced that Chillingworth’s “Principles were Latitudinarian, and of Extensive Charity” and “His Doctrine about Sincerity,

¹⁵³ Hare, Church-Authority, p 42, 43. Rebecca Warner has drawn attention to the wide diversity of Low Church thought in this period and classified Francis Hare as a Low Church Anti-Bangorian. Warner, ‘Low Churchmanship’, p 16 Like Hoadly, Hare was a committed Whig, but the above evidence does suggest that Hare’s religious ideas appear to have changed significantly between 1714 and 1719.

¹⁵⁴ Sherlock, Vindication, 1718, p 31.

¹⁵⁵ Works, ii, p 731, 586. James Peirce, Some Reflections upon Dean Sherlock’s Vindication of the Corporation and Test Acts, London, 1718, p 18-19.

¹⁵⁶ Works, ii, p 586.

¹⁵⁷ Works, ii, p 904. [Sykes], External Peace, p 11, 40. Whitby, Defense, p 35-36.

¹⁵⁸ Works, ii, p 904. Chillingworth, Protestants, p 375.

and the Acceptance of sincere Persons was that which” his adversaries had “fatally misrepresented, as making All Religions the same.”¹⁵⁹ In accordance with Chillingworth’s approach, Hoadly maintained that all Christians had a duty to use their own abilities and search Scripture for the tenets of their faith.¹⁶⁰ As we have seen in chapter one of this thesis, Hoadly was convinced that it was ultimately an individual’s sincerity and good work which justified him before God.¹⁶¹

Hoadly’s opponents, including Thomas Sherlock, Andrew Snape, Henry Stebbing, John Rogers (1679-1729) and the Nonjuror William Law emphasised religious authority and viewed salvation as a collective enterprise which involved the Church, the state and the individual.¹⁶² They were, therefore, sure that Hoadly’s notion of sincerity, which emphasised personal faith, undermined the necessity of a visible church and provided an inadequate basis for salvation.¹⁶³ His views on sincerity were undoubtedly both misunderstood and misrepresented by his opponents. John Rogers assumed that this sincerity was merely a present persuasion of mind, even though Hoadly had made it quite clear that sincerity assumed diligent inquiry.¹⁶⁴ “Meer sincerity”, the committee of the Lower House of Convocation

¹⁵⁹ Works, ii, p 618. Francis de la Pillonniere, who had been tutor to Hoadly’s children became involved in the Bangorian controversy. In his A Reply to Dr Snape’s Vindication of a Passage in his Second Letter to the Bishop of Bangor Relating to Mr Pillonniere, London, 1718, p 6 he complained that freethinker and latitudinarian were often treated as if they were synonymous even though some of the greatest men in the Church of England had been described as “Latitudinarian”.

¹⁶⁰ Works, i, 238; ii, p 490.

¹⁶¹ Works, ii, p 490.

¹⁶² For more details see Cornwall, ‘Church and Salvation’.

¹⁶³ Sherlock, Some Considerations, p 40. Snape, Second Letter, p 60.

¹⁶⁴ John Rogers, Discourse of the Visible and Invisible Church of Christ (4th corrected edition), London, 1719, p 23. Rector of Wrington, Somerset in 1716, John Rogers was appointed canon of Wells in 1719 - DNB, Vol. 17, p 135. Works, ii, p 893.

asserted, was not enough for salvation.¹⁶⁵ Hoadly agreed, the rewards did not depend solely on sincerity, but on the use of the capacities and talents which God had given them.¹⁶⁶ He was convinced that God expected individuals to turn to Scripture and use all their capacities, talents and all helps at hand in order to make a sincere decision.¹⁶⁷ Henry Stebbing concluded that “his Lordship hath declared, that when a Man ... [did] chuse a Communion, the Sincerity of Private Judgement ... [would] justify him if he ... [chose] the worst!”¹⁶⁸ John Pyle replied to Stebbing and defended the Bishop’s position on sincerity.¹⁶⁹ Hoadly also made it clear that the method which he advocated was preferable to any other merely because it involved choice in religion.¹⁷⁰ Nevertheless, he added that, he could never put his “own Salvation” upon “being certainly in the Right” until he was certain of his own “Infallibility”.¹⁷¹

The Non-juror William Law made particularly vicious attacks on Hoadly’s notion of sincerity. By telling all kinds of people, including Quakers, Socinians, Jews and Turks that if they were sincere they were in God’s favour, Law declared that Hoadly had cancelled all obligation to a particular communion.¹⁷² He accused the Bishop of taking away priests and sacraments, leaving sincerity as “the great universal Atonement for all”.¹⁷³ Thomas Herne and John Jackson were amongst those who responded to

¹⁶⁵ Report of the Committee, p 11.

¹⁶⁶ Works, ii, p 876.

¹⁶⁷ Works, ii, p 876, 872, 490.

¹⁶⁸ Henry Stebbing, Remarks upon a Position of the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Bangor concerning Religious Sincerity, London, 1718, p 9-11.

¹⁶⁹ Thomas Pyle, A Farther Vindication of the Lord Bishop of Bangor ... with Respect to the Doctrine of Sincerity, (no date or place of publication). Whitby, Defense, p 19.

¹⁷⁰ Works, ii, p 490.

¹⁷¹ Works, ii, p 492.

¹⁷² Law, Bishop of Bangor’s Late Sermon, p 5-7.

¹⁷³ Law, Bishop of Bangor’s Late Sermon, p 13.

Law's attacks.¹⁷⁴ In a particularly detailed defence, John Jackson (1686-1763) argued that Law had misrepresented Hoadly.¹⁷⁵ Jackson contended that Hoadly had only discussed Christian denominations and had never thought of comparing Christians with Jews or Turks.¹⁷⁶ The Bishop had not, in Jackson's view, depreciated the sacraments, nor had he argued against all authority, merely authority in matters of faith.¹⁷⁷

Law was not a particularly significant writer at that time and Hoadly did not reply to him because he had already justified his own ideas to the committee of the Lower House of Convocation.¹⁷⁸ Historians have, however, tended to accept the view of Thomas Sherlock and Dean Hook (1842) that Hoadly did not have the ability to counter Law's arguments.¹⁷⁹ Nevertheless, writing in 1975 Henry Rack came to the conclusion that Law was far from completely demolishing "the points which Hoadly was trying to make".¹⁸⁰

After considering the debate over the nature of the Church let us now focus on the relationship between the Church and state and the ways in which the Church was supported. The Anti-Bangorians saw the magistrate as the vicegerent of God and as such believed that it was his duty to maintain

¹⁷⁴ [Herne], False Notion.

¹⁷⁵ Jackson, Grounds, p 56, 58, 63, 73, 78.

¹⁷⁶ Jackson, Grounds, p 56.

¹⁷⁷ Jackson, Grounds, p 59, 78.

¹⁷⁸ Works, ii, p 694.

¹⁷⁹ Sherlock, Condition, p 62. Rack, 'Christ's Kingdom', p 275.

¹⁸⁰ Rack, 'Christ's Kingdom', p 282.

religion.¹⁸¹ When Christian emperors and kings became Christ's subjects they had, according to the Nonjuror George Hickes, an obligation to defend the Christian church, its rights and its government.¹⁸² As noted earlier in the chapter, the Anti-Bangorians believed that the Bishops had been given divine authority to govern the Church and consequently Nonjurors such as Hickes claimed that "the Church" was "perfectly independent of the State or Secular Power".¹⁸³ Unlike the Nonjurors, Hoadly's opponents within the Church did not talk in terms of independence but tended to stress the inter-dependence of Church and state.¹⁸⁴ Moreover, as the Church and state were both considered pillars of the constitution, any danger to the Church was considered a danger to the state.¹⁸⁵

Hoadly's views on the relationship between Church and state were at times vague and occasionally appeared contradictory. As an example, his writings in the Bangorian controversy have been called erastian, yet the Committee of the Lower House of Convocation maintained that they undermined the power of the magistrate in ecclesiastical and religious affairs.¹⁸⁶ These problems can to some extent be resolved by identifying the audience to which each piece of work was addressed and also by trying, with difficulty at times, to determine whether Hoadly was discussing the invisible or the visible Church.¹⁸⁷

Moreover, as a bishop of the established Church who was unhappy with some of its authoritarian methods it was perhaps understandable that he did not

¹⁸¹ Works, ii, p 536. Report of the Committee, p 4, 16.

¹⁸² Hickes, Constitution, p 24, 25, 26, 81.

¹⁸³ Hickes, Constitution, p 24, 152.

¹⁸⁴ Sherlock, Some Considerations, p 40.

¹⁸⁵ Cockburn, Review, 1718, p 37. Sherlock, Vindication, p 6.

¹⁸⁶ Gascoigne, Cambridge, p 124. Sykes, Church and State, p 292. Rack, 'Christ's Kingdom', p 277. Report of the Committee, p 4.

¹⁸⁷ Works, ii, p 480.

always clarify his ideas.

In contrast to the Nonjurors, who believed that the Church of England was independent of the state, Hoadly and the Bangorians, including A A Sykes and John Jackson, were convinced that the visible Church was part of the temporal sphere and consequently subject to human authority and the civil (although not the spiritual) power of the magistrate.¹⁸⁸ In A Preservative, which was written specifically against the Nonjurors, Hoadly used the natural law of self-preservation together with the Gospel to make his point. It was, he declared, an uncontested principle “that every Civil Government hath a Right to every Thing necessary for its own Defense, and Preservation”.¹⁸⁹ In addition he turned to Scripture and maintained that it had “left Civil Government as it found it” and had “put its Ministers, and Preachers, as far as the Ends of Civil Government reach[ed], equally under its Authority”.¹⁹⁰ From the Gospel he described how Solomon had the authority to deprive Abiathar of his ecclesiastical office and in the public interest St John of Chrystostom had also been banished by the civil magistrate.¹⁹¹ Hoadly insisted that regardless of how an issue originated, if it affected a civil power it became a civil nature and therefore “the Object of the Magistrate’s Care and Concern”.¹⁹² So, public preaching and praying were essentially a spiritual matter and as such did not come under the authority of the civil magistrate. However if, as in the case of the Nonjurors, their preaching was directed against a civil government, then

¹⁸⁸ Hickes, Constitution, p 24 & 26. Works, i, p 574, 596, ii, p 500. Unlike Hoadly, Luther had maintained that the magistrate possessed spiritual authority - McGrath, Reformation Thought, chapter 8, p 144. [Sykes], Answer to the Non jurors, p 27. Jackson, Grounds, p 19, 20.

¹⁸⁹ Works, i, p 574.

¹⁹⁰ Works, i, p 580.

¹⁹¹ Works, i, p 577.

¹⁹² Works, i, p 581.

this became rebellion which was undoubtedly a civil matter.¹⁹³ As Hoadly emphasised the preservation of the state, this led contemporaries and later commentators to consider A Preservative erastian or even ultra-erastian.¹⁹⁴ Ursula Henriques found that, at the end of the eighteenth-century, selections from the book were used to argue that a government had a right to deny religious equality if this was likely to undermine the security of state.¹⁹⁵

This does not, however, do justice to Hoadly's work because, as we have already seen, the Bangorian sermon was written against all those who wanted to use ecclesiastical and civil authority to promote the 'true' Christian religion in the Church of England.¹⁹⁶ Hoadly and like-minded thinkers including A. A. Sykes, John Jackson and Daniel Whitby believed that real church or true Christian faith was based on a spiritual relationship between an individual and Christ and as such they did not think that it came within the jurisdiction of Church governors or the civil magistrate.¹⁹⁷ In the view of Hoadly (and also his supporters) it was not the function of the magistrate to preach the word of God but to promote the common good, encourage virtuous acts and to promote religious toleration.¹⁹⁸ So, in contrast to the erastian label which has been attached to A Preservative, the committee of the Lower House of Convocation was furious that some passages of the sermon appeared destructive of regal and legislative power in religious matters.¹⁹⁹

¹⁹³ Works, i, p 581.

¹⁹⁴ British Library Add MS 6117, p 67 Letter from Edward Synge, Archbishop of Tuam to William Wake 15 January 1716/17. Gascoigne, Cambridge, p 124. Sykes, Church and State, p 292. Rack, 'Christ's Kingdom', p 277.

¹⁹⁵ Ursula Henriques, Religious Toleration in England 1787-1833, London, 1961, p 22.

¹⁹⁶ Works, ii, p 405, 407, 408..

¹⁹⁷ Works, ii, p 408, 405, 407, 500. Sykes, Difference, p 4. Jackson, Grounds, p 28.

¹⁹⁸ Works, ii, p 500, 516-518, 583. See also [Sykes], Answer to the Non-jurors, p 10-11. Jackson, Grounds, p 34.

¹⁹⁹ Report of the Committee, p 15-18.

As we have noted, Hoadly tried to encourage religious toleration. So what was his attitude towards the privileged position of the established Church of England? The Bishop did not consider the Church of England perfect but he did believe that it was the best church he knew of.²⁰⁰ Furthermore, he maintained that it was “the great Bulwark ... against Popery”.²⁰¹ Hoadly took great pleasure in declaring that he had chosen to support the Church of England and throughout his life he made every effort to make it comprehensive and tolerant.²⁰² As an example, as we saw in chapter one, he attempted to persuade Church governors to relax rules and regulations so that as many Protestant Dissenters as possible could be included in the Church.²⁰³ Hoadly also tried to encourage Protestant Nonconformists to put aside their differences and join the Church of England in its fight against popery.²⁰⁴ The Bishop acknowledged that the Church which he had chosen had originally been established by law, and it should be noted that he never advocated disestablishment.²⁰⁵ At the same time, Hoadly could not accept that the Church should be supported by harsh popish legislation such as the Test and Corporation Acts which deprived good Protestant citizens of their civil rights merely because they could not in all sincerity conform to the established

²⁰⁰ Works, i, p 285.

²⁰¹ Works, ii, p 590.

²⁰² Works, ii, p 516, 554-555, 904. Hoadly spoke in the House of Lords in favour of a bill to repeal the Occasional Conformity and Schism Acts, 13 December, 1718. - Cobbett, Parliamentary, vol 12, p 572.

²⁰³ Works, ii, p 210.

²⁰⁴ Works, ii, p 427. 615; i, p 283-285, 275.

²⁰⁵ Works, ii, p 427.

Church.²⁰⁶

The Test and Corporation Acts had been passed in an effort to ensure that the sacrament of the Lord's Supper was taken in accordance with the rites of the Church of England as a qualification for civil, military and corporate offices.²⁰⁷ Hoadly and Thomas Sherlock were two of the main combatants in this aspect of the controversy and their writings were republished in later years to defend very different views in this debate. Dean Sherlock was absolutely convinced that Hoadly's Bangorian sermon was designed to make way for the repeal of the Test Act.²⁰⁸ Sherlock's writings consistently stressed the interdependence of Church and state and the mutual support that one had for the other. He defended the acts because he genuinely felt that they were the best way of determining a person's attitude towards the Church and therefore the state.²⁰⁹ Both the Test and Corporation Acts were, the Dean claimed, directed against the Protestant Dissenters.²¹⁰ According to him, they had caused the Civil War, murdered the King, tried to destroy the Church and he claimed that they could never be trusted in positions of power and influence.²¹¹ It is important to bear in mind that Sherlock did not consider the Test and Corporation Acts oppressive because he was certain that they were essential to the

²⁰⁶ Works, ii, p 726, 727, 788. Hoadly did not justify the exclusion of Roman Catholics from office on account of their religion but because experience had shown that they were enemies to the civil government. William Fleetwood made the same point in Papists Not excluded from the Throne upon the Account of Religion, (which was a vindication of Hoadly's Preservative), in A Complete Collection of the Sermons, Tracts, and Pieces of all kinds, that were written by the R R Dr William Fleetwood, London, 1737, p 708-709.

²⁰⁷ N C Hunt, Two Early Political Associations, Oxford, 1961, p 121.

²⁰⁸ Sherlock, Vindication, preface.

²⁰⁹ Sherlock, Vindication, p 35.

²¹⁰ Sherlock, Vindication, p 5. Sherlock, An Answer to the Lord Bishop of Bangor's Late Book; entitled The Common Rights of Subjects defended, London, 1719, p 20.

²¹¹ Sherlock, Vindication, p 34-39.

preservation of the constitution.²¹²

Now although Hoadly never advocated the separation of Church and state he did believe that they should be supported in very different ways. In both the Bangorian controversy and the debate which surrounded the sacrament during the 1730s, (which will be discussed in chapter six of this thesis), he argued vigorously against the Test and Corporation Acts. In The Common Rights of Subjects defended, and the Nature of the Sacramental Test, considered (1719), Hoadly complained that instead of using methods from the Gospel to support religion, some Churchmen used state methods of self-defence which he claimed harmed the Church of England and resulted in religious persecution.²¹³ Sherlock maintained that the intention behind the acts was to keep Nonconformists out of office so that places of power and trust remained in the hands of those who supported the Church.²¹⁴ But Hoadly insisted that the intention of the Test act was to protect the state against Roman Catholics not Protestants.²¹⁵ Furthermore, he argued that Protestant Nonconformists had not condemned the Church of England as unlawful and could in safe conscience receive communion in the Church.²¹⁶

The Bishop argued very forcefully that as the sacrament was a religious rite it was totally inappropriate to use it as a political test. Receipt of the sacrament was, he contended, an indication that a man was a member of Christ's universal church, not a member of a particular church.²¹⁷ Sadly, the most

²¹² Sherlock, Vindication, p 51.

²¹³ Works, ii, p 810.

²¹⁴ Works, ii, p 700. Sherlock, Vindication, p 5.

²¹⁵ Works, ii, p 701.

²¹⁶ Works, ii, p 701.

²¹⁷ Works, ii, p 803.

sacred act of the remembrance of Christ had, he claimed, been turned into a state instrument which excluded some good citizens from office.²¹⁸ Hoadly declared that his opponents misused “the Holy Sacrament, instituted by Our Lord Himself; appointed by Him solely for the Solemn Commemoration of His Death, and made a Part of the Religious Worship of Christians”; they debased “the most Sacred Thing in the World into a Political Tool, and an Engin of State”.²¹⁹ As far as the Bishop was concerned it was not even a reliable tool. It did not provide evidence of a person’s loyalty to the Church of England because an atheist or infidel could easily have taken the oath. Nor was the receipt of the sacrament a good test of an individual’s patriotism.²²⁰ Yet, like the Nonconformists Hoadly argued that good Protestant citizens had forfeited their civil rights merely because they had, in some respects, differed from the established Church.²²¹

Although Hoadly wrote against the Test and Corporation Acts, it is important to appreciate that he did acknowledge the importance of some kind of test for political office.²²² Consequently, the dispute surrounded the type of test which was appropriate. Sherlock argued that the use of oaths was always founded and performed upon the principles of religion.²²³ In other words, he believed that religion was a test whenever an oath was required.²²⁴ The Bishop accepted that an oath acknowledged the fear of a superior being but he claimed that there was very little religion in an oath compared to the very

²¹⁸ Works, ii, p 523, 707.

²¹⁹ Works, ii, 524-525, 522.

²²⁰ Works, ii, p 708, 550, 723.

²²¹ Works, ii, p 727. Peirce, Some Reflections, p 29.

²²² Works, ii, p 805.

²²³ Sherlock, Vindication, p 91.

²²⁴ Sherlock, Vindication, p 106, 115.

sacred ceremony of the sacrament.²²⁵ Besides, Hoadly was very confident that a civil oath could be specifically designed for secular use.²²⁶

In conclusion, contemporaries and later commentators have maintained that Hoadly's ideas undermined or even dissolved the visible Church.²²⁷ This chapter has shown that although Hoadly and his opponents both believed that they tried to defend the Church of England they held very different ideas on the nature of the Church and the way in which it was supported. The Anti-Bangorians emphasised the visible Church and maintained that Christianity, the Reformation and the Church of England were sustained by ecclesiastical and civil authority together with religious discipline and obedience.²²⁸ The Bishop's opponents contended that both the Church and state had an important role to play in the salvation of the laity and were convinced that it was the duty of the state to support true religion with civil legislation.²²⁹ The Anti-Bangorians also believed in the supernatural powers of the apostles and the divine authority which they passed on to their successors for the government of the Church.²³⁰ Although the Anti-Bangorians acknowledged that all Protestants needed to turn to Scripture for the Christian faith they were sure that the text needed to be interpreted in accordance with the dictates of

²²⁵ Works, ii, p 805. Sherlock, Vindication, p 86.

²²⁶ Works, ii, p 524, 805.

²²⁷ Law, Bishop of Bangor's Late Sermon, p 2. Snape, Letter to the Bishop of Bangor, p 4. Sykes, Church and State, p 293.

²²⁸ Rogers, Visible and Invisible, p 38, 121. Snape, Second Letter, p 34. Sherlock, Vindication, p 31.

²²⁹ Works, ii, p 511. Sherlock, Some Considerations, p 40. Snape, Second Letter, p 60.

²³⁰ Hicke, Constitution, p 66-68. [Howell], Schism, p 15. Law, Second Letter, p 2.

the Church fathers and Church governors.²³¹

This notion of the Church and the way in which it was supported was, in Hoadly's view, more reminiscent of the Roman than the Protestant Church. It was, he contended, popish and authoritarian.²³² Throughout the controversy he attacked what he believed was excessive ecclesiastical and civil authority in matters of faith.²³³ The Bishop was convinced that he defended the true principles of Christianity, the Reformation and the Church of England when he stressed the individual nature of salvation, liberty of religious inquiry and personal judgement in matters of faith.²³⁴ Hoadly maintained that the visible Church was a human organisation with human authority which performed an important function when it brought men nearer to Christ.²³⁵ However, like Luther, he emphasised the invisible rather than the visible Church. Real religion was inward and, according to Hoadly, the true church was composed of individual Christians who belonged to a spiritual community united in the faith of Christ.²³⁶ Following in the tradition of the early Protestant reformers and in particular the seventeenth-century divine William Chillingworth, Hoadly encouraged Christians to turn to Scripture rather than Church governors for the tenets of their faith.²³⁷ He reminded his audience that the Bible was the religion of Protestants and he tried to recall men to Christ's "Words, ... His Instructions, and His Authority".²³⁸

²³¹ Hare, Church-Authority, p 42, 43.

²³² Works, ii, p 724, 556.

²³³ Works, ii, p 455, 457.

²³⁴ Works, ii, p 496, 451.

²³⁵ Works, ii, p 473.

²³⁶ Works, ii, p 404-406, 477.

²³⁷ Chillingworth, Protestants, p 375. Works, ii, p 427.

²³⁸ Works, ii, p 891, 559. Chillingworth, Protestants, p 375.

Chapter 5 - The 'Britannicus Letters' (1722-1724/5)

Historians have sometimes given the impression that after the Bangorian controversy Hoadly lost both ecclesiastical and political influence.¹ Indeed, John Kenyon writing in Revolution Principles (1977) mistakenly believed that “neither Walpole nor Pelham had any use for the most aggressively Whig churchman of the century.”² Yet, Hoadly was translated to Hereford in 1721 and advanced to the more prosperous see of Salisbury in October, 1723. Moreover, as one of Walpole’s major Whig propagandists he wrote in the newspaper the London Journal, usually under the pseudonym of ‘Britannicus’, most weeks from September 1722 until March 1724/5. ‘Britannicus’ is a Latin name and a number of historians, including J G A Pocock and Reed Browning, have stressed the use of classical authorities and ideas in the late seventeenth and eighteenth-centuries.³ Reed Browning (1982) has argued that Hoadly, as well as other Court Whigs, employed the classics to support their own views.⁴ However, the work of Pocock and Browning has tended to ignore, or at least underestimate the Christian heritage. As we have seen earlier in this thesis, like the Christian humanists and early Protestant theologians and reformers, Hoadly synthesised classical and Christian ideas.⁵ The purpose of this chapter is, therefore, to examine the ‘Britannicus Letters’ and demonstrate how

¹ Clark, English Society, p 138. Kenyon, Revolution Principles, p 196, 197, 202.

² Kenyon, Revolution Principles, p 197. For a more accurate assessment of Hoadly’s contribution see Reed Browning, ‘Benjamin Hoadly (1676-1761) The Court Whig as a Controversialist’, Chapter III of his Court Whigs. Targett, ‘Walpole’s Newspapers’. See also Simon Targett, ‘A Pro-Government Newspaper During the Whig Ascendancy: Walpole’s London Journal, 1722-1738’ in Journal of History and Politics, edited by Karl Schweizer and Jeremy Black, 1989, vii, p 1-33.

³ J G A Pocock, Politics, Language and Time (1971), 1972, especially chapters 3 and 4. Pocock, Machiavellian Moment. Browning, Court Whigs.

⁴ Browning, Court Whigs, p 67-89.

⁵ See p 57-58, 71, 91, 97-98, 104, 107 of this thesis.

the Bishop used classical concepts and Christian/Reformation language and ideas to defend the Court Whig cause.

Before focusing on the 'Britannicus Letters' let us look at the context within which they were written. The political and economic impact caused by the 'crash' of South Sea shares in 1720 was enormous and has been well documented.⁶ For the purpose of this thesis it is, however, important to bear in mind that when Robert Walpole was appointed First Lord of the Treasury in April 1721 he chose to defend some of the government ministers who had been involved in the South Sea affair.⁷ This decision to support a limited policy of retribution soon earned him the nick name of "the Screen", a defender of corrupt political practices, self-seekers, criminals and the enemy of justice.⁸ Kramnick has incorrectly suggested that before Bolingbroke's return from exile and the appearance of The Craftsman newspaper on 5 December, 1726 that Walpole only had token opposition.⁹ It is certainly more accurate to suggest that during 1721-25 Walpole was attacked by many parties and factions.¹⁰ Charles Realey has identified numerous sources of opposition including Sunderland's supporters in the cabinet, Hanoverian courtiers around the King, the City of London, some of the principal writers of the day (including Pope, Gay, Swift, Bathurst, Arbuthnot and Friend), the Leicester House clique around the Prince and Princess of Wales, Scottish members of parliament and peers, Tories, Jacobites and discontented Whigs.¹¹

⁶ See John Carswell, The South Sea Bubble, Stanford, (1960) revised edition 1993. Isaac Kramnick, Bolingbroke and His Circle, Ithica & London, 1968.

⁷ Charles B Realey, 'The Early Opposition to Sir Robert Walpole 1720-27' in Humanistic Studies of the University of Kansas, vol iv, Kansas, 1932, p 19.

⁸ Realey, 'Early Opposition', p 19.

⁹ Kramnick, Bolingbroke, p 18.

¹⁰ Realey, 'Early Opposition', p 66.

¹¹ Realey, 'Early Opposition', p 36-66.

In order to appreciate fully Hoadly's defence of Walpole's Whig administration, it is particularly important to understand the potential threat posed by two 'groups' - the Jacobites and the Independent Whigs. In the first instance let us turn our attention to the Jacobite threat. The existence of a rival claimant to the throne was, as Jeremy Black has observed, a destabilising feature of British politics which had major implications for international relations.¹² Indeed, in A S Foord's words "everyone cast into opposition found there the sanguine, eager Jacobites, anxious to fall in with any malcontents".¹³ The South Sea crisis undoubtedly provided the Jacobites with an excellent opportunity to rally support for their cause and to some observers, including Hoadly, the Protestant line was in imminent danger.¹⁴ On 10th October 1720, in the midst of the financial crisis, the Pretender issued a declaration which was intended to sow dissension in Britain.¹⁵ Arthur Onslow, who was the future speaker of the House of Commons, wrote that as the King was abroad and the "rage against the Government was such for having as they thought drawn them into this ruin" he was almost certain that if "the Pretender" had "landed at the Tower, he might have rode to St James's with very few hands held up against him".¹⁶

In addition, the administration and others, including The London Journal of 3

¹² Jeremy Black, 'Introduction: an Age of Political Stability?' in Britain in the Age of Walpole, edited by Jeremy Black, London, 1984, p 2. See also J C D Clark, Samuel Johnson, Cambridge, 1994.

¹³ HMC Stuart Papers, v 609, quoted in Foord, Opposition, p 77.

¹⁴ Paul S Fritz, English Ministers and Jacobitism between the Rebellions of 1715 and 1745, Toronto, 1975, p 66, 67. Works, iii, p 20.

¹⁵ Realey, 'Early Opposition', p 49. Foord, Opposition, p 74.

¹⁶ HMC Onslow MSS 504 quoted in Fritz, English Ministers, p 68.

September 1720, were extremely alarmed by the number of newspapers written by Jacobites and Catholics during this period.¹⁷ Paul Monod's research has also confirmed the existence of a flourishing Jacobite press at this time.¹⁸ The longest running Jacobite newspaper was published by Nathaniel Mist who took over Robert Mawson's Weekly Journal or Saturday's Post in 1716 and ran it for another twenty one years as Mist's Weekly Journal (1725-8) and Fog's Weekly Journal (1728-37).¹⁹ After Mist was forced into exile his partner Dr Gayland printed the Jacobite Freeholder's Journal (1722-23) and followed it with The Loyal Observator Reviv'd. Jacobite periodicals were extremely popular and Paul Chapman has estimated that Mist's papers sold about 10,000 copies every week in the 1720s.²⁰

Most Jacobites were Tories but it is important to appreciate that some Jacobite Whigs did exist.²¹ Mark Goldie has shown that for a variety of reasons some radical Whigs did remain loyal to James II.²² Moreover, for tactical reasons some political malcontents dabbled with Jacobitism. For example, when Sunderland was involved in the dubious South Sea transactions and was forced to resign from the Treasury he tried to use the Jacobites for his own purpose and opened negotiations with Jacobite leaders Strafford, Orrery and

¹⁷ Charles B Realey, 'The London Journal and Its Authors, 1720-23' in Humanistic Studies of the University of Kansas, vol v, Kansas, 1936, p 64. Laurence Hanson, Government and the Press 1695-1763, London, 1936, p 64 and 65.

¹⁸ Paul Kleber Monod, Jacobitism and the English people, 1688-1788, Cambridge, 1989, p 28. Jeremy Black has also commented on the resilience of the Jacobite press, The English Press in the Eighteenth Century, London, 1987, p 144.

¹⁹ Monod, Jacobitism, 1989, p 29.

²⁰ Paul Chapman, 'Jacobite Political Argument in England 1714-1766', Cambridge PhD, 1983 p 198-211 quoted in Monod, Jacobitism, p 30.

²¹ McMahon, Radical Whigs, p 179.

²² Mark Goldie, 'John Locke and Anglican Royalism' in Political Studies, 31, 1983 p 77 and 'The Roots of True Whiggism' in History of Political Thought, 1, 1980, p 217, 224, 228-9. McMahon, Radical Whigs, p 179.

others.²³ However, although more research needs to be carried out, there do not appear to have been many serious Whig converts to the Pretender at this time apart from Lord Wharton and Lord Rialton.²⁴

After discussing the potential threat posed by Jacobites we can now focus on the problem caused by dissident Whigs. Although the majority of Whigs were Hanoverians this did not mean that like Hoadly they supported the Whig ministry. Indeed, discontented Country or Independent Whigs maintained that once in power the Court Whigs had abandoned their moral, political and economic principles.²⁵ In an attempt to legitimise their criticism, the Independent Whigs adopted the name patriot and argued that they were good citizens who worked for the nation.²⁶ Very soon, all sides in these debates used the rhetoric of patriotism and claimed that they were the true patriots who laboured for the common good.²⁷

Classical writings were an important source of these patriotic ideas. Although many eighteenth-century writers applauded the political liberty enjoyed by the ancients, they were also preoccupied with the reasons for the decline of the great republics - absolute rule, corruption and the loss of liberty which followed.²⁸ In particular there was, as Reed Browning has demonstrated, a

²³ G V Bennett, 'Jacobitism and the Rise of Walpole' in Historical Perspectives, edited by Neil McKendrick, London, 1974, p 73, 74, 77.

²⁴ McMahon, Radical Whigs, p 178. See also Linda Colley, In Defiance of Oligarchy - The Tory Party 1714-60, Cambridge, 1982, p 49, 201.

²⁵ John Trenchard and Thomas Gordon, Cato's Letters, (with additions), 4 volumes, London, 1724. [Thomas Gordon], The Character of an Independent Whig, London, (fifth edition) 1720, p 3.

²⁶ A S Foord, His Majesty's Opposition 1714-1830, Oxford, 1964, p 65, 105, 107. In Stuart times critics of the government had used the term 'patriot'.

²⁷ [Trenchard & Gordon], Cato's Letters, i, p 281. Works, iii, p 7, 8.

²⁸ Howard Weinbrot, Augustus Caesar in "Augustan" England, Princeton, 1978, p 7, 34. J A W Gunn, Beyond, p 10-12. Browning Court Whigs, p 8.

cult of the Roman patriot Cato at this time.²⁹ Joseph Addison's tragedy Cato had opened at Drury Lane in 1713.³⁰ Cato of Utica (95-46 BC) the inspiring figure of late republican Rome and great grandson of Cato the Censor set the pattern for a patriotic life.³¹ As a call for both virtue and liberty it was not surprising that many staked a claim on Cato.³² The Independent Whig Thomas Gordon wrote a number of tracts under the pseudonym of 'Britannicus' on the theme of Cato, patriotism and the struggle against corruption.³³ However, without doubt the most popular were 'Cato's Letters'. The 'Letters' were written by John Trenchard and, fellow Independent Whig, Thomas Gordon. They were published in The London Journal and later in The British Journal between November 1720 and July 1723.³⁴ Rather than overtly criticising the Whig administration and their handling of the South Sea crisis, Trenchard and Gordon discussed tyranny and the loss of liberty in Rome rather than London. Sometimes the allegories to contemporary men and events were even too obscure for the readers of the day and a key was privately circulated.³⁵

So what was 'Cato's' message and how did the 'Letters' appear to undermine the Whig administration? The 'Letters' certainly attacked any attempt at party

²⁹ Browning, Court Whigs, p 1-8.

³⁰ Browning, Court Whigs, p 1.

³¹ Browning, Court Whigs, p 1, 5.

³² Browning, Court Whigs, p 4. As an example the Whig writer Richard Steele drafted the essay A Comparison between Cato and Caesar, London, 1713. The Tory pamphleteer Jonathan Swift later developed what has been called a "Catonic fixation" and in Gulliver's Travels linked the Roman with Brutus, Junius, Socrates and Epaminondas. - Browning p 5, 7.

³³ [Thomas Gordon] Britannicus, The Conspirators; or The Case of Catiline, London, 1721. Britannicus, Francis, Lord Bacon: or, The Case of Private and National Corruption, and Bribery, Impartially Consider'd, London, 1721.

³⁴ [Trenchard & Gordon], Cato's Letters. According to Marie McMahon, Gordon made his debut by taking part in the Bangorian Controversy and it was this that brought him to the attention of Trenchard - Radical Whigs, p 153.

³⁵ Realey, 'London Journal', p 7.

political discipline. According to these Independent Whigs, a good patriot was truly independent and did not slavishly follow party political leaders. 'Cato' told his readers that although he considered himself a Whig, he felt perfectly free to censure the Whig leaders and agreed with what he called sensible Tories in defending old English liberty.³⁶ Moreover, he was convinced that men changed their principles when in power so that "A Tory under Opposition, or out of Place", was "a Whig; and a Whig with Power to oppress", was "a Tory".³⁷ A true patriot, in 'Cato's' view, did not pursue selfish or party interests, or strive for luxury - rather he tried to promote virtue, liberty and the common good.³⁸

The 'Letters' were certainly sceptical of the motives which encouraged individuals to undertake political office. They were also critical of the qualities which were required in order to succeed. 'Cato' contended that, as art and treachery were necessary to rise in politics, it made it "almost impossible for a truly great or virtuous Man to attain those Stations".³⁹ Along with Hoadly, the eighteenth-century 'Cato' demonstrated his Whig principles and defended the contractual nature of government.⁴⁰ The authors of 'Cato's Letters' also supported the rule of law and a balanced constitution.⁴¹ However, unlike Hoadly, the 'Letters' did put forward a pessimistic view of human nature. They held that as men were naturally corrupt and selfish, the good patriot had to be ever vigilant because even the best constitutions could deteriorate and

³⁶ [Trenchard & Gordon], Cato's Letters, i, p 170, 109.

³⁷ [Trenchard & Gordon], Cato's Letters, iii, p 206.

³⁸ [Trenchard & Gordon], Cato's Letters, vol i introduction pages iv, vi, viii; i, p 67, i, p 70.

³⁹ [Trenchard & Gordon], Cato's Letters, i, p 90.

⁴⁰ Works, ii, p 254. [Trenchard & Gordon], Cato's Letters, p 264.

⁴¹ [Trenchard & Gordon], Cato's Letters, i, p 263, 118.

become the worst.⁴² The 'Letters' encouraged a true patriot to reject a consolidation of power in the ministry which could so easily turn into religious and political tyranny, or economic monopoly.⁴³ 'Cato' vigorously attacked the government's handling of the South Sea affair and also argued that the suspension of habeas corpus and the use of standing armies were a deprivation of civil liberty.⁴⁴

Although this is not the place for a rigorous analysis of 'Cato's Letters' it is important to appreciate that historians have differed markedly, not only in the interpretation of the essays, but also in the part they played in the politics of the day. Some scholars, including H T Dickinson, J G A Pocock and Isaac Kramnick, have viewed the period as a clash between Court and Country and maintained that 'Cato's Letters' and Bolingbroke's later attacks were part of the Country opposition against the Court.⁴⁵ Pocock argued that the authors of 'Cato's Letters' and Bolingbroke both employed the language of civic humanism.⁴⁶ According to him, these neo-Stoic writers, found fulfilment in a secular framework - by citizenship and virtue in working for the common good.⁴⁷ They idealised the notion of a balanced constitution put forward by

⁴² [Trenchard and Gordon], Cato's Letters, iii, p 17, 22. For other examples of the view that people might betray their own liberties see Walter Moyle, The Second Part of an Argument shewing that a Standing Army is Inconsistent with a Free Government, London, 1697. John Toland, The Art of Governing by Parties, London, 1701 and Charles D'Avenant Of Private Mens Duty in J A W Gunn, Beyond, p 12-16.

⁴³ [Trenchard & Gordon], Independent Whig, London, 1721. [Trenchard & Gordon], Cato's Letters, ii, p 225, i, 198, ii, 106, iv, p 78.

⁴⁴ [Trenchard and Gordon], Cato's Letters, i, p 36, 169, 198, iii, p 77, 78. For opposition to standing armies also see [John Trenchard and Walter Moyle], An Argument Shewing, that a Standing Army is inconsistent with a Free Government, London, 1697. Lois G Schworer, No Standing Armies, Baltimore and London, 1974.

⁴⁵ Dickinson, Liberty and Property, chapters 4 and 5. J G A Pocock, 'Machiavelli, Harrington and English Political Ideology in the Eighteenth Century', 1965 reprinted in Pocock, Politics, p 108. Kramnick, Bolingbroke, p 138.

⁴⁶ Pocock, Politics, p 107.

⁴⁷ Pocock, Politics, p 85. Pocock, Machiavellian Moment, p 484.

Aristotle and Polybius, read Machiavelli as a discourse on virtue and corruption, quoted Harrington to support propertied independence and the right to bear arms and the neo-Harringtonians for their adherence to an ancient constitution.⁴⁸ As Pocock portrayed it, the patriotic thought of the country school was based on a classical-medieval appeal to the past.⁴⁹

In contrast, other historians including J C D Clark and Linda Colley maintained that the evidence supported a Whig versus Tory political conflict.⁵⁰ Caroline Robbins, Quentin Skinner and Marie McMahon have all considered 'Cato's Letters' part of the Whig canon.⁵¹ Indeed, Marie McMahon's recent study has argued that authors of 'Cato's Letters' were devout Hanoverians, Lockean theorists, theologically heterodox and vigorously anti-clerical.⁵² She came to the conclusion that Trenchard and Gordon were first and foremost Whigs who published 'Cato's Letters' "to exhort and instruct a Whig government, not to oppose it".⁵³

It must be said that from the ministry's standpoint 'Cato's Letters' did not look

⁴⁸ Pocock, Politics, p 86-88, 114, 120. Pocock, Machiavellian Moment, p 450, 484.

⁴⁹ Pocock, Politics, p 145.

⁵⁰ J C D Clark, Revolution and Rebellion, Cambridge, 1986 p 112-114, 132-156. Linda Colley, Britons. Forging the Nation 1707-1837, New Haven & London, 1992. Researching into the period 1689-1720 David Hayton came to the conclusion that in "constructing a model of political structure ... we should take as our basis the two-party system of Whig versus Tory, and regard the conflicts between Court and Country rather as 'superstructural'; or even, for this limited purpose, leave the Country interest entirely on one side, as in itself too complex a phenomenon to fit properly into such conventional forms of historical pattern making".- David Hayton, 'The 'Country' interest and the party system, 1689-c1720' in Party and Management in Parliament, 1660-1784, edited by Clyde Jones, New York, 1984, p 66. See also David Hayton, 'Moral Reform and Country Politics in the Late Seventeenth Century House of Commons' in Past and Present, 1990, p 48-91.

⁵¹ Robbins, Commonwealthman, p 6 & 88. Quentin Skinner, 'The Principles and Practice of Opposition: the Case of Bolingbroke versus Walpole' in Historical Perspectives, edited by Neil McKendrick, London, 1974, p 114 & 126. McMahon, Radical Whigs, p 4.

⁵² Radical Whigs, chapters 3 and 4.

⁵³ Radical Whigs, p 118.

like constructive criticism, but anti-government propaganda which made the country more susceptible to a counter-revolution and Stuart restoration.⁵⁴ Moreover, the popularity of The London Journal meant that the government could not afford to ignore it. The newspaper was, according to Hanson, the most popular weekly of the eighteenth-century. In its heyday it could command a sale of between 10,000 and 15,000 copies per issue.⁵⁵ Occasionally, the government had taken repressive action. When the paper reported proceedings of the Parliamentary Committee of Secrecy into the South Sea affair in August 1721, printing presses were broken and copies of the paper were seized.⁵⁶ Nevertheless, Walpole soon realised that prosecution was a less effective weapon than persuasion and education so arrangements were made to buy the newspaper. Although John Peele continued as part owner and publisher, The London Journal became a ministerial paper in September, 1722.⁵⁷ As an antidote for unfavourable propaganda the administration arranged for a free weekly distribution by the Post Office. According to Michael Harris, 650 free copies of the newspaper were distributed each week in 1722 but this figure had risen to 12,500 copies per issue in 1734.⁵⁸

Walpole needed an experienced polemicist to encourage the Independent Whigs to support the Whig administration and to combat the threat of Jacobitism. In an attempt to achieve these ends Hoadly wrote the 'Britannicus

⁵⁴ Works, iii, p 10.

⁵⁵ Hanson, Press, p 85.

⁵⁶ Realey, London Journal, p 13, 15 & 16.

⁵⁷ Realey, London Journal, p 25.

⁵⁸ Michael Harris, 'Print and Politics in the Age of Walpole', in Age of Walpole, edited by Black, p 201. See also Michael Harris, London Newspapers in the Age of Walpole, London and Toronto, 1987.

Letters' in The London Journal most weeks from 15 September, 1722 until March, 1724/5.⁵⁹ Unfortunately, there is no evidence to indicate how Hoadly became involved in The London Journal. Walpole may have asked the Bishop personally, or in a letter which has since been lost. Perhaps an intermediary was involved in the affair. Hoadly may have even volunteered his own services. However, we do know that by the time that the Bishop severed his links with the newspaper, the immediate fear of a Jacobite invasion and the furore surrounding the Atterbury plot had subsided and the Whigs seemed more united.⁶⁰ The 'Britannicus Letters' amount to 392 folio pages in the Works. Most of the 'Letters' in the Works appear to have been written by Hoadly, although it is important to note that John Hoadly (the editor of the Works) did include a number which were not composed by his father.⁶¹

As a bishop of the established Church, convention dictated that Hoadly published these 'Letters' under an assumed name.⁶² In the main, he wrote under the pseudonym of 'Britannicus', although occasionally Hoadly used the names of 'Philopatris', 'Philhistoricus', 'Philaretus' and sometimes 'A. B'. It is difficult to know how many people realised that the Bishop was the author of the 'Britannicus Letters'. Alexander Pope appeared to believe that Hoadly was 'Britannicus'.⁶³ But writing in the 1930s, Charles Realey attributed the 'Britannicus Letters' to a ministerial journalist by the name of Osborne.⁶⁴ The

⁵⁹ Works, iii, p 3-395. 16 January-20 March he wrote to 'Britannicus' using the name 'Philopatris'.

⁶⁰ Works, iii, p 204, 352, 355. Matthew Concanen stepped into Hoadly's place and from 1725 the London Journal and other government newspapers focused on the Scriblerians. (Swift, Pope, Gay, etc). Targett, 'Walpole's Newspapers', p 159.

⁶¹ Works, iii, p 330. According to John Hoadly, his father only composed one letter (1 August) between May and 28 November, 1724.

⁶² Targett, 'Walpole's Newspapers', p 205-206.

⁶³ Note on Pope's MS of The Dunciad cited in David Wheeler, 'Hoadly, Henley, and The Dunciad' in Scriblerian and the Kit-Cats, vol 16, 1983, p 59-61.

⁶⁴ Realey, 'The Early Opposition', p 63.

research carried out for this thesis does, however, confirm Hoadly's authorship of most of the 'Letters' printed in the Works. A private letter dated 4 July, 1723 from 'Britannicus' to Sir Robert Walpole was without doubt written by the Bishop.⁶⁵ Moreover, the Bishop used the same ideas and authorities in both his pre-Walpolean writings and in the 'Britannicus Letters'. For example Hoadly appropriated classical figures, in particular Cicero, for his own cause.⁶⁶ Like the ancients he continually encouraged individuals to use reason and to consider the common good.⁶⁷ Hoadly's writings also reflected the belief that truth and utility were compatible.⁶⁸ Furthermore, as in earlier publications, the Bishop blended these classical concepts with religious ideas and language. Consequently, we find that Hoadly frequently employed the rhetoric of anti-popery. He consistently appealed to the Christian/Reformation principles of liberty of religious inquiry and independent judgement in matters of faith. Finally, the Bishop continually eulogised the religious and political liberties gained in the 1688 Revolution.⁶⁹

The 'Britannicus Letters' certainly had pride of place in the journal and covered approximately two and a half pages of the six page newspaper.⁷⁰ The Bishop probably exercised editorial power but in times of political crisis

⁶⁵ PRO Letter from 'Britannicus' to 'Sir' [Robert Walpole] 4 July, 1723, SP 35/44/16. I have compared this letter with one signed by Hoadly and it was certainly written by the Bishop.

⁶⁶ Works, i, p 146; iii, p 28, 29.

⁶⁷ Works, ii, p 18, 71; iii, p 79.

⁶⁸ Works, ii, 33, 75; iii, p 266.

⁶⁹ Works, ii, 489, 496; iii, p 373, 385; i, p 615-622; iii, 219, 223.

⁷⁰ The London Journal, 6 July, 1723.

Walpole and Hoadly were in close contact.⁷¹ The London Journal was the first of Walpole's newspapers to have been directly sponsored by the Treasury. However, the minister undoubtedly considered that this policy was successful because he introduced The Free Briton on 4 December 1729 as an antidote to The Craftsman. The Daily Courant was remodelled in 1730 to meet Walpole's demands. Other ministerial newspapers included The Corn Cutter's Journal which began in October, 1733 and The Daily Gazetteer which was established in June, 1735.⁷²

In general, Walpole's newspaper writers have been given a bad press. In Pope's biased view they were a "low-born, cell-bred, selfish, servile band".⁷³ Writing in 1936 Laurence Hanson contended that Walpole's money could not buy talent and argued that the opposition were better equipped.⁷⁴ In 1984 Michael Harris also declared that the Walpole government employed "a range of authors conspicuously short of reputation and literary talent".⁷⁵ It must be said that the opposition certainly did have the support of many gifted writers. Swift's Gulliver's Travels appeared in 1726, Gay's Beggar's Opera in 1728, Pope's Dunciad in 1728, Lyttleton's Letters from a Persian in 1735 and Bolingbroke's The Idea of a Patriot King in 1738.⁷⁶

⁷¹ Targett, 'Walpole's Newspapers', p 115. PRO Letter SP35/44/16. As an example in a letter dated 4 July, 1723 'Britannicus' outlined the strategy he intended to employ in the 'Britannicus Letters' and asked Walpole for his approval. Due to public sympathy for Atterbury, Hoadly had decided to end his criticisms of the Nonjuror George Kelly and begin a detailed assault on Atterbury's defence. Walpole must have agreed because this plan was put into effect on 13 July. - Works, iii, p 155. For further details on Kelly and Atterbury see p 178-182 of this thesis.

⁷² Targett, 'Walpole's Newspapers', p 126, 132-140. Authors of the Flying Post, British Journal Hyp Doctor were also given places or pensions.

⁷³ Pope, The Dunciad Variorum quoted in Targett, 'Walpole's Newspapers', p 239.

⁷⁴ Hanson, Press, p 117.

⁷⁵ Harris, 'Print and Politics', p 197.

⁷⁶ W A Speck, Society and Literature in England 1700-60, Dublin, 1983, p 26-33.

Simon Targett's research has however shown that Walpole's writers were not short of either talent, status or principle.⁷⁷ The regular newspaper contributors Benjamin Hoadly, Matthew Concanen, James Pitt, Ralph Courteville, William Arnall and John Henley were all dedicated political writers.⁷⁸ Only James Ralph, Benjamin Norton Defoe and Thomas Cooke could be called Grub Street hacks.⁷⁹ As a bishop of the established Church, a committed Whig and an experienced propagandist, Hoadly certainly did not conform to Pope's description of Walpole's writers. It was also extremely obvious that Hoadly spent a good deal of both time and energy on the 'Britannicus Letters'.⁸⁰

The pseudonym 'Britannicus' gave some indication of the subject matter of the 'Letters'. They were primarily essays on patriotism and matters which were of vital importance to all good citizens.⁸¹ However, unlike 'Cato's Letters' the 'Britannicus Letters' were written from the perspective of those in power. The Bishop's aim was undoubtedly to appropriate the idea and language of patriotism for the Court Whig cause.⁸² Throughout the 'Letters' 'Britannicus' consistently argued that the country was in imminent danger of invasion and insurrection in favour of a Catholic king who would overturn all the benefits gained at the Reformation and the 1688 Revolution.⁸³ Hoadly attempted to portray the ministry as true patriots who worked for the common good against

⁷⁷ In *Machiavellian Moment*, p 483 J G A Pocock had written that "the Walpolean writers proclaimed a world of kinetic history, without principle or virtue, in which men were governed through the interests and passions that made them what they were at the moment".

⁷⁸ Targett, 'Walpole's Newspapers', p 207.

⁷⁹ Targett, 'Walpole's Newspapers', p 239.

⁸⁰ *Works*, iii, p 1-395.

⁸¹ *Works*, iii, p 4.

⁸² *Works*, iii, p 7, 8.

⁸³ *Works*, iii, p 10.

all the evils of Jacobitism and popery.⁸⁴ Government critics were, he contended, traitors or duped by traitors, so he used the 'Letters' to try to persuade Whigs, Protestants and indeed all good citizens that it was their patriotic duty to support the court at such a difficult time.⁸⁵

Hoadly used both the classics and Christian/Reformation principles to discuss his notions of true patriotism. First, classical analogies were employed to claim Cato and Cicero for the Court Whigs.⁸⁶ 'Britannicus' was particularly concerned that the authority of Cato had been used to popularise the idea that opposition was the main rule of patriotism.⁸⁷ The authors of 'Cato's Letters' had suggested that a patriot should constantly criticise the government and never accept a post or pension.⁸⁸ The Bishop believed that these were the personal views of jealous people, they were certainly not patriotic virtues.⁸⁹ Hoadly was sure that a true patriot should "serve" his country and he contended that the "Patriotism of Men in Power" could merit the title of "True Patriots, perhaps much more than Any under them".⁹⁰

The Walpole administration had been severely criticised because it suspended habeas corpus and raised a standing army when it believed that it

⁸⁴ Works, iii, p 78. For anti-popery rhetoric Haydon, Anti-Catholicism.

⁸⁵ Works, iii, p 5, 9-11.

⁸⁶ Works, iii, p 30, 32. As early as 1716 Cato was made an advocate of the Whig ministry with Jonathan Smedley's A Discourse Concerning the Love of Our Country. See also Cato's Dream, Dublin 1723, Cato's Letter to the Bishop of Rochester, London, 1723 - Browning, Court Whigs, p 8. Others, including pro-government writers in St James's Journal, (15 November, 1722), The Whitehall Journal, (6 November, 1722) & the anonymous The Censor Censur'd: or Cato Turned Catiline, London, 1722 argued that the technique of alluding to parallels between Britain and Rome were unfair because times were so very different - Gunn, Beyond, p 22.

⁸⁷ Works, iii, p 10, 28-30.

⁸⁸ Works, iii, p 4, 6.

⁸⁹ Works, iii, p 7, 12.

⁹⁰ Works, iii, p 8, 7.

had uncovered a Jacobite plot.⁹¹ In response, 'Britannicus' used his interpretation of the Catiline conspiracy to demonstrate that Cato and Cicero had both supported the use of emergency powers to protect Rome and the liberties of her subjects.⁹² In the period in question, Caesar had argued that these new powers could be used against the state and its citizens. But Hoadly maintained that Cato realised that extra-ordinary measures were sometimes necessary to preserve liberty.⁹³ So Cato, like Walpole many years later, supported an increase in executive power to restrain subjects and raise an army.⁹⁴

The work of Reed Browning and Peter Miller has shown that although initially the appropriation of Cato was dominant, he was soon replaced in Court Whig philosophy by the more pragmatic Cicero.⁹⁵ As we have already noted, Hoadly employed his own interpretation of Cicero in debates with the Deists in 1713.⁹⁶ In addition, on 3 November 1722 'Britannicus' suggested that Cicero would have approved of the ministry's actions to defend the state.⁹⁷ The Bishop had a practical Ciceronian approach to politics. He asked his readers not to expect too much from either human nature or the political system. It was, he believed extremely easy to create utopias and criticise the administration.⁹⁸ If "a Man were to sit down and frame a Model of a New Commonwealth, He

⁹¹ Works, iii, p 29. See also Browning, Court Whigs, p 87. Peter N Miller, Defining the Common Good, Cambridge, 1994, p 87.

⁹² Works, iii, p 28-30.

⁹³ Works, iii, p 32.

⁹⁴ Works, iii, p 32.

⁹⁵ Browning, Court Whigs, p 213. Miller, Common Good, p 89.

⁹⁶ [Hoadly], Queries recommended to the Authors of the late Discourse of Free-Thinking in Works, i, p 146, 147. See chapter 2, p 68 of this thesis.

⁹⁷ Works, iii, p 28, 29.

⁹⁸ Works, iii, p 215.

might please Himself by fashioning it, in the Theory, to all that Perfection of Beauty and Usefulness which his own Imagination could invent”.⁹⁹ However, the Bishop declared that, government was “a Matter of Practice” not speculation and, as it was practised by men, it would always fall short of perfection.¹⁰⁰ Instead of constantly criticising Court policies he believed citizens should have realised that conditions in the nation had improved.¹⁰¹

Although Hoadly acknowledged that ‘true’ happiness could not be found in this world, like Cicero, Hoadly also believed that utility was a virtue when it promoted public happiness and safety.¹⁰² Throughout the ‘Britannicus Letters’ and other political works the Bishop appealed to the notion of national happiness as a test of political legitimacy.¹⁰³ For Hoadly, public happiness incorporated national peace and economic prosperity, including the rise in public credit and an increase in manufacturers.¹⁰⁴ However, as Reed Browning has recognised, the utilitarian rationale focused on results and did not offer any protection against a benevolent despot.¹⁰⁵ Moreover, no regime could be safe if its claim to validity rested purely on its ability to create material happiness.¹⁰⁶ The government would undoubtedly be offered greater security if it adhered to the timeless principles of natural law.¹⁰⁷

One of Cicero’s main contentions was that reason and natural law would

⁹⁹ Works, iii, p 215.

¹⁰⁰ Works, iii, p 215, 209.

¹⁰¹ Works, iii, p 265, 266, 364.

¹⁰² Miller, Common Good, p 57. Works, ii, p 75, iii, p 266.

¹⁰³ Works, ii, p 33; iii, p 257, 259, 263, 266, 354. Browning, Court Whigs, p 73.

¹⁰⁴ Works, iii, p 263, 266.

¹⁰⁵ Browning, Court Whigs, p 238.

¹⁰⁶ Browning, Court Whigs, p 238.

¹⁰⁷ Browning, Court Whigs, p 238.

encourage men to work for the common good.¹⁰⁸ Encouraging individuals to make their own needs subservient to the common good was always a dominant theme in Hoadly's political writings. Indeed, in The Measures of Submission to the Civil Magistrate considered (1706) he used both classical ideas and religious authorities to argue that to strive for the common good was the test of a magistrate's legitimacy.¹⁰⁹ Writing as 'Britannicus' in the 1720s, Hoadly also tried to persuade his audience that the Whig ministry worked for the whole nation.¹¹⁰ Furthermore, he encouraged all good patriots to do the same.¹¹¹ He defended liberty of the press - whenever this had been taken away it had ended in "Darkness, in the Intellectual World, ... Baseness in the Moral World, . [and] ... Slavery, in the Political World".¹¹² Nevertheless, he strongly urged all patriots to use self restraint, for finding fault always needed to be tempered by an over-riding concern for the common good.¹¹³

The Court Whigs also used Cicero to support the view that self-interest and patriotism were compatible.¹¹⁴ Government ministers had frequently been charged with corruption, particularly in their response to the South Sea affair.¹¹⁵ It should be stressed that the Bishop never defended corrupt political practices, nor did he contend, as Bernard Mandeville had done that if private 'vices' were carefully managed they could benefit society.¹¹⁶ Nevertheless, he

¹⁰⁸ Miller, Common Good, p 23. Browning, Court Whigs, p 232, 242. Todd, Christian Humanism, p 28.

¹⁰⁹ Works, ii, p 18, 33, 71. - See p 104-105 of this thesis. Miller, Common Good, p 82.

¹¹⁰ Works, iii, p 266.

¹¹¹ Works, iii, p 266.

¹¹² Works, iii, p 79. For Hoadly's defence of liberty of the press see Works, i, p xxii.

¹¹³ Works, iii, p 79.

¹¹⁴ Miller, Common Good, p 70.

¹¹⁵ Works, iii, p 281.

¹¹⁶ M M Goldsmith, 'Public Virtue & Private Vices', in Eighteenth Century Studies, 9, 1975-6 & 509. Bernard Mandeville defends Fable of the Bees, in The London Journal, 10 August, 1723.

realised that self-interest was a very powerful motive and he did not think that ministers should be discouraged from entering into anything reasonable which benefited themselves and the nation. For “self-interest” when “rightly understood and rightly applied at least in its Effects and Consequences” was, according to Hoadly, “the same with Public Virtue”.¹¹⁷ There was, he argued, frequently a similarity between the true interest of a private person and the true interest of society. He maintained that both longed for peace and justice and the reputation of both depended on honesty.¹¹⁸

As we have already mentioned, Pocock has argued that the authors of ‘Cato’s Letters’ used the language of civic humanism. Browning also stressed the importance of the classics and emphasised the Ciceronian aspects of the Court Whig philosophy. However, like the Christian humanists Hoadly employed both classical and Christian ideas. Indeed, the Bishop’s idea of patriotism was inextricably linked to Christian/Reformation principles and frequently expressed itself in the rhetoric of virulent anti-popery. As we have seen in earlier chapters of this thesis, Hoadly viewed Christianity and the Protestant religion as ‘protest’ movements, crusades for freedom against excessive temporal authority in religious affairs.¹¹⁹ They were, in his view, based on individual religious inquiry and private judgement in matters of faith.¹²⁰ Moreover, according to Hoadly, religious and political freedom were totally inseparable.¹²¹ Consequently, as discussed in chapter three of this thesis, the Reformation principle of resistance became, for Hoadly, a principle

¹¹⁷ Works, iii, p 217.

¹¹⁸ Works, iii, p 269.

¹¹⁹ See pages 57, 107, 155 of this thesis.

¹²⁰ For a detailed discussion of this see chapters 2 and 4 of this thesis.

¹²¹ Works, iii, p 370.

of the 1688 Revolution.¹²² He was absolutely convinced that the future of the Protestant Church and state in England depended on the success of the 1688 Revolution and subsequently the Hanoverian succession.¹²³ Only a Protestant succession could, the Bishop contended, safeguard the Protestant Church and guarantee constitutional government, the rule of law and the security of individuals and their property.¹²⁴

Hoadly viewed popery as the perversion of the most perfect religion.¹²⁵ As we have seen in other chapters of this thesis, Hoadly linked popery with excessive church authority, superstition, blind submission to man made laws, religious oppression and persecution.¹²⁶ In political terms the fear of popery was associated with the restoration of a Roman Catholic king and the unwelcomed influence of Rome and France.¹²⁷ In the 'Britannicus Letters' Hoadly told Britons that "Popery" was not "an innocent thing"; experience had shown him that such a combination had in the past resulted in arbitrary rule, political tyranny and economic deprivation.¹²⁸ Popery was, he contended, "a Word which itself" signified "a composition of the greatest of all evils united, cruelty without mercy, darkness without light, chains as the reward of obedience".¹²⁹

From the time of the Reformation in England there has been, as Christopher Hill, Patrick Collinson, J C D Clark and Linda Colley have noted, a close

¹²² See page 111 of this thesis.

¹²³ *Works*, iii, p 219-225

¹²⁴ *Works*, iii, p 42-48. See chapter 3 of this thesis for further details.

¹²⁵ *Works*, iii, p 51.

¹²⁶ *Works*, i, p 544-554; ii, p 916.

¹²⁷ *Works*, iii, p 20, 39, 40-41, 52, 88.

¹²⁸ *Works*, iii, p 35, 41, 50, 214, 220, 235, 264.

¹²⁹ *Works*, iii, p 223.

association between Protestantism and patriotism even though, as Tony Claydon and Ian McBride have recently warned, the relationship was extremely complex.¹³⁰ The 'Britannicus Letters' can undoubtedly be viewed as an effort to create, or rather reaffirm, the connection between Protestantism and patriotism. Hoadly tried to encourage all Whigs, Protestants and indeed all good patriots to support the Protestant succession and the Whig ministry in their effort to protect the nation from Jacobitism and popery.¹³¹

As discussed in chapter three of this thesis, Hoadly vigorously defended the 1688 Revolution. Each November, on the anniversary of William's landing at Torbay, 'Britannicus' celebrated the Revolution. It was, he declared, a month sacred to the cause of Protestantism and liberty.¹³² The Bishop reminded his audience of their loss in 1688 - a Roman Catholic king who served the interest of his own church and who believed that he would be damned if he did not destroy the Protestant Church.¹³³ A king who had set up a dispensing power above the law.¹³⁴ Hoadly eulogised the benefits of 1688. The country had gained Protestant monarchs who did not rule according to their own arbitrary will but within the bounds of the constitution.¹³⁵ The Revolution had promoted

¹³⁰ Christopher Hill, 'History and Patriotism' in Patriotism, i, edited by Raphael Samuel, London and New York, 1989, p 159. Patrick Collinson, The Birthpangs of Protestant England, New York, 1988, p 11. For a discussion of religion in creating the British culture see also Clark, English Society. Colley, Britons. Linda Colley, 'Britishness and Otherness' in Journal of British Studies, 31, 1992. Tony Claydon and Ian McBride, 'The trials of the chosen peoples: recent interpretations of protestantism and national identity in Britain and Ireland', in Protestantism and National Identity Britain and Ireland c.1650 - c.1850, edited by Claydon and McBride, Cambridge, 1998, p 25, 26 - For example, although Protestantism may have defined the outer circle of nationality there were important differences between British Protestants.

¹³¹ Works, iii, p 44, 10, 17, 20, 23.

¹³² Works, iii, p 219, 225.

¹³³ Works, iii, p 220.

¹³⁴ Works, iii, p 220.

¹³⁵ Works, iii, p 225.

justice and defended individuals and their property.¹³⁶ Most important, the events of 1688 had, Hoadly argued, secured the Protestant Church and guaranteed religious toleration.¹³⁷

In December 1722 and the spring of the following year 'Britannicus' defended a government bill to raise money on the estates of Roman Catholics.¹³⁸ In the eyes of opponents it certainly looked as if a Whig government which professed religious toleration was involved in religious persecution.¹³⁹ Writing in 1982 Browning found 'Britannicus's apologies for the bill "unsustainable".¹⁴⁰

However, Browning did not appear to appreciate Hoadly's real fear of popery and Jacobitism and the limits to his toleration. 'Britannicus' affirmed that he did not approve of religious tests or any kind of religious persecution, nor did he believe that Catholics should be asked to swear against

transubstantiation.¹⁴¹ He implied that he would gladly have supported toleration for Catholics if their patriotism could have been assured.¹⁴²

Nevertheless, like John Locke, William Fleetwood and others he was convinced that Catholics owed their allegiance to the Pope and the Roman Catholic Church rather than the nation.¹⁴³ 'Britannicus' declared that an "English Papist must have Him for his King, whom the Pope, and his Priests, acknowledge for King of England, and He can have no other".¹⁴⁴ As a

¹³⁶ Works, iii, p 225, 35.

¹³⁷ Works, iii, p 225.

¹³⁸ Works, iii, p 52. It was later amended to include Nonjurors. iii, p 209, 211.

¹³⁹ Works, iii, p 52

¹⁴⁰ Browning, Court Whigs, p 75.

¹⁴¹ Works, iii, p 67.

¹⁴² Works, iii, p 69.

¹⁴³ Works, iii, p 58. [John Locke], A Letter Concerning Toleration, London, (1689), edited and introduced by J W Gough, Oxford, 1946, p 155, 156. Fleetwood, Papists Not excluded (1717) in Fleetwood, Collection, p 708-709.

¹⁴⁴ Works, iii, p 382.

consequence, Hoadly declared that it was not persecution but self preservation for a state to defend itself from its civil enemies.¹⁴⁵

During the autumn of 1722 and throughout the following summer, the newspapers were full of the Jacobite plot and subsequent trials of Christopher Layer, George Kelly and Francis Atterbury.¹⁴⁶ Writing in 1974, G V Bennett was of the opinion that real plots in favour of the Stuart cause were ill-managed and abortive affairs and argued that the administration had created the impression that there was a united and widespread conspiracy to further their own political ends.¹⁴⁷ In contrast, Eveline Cruickshanks supports the view that Walpole's fears of Jacobitism were very real and based on his vast intelligence network both at home and abroad.¹⁴⁸

It may be useful to give a brief outline of the plots before explaining Hoadly's part in this affair. As we have already noted, Jacobites had become more confident of success after the South Sea crisis. Francis Atterbury, Bishop of Rochester was one of the Pretender's chief organisers in England and corresponded with James on a regular basis. On 20th April 1722, Atterbury dictated three letters to the Reverend George Kelly, a young Nonjuror who travelled for the Pretender.¹⁴⁹ The letters were addressed to General Dillon, Lord Mar and the Pretender under the feigned names of Chivers, Musgrave

¹⁴⁵ Works, iii, p 58.

¹⁴⁶ For a full discussion see Bennett Tory Crisis, chapters 12-14 and his article 'Jacobitism and the Rise'. For the earlier period see G V Bennett, 'English Jacobitism, 1710-1715, Myth and Reality', in Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 32, 1982.

¹⁴⁷ Bennett, 'Jacobitism and the Rise', p 89.

¹⁴⁸ Eveline Cruickshanks, 'The Political Management of Sir Robert Walpole, 1720-42', in Age of Walpole, edited by Black, p 30.

¹⁴⁹ Works, iii, p 176, 177.

and Jackson.¹⁵⁰ However, the Post Office intercepted these letters and after a rigorous examination Kelly implicated the Bishop of Rochester.¹⁵¹ The Reverend Philip Neyno, an Irish Nonjuror who occasionally acted as secretary to Kelly, also volunteered information that Atterbury was the real leader of a Jacobite conspiracy in England.¹⁵² Meanwhile, in a separate incident, the Post Office intercepted correspondence by John Plunket, an employee of Christopher Layer, a Norfolk Barrister with Nonjuring principles who had worked his way into Jacobite circles.¹⁵³ Two bundles of treasonable material were discovered in Layer's lodgings.¹⁵⁴ Layer was subsequently tried and received the death sentence.¹⁵⁵ Kelly was sent to the Tower but escaped and later took part in the Scottish rebellion of 1745.¹⁵⁶ Atterbury was arrested, confined in the tower for high treason and after his trial banished from the country.¹⁵⁷

The government did appear to magnify the crisis and, for the purpose of this thesis it is important to appreciate that opponents vigorously attacked their actions during this period. Walpole and the administration were censured for their use of spies and code breakers in detecting the conspirators.¹⁵⁸ As we have already noted, the suspension of habeas corpus caused fear and resentment.¹⁵⁹ Tension also increased when guards were stationed in Hyde

¹⁵⁰ Works, iii, p 176.

¹⁵¹ Bennett, 'Jacobitism and the Rise', p 83, 85.

¹⁵² Bennett, 'Jacobitism and the Rise', p 87.

¹⁵³ Fritz, English Ministers, p 7.

¹⁵⁴ Bennett, 'Jacobitism and the Rise', p 88.

¹⁵⁵ Bennett, Tory Crisis, p 272.

¹⁵⁶ Bennett, Tory Crisis, p 273.

¹⁵⁷ Bennett, Tory Crisis, p 257, 276.

¹⁵⁸ Fritz, English Ministers, p 111, 112.

¹⁵⁹ Works, iii, p 19. Bennett, 'Jacobitism and the Rise', p 88. Fritz, English Ministers, p 6.

Park and several regiments were moved to Salisbury Plain and Hounslow Heath.¹⁶⁰ In addition, the procedure of the trials was somewhat suspect. For example, proceedings against Atterbury were based on the rather dubious legal practice of a bill of pains and penalties, and when his trial did take place in the House of Lords, the evidence did not meet the usual standards of proof required in the courts of Common Law.¹⁶¹

Writing under the name of 'Britannicus', Hoadly worked hard to counter these criticisms and portray the government as good patriots who tried to secure the gains made at the Reformation and Revolution and defend the nation from popery.¹⁶² The ministry were, he contended, fully entitled to use all the powers at their disposal in order to save the state and he urged all citizens to support them.¹⁶³ Hoadly appreciated that many Englishmen feared the loss of individual liberty associated with the maintenance of a standing army.¹⁶⁴ But he tried to persuade them that there was nothing to fear from an army when it was accountable to Parliament.¹⁶⁵ Moreover, 'Britannicus' declared that he could not understand how Britons and Protestants, laboured night and day for a popish prince who would certainly have destroyed the Church and religious toleration, together with the privileges of law, liberty and property.¹⁶⁶ Readers were told that only diligent detective work on the part of the government had saved the Protestant nation from the "Disorder, Confusion, Violence [and]

¹⁶⁰ McMahon, Radical Whigs, p 169.

¹⁶¹ Bennett, Tory Crisis, p 264, 258, 272.

¹⁶² Works, iii, p 8, 28, 29, 50, 53, 219, 370.

¹⁶³ Works, iii, p 13.

¹⁶⁴ Works, iii, p 305.

¹⁶⁵ Works, iii, p 305.

¹⁶⁶ Works, iii, p 88.

Lawless Rapine” which would have attended Jacobitism.¹⁶⁷

‘Britannicus’ assured his audience that Christopher Layer had been equitably tried and condemned.¹⁶⁸ Moreover, he warned his readers not to be fooled by the modesty and gentility of Kelly’s performance.¹⁶⁹ The full force of his attack was, however, reserved for the Bishop of Rochester. As we have seen earlier in this thesis, Hoadly and Atterbury were longstanding enemies and had clashed on numerous occasions.¹⁷⁰ Although Atterbury was exiled in June 1723, that was certainly not the end of the affair.¹⁷¹ The Duke of Wharton’s Jacobite newspaper the True Briton continued to defend Atterbury and attack the ministry.¹⁷²

‘Britannicus’ took urgent steps to counter this anti-government propaganda and from 13 July until 5 October 1723 laboriously answered Atterbury’s defences and complaints.¹⁷³ According to ‘Britannicus’, all the evidence indicated that the Bishop of Rochester had dictated the letters to Kelly, corresponded with the Pretender and was guilty of high treason.¹⁷⁴ Hoadly ridiculed the late bishop’s explanation that he was ill and could not possibly have dictated the letters at that time.¹⁷⁵ Atterbury had claimed that government ministers had created a fictitious plot and forged evidence against

¹⁶⁷ Works, iii, 264.

¹⁶⁸ Works, iii, p 81.

¹⁶⁹ Works, iii, p 122, 123.

¹⁷⁰ Bennett, Tory Crisis, p 105-112. Chapter 3, p 86, 90, 99, 100 of this thesis. Works, ii, p 287.

¹⁷¹ Bennett, Tory Crisis, p 272, 276

¹⁷² PRO Letter SP35/44/16. D H Stevens, Party Politics and English Journalism 1702-1742, Chicago/Menasha, 1916, p 115.

¹⁷³ Works, iii, p 155-208.

¹⁷⁴ Works, iii, p 203.

¹⁷⁵ Works, iii, p 180.

him.¹⁷⁶ Indeed, 'Britannicus' maintained that his defence consisted in "One single Word, FORGERY, repeated over and over again".¹⁷⁷ As a cleric Atterbury had expected special treatment, but 'Britannicus' insisted that all state criminals were treated equally.¹⁷⁸ Moreover, as in his debates with the Nonjurors in the previous decade, Hoadly was convinced that civil government had every right to limit the power of the clergy when the security of the state was at stake.¹⁷⁹ In his view, Atterbury was very lucky that he had been given exile instead of the death penalty.¹⁸⁰ By the end of September 'Britannicus' realised that he had probably "quite wearied the Reader with the Tedious Particularity of these Remarks upon Every Branch of the late Bishop of Rochester's Defence" but believed it had been necessary to do so for the sake of the country and the government ministers who had been "infamously abused".¹⁸¹

After the trials Hoadly continued to warn good patriots of the dangers of Jacobitism and popery. The Bishop certainly did not want citizens to be duped by what he considered to be pro-Catholic propaganda. To give an example, The Life of Francois de Salignac de la Motte Fenelon, Archbishop and Duke of Cambray had been translated from the French of Andrew Michael Ramsay and published in London in 1723. The Archbishop was the celebrated author of the Adventures of Telemachus which was also translated into English and

¹⁷⁶ Works, iii, p 207.

¹⁷⁷ Works, iii, p 205.

¹⁷⁸ Works, iii, p 199, 200.

¹⁷⁹ Works, iii, p 199.

¹⁸⁰ Works, iii, p 198.

¹⁸¹ Works, iii, p 204.

went through many editions during the eighteenth-century.¹⁸² The author of Cambray's Life argued that the Catholic Archbishop had been an ardent proponent of both religious and political freedom.¹⁸³ Hoadly could not accept this interpretation. For him, liberty and freedom could only be associated with primitive Christianity and the Protestant religion, not the Roman Catholic Church. Hoadly acknowledged that Cambray had been a noble man but, sadly because he was a Catholic, he had been forced to subordinate his reason to the authority of the Roman Church.¹⁸⁴ The Bishop warned his audience that Cambray may have talked of liberty and toleration, but his first allegiance was to his own church. 'Britannicus' declared that the Archbishop would have turned into a persecutor if the Pope had instructed him to do so!¹⁸⁵

In a similar way, Hoadly criticised The Life of Cardinal Wolsey which was written by Richard Fiddes and published anonymously in 1724. A cleric and 'man of letters' Fiddes mixed in Tory circles and had been acquainted with the earl of Oxford, Swift, Sherlock and Atterbury.¹⁸⁶ In the preface to his work Fiddes, perhaps unwisely, paid tribute to Atterbury who had offered him accommodation.¹⁸⁷ Throughout this thesis we have seen how the Reformation was used by later authors to champion their own causes - Fiddes and of course Hoadly were no exceptions to this. Fiddes not only attempted to vindicate Wolsey's memory but he also gave a view of the Reformation which

¹⁸² Adventures of Telemachus, (son of Ulysses) 1699?, Paris. The New Adventures of Telemachus by the Reverend G Stubbs was also written to counteract the propaganda surrounding the publication of the life of Cambray. 'Britannicus' introduced this to The London Journal on 6 June, 1724 - Works, iii, p 330.

¹⁸³ Works, iii, p 229.

¹⁸⁴ Works, iii, p 236, 231.

¹⁸⁵ Works, iii, p 242.

¹⁸⁶ DNB, vi, p 1262.

¹⁸⁷ DNB, vi, p 1262.

was certainly more sympathetic to the unreformed mediaeval church. Fiddes was immediately attacked in the pulpit and the press. Dr Knight, who was prebendary of Ely, denounced Fiddes as 'throwing dirt upon the happy reformation of religion amongst us'.¹⁸⁸ 'Britannicus' declared that Fiddes had attacked private judgement which was the very foundation of the Reformation in England.¹⁸⁹ Furthermore, by asserting the independence of the Church he had, according to Hoadly, undermined the royal supremacy gained at the Reformation.¹⁹⁰ Hoadly told his readers that he wanted to make them aware that The Life of Cardinal Wolsey made plausible excuses for those who lived and died in the "Bigotry and Tyranny of the Church of Rome".¹⁹¹

Hoadly undoubtedly feared the religious and political effects of popery at home and abroad. As Colin Haydon's work has shown, with Protestantism pushed to the periphery of Europe and the counter-Reformation advancing, especially in Hapsburg lands, the fear of the threat posed by Catholic powers was very real.¹⁹² The Flying Post of 15-17 December, 1724 included a narrative on the cruel executions at Thorn.¹⁹³ In the weeks which followed 'Britannicus' also used the horrors of the massacres of Protestants at Thorn in Prussia, to remind all Protestants that religious and civil freedom were inseparable. He also cautioned them on the dangers which would follow the restoration of a Catholic king in England.¹⁹⁴ According to 'Britannicus',

¹⁸⁸ DNB, vi, p 1262.

¹⁸⁹ Works, iii, p 385.

¹⁹⁰ Works, iii, p 384-386.

¹⁹¹ Works, iii, p 389. Richard Fiddes was however given the opportunity to reply. In The London Journal of 29 February, 1724/5 attacking what he considered to be the "impious latitudinarian principles" of Britannicus. [Richard Fiddes], An Answer to Britannicus, Compiler of the London Journal by the compiler of Cardinal Wolsey's Life, London, 1725.

¹⁹² Haydon, Anti-Catholicism, p 25.

¹⁹³ Haydon, Anti-Catholicism, p 25.

¹⁹⁴ Works, iii, p 370.

although the riot at Thorn in the summer of 1724 was started by a Jesuit, Protestants were blamed.¹⁹⁵ Hoadly described in great detail the atrocities which followed. Some Protestants were beheaded, others quartered and burnt, Protestant councillors were removed and Protestant property was confiscated.¹⁹⁶ 'Britannicus' warned his readers that every "Advance of the Power of Bigotry abroad" threatened Britons "with a Popish Pretender at home" and "with Him, All the Train of his Attendants, Superstition and Cruelty".¹⁹⁷

'Britannicus' continually tried to persuade his audience that the peace and prosperity of the nation could only be achieved by supporting the Protestant establishment and the Whig administration.¹⁹⁸ Only the vigilance of the ministry, he reiterated, had ensured that Britons remained free from the "Popish Yoke".¹⁹⁹ Moreover, he was convinced that religious and political freedoms were prerequisites of economic prosperity.²⁰⁰ The association of Whigs as businessmen and professionals had led to an unfavourable image in contemporary opposition literature. As early as 1700 The Character of a Whig under Several Denominations had described 'the factious seditious illiterate whig lawyer' and the 'politick tricking overreaching trading whig'.²⁰¹ In The True Picture of a Modern Whig (1701) and its sequels Charles Davenant wrote of the penniless adventurer Tom Double who rose to riches by a career of

¹⁹⁵ Works, ii, p 367, 368.

¹⁹⁶ Works, iii, p 367, 368.

¹⁹⁷ Works, iii, p 371.

¹⁹⁸ Works, iii, p 356.

¹⁹⁹ Works, iii, p 265.

²⁰⁰ Works, iii, p 261.

²⁰¹ Speck, Society, p 15.

corruption.²⁰² However, Whig politicians did not invent manipulative political and economic practices and, as W A Speck has written, the notion of a deliberate conspiracy appealed to all those who had been alienated rather than the realities of the regime.²⁰³ 'Britannicus' defended Walpole's economic policies. There had, he argued, been a substantial rise in investments and an increase in the price of stocks which had been based on real confidence in the administration.²⁰⁴ Manufactures and commerce had also expanded and were accompanied by a favourable balance of trade.²⁰⁵ The situation, he realised, was far from perfect and the public debt continued to be a problem.²⁰⁶ Nevertheless, Hoadly was sure that there were no easy solutions, repayment would take time and it needed to be done with a strict regard to both private property and public confidence.²⁰⁷

Conclusion

It has sometimes been assumed that Walpole only had token opposition before 1726 and that he had no use for Hoadly, "the most aggressively Whig churchman of the century".²⁰⁸ This chapter challenges such a view. The research has found that during the period in question Walpole was threatened by numerous different factions. As Walpole's first newspaper editor, Hoadly

²⁰² Speck, Society, p 16, 17.

²⁰³ Speck, Society, p 36.

²⁰⁴ Works, iii, p 258.

²⁰⁵ Works, iii, p 260, 261.

²⁰⁶ Works, iii, p 268.

²⁰⁷ Works, iii, p 268.

²⁰⁸ Kramnick, Bolingbroke, p 18. Kenyon, Revolution Principles, p 197.

vigorously countered anti-government propaganda and staunchly defended the Court Whig cause.²⁰⁹ Writing under the pseudonym of 'Britannicus', he explained ministerial policies and used the fear of Jacobitism and popery to try to unite the Whigs and indeed all good Protestants. Although it is extremely difficult to assess the contribution of one newspaper writer, Hoadly undoubtedly played an important part in ensuring that the Whig administration was more secure and the Whigs more united in 1724 than they had been in 1721.²¹⁰

Historians have often given the impression that the ideas and language of patriotism at this time were the preserve of the opposition.²¹¹ This work has shown that Hoadly tried to persuade readers that the Walpole administration and all who supported them were the true patriots because they did not merely criticise but defended the state against the common enemy.²¹² 'Britannicus' used classical figures and concepts together with religious ideas and language to support his notion of patriotism. Along with other Whigs, he attempted to appropriate Cato for the Court Whig cause and he was also one of the first to suggest that Cicero would have been a Walpole supporter!²¹³ Hoadly's pragmatic approach to politics, his emphasis on reason and the common good, his belief that self interest and social, truth and utility could be compatible can all be viewed as Ciceronian.²¹⁴ However, as we have seen, Hoadly's views of patriotism were also based on his interpretation of Christian,

²⁰⁹ *Works*, iii, p 4-395.

²¹⁰ For the view that Walpole was more secure after 1723 see Bennett, 'Jacobitism and the Rise', p 92. Fritz, *English Ministers*, p 139. Realey, 'Early Opposition', p 153.

²¹¹ Hugh Cunningham, 'The language of patriotism', in Samuel, *Patriotism*, i. Also Kramnick, *Bolingbroke*, p 28-33. Pocock, *Politics*, p 104-147. Skinner, 'Opposition'.

²¹² *Works*, iii, p 4-8, 11.

²¹³ *Works*, iii, p 28-33. Browning, *Court Whigs*, p 219.

²¹⁴ *Works*, iii, p 215, 209, 79, 217, 279.

Reformation principles and they were frequently expressed in the rhetoric of anti-popery. 'Britannicus' portrayed a good patriot as a Protestant who defended liberty of religious inquiry, independent judgement in matters of faith, religious toleration, constitutional government and the rule of law - indeed, all the religious and political liberties which he associated with the Reformation and the 1688 Revolution.²¹⁵

²¹⁵ Works, iii, p 220, 223-225, 237-242, 260-261.

Chapter 6 - The debate surrounding the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper (1732-37)

If we now turn our attention to the third decade of the eighteenth-century we find that the Whig administration was under increasing pressure from Dissenters to abolish sacramental tests as a qualification for civil office.¹ At the same time supporters of the Tests maintained that the Church and State could only be secure if office holders were prepared to take the sacrament of the Lord's Supper in accordance with the rites of the established Church.² As we have seen, Hoadly always argued against religious tests and he composed A Plain Account of the Nature and End of the Lord's Supper (1735) and The Objections against the Repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts considered; being an Answer to a Pamphlet lately published intituled, The Dispute Adjusted by Edmund Gibson, D. D. Lord Bishop of London (1736) to defend this view. Both works were published anonymously and although Objections did not receive much attention³, A Plain Account caused an outcry, especially when it was known that it was written by Hoadly, the new Bishop of

¹ The Corporation Act (1661) required all mayors, aldermen, councillors, and borough officials to swear loyalty to the monarch and take the sacrament of the Lord's Supper according to the rites of the Church of England. The Test Act of 1673 imposed a sacramental test on all holders of civil and military offices under the crown but this did not apply to MPs. The Test Act of 1678, which did apply to MPs, required only that they took the oaths of allegiance and supremacy and subscribe to a declaration against transubstantiation and the adoration of the Virgin Mary and the saints. The only occasion on which a sacramental test was applied to MPs was in 1661. - Michael R Watts, The Dissenters, I, Oxford, 1978, p 223, 252.

² [Edmund Gibson], The Dispute Adjusted about the Proper Time of Applying for a Repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts: By Showing, that No Time is Proper, Oxford, 1732, p 16. [Thomas Sherlock], The History of the Test Act: In which the Mistakes in some late writings against it are rectified, and the Importance of it to the Church explain'd, London, 1732, p 22.

³ Objections against the Repeal is classified as anonymous in the British Library Catalogue of Printed Books. John Hoadly maintained that his father was the author of Objections. Works, i, p xxiii; ii, p 971 ff. In many respects the pamphlet reflects the Bishop's dispute with Sherlock almost two decades before. See The Common Rights of Subjects defended (1719) in Works, ii, p 692 ff discussed on pages 152-154 of this thesis.

Winchester.⁴ Contemporary commentators described Hoadly's ideas on the sacrament as novel,⁵ the work of a Socinian,⁶ Deist,⁷ or atheist.⁸ However, this research will argue that the Bishop's ideas were far from new and did not come from his alleged Socinianism or Deism. Rather, in defending his views, Hoadly employed the sacramental ideas of the Protestant reformer Huldreich Zwingli (1484-1531) and John Hales (1584-1656). Moreover, the Bishop's purpose was not, as his enemies asserted, to destroy Christianity or the established Church. Instead, his aim was to reform the Church and state, by attacking the superstition which surrounded the eucharist, as well as making every effort to persuade his audience that the use of the sacrament as a political test was not only a perversion of its original Christian function, but an act of religious and political persecution.⁹

In order to understand Hoadly's writings it is necessary to review briefly the context within which they were written. Linda Colley has described politics in this era as primarily as a clash between Tories and Whigs.¹⁰ Yet, it is important to appreciate the extent to which religious issues divided the Whigs themselves. Clerical Whigs, led by Edmund Gibson were certainly concerned about the security of the establishment and became increasingly alienated by the anti-clerical measures which the lay Whigs introduced into parliament after

⁴ Historical Manuscripts Commission, Manuscripts of the Earl of Egmont, London, 1923, ii, p 188. Hoadly was translated to the prosperous see of Winchester in September, 1734.

⁵ Brett, A True Scripture Account, p 125.

⁶ Brett, True Scripture Account, p 169. William Law, A Demonstration of the Gross and Fundamental Errors of a late Book called A Plain Account, 1737, p 99, 102.

⁷ Anon MS in Bodleian, MS Rawl. 394 fols 46-48. Gloster Ridley, The Christian Passover, 1736, p 4.

⁸ Law, A Demonstration, p 211.

⁹ Works, ii, 980, iii, 858, 881, 892, 900.

¹⁰ Colley, Oligarchy, p 7, 92

1727.¹¹ As we shall see, the Protestant Dissenters created even greater problems for Walpole's Whig administration. Walpole undoubtedly valued their electoral support but realised that their demands antagonised many Anglicans.¹² This situation became even more acute when Dissenters formed political organisations to promote their cause.

As N C Hunt's valuable research has shown, the Quakers had emerged as a political association by 1730.¹³ The Quakers could not accept that there was any scriptural justification for the payment of tithes and consequently only paid them after prosecution.¹⁴ The subject of costly and time-consuming litigation in the Exchequer and Ecclesiastical Courts, the Quakers maintained that they were being persecuted.¹⁵ Consequently, in 1736 the Quakers tried to force their Tithe Bill on the statute book.¹⁶ This bill, which was introduced with the official support of the government, proposed cheap and speedy prosecution for the non-payment of tithes, ecclesiastical rates and other ecclesiastical dues.¹⁷ Edmund Gibson was concerned that the restricted jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical courts attacked the rights and privileges of the established Church. Active against the measure, Gibson sent out a circular letter to the clergy advising them to petition against the proposal.¹⁸ The Bill was

¹¹ Stephen Taylor, 'Sir Robert Walpole, the Church of England and the Quakers Tithe Bill of 1736' in *The Historical Journal*, 28, 1, 1985 p 52. Sykes, *Gibson*, p 150, 165. T F J Kendrick, 'Sir Robert Walpole, The Old Whigs and the Bishops, 1733-36: A Study in Eighteenth Century Parliamentary Politics', in *The Historical Journal*, XI, 3, 1968, p 432.

¹² Hunt, *Two Early*, p xiv-xv. Demands included passing the Quakers Tithe Bill and the abolition of the Test and Corporation Acts.

¹³ Hunt, *Two Early*, p xiv.

¹⁴ Hunt, *Two Early*, p 62, 63.

¹⁵ Hunt, *Two Early*, p 64.

¹⁶ Hunt, *Two Early*, p 1.

¹⁷ Hunt, *Two Early*, p 62.

¹⁸ Taylor, 'Sir Robert Walpole', p 65, 66. Sykes, *Gibson*, p 165.

eventually defeated in the House of Lords 35 in favour and 54 against.¹⁹

There was a majority of nineteen votes against the Bill and fifteen of those were bishops.²⁰ As he did not want to appear to vote against the interests of the Church Hoadly abstained.²¹ Despite the claims of his critics, the Bishop supported the Church of England, even though he continually tried to make it more tolerant and conformable to his understanding of the principles and practices of the Reformation.²² Hoadly explained his position at a Charge at Winchester in the summer of 1736.

My Conformity to the Church Established was [he argued] founded ... upon my inward Conviction of its Excellency above any other that I knew of and I have not one Principle within Me that ... [could] induce Me to consent to any thing, that may hurt either its Establishment, or Legal Revenues ... Not from my thinking it all perfection, and incapable of Amendment; but from my persuasion that Nothing better is likely, in this imperfect State of Ignorance and Passion, to be put in the place of it ... If I have at any Time differed from Wise and Worthy Men, about the Most effectual Methods of shewing this Regard, it has been honestly; and for no other Reason but because I have really thought some Ways of doing it likely in the event to be prejudicial to their Interests.²³

After discussing briefly Hoadly and the Quakers' Tithe Bill, let us now turn our attention to the the main body of Protestant Dissenters. The Presbyterians,

¹⁹ Hunt, *Two Early*, p 91. Hunt and Kendrick have suggested that Walpole supported the Quakers Tithe Bill to engineer a split with his ecclesiastical adviser Edmund Gibson. However, Stephen Taylor concluded that Walpole supported the Bill unaware that it would give such offence to the Church and that the break with Gibson was unintended. Hunt, *Two Early*, p 92. Kendrick, 'Sir Robert Walpole', p 436. Taylor, 'Sir Robert Walpole', p 54, 55, 76.

²⁰ Hunt, *Two Early*, p 91.

²¹ John Hoadly footnote in *Works*, iii, p 492.

²² *Works*, ii, p 988; iii, p 862.

²³ *Works*, iii, p 491, 492.

Independents and Baptists created their own political association which was known as the Dissenting Deputies.²⁴ One of the main purposes of the Deputies was to put pressure on the government to repeal the Test and Corporation Acts.²⁵ Strictly speaking, as already noted, the sacrament of the Lord's Supper had to be taken in accordance with the rites of the Church of England as a qualification for civil, military and corporative offices.²⁶ The Church was considered to be a pillar of the state and it was assumed that only those who could demonstrate loyalty to the Church would be loyal to the state. If they had not conformed to the requirements of the Test and Corporation Acts then Indemnity Acts sometimes prevented prosecution, but there was no regularity in passing the Indemnity Acts and they were not passed in 1730 or 1732.²⁷ Occasional conformity was the only certain avenue to office holding although it was not acceptable to many Nonconformists.²⁸ In addition, all Dissenters objected to the principle of a religious test for civil office.²⁹

The Committee of Dissenting Deputies made a slow start in 1733 (and indeed until 1735) under the chairmanship of Samuel Holden.³⁰ Walpole was well aware that the issue of the Tests split Whig supporters so he hoped that the Dissenters would postpone their repeal application until after the election. Hoadly was on good terms with moderate Nonconformists and Walpole was convinced that the Bishop was the only one within the establishment who

²⁴ Hunt, *Two Early*, p xv.

²⁵ Hunt, *Two Early*, p 120.

²⁶ Hunt, *Two Early*, p 121.

²⁷ D L Keir, *Constitutional History of Modern Britain*, 3rd edition, p 430 in Hunt, *Two Early*, p 122, 123. The Indemnity Acts meant that Dissenters who had not taken the sacrament according to the rites of the Church of England were not prosecuted but they were still required to take the qualifying sacrament.

²⁸ See Chapter 1 of this thesis for a discussion of occasional conformity.

²⁹ Hunt, *Two Early*, p 121.

³⁰ Hunt, *Two Early*, p 163.

could influence them.³¹ The Minister was however, reluctant to ask Hoadly for help because he believed that the Bishop had been offended when he had not been offered the see of Durham in 1730.³² Instead, it was agreed that the Queen should approach Hoadly. The Queen told him that it was not the appropriate time for repeal.³³ She explained that some Church Whigs would not extend toleration and was convinced that the issue could tear the Whig party to pieces in the forthcoming elections.³⁴ It has sometimes been suggested that Hoadly was a political opportunist rather than a man of principle.³⁵ The evidence does not support this view. The Bishop reminded the Queen that he had already spoken and written against the Test and Corporation Acts and informed her that he would support repeal whenever it was proposed in Parliament.³⁶ Nevertheless, he realised that the issue was dividing the Whigs and agreed to speak to the Dissenters.³⁷ Unfortunately, Hoadly found himself in a difficult position. The Nonconformists did not think that the Bishop had argued their case strongly enough, and the government

³¹ Lord John Hervey, Some Materials Towards Memoirs of the Reign of George II, edited by Romney Sedgwick, London, 1931, vol i, p 123, 124. As an example John Hoadly told readers that Dr Avery was his father's close friend. - Works, ii, p 971. Benjamin Avery was originally a Presbyterian minister in London who left the ministry in 1720 after the Salter's Hall controversy on subscription in 1719. He acted for several years as secretary to the Dissenting Deputies and worked for theological liberalism and contributed to the Occasional Papers (1716-19) (sometimes known as the Bagweel Papers) - DNB ii, p 274, 275.

³² Hervey, Some Materials, i, p 123, 124.

³³ Hervey, Some Materials, i, p 124.

³⁴ Hervey, Some Materials, i, p 125.

³⁵ In Pope's view Hoadly would fight for those who would pay him, (see note 51 page 12 of this thesis) cited by J A Downie in the Age of Walpole, edited by Black, p 174.

³⁶ Hervey, Some Materials, i, p 125. Plumer's motion to repeal the Test was introduced into the Commons on 12 March, 1735/36. Walpole spoke against the bill which was defeated 251 to 123. See Richard Chandler, The History and Proceedings of the House of Commons from the Restoration to the Present Time, London, 1742, ix, p 161-172. Cobbett's Parliamentary History, ix, p 1046-1059.

³⁷ Hervey, Some Materials, i, p 126. It was apparently during subsequent meetings with the Queen and Walpole that Hoadly was promised preferment. It is however important to note that Hoadly did not abandon his principles in order to gain promotion. Hervey, ii, p 395.

believed that he had given too much support to the Dissenters.³⁸

The Queen and Walpole had both given the impression that the time was not right for repeal. However, Thomas Sherlock's The History of the Test Act (1732) and the anonymous tract The Dispute Adjusted (1732) written by Edmund Gibson maintained that there would never be a good time to repeal the Acts. These writers argued that the Test and Corporation Acts were designed for the peace and security of both Church and state.³⁹ They claimed that Church and state needed to support one another and believed that it was crucial for people who were employed by the state to conform to the established Church.⁴⁰ Gibson was convinced that those who wanted to abolish the Tests were against any kind of Church establishment.⁴¹ Sherlock feared that Dissenters would be joined by Deists and infidels to pull down the Church of England.⁴² It is important to appreciate that neither seemed to expect the established Church to survive without the protection of the Test Acts.⁴³

As additional ammunition, both Gibson and Sherlock declared that under the terms of the Act of Union, all laws which were in force for the establishment and preservation of the Church were to remain in force forever.⁴⁴ They also claimed that the repeal of the Tests would extend the terms of the Toleration

³⁸ Hervey, Some Materials, i, p 132.

³⁹ [Gibson], Dispute Adjusted, p 4. Sherlock, History of the Test, p 22. Many years later J C D Clark argued that the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts and Catholic Emancipation 1828/29 marked the end of the ancien regime. He contended that rather than emancipation being an aspect of parliamentary reform, reform was a consequence of the shattering of the old order by emancipation. Clark, English Society, p 409, 410-412, 419.

⁴⁰ Sherlock, History of the Test, p 27. [Gibson], Dispute Adjusted, p 6.

⁴¹ [Gibson], Dispute Adjusted, p 11.

⁴² [Gibson], Dispute Adjusted, p 11. Sherlock, History of the Test, p 29.

⁴³ [Gibson], Dispute Adjusted, p 13. Sherlock, History of the Test, p 22.

⁴⁴ [Gibson], Dispute Adjusted, p 4. Sherlock, History of the Test, p 26.

Act.⁴⁵ The Toleration Act was, in Sherlock's view, designed as an "Ease to Scrupulous Consciences in the Exercise of Religion" rather than to allow Nonconformists temporal power.⁴⁶ Moreover, he believed that the Dissenters misled people into thinking that both Houses of Parliament had, for a number of years, wanted to give them relief.⁴⁷

There was an enormous response to both these works including Hoadly's anonymous tract The Objections against the Repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts considered; being an Answer to a Pamphlet,... intituled, The Dispute Adjusted by Edmund Gibson, D D Lord Bishop of London. For an unknown reason there was a delay and the pamphlet was not published until 1736 with an anonymous preface by the Bishop's close friend Dr Benjamin Avery.⁴⁸ As we have seen, writers such as Gibson and Sherlock who defended the Test Acts contended that those who wanted repeal were against any kind of Church establishment. In contrast, Hoadly tried to persuade his audience that he believed that these acts were totally unjustifiable and yet he was at the same time "truly and sincerely for the Establishment".⁴⁹ He supported the Church of England and argued that there had been an established Church before these acts and he was convinced that there would still be one after repeal.⁵⁰ He declared that he merely differed "in the Methods of supporting the same Thing".⁵¹

Gibson had justified the Tests by arguing that all government was founded on

⁴⁵ [Gibson], Dispute Adjusted, p 14, 16. Sherlock, History of the Test, p 25, 26.

⁴⁶ Sherlock, History of the Test, p 25, 9.

⁴⁷ Sherlock, History of the Test, p 7.

⁴⁸ John Hoadly, 'Hoadly' in Works, i, p xxiii

⁴⁹ Works, ii, p 985.

⁵⁰ Works, ii, p 985.

⁵¹ Works, ii, p 985.

an abridgement of Natural rights.⁵² Hoadly agreed that a man could voluntarily consent to give up rights which were of a civil nature but he declared that religious rights were God given and therefore not transferable.⁵³ The Bishop contended that the anonymous author of The Dispute Adjusted had applied the same methods to civil and religious issues and thus laid a foundation “for eternal Persecution through all its Degrees”.⁵⁴ He reminded his audience that the Church of Rome had moved from one harsh measure to another. Hoadly was convinced that such practices wounded religion and were certainly a blot on the honour of the established Church.⁵⁵ As in his Bangorian writings, the Bishop reminded his audience that the Church of England was a Protestant church and as such it needed to be preserved by tolerant, Christian methods.⁵⁶ Thus it was, in his view, totally inappropriate to make a “sacred Institution of CHRIST the instrument of this Exclusion” from political office.⁵⁷

As we have seen, Gibson and Sherlock were certain that the peace and security of the nation was at stake if the terms of the Toleration Act were altered. In contrast, Hoadly regarded the Toleration Act as a starting point.⁵⁸ After a hazardous revolution in 1688, he appreciated that parliament had not wanted to go further.⁵⁹ However, he was sure that it was time to strengthen toleration by repealing the Test and Corporation Acts.⁶⁰ It was extremely

⁵² Works, ii, p 987.

⁵³ Works, ii, p 987, 988.

⁵⁴ Works, ii, p 989.

⁵⁵ Works, ii, p 988, 985.

⁵⁶ Works, ii, p 988, 990, 986.

⁵⁷ Works, ii, p 988, 990, 986.

⁵⁸ Works, ii, p 974.

⁵⁹ Works, ii, p 973.

⁶⁰ Works, ii, p 974.

unfair, Hoadly claimed, to disadvantage faithful subjects merely because they differed in some respects from the established Church.⁶¹ All loyal subjects, he insisted, should be able to serve their country.⁶² Gibson had declared that if the Acts were repealed it would allow enemies of the Church into places of trust and they would subsequently attempt to destroy the establishment.⁶³ Hoadly professed that it would merely take off an incapacity because good candidates still needed to be elected into office.⁶⁴ In any event, he was sure that Dissenters did not want to ruin the Church.⁶⁵ Since the Revolution the Church had been gaining members and the Toleration Act had diminished the number of Nonconformists.⁶⁶ Convinced that severity increased a dislike, he thought that the removal of the Test and Corporation Acts would be more likely to bring Dissenters over to the established Church.⁶⁷

He went on to argue that the Test Act (1673) was not designed against Dissenters but Roman Catholics.⁶⁸ In earlier chapters of this thesis we have seen how Hoadly argued that if Roman Catholics gained political office they would endanger the security of the state.⁶⁹ However, in Objections he did change his mind and maintained that Roman Catholics could be given civil rights if they gave the King and government their allegiance and fidelity as civil subjects.⁷⁰ The Bishop did not support any kind of religious tests and this

⁶¹ Works, ii, p 975.

⁶² Works, ii, p 974.

⁶³ Works, ii, p 979.

⁶⁴ Works, ii, p 980, 981.

⁶⁵ Works, ii, p 983.

⁶⁶ Works, ii, p 984. More recent research confirmed Hoadly's point see Watts, Dissenters, I, p 386.

⁶⁷ Works, ii, p 984.

⁶⁸ Works, ii, p 981.

⁶⁹ Works, ii, p 788 - Common Rights of Subjects defended (1719).

⁷⁰ Works, ii, p 982.

included a declaration against transubstantiation. In his view, members of the Roman Church would need to take an oath of allegiance to the King, abjure allegiance to the pretender and declare that no power on earth had authority to release them from oaths.⁷¹ As Roman Catholics did not think that the Church of England was a proper church, Hoadly concluded that they would probably damage it if they could.⁷² Nevertheless, as long as Catholics gave assurances of their loyalty to the civil government, he maintained that they needed to be released from the penalties of the Act.⁷³

Although Hoadly was prepared to extend civil rights to Roman Catholics, albeit under conditions that most of them could not accept, this appeared to be a minority opinion amongst those who wanted the repeal of the sacramental tests. Most writers still regarded Catholics as enemies to society.⁷⁴ A number agreed that the qualification required for a Member of Parliament (Test Act of 1678) would be adequate for other offices and at the same time keep Catholics out of positions of power.⁷⁵ Under these conditions the individual would have been required to take an oath of allegiance and supremacy, declare against transubstantiation and adoration of the virgin Mary and make this without any dispensation granted by the Pope.⁷⁶

Hoadly and anti-Test writers were however united in condemning popish

⁷¹ Works, ii, p 982.

⁷² Works, ii, p 982.

⁷³ Works, ii, p 982.

⁷⁴ Anon, The Rights and Liberties of Subjects Vindicated: In Answer to the Adjuster of the Dispute, London, 1732, p 1. Anon, The Clergyman's Petition for a Repeal of the Sacramental Test, London, 1736, p 16.

⁷⁵ Anon, The Reasonableness of Applying for the Repeal or Explanation of the Corporation and Test Acts, Impartially Consider'd, London, 1736, p 21, 22. Anon, Brief Remarks upon the Dispute adjusted, London, 1733, p 9. [Arthur Ashley Sykes], The Corporation and Test Acts proved to be of no importance to the Church, London, 1736, p 54.

⁷⁶ Anon, The Reasonableness, p 21, 22.

methods such as bigotry, oppression and persecution wherever it was found.⁷⁷ We have already seen how Hoadly viewed Christianity and the Reformation as liberating movements.⁷⁸ The Bishop and others, including the Nonconformist Samuel Chandler, believed that the established Church had abandoned the freedom and toleration which they associated with Christianity and the Reformation.⁷⁹ Chandler and the anonymous author of Rights and Liberties maintained that the Church had forsaken these liberating principles and had become crowded with people like the writer of the Dispute Adjusted who had “popish Souls in protestant Bodies”.⁸⁰ The Test and Corporation acts were consistently seen as anti-Christian persecuting acts which abridged natural rights.⁸¹ The Acts were considered a “Profanation of the Lord’s Supper.”⁸² It was argued that it was a religious rite, not a political test and that it was a perversion for one set of Christians to use the sacrament against another.⁸³ The author of The Rights and Liberties complained that heaven had become a handmaiden to earth.⁸⁴ He argued that the sacrament was a religious rite

⁷⁷ Anon, Rights and Liberties, p 13 & 26. Samuel Chandler, The History of Persecution, London, 1736, p lxxxvii. Anon, The Reasonableness, p 4. Anon, An Answer to the Dispute Adjusted, London, 1732, p 22. For many years the Anti-Christ or persecuting spirit was associated with the papal hierarchy and papal methods but at the end of the eighteenth-century Samuel Horsley began to transfer this from Rome to France. He saw the dreadful power of persecution in what he considered to be an atheistical democracy. - Andrew Robinson, ‘Identifying the Beast: Samuel Horsley and the Problem of Papal Anti Christ’, in Journal of Ecclesiastical History, vol 43, 4, October, 1992.

⁷⁸ Works, ii, p 597, 615, 744, 746-747.

⁷⁹ Chandler, Persecution, p lxxxii-lxxxvii.

⁸⁰ Chandler, Persecution, p lxxxv. Anon, Rights and Liberties, p 24.

⁸¹ Anon, The Reasonableness, 1736, p 4. Chandler, Persecution, p 446, 447. Anon, Reasons for Applying to Parliament, the ensuing session, for the Repeal of so much of the Corporation and Test Acts, as affects the Protestant Dissenters; addressed to the Gentlemen of the Committee, (no date of place of publication), p 1. Anon, Answer to the Dispute Adjusted, p 5. Anon, Brief Remarks, p 15. Anon, A True Churchman’s Reasons for repealing the Corporation and Test acts, London, 1732, p 9. [Sykes], Corporation and Test Acts, 20, 71. Chandler, Persecution, p xlii.

⁸² [Sykes], Corporation and Test Acts, p 17.

⁸³ [Sykes], Corporation and Test Acts, 1736, p 20. Anon, True Churchman’s Reasons, p 23. Anon, Brief Remarks, p 23. [Samuel Chandler], The Dispute Better Adjusted, London, 1732, p 4.

⁸⁴ Anon, Rights and Liberties, p 25.

which was intended to perpetuate the memory of Christ,⁸⁵ and remind Christians of their obligations to lead a good life.⁸⁶ However, when the sacrament was prostituted to secular use it led to deism because it demonstrated to some people that religion was not important.⁸⁷

Hoadly and many of the moderate Nonconformists argued that gentle methods were far more likely to reconcile Dissenters to the Church⁸⁸ and that the unity of Protestants would provide more security to the Church and State than any Test.⁸⁹ The Bishop had always worked towards a comprehensive Church.⁹⁰ As we have seen in earlier chapters of this thesis, he urged Church governors to be more tolerant and tried to persuade Dissenters to put aside what he considered to be small differences in ceremony and join the established Church.⁹¹ Chandler expressed the view of many Nonconformists when he claimed that Presbyterians and Independents would support the national church if the foundation was broader.⁹² He maintained that the Church's articles of faith needed to be more generous so that all sincere Christians could subscribe to them.⁹³ However, neither Chandler nor Hoadly, believed that an established Church should persecute Christians and usurp their religious and political rights.⁹⁴

⁸⁵ Anon, Rights and Liberties, 1732, p 20. Also see Anon, True Churchman's Reasons, p 23, p 24.

⁸⁶ Anon, Rights and Liberties, p 25.

⁸⁷ Anon, Rights and Liberties, p 26.

⁸⁸ Anon, The Reasonableness, p 8. Anon, Clergyman's Petition, p 22.

⁸⁹ [Sykes], Corporation and Test Acts, p 65.

⁹⁰ Works, ii, p 615 and chapter 1 of this thesis.

⁹¹ These were not small differences as far as the Dissenters were concerned. See chapter 1, page 45 ff of this thesis for further details.

⁹² [Chandler], Better Adjusted, p 30. Anon, Brief Remarks, p 14, 15.

⁹³ Chandler, Persecution, lxxxvii.

⁹⁴ [Chandler], Better Adjusted, p 27. See Chapter 4, pages 150-154 of this thesis.

Hoadly's A Plain Account of the Nature and End of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper which appeared in the summer of 1735 caused a storm of protest. Later commentators have in general viewed the book in a purely religious context.⁹⁵ Nevertheless, although Hoadly did not mention the Tests by name, contemporaries including supporters such as the anonymous author of A Farther Defence⁹⁶ and critics including Biscoe and Warburton were well aware that A Plain Account was, in part, written to reject sacramental tests.⁹⁷ The Bishop's declared aim was to explain the 'true' nature, end and effect of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.⁹⁸ However, he attempted to further the campaign for the repeal of the Tests by continually emphasising that the sacrament was a religious duty, an act of honour paid by Christians to their master, and not a political test.⁹⁹ Furthermore, as the sacrament was instituted by Christ, Hoadly affirmed that it should only be performed in accordance with

⁹⁵ For an exception see Taylor, 'Newcastle Years 1742-62', p 129.

⁹⁶ As there is no evidence that A Farther Defence of the Plain Account, 1735, A Defence of the Plain Account, 1735 and An Apologetical Defence, 1735 were in fact written by the Bishop they have been treated as anonymous in this paper. It should however be noted that the latter was attributed to Hoadly in the British Library Catalogue and the classifiers considered that he could have been the author of the first two tracts.

⁹⁷ Anon, Farther Defence, 1735, p 24. R Biscoe, Remarks on a Book lately published, Entitled, A Plain Account of the Nature and End of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, (second edition), London, 1735, p 20. [William Warburton], The Alliance between Church and State, or the Necessity and Equity of an Established Religion and a Test Law Demonstrated, London, 1736, p 5. Unlike Gibson and Sherlock, Warburton used the language of natural rights and contract to defend the alliance between Church and state and the Test Acts. (p 5, 21 & 109 ff) He argued that an established Church was necessary to secure a peaceful society and assumed that this could only be maintained by a Test Act. (p 112, 116) Warburton provided an explicitly utilitarian defence of the establishment - "The true end for which religion" was established was "not to provide for the true faith, but for civil utility". (p 154) For the view that Warburton's politic alliance based on utility rather than truth was not widely shared see Stephen Taylor, 'William Warburton and the Alliance of Church and State' in the Journal of Ecclesiastical History, No 2, vol 43, April, 1992, p 286. For Warburton - A W Evans, Warburton and the Warburtonians, London, 1932 and R W Greaves, 'The Working of the Alliance' in Essays in Modern English Church History, edited by G V Bennett and J D Walsh, London, 1966.

⁹⁸ Works, iii, p 843.

⁹⁹ Works, iii, 858, 881, 892, 900.

Christ's will, not according to the dictates of others.¹⁰⁰

The eucharist had been chosen as a test because most Christians viewed it as the most important ceremony, a duty which encompassed all the rest, and where God's grace was conveyed to worthy receivers.¹⁰¹ A Plain Account undoubtedly undermined this notion of the sacrament. As we shall see in more detail later in this chapter, Hoadly argued that no one duty could be used to show a person's allegiance to Christ.¹⁰² The sacrament of the Lord's Supper was, according to the Bishop, a symbol of spiritual union, not a political tool or a method to be used to divide Christians.¹⁰³ It was, he contended, an institution designed "equally" for "all" ages of the Church and for "all" Christians in every age.¹⁰⁴

As well as a contribution to the dispute over the repeal of sacramental tests, A Plain Account was also an important treatise on the nature and purpose of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The book, as already indicated, has usually been read from a religious perspective. Although A Plain Account has not been the focus of any research, a number of commentators including William van Mildert and J Hunt in the nineteenth-century, and Norman Sykes and Alf Hardelin in the twentieth-century have commented on the work.¹⁰⁵ To date the

¹⁰⁰ Works, iii, 846, 843. John Hales (1584-1656) also rejected the use of the sacrament as an arbiter of civil business - see tract on the 'sacrament' (1677, 1708 & 1716) in Works of John Hales, edited by Dalrymple, i p 60. Part of this tract was reprinted as part of the anonymous A Defence of the Plain Account Against the Objections obtained in the Remarks ..., London, 1735.

¹⁰¹ Waterland, Review, p 21.

¹⁰² Works, iii, p 844, 899.

¹⁰³ Works, iii, p 856, 898.

¹⁰⁴ Works, iii, p 852.

¹⁰⁵ William van Mildert, 'A Review of the Author's Life and Writings' in The Works of Daniel Waterland, Oxford, 1823, i, p 208-215. Hunt, Religious Thought, iii, p 56. Sykes, 'Hoadly', p 150, 151. Alf Hardelin, The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist, Uppsala, 1965, p 126, 127.

fullest account can be found in Darwell Stone, A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist (1907).¹⁰⁶ A study of the debate surrounding the Lord's Supper not only shows Hoadly's eucharistic ideas, but also gives some indication of the complexity and variety of sacramental thought which existed within the Church of England in the period.

After the Restoration non-attendance at the Lord's Supper proved to be a difficult pastoral problem.¹⁰⁷ Although Hoadly has frequently been censured for neglecting clerical duties, his declared purpose in writing A Plain Account was to remove the mystery which was attached to the rite and encourage Christians to attend communion.¹⁰⁸ Furthermore, he informed his readers that he had preached the substance of the book when he had the care of a London parish.¹⁰⁹ Indeed many aspects of A Plain Account can be found in a series of sermons on the Terms of Acceptance with God (1711) which does show the consistency of many of his ideas.¹¹⁰ In A Plain Account Hoadly wrote that sincere Christians were "often in danger of great Errors or of great Superstition which made their desire to be truly religious a Burthen (sic) and Misery, instead of the Delight of their lives".¹¹¹ Consequently he "endeavoured to represent One of our Lord's Institutions, in its original Simplicity" and if what he had done proved "at all successful in removing any Error, or Superstition from

¹⁰⁶ Darwell Stone, A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, London, 1907, ii, p 488-500.

¹⁰⁷ For pastoral problems faced by the clergy see Jeremy Gregory, 'The eighteenth-century Reformation: the pastoral task of Anglican clergy after 1689' in Church of England, edited Walsh et al.

¹⁰⁸ Works, iii, p 851.

¹⁰⁹ Works, iii, p 843.

¹¹⁰ Works, iii, p 843, p 496. In Terms of Acceptance (1711) he defended the use of plain expressions because he declared that he wanted his sermons to be useful. Works, iii, p 495. As in Plain Account he urged his parishioners to return to the Gospel instead of depending on modern religious authorities. - iii, 501. In both Terms of Acceptance and Plain Account he maintained that faith needed to be accompanied by personal repentance as well as charity towards others. - iii, 554, 596, 563.

¹¹¹ Works, iii, p 842.

this part of Christianity" he maintained that he would regard his "Pains well bestowed".¹¹²

The Bishop asserted his Reformation methodology at the beginning of the book. As taking part in the Lord's Supper was, he declared, a duty made by the positive institution of Christ it was important to do it according to "his" will.¹¹³ Aware that language and customs changed over time, like the Christian humanists and the Protestant reformers and theologians Huldreich Zwingli, William Chillingworth and John Hales, he believed it was necessary to return to the original accounts which could only be found in the Bible.¹¹⁴ In his view the "Passages in the New Testament, which relate[d] to this Duty, and They alone, ... [were] the Original Accounts of the Nature and End of this Institution, and the only Authentick Declarations, upon which ... later ages ... [could] safely depend".¹¹⁵ However, after directing the attention of the laity to these sections, Hoadly contended that the individuals had to judge for themselves.¹¹⁶

Christians, he was convinced, should take their religious duties from the Bible, not devotional books or the authority and imaginations of others.¹¹⁷ The

¹¹² Works, iii, p 845.

¹¹³ Works, iii, p 846.

¹¹⁴ Works, iii, p 847, 848, 862. Hoadly considered the texts of Matthew xxvi 26-28, Mark xiv 22-24, Luke xxii 19-20 and 1 Cor xi 20-34, 1 Cor x 16-21. He discounted John chapter 6 because the early Christians did not think it concerned this rite and it did not say a word about remembrance. iii - 875, 876.

¹¹⁵ Works, iii, p 847.

¹¹⁶ Works, iii, p 845.

¹¹⁷ Works, iii, p 846 & 847. For devotion books see John Gauden, The Whole Duty of a Communicant (1686), London, 1701. Anthony Horneck, The Crucified Jesus: or A full Account of the Nature, End, Design and Benefits of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, (second edition), London, 1689. A Week's Preparation towards a Worthy Receiving of the Lord's Supper - Anon, 1679 became a standard book of the time and passed through 51 editions by 1751 - Stone, Eurcharist, ii, p 457.

Bishop was explicit in his attack on the Roman Catholic sacramental doctrine but, without mentioning any names or publications, he also censured those who propagated Protestant eucharistic beliefs that have since been labelled 'virtualism' and 'receptionism'. Hoadly first turned to Roman Catholic doctrines. The teachers of Rome, he declared, had tried to throw a cloud of darkness over things and advanced the proposition that at the eucharist bread and wine were changed into the body and blood of Christ.¹¹⁸ They spoke of an altar and, according to Hoadly, thought of their priests as sacrificers offering the body and blood of Christ which had been given on the cross.¹¹⁹ This popish absurdity of the real sacrifice of a present body was in his view "monstrous".¹²⁰

Hoadly was even more concerned by the superstition which surrounded some of the Protestant eucharistic doctrines.¹²¹ In particular, he worried that some Protestants who had rejected this notion of 'real sacrifice' at the Reformation were still clinging to the notion.¹²² Moreover, he was convinced that this was not Scriptural - St Paul had never mentioned the real sacrifice of bread and wine in order to obtain God's grace.¹²³ John Johnson, vicar of Cranbrook, put forward the most developed English Protestant doctrine of material sacrifice in this period in his book The Unbloody Sacrifice, and Altar, Unveiled and Supported (volume 1 - 1714, volume 2 - 1718). Johnston contended that he pleaded for the sacrifice practised by early Christians, an unbloody sacrifice of bread and wine which was consecrated into the sacramental body and blood

¹¹⁸ Works, iii, p 850, 851.

¹¹⁹ Works, iii, p 862.

¹²⁰ Works, iii, p 854, 862.

¹²¹ Works, iii, p 862.

¹²² Works, iii, p 862. For Hoadly's views on episcopacy and the status of the Church of England clerics who performed this ceremony see pages 46-49, 137-140 of this thesis.

¹²³ Works, iii, p 859.

of Christ by the secret operation of the holy spirit. Johnson's eucharistic views have been described as 'virtualism' because he attributed a high degree of instrumentality to the elements and believed that what was given in the eucharist was 'virtually' the body and blood of Christ, not in substance, but in "power and effect" and therefore a means of distributing divine grace, the pardon of sins and everlasting life.¹²⁴ In view of the later discussion, it is also important to note that Johnson was critical of those who believed in a spiritual sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.¹²⁵ He censured Zwinglians, Arminians and Socinians who contended that the sacramental body and blood were mere symbols without any divine power.¹²⁶ Johnson also condemned the views of John Hales, as well as many in his own age who, he believed, ridiculed the mystical power of the holy spirit working through the bread and wine.¹²⁷

Hoadly was just as disturbed by the mystical eucharistic beliefs which later

¹²⁴ Johnson, The Unbloody Sacrifice, and Altar, Unveiled and Supported, (London, vol i -1714, 1724 edition; vol ii 1718), Oxford, 1847, i, p 322, ii, p 170 & 179. Hardelin, Eucharist, p 126. Stone, Eucharist, ii, p 474-476,

¹²⁵ Johnson, Sacrifice, ii, p 169.

¹²⁶ Johnson, Sacrifice, reprint of second edition 1724, i, p 305. Daniel Waterland believed that the "low" notion of the sacrament could be traced from Zwingli to the Anabaptists, Socinians and Remonstrants (ie Dutch Arminians) - A Review, p 249. H C Grove attributed the rise of Zwinglian notions to the influence of Arminian rather than Calvinist divines - The Teaching of the Anglican Divines of the Time of King James I and King Charles I on the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, London, 1858, p 6-7, 15-16 quoted in Peter B Nockles, The Oxford Movement in Context - Anglican High Churchmanship 1760-1857, Cambridge, 1994, p 236. Moderation was the hallmark of the Arminian method which moved in the direction of liberalism and comprehension. Leading principles included the universality of atonement and freedom of the human will. The Arminianism of Laud was not the Dutch Arminianism of Arminius who would have condemned its sacramentarianism as superstition. Frederick Platt, 'Arminianism' in Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, edited by James Hastings, Edinburgh/New York, 1908, i, p 808, 811, 813. Nicholas Tyacke, The Rise of English Arminianism c 1590-1640, Oxford, 1987, p 247. Nicholas Tyacke, 'The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered', Past and Present, 115, 1987 and Peter White 'A Rejoinder' in Past and Present, 115, 1987. Anthony Milton, Catholic and Reformed, Cambridge, 1995, p 437.

¹²⁷ Johnson, Sacrifice, 1714/1728, i, p 268.

came to be known as 'receptionism'.¹²⁸ According to Darwell Stone, this was the most pervasive sacramental view in the period and undoubtedly the clearest example was put forward by Daniel Waterland.¹²⁹ Although Waterland's Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist (1737) was a response to Hoadly's Plain Account it may be useful at this stage to use the book to try to capture the essence of receptionism. Waterland was convinced that participation in the Lord's Supper was the most important Christian duty and one which contained all the rest.¹³⁰ It was, according to him, a proper sacrifice, but a spiritual, rather than a material offering of prayer and thanksgiving.¹³¹ In return the holy ghost which, in Waterland's view, was present but invisible, conferred grace (not through the elements but) through the worthy receiver.¹³² In this mystical union with Christ, the worthy communicant was given mercy, favour and a limited, though not necessarily certain, remission of sins.¹³³

Hoadly used A Plain Account to refute what he considered to be these superstitious eucharistic notions. Some contemporary critics tried to persuade their audience that the Bishop's ideas were novel, however other readers were well aware that Hoadly employed Zwinglian ideas which were adopted by John Hales (1584-1656).¹³⁴ In his research into A History of the Doctrine of the Eucharist Darwell Stone recognised the Bishop's debt to Zwingli and

¹²⁸ Works, iii, p 893, 898.

¹²⁹ Stone, Eucharist, ii, p 515. Waterland, A Review.

¹³⁰ Waterland, A Review, p 21.

¹³¹ Waterland, A Review, p 48, 38.

¹³² Waterland, A Review, p 420, 265.

¹³³ Waterland, A Review, p 263, 352.

¹³⁴ Brett, True Scripture Account, p 125. Conyers Place, Remarks on a Treatise Entitled A Plain Account, London, 1735, p 34 & 35. Waterland, A Review, p 4, 248, 249, 264. A Defence of the Plain Account. Anon, A Proper Answer to a Late Abusive Pamphlet Entitled, The Winchester Converts, Oxford, 1735, p 34, 37.

Hales.¹³⁵ Although Christopher Cocksworth contended that “Hoadley’s (sic) thought was based on the most negative elements in Zwingli’s thought, placed in the framework of a weakened Christology and soteriology”, Alf Hardelin came to the conclusion that the Bishop was the leading representative of the eucharistic school of “memorialism” during the eighteenth century.¹³⁶

Furthermore, by the time that the Oxford Movement dawned, in the early part of the nineteenth-century, Zwinglian memorialism appears to have been widespread and the Tractarians singled out Hoadly for disseminating these ideas.¹³⁷

So what was the Zwinglian eucharistic doctrine of memorialism and how did Hoadly use it? Zwingli had rejected the exalted powers claimed by the Roman Catholic Church. In particular the notion of real sacrifice where priests consecrated the bread and wine and offered what they considered to be the body and blood of Christ to God the Father.¹³⁸ Catholic priests believed that they received Christ’s holiness, merits and powers and participated in his mission of dispensing salvation.¹³⁹ However, as far as Zwingli was concerned nothing mystical happened at communion; it was a memorial, or commemoration of the sacrifice once and for all offered on the cross, and the seal of redemption given in Christ.¹⁴⁰

John Hales used the main aspects of Zwingli’s eucharistic beliefs in A Tract on

¹³⁵ Stone, Eucharist, ii, p 489, 495.

¹³⁶ Cocksworth, Eucharistic Thought, p 61. Hardelin, Eucharist, p 126. Stone, Eucharist, ii, p 489, 514, 515.

¹³⁷ Hardelin, Eucharist, p 127, 14, 15, 98. ESTC - A Plain Account was published in 1735, 1736, 1745, 1751, 1767, 1772, 1773, 1774.

¹³⁸ Francis Clark, Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation, London, 1960, p 94.

¹³⁹ Clark, Eucharistic Sacrifice, p 94 & 103.

¹⁴⁰ Clark, Eucharistic Sacrifice, p 105.

the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and concerning the church's mistaking itself about fundamentals (published in 1635, 1677, 1708 & 1716 - part of the tract was reprinted in 1735 to support Hoadly).¹⁴¹ Hales attacked both Catholic and reformed notions of the sacrament which in his view encouraged superstition.¹⁴² He argued that the Church had added too many formalities and ceremonies to the sacraments and was particularly concerned that so much emphasis had been placed on the words of consecration.¹⁴³ Hoadly was familiar with the writings of John Hales and it is probable that he took his Zwinglian eucharist ideas directly from him.¹⁴⁴ Norman Sykes was undoubtedly correct to suggest that A Plain Account was used as an attack on the sacerdotal powers of the clergy.¹⁴⁵ As we have seen, throughout Hoadly's life he wrote against the mystical powers claimed by clerics.¹⁴⁶ In the tradition of the early Protestant reformers Hoadly appeared to see himself as purifying the Church and, like Zwingli and Hales before him, rejected the notion of a sacrifice performed by priests.¹⁴⁷ He argued that the Lord's supper could not be compared to the sacrifices of the Jews and Heathens.¹⁴⁸ In his view, the only person who answered to the Jewish priest, considered as a sacrificer,

¹⁴¹ For John Hales see Stone, Eucharist, ii, p 314. Hales was a friend of William Chillingworth and Lord Falkland. In his younger days Hales was a Calvinist but according to his friend Faringdon when he was employed at the Synod of Dort he bade "John Calvin good night" - Golden Remains of the Ever Memorable, Mr John Hales, second edition, London, 1673 introduction by John Pearson which has no pagination. But in Tulloch's view, Hales did not say good morning to Arminius - John Tulloch, Rational Theology and Christian Philosophy in England in the Seventeenth Century, London, 1872, i, p 191. The research of Edward Angus George has shown that the effect of the synod was to free his mind from bigotry and controversy. He argued that Hales rejected the Laudian insistence on uniformity of ceremony and the Calvinist uniformity of doctrine and appreciating some aspects of each he sought unity of spirit. - George, Men of Latitude, p 17, 25, 27, 40, 38. Milton, Catholic and Reformed, p 165.

¹⁴² Hales, 'sacrament' (1635) in Hales Works, edited by Dalrymple, i, p 55, 56, 61 & 62.

¹⁴³ Hales, 'sacrament' in Hales Works, i, p 53.

¹⁴⁴ Works, ii, p 857.

¹⁴⁵ Sykes, 'Hoadly', p 150.

¹⁴⁶ See Works, i, p 477, ii, p 471, 423 and pages 47-48, 131-132 of this thesis.

¹⁴⁷ Works, iii, p 860, 861.

¹⁴⁸ Works, iii, p 860, 861.

was Jesus who voluntarily offered himself up, and the only thing which answered to the altar was the cross on which he died.¹⁴⁹ Along with Hales, Hoadly did not place emphasis on priestly consecration. The Bishop was convinced that Christ used the bread and wine to give thanks to God.¹⁵⁰ The notion of sacrifice was, he held, figurative - the only sacrifice practised in the Church of England was one of praise and thanksgiving and devotion to God.¹⁵¹

Fundamental to the eucharistic thought of Zwingli and later Hales and Hoadly was that nothing mystical happened to the bread and wine which were merely signs or symbols. Zwingli wrote that "this is my body" should be understood as this represented Christ's body.¹⁵² Moreover, he pointed to the crucial link in this theory between signifying and remembering - "Take, eat; this is my body" was, he said, swiftly followed by "Do this in remembrance of me".¹⁵³ As Hales commented the bread and wine were signs, not of anything exhibited at communion but of something given long ago.¹⁵⁴ Hales and Hoadly both assured their readers that Scripture was full of figurative expressions which were not to be taken literally.¹⁵⁵ To explain this more clearly, Hoadly chose an example which had been given by Samuel Clarke in his Exposition of the Church Catechism (1729). Both Hoadly and Clarke noted that although Christ had called himself a vine and a door, no one really believed that he was a vine

¹⁴⁹ Works, iii, p 861.

¹⁵⁰ Hales, 'sacrament' in Hales Works, i, p 53.. Works, iii, p 881.

¹⁵¹ Works, iii, p 883.

¹⁵² Stephens, Zwingli, p 108.

¹⁵³ Stephens, Zwingli, p 99.

¹⁵⁴ Hales, 'sacrament' in Hales Works, i, p 62.

¹⁵⁵ Hales, 'sacrament' in Hales Works, i, p 59, 62. Works, iii, p 851.

or a door.¹⁵⁶ Similarly, when the Apostles referred to the bread and wine as Christ's body and blood, this was also a figurative expression.¹⁵⁷ Hoadly argued that by "all the Rules of Interpretation agreeably to the Way of speaking throughout the Whole ... the bread and wine... [were] ... Memorials of his Body and Blood".¹⁵⁸ "The simple primary Idea" of the Lord's Supper was, according to Hoadly as well as Zwingli and Hales, the "Remembrance of Christ's Death".¹⁵⁹

As well as challenging the mediaeval doctrine of transubstantiation, Zwingli also dismissed Luther's belief in the real presence of Christ's body and blood at the eucharist.¹⁶⁰ He made a sharp distinction between the humanity and divinity of Christ and, as Christ's body was human, believed that it could only be in one place at one time.¹⁶¹ A century later Hales argued that, even though some Protestants had rejected transubstantiation, they had fallen into other superstitious errors and held onto the belief that real presence was in some way mysteriously conveyed to the worthy receiver.¹⁶² Hoadly started from the premise that "the End for which our Lord Instituted this Duty, was the Remembrance of Himself" and then condemned the absurdity and falsehood of transubstantiation or "any Bodily Presence of Christ in this rite" which contradicted the notion of remembrance.¹⁶³

¹⁵⁶ Works, iii, p 850. Samuel Clarke, An Exposition of the Church Catechism, London, 1729, p 309, 310.

¹⁵⁷ Works, iii, p 850. Clarke, An Exposition, p 310.

¹⁵⁸ Works, iii, p 850.

¹⁵⁹ Works, iii, p 894, Stephens, Zwingli, p 99. Hales, 'sacrament', in Hales Works, i, p 62.

¹⁶⁰ Stephens, Zwingli, p 96, 109. Cocksworth, Eucharistic Thought, p 22.

¹⁶¹ Stephens, Zwingli, p 101. Cocksworth, Eucharistic Thought, p 23.

¹⁶² Hales, 'sacrament', in Hales Works, i, p 59 & 60.

¹⁶³ Works, iii, p 852.

Unlike the supporters of the Roman Catholic eucharistic doctrine and the adherents of virtualism and receptionism, Zwingli, Hales and Hoadly could not accept that any mystical benefits were given at the eucharist.¹⁶⁴ Zwingli and Hoadly were quite specific; the rite was a remembrance of the Lord's sacrifice and benefits which had already been promised on certain conditions.¹⁶⁵

According to the Bishop "Duties how well so ever performed, ... [could] not be supposed to operate as Charms".¹⁶⁶ In his view Christians needed to be content with what Christ their master and his Apostles had taught them to expect from this duty and not magnify it into what he never designed it to be.¹⁶⁷

Using the contemporary labels which were applied to high and low churchmanship he wrote, "Let them not esteem That as a Low Dispensation which" was "as High as it was His Will to make it ... Let them remember that All beyond" was "no better than a Dream: pleasing perhaps at present: but in the end, hurtful to Those who infuse[d] it into others".¹⁶⁸

Hoadly maintained that the Lord's Supper was a method not an end.¹⁶⁹ It was an institution designed so that free agents could reform their lives.¹⁷⁰

However, he was particularly concerned that people expected immediate benefits from the eucharist, and annexed to this one duty blessings that belonged to the whole system of Christianity.¹⁷¹ Scripture was plain, favour could only be gained by an actual amendment and "Practice Conformable" to

¹⁶⁴ Clark, Eucharistic Sacrifice, p 109. Hales, 'sacrament' in Hales Works, i, p 61, 62. Works, iii, p 900.

¹⁶⁵ Works, iii, p 889.

¹⁶⁶ Works, iii, p 892.

¹⁶⁷ Works, iii, p 900.

¹⁶⁸ Works, iii, p 900.

¹⁶⁹ Works, iii, p 895.

¹⁷⁰ Works, iii, p 893.

¹⁷¹ Works, iii, p 885, 844, 893.

the “Whole System” of Christian virtues.¹⁷² Participation in the Lord’s Supper did not mean forgiveness, it was a prayer to God for assistance.¹⁷³ It was, in the Bishop’s view, an acknowledgement that Christians should try to live a pious and virtuous life and this was “the highest Good of Mortal Man”.¹⁷⁴ He was convinced that Christians should concentrate on their duty to depart from sin and practise virtue rather than dwell on exalted privileges and supernatural favours.¹⁷⁵ Hoadly contended that obedience to all the laws of the Gospel resulted in “Happiness here” and favour with God and, he declared, “what reasonable Creature would not be content with Benefits of this sort”.¹⁷⁶

After trying to show the Zwinglian aspects of A Plain Account it is now necessary to focus on an important part of the eighteenth century debate - the nature of a worthy communicant. As already noted, attendance at the eucharist was extremely low after the Restoration. Hoadly was convinced that many were discouraged by devotional books and preachers who expected a long period of preparation before attendance.¹⁷⁷ In his view, they frightened the laity with I Corinthians Chapter 12 verses 20-34 and argued that an unworthy communicant would be damned; (this was also incorporated into the book of Common Prayer).¹⁷⁸ The Bishop was convinced that St Paul’s words were frequently used out of context.¹⁷⁹ The only person who needed to be afraid of the Apostle’s warning, he explained, was one who treated the Lord’s

¹⁷² Works, iii, p 897, 893.

¹⁷³ Works, iii, p 889.

¹⁷⁴ Works, iii, p 891, 892.

¹⁷⁵ Works, iii, p 900.

¹⁷⁶ Works, iii, p 891, 892.

¹⁷⁷ Works, iii, p 846, 847.

¹⁷⁸ 1 Cor xii 20-34. Works, iii, p 863.

¹⁷⁹ Works, iii, p 864.

Supper as entertainment and ate and drank without remembering Christ.¹⁸⁰ Moreover, he contended that the word “unworthily” referred to the Christian’s frame of mind “at the time” of the performance of this rite.¹⁸¹ He urged the laity not to be discouraged by a long preparation because it did not take long for people to assure themselves that they came as sincere disciples.¹⁸² However, if a communicant attended the eucharist with a sincere remembrance of Christ but was a habitual sinner, according to Hoadly, he would have been condemned for the disobedience of his whole life-style.¹⁸³

Both contemporary and later writers have rather deprecatingly described Hoadly’s view of the Lord’s Supper as a “mere” or “bare” remembrance but it should be noted that the Bishop taught a doctrine which required positive participation.¹⁸⁴ It was, he argued, the communicant “alone” who needed to remember Christ.¹⁸⁵ To communicate worthily was, according to him, to take the bread and wine and personally commemorate Christ’s death.¹⁸⁶ The worthy communicant needed to express thankfulness for Christ’s doctrine, his example, life and death and truly believe him to have been sent by God.¹⁸⁷ The individual was voluntarily to express dependence on Christ and expect to be happy on his terms only.¹⁸⁸ It was, according to Hoadly, necessary for the participant to make a strict promise to live by the whole of Christ’s will as set

¹⁸⁰ Works, iii, p 864, 869.

¹⁸¹ Works, iii, p 868.

¹⁸² Works, iii, p 868.

¹⁸³ Works, iii, p 871, 872.

¹⁸⁴ Brett, True Scripture Account, p 135. Waterland, A Review, p 600. van Mildert, ‘Life’, i, p 208. Cocksworth, Eucharistic Thought, p 61.

¹⁸⁵ Works, iii, p 881.

¹⁸⁶ Works, iii, p 882.

¹⁸⁷ Works, iii, p 877.

¹⁸⁸ Works, iii, p 877.

out in the New Testament.¹⁸⁹ To sum up, the requirements for participation in the Lord's Supper were, in his view, personal expressions of faith, repentance, thankfulness and charity.¹⁹⁰ At the same time, he assured his audience that the eucharist was also a collective experience which was designed to unite all Christians throughout the world as joint members of the same body with Christ as the head.¹⁹¹

There was an enormous response to A Plain Account - most of it, it must be said, was critical. The Queen declared that having "got to the top of his preferment; ... [Hoadly] ought to have kept his notions to himself, and not have drawn all the clergy on his back".¹⁹² Waterland wrote that there were "two Extremes, viz of Superstition on one Hand and of Profaneness on the other", but it appeared to him "to be much safer and better to lean towards the former Extreme, than to incline to the latter".¹⁹³ Hoadly was charged with sinking "the Sacrament still lower in the esteem of the world" of destroying the Christian religion,¹⁹⁴ and preaching doctrines that would only help Arians, Socinians, Deists and Atheists.¹⁹⁵ A Plain Account was, according to the author of The Winchester Converts, "one of the most Spiritless, Unedifying, Pieces of Divinity".¹⁹⁶

¹⁸⁹ Works, iii, p 882.

¹⁹⁰ Works, iii, p 879.

¹⁹¹ Works, iii, 855, 856, 882.

¹⁹² Egmont Manuscripts, ii, p 188.

¹⁹³ Waterland, A Review, p 11.

¹⁹⁴ [Philip Skelton], Vindication of the R R the Lord Bishop of Winchester, London, 1736, p 6, 1.

¹⁹⁵ Brett, True Scripture Account, p 5. [Patrick Delany], A Letter to a Lord, In Answer to his late Book entitled, A plain Account of the Nature and End of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, London, 1736, p 23.

¹⁹⁶ [Thomas Tovey], The Winchester Converts, London, 1735, p 75, 76.

Many attacked Hoadly's methodology; the "Novelty of it" was in Daniel Waterland's view "a strong Presumption against it".¹⁹⁷ Waterland contended that the Church of England relied on Scripture, reason and the authority of former ages, "their Judgement" was "not to be slighted nor their Instructions to be despised".¹⁹⁸ Brett was convinced that Scripture was not as plain as Hoadly had suggested; the Nonjuror believed that it needed a qualified interpreter.¹⁹⁹ The bare words of Scripture were, according to William Law, poor, empty and superficial and he was sure that what Christ said had a much deeper sense.²⁰⁰ Moreover, Law declared that the sacrament could only be understood in the context of the whole Christian religion.²⁰¹ The Apostles, he argued, did not know the nature and end of the sacrament until after the death, resurrection and ascension of Christ.²⁰²

Many critics maintained that Hoadly had given a Socinian interpretation of the eucharist and had lessened the role of Christ.²⁰³ In Brett's view the author of A Plain Account thought that Christ was merely a good man who taught moral duties, whereas in Law's words "Jesus Christ was truly and essentially God, as well as a perfect Man".²⁰⁴ Waterland stated that Socinians made remembrance of Christ the sole end of the eucharist, whereas a Christian remembered

Him not barely as a wise Man, or a good Man, or an

¹⁹⁷ Waterland, A Review, p 9.

¹⁹⁸ Waterland, A Review, p 1, 3.

¹⁹⁹ Brett, True Scripture Account, p 10.

²⁰⁰ Law, A Demonstration, p 10.

²⁰¹ Law, A Demonstration, p 63.

²⁰² Law, A Demonstration, p 68.

²⁰³ Waterland, A Review, p 18. Richard Warren, An Answer to a Book Intituled A Plain Account of the Nature and End of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, Cambridge, 1736, part iii, p 102. Anon, Christian Exceptions to the Plain Account of the Nature and End of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, 1736, p 39. Brett, True Scripture Account, p 5.

²⁰⁴ Brett, True Scripture Account, p 164, 169. Law, A Demonstration, p 99.

eminent Prophet, a chief Martyr, or as our particular Master, or Founder, or Redeemer, but as an almighty Saviour and Deliverer, as the only begotten of the Father, very God of very God, of the same divine Nature, of Glory equal, of Majesty coeternal.²⁰⁵

Waterland also complained that Zwinglians (such as Hoadly), saw no medium between local presence and no presence at the eucharist.²⁰⁶ However, without doubt the greatest criticism of A Plain Account was that the author did not appear to believe that there were any benefits attached to taking part in communion. In Waterland's view eating and drinking was the symbol of receiving, not of commemoration.²⁰⁷ Waterland, Ridley, Warren, Biscoe, Tovey, Law and many many more argued that Scripture had shown that Christ had died for the atonement of sins, that the benefits remained invisible but present and were given in the eucharist.²⁰⁸

Finally, they complained that the author of A Plain Account had a "masterly Talent, in effectually lightning both the Burden of Examination and Preparation".²⁰⁹ They argued that preparation and repentance were crucial before taking part in communion.²¹⁰ According to Skelton, Hoadly believed that even the lukewarm and indolent could safely communicate.²¹¹ Without preparation Skelton was sure that attendance at the eucharist would increase

²⁰⁵ Waterland, A Review, p 79.

²⁰⁶ Waterland, A Review, p 248, 264.

²⁰⁷ Waterland, A Review, p 333.

²⁰⁸ Brett, True Scripture Account, p 29, 129. Law, A Demonstration, p 86, 149. [Skelton], Vindication, p 20. Place, Remarks, p 11, 81. Ridley, Christian Passover, p 38, 44. Warren, Answer to a Book, ii, p 10. Benjamin Holloway, The Commemorative Sacrifice, Oxford, 1737, p 28. Anon, Christian Exceptions, p 27, 33. [Biscoe], Remarks, p 35, 45. [Delany], Letter to A Lord, p 8, 23. [Tovey], Winchester Converts, p 58.

²⁰⁹ Place, Remarks, p 9.

²¹⁰ Place, Remarks, p 71. Ridley, Christian Passover, p 51. Warren, Answer to a Book, ii, p 53, p 88. Anon, The Occasional Paper, London, 1735, iii, p 24, 1736 - x, p 21. [Edmund Gibson], An Answer to a Late Pamphlet, Entitl'd An Apologetical Defence, London, 1735, p 6.

²¹¹ [Skelton], Vindication, p 4.

but it would “bring in Guests from the Streets and Common Roads” and “from the common Shores and Dunghills too”.²¹²

However, not all the responses were critical. Indeed, some argued that the publication of A Plain Account was necessary to reform the Church, remove superstition and encourage attendance at communion.²¹³ They vigorously defended Hoadly’s use of Scripture as the standard of truth.²¹⁴ Some of these authors noted the similarity between the views of A Plain Account and the sacramental doctrine of John Hales.²¹⁵ Moreover, the author of A Defence contended that, unlike the author of A Plain Account, Hales had never been suspected of any design against either Christianity or the established Church.²¹⁶ In reply to the charge of Socinianism, the author of A Proper Answer gave the Zwinglian response that when remembering the sufferings of Christ surely it was more appropriate to remember him as man, than God.²¹⁷ The Bishop’s supporters maintained that he had not denied Christ’s merits merely the “fancied privileges” which had been annexed to the eucharist rather than the real benefits which belonged to the Christian religion as a whole.²¹⁸

Conclusion

After the publication of A Plain Account Hoadly complained to the clergy at

²¹² [Skelton], Vindication, p 59.

²¹³ Anon, Defence of the Plain Account, p 32, 40. Anon, Farther Defence p 21, 34. Anon, Apologetical Defence, p 3, 7, 17-19, 37. [Wingfield], Discourse, p 4. Anon, A Proper Answer to a Late Abusive Pamphlet Entitled, The Winchester Converts, Oxford, 1735, p 1.

²¹⁴ Anon, A Proper Answer, p 36. Anon, Defence of the Plain Account, p 40.

²¹⁵ Anon, Defence of the Plain Account, p 46 ff. Anon, Farther Defence, p 25. Anon, Proper Answer, p 34, 37.

²¹⁶ Anon, Defence of the Plain Account, p ii, iv.

²¹⁷ Anon, Proper Answer, p 11.

²¹⁸ Anon, Proper Answer, p 16, 41, 42. [Wingfield], Discourse, p 18. Anon, Defence of the Plain Account, p 29. Anon, Apologetical Defence, p 7.

Winchester (1736)

I am not what I have sometimes groundlessly and cruelly represented to be ... The Consequences which Others have drawn for Me, from Words of mine, in some of my Writings, particularly a late one: and the Opinions They have arbitrarily imputed to me; Some of them I abhor: Others I am as utter a Stranger to, as any of themselves; and can as sincerely disown as They can.²¹⁹

As we have seen, contemporary critics argued that Hoadly's ideas were novel, those of a Socinian, Deist or atheist and some later commentators have described the work as the product of a weak Christian sentiment.²²⁰ This chapter has tried to show that it was not Hoadly's aim to destroy but to reform by trying to remove persecution and superstition in both Church and state.²²¹ Although he has been charged with holding doctrines which would undermine the Church, perhaps the Bishop had more confidence in the Church of England than many of his brethren.²²² Certainly he did not think that the Church needed the support of the Test and Corporation Acts which he considered methods of religious and political persecution.²²³ He attacked the ceremony and mysticism which surrounded the sacrament of the Lord's Supper but it should also be remembered that there were many positive aspects to his eucharistic teaching. Like earlier Protestant reformers Zwingli and John Hales, the Bishop stressed the authority of Scripture rather than the religious custom of former ages.²²⁴ He emphasised the humanity of Christ, his

²¹⁹ Works, iii, p 491.

²²⁰ Brett, True Scripture Account, p 125, 169. Law, A Demonstration, p 99, 102, 211. Anon, MS in Bodleian, MS Rawl 394 fols 46-48. Ridley, Christian Passover, p 4. van Mildert, 'Life' in Works of Waterland, i, p 210. Cocksworth, Eucharistic Thought, p 61.

²²¹ Works, ii, 980; iii, p 852.

²²² [Gibson], Dispute Adjusted, p 16. Sherlock, History of the Test, p 22. [Warburton], Alliance, p 5.

²²³ Works, ii, p 980.

²²⁴ Works, iii, p 847.

example and his doctrine.²²⁵ Moreover, rather than trying to destroy Christianity, as his critics asserted, he undoubtedly tried to encourage people to embrace and live by the whole system of Christian values.²²⁶ Hoadly's eucharistic teaching was not institutional but very individual because he believed that each communicant should voluntarily and personally remember and profess faith in Christ who lived and died for humanity.²²⁷ At the same time he viewed the Lord's Supper as a religious rite which unified and promoted fellowship with all Christians throughout the world.²²⁸

²²⁵ Works, iii, p 851, 881.

²²⁶ Works, iii, p 882, 892, 899.

²²⁷ Works, iii, 881, 882, 896.

²²⁸ Works, iii, 902.

Reformation Principles - Conclusion

What is the significance of this research? As this is the first comprehensive study of Hoadly's ideas it has, until now, been difficult to fully appreciate his contribution to the religious and political debates of the period. This study has demonstrated that the Bishop was involved in most of the polemical battles of his day and, although he was not an original thinker, he vigorously promoted Latitudinarian ideas and was undoubtedly one of the foremost Whig propagandists of his generation. Contemporary opponents contended that Hoadly was an ambitious, unprincipled opportunist who used the ideas of Deists, Socinians and atheists to foster anarchy in the Church and rebellion in the state.¹ Although some later commentators have been more objective, many have accepted the view that Hoadly employed the secular reason of the Deists to dilute Christianity and undermine the established Church.² However, my research challenges such an interpretation and has demonstrated that the Bishop was not an unprincipled opportunist but a committed Protestant and a staunch Whig. Hoadly did not aim to destroy but to reform, by challenging superstition and opposing persecution in Church and state as well as championing individual religious and political liberties.³ My work has also found that the Bishop's debt to the Christian religion and the early Protestant reformers has been ignored or underestimated. Indeed, this thesis has demonstrated that Hoadly continually appealed to what he considered to be the principles and practices of primitive Christianity, the Reformation and the

¹ Atterbury quoted in Greig, 'Heresy Hunt', p 572. Waterland, A Review, p 9, 1 & 13. Brett, True Scripture Account, p 5, 125, 169. Law, A Demonstration, p 99, 102, 211. Law, Bishop of Bangor's Late Sermon, p 22. Ridley, Christian Passover, p 4. Sherlock, Condition and Example, p 56. Hare, Church Authority, p vi. Stebbing, Defence, p 20. [Atterbury], Some Proceedings, p 35. Anon, St Paul, p 10, 16, 13.

² Cassan, Salisbury, p 210. Overton & Relton, History, p 14. Sykes, 'Hoadly', p 28, 118, 148. Dickinson, 'Hoadly', 349.

³ Works, ii, p 571-572, 615, 726-727, 744, 746-747, 788; iii, p 842.

Church of England.⁴

In order to reflect on Hoadly's Reformation principles and rhetoric, it might be useful to review briefly each chapter of this thesis. Throughout his life the Bishop made every effort to promote peace and unity amongst Protestants and Whigs. Hoadly was the grandson of a Puritan and the son of a conformist and he believed that the pious reforming Puritan tradition was part of the Anglican tradition.⁵ As they did not consider the Church of England sinful, chapter one shows how he attempted to convince the moderate Nonconformists that it was totally unnecessary to separate.⁶ Hoadly tried to persuade Edmund Calamy and the 'Middle Way Men' to join the established Church and continue the reformation from within.⁷

As discussed in chapter two, Hoadly advocated the use of individual reason in religion and, as a result, contemporaries and later writers have frequently linked him with the epistemology of the Deists.⁸ Nevertheless, this research has revealed that the approaches of the Deists and of Hoadly were significantly different. Like the Christian humanists of Northern Europe, and Protestants reformers and theologians, including Richard Hooker, William Chillingworth and John Hales, Hoadly used individual human reason (applauded by the ancients) to promote rather than undermine Christianity.⁹

⁴ Works, i, p 149, 159 178, 260-261; ii, p 54, 138, 139; iii, p 862.

⁵ John Hoadly, 'Hoadly', in Works, i, p vi. Works, i, p 265, 266, 273. The term 'Puritan' is open to debate see Collinson, English Puritanism, p 7-14.

⁶ Works, i, p 298, 325.

⁷ Works, i, p 262.

⁸ Atterbury, cited by Hoadly in Works, i, p 96, 97. For a later comment see Curate of Middlesex, Muster-Roll, title page, 1720. Stephen, English Thought, ii, p 131. Sykes, 'Hoadly', p 148-150. Dickinson, 'Hoadly', p 349.

⁹ Works, i, p 156-158. Todd, Christian Humanism. Reardon, Reformation. Trueman, Luther's Legacy. Stephens, Zwingli. George, Men of Latitude. Orr, Reason.

This was, however, the methodology which Hoadly firmly associated with the Reformation, and in particular with the seventeenth-century theologian William Chillingworth.¹⁰ Chillingworth and Hoadly both encouraged individuals to turn to Scripture for the tenets of their faith but they also expected Christians to defend those truths.¹¹ In Hoadly's Reformation epistemology we should never forget that he employed the God-given reason of a Christian apologist not the secular reason of a Deist.¹²

Chapter three considered the increase in Nonjuring, High Church and Tory propaganda in the first decade of the eighteenth-century. These views of natural subjection, divine hereditary monarchy and passive obedience not only attacked Whig doctrines but also appeared to undermine the lawfulness of resistance used in the 1688 Revolution and the Protestant succession.¹³ Hoadly countered this propaganda and made every effort to demonstrate that the Whig doctrines of natural equality, government by consent and limited resistance were completely consistent with Scripture. Charles Leslie, Francis Atterbury, Henry Sacheverell and others insisted that resistance was a sin.¹⁴ But Hoadly argued very persuasively that resistance had not been considered a sin at the Reformation, when Protestants had separated rather than accept the tyranny of the Church of Rome.¹⁵ In addition, he assured his audience that the doctrine of limited resistance accorded with the homilies of the Reformation Church, convocations of the lower house in Queen Elizabeth's time and the

¹⁰ *Works*, i, p 529. ii, p 580-581, 621.

¹¹ *Works*, ii, p 617, 618.

¹² *Works*, i, p 166.

¹³ [Leslie], *A View*, i, numbers 49-56, 85.

¹⁴ [Leslie], *A View*, i, number 92. Atterbury, *Sermon ... May 17*, p 18, 9. Sacheverell, *Perils*, p 19.

¹⁵ *Works*, ii, p 54, 138, 139.

writings of the “judicious” Hooker.¹⁶

The Bishop was also extremely concerned with claims of divine ecclesiastical authority and passive obedience made by Nonjurors and some clerics within the established Church. Hoadly was convinced that such ideas were popish and authoritarian.¹⁷ Chapter four of this thesis analysed Hoadly’s views of the Reformation Church. According to him, the visible Church was a human organisation with human authority which provided a useful function when it brought men nearer to Christ.¹⁸ However like Luther, the Bishop emphasised the invisible, spiritual church.¹⁹ Again, following in the tradition of William Chillingworth, the Bishop reminded his audience that the Bible was the religion of Protestants and encouraged individuals to turn to Scripture rather than Church governors for their faith.²⁰ Hoadly contended that he defended the true principles of Christianity, the Reformation and the Church of England when he stressed liberty of religious inquiry, personal judgement in matters of faith and the individual nature of salvation.²¹

As discussed in chapter five, the economic crisis caused by the South Sea affair in the 1720s divided the Whigs and appeared to leave the country vulnerable to a Catholic restoration.²² In an attempt to unite Whigs and Protestants, and explain government policy at the time of the Atterbury affair, Hoadly wrote the ‘Britannicus Letters’ in The London Journal most weeks from

¹⁶ Works, ii, p 89.

¹⁷ Works, ii, p 561.

¹⁸ Works, ii, p 473.

¹⁹ Works, ii, p 406. Rupp and Drewery, editors, Luther, p 166. McGrath, Reformation Thought, p 140.

²⁰ Works, ii, p 903. Chillingworth, Protestants, p 114, 333.

²¹ Works, ii, p 496, 451.

²² Realey, ‘Early Opposition’, p 36-66.

15 September 1722 until March 1724/5.²³ An extremely experienced Whig propagandist, the Bishop portrayed Walpole and his supporters as true patriots who defended individual liberty of religious inquiry, religious toleration, constitutional government, the rule of law, freedom of expression and indeed all the religious and political liberties which he associated with the Reformation and the 1688 Revolution.²⁴

In the mid 1730s Hoadly was involved in a debate surrounding the sacrament of Lord's Supper.²⁵ As noted in chapter six, although the Bishop supported the established Church, he believed that to use the sacrament as a test for political office was a form of religious and political persecution.²⁶ In addition, he attacked the superstition and mysticism which surrounded some Protestant eucharistic doctrines.²⁷ Hoadly was convinced that he was in the Reformation tradition, and like Zwingli and John Hales before him, argued that no mystical benefits were given at the eucharist.²⁸ The Bishop was the leading representative of 'memorialism' in this period. The Last Supper was, according to Hoadly, a commemorative rite where each individual Christian joined with others to remember and personally declare faith in Christ.²⁹

Contemporary opponents maintained that Hoadly changed his principles for personal gain.³⁰ The facts do not however support this charge. Hoadly's

²³ Works, iii, p 3-395.

²⁴ Works, iii, p 4-8, 11, 220, 223-225, 237-242, 260-261.

²⁵ Works, ii, p 971; iii, p 843.

²⁶ Works, ii, p 726, 727, 788.

²⁷ Work, iii, p 862.

²⁸ Works, iii, p 862, 900. Stephens, Zwingli, p 108. Hales, 'sacrament' in Hales Works, i, p 61, p 62.

²⁹ Works, iii, p 894. Stephens, Zwingli, p 99. Hales, 'sacrament', in Hales Works, i, p 62.

³⁰ Pope quoted in Downie, 'Walpole', in Age of Walpole, p 174. See also Sherlock, Vindication, p 115, 116. Snape, Letter to the Bishop of Bangor, p 39.

principles remained remarkably consistent throughout his lifetime. He always maintained that sincere Christian faith was more important than positive religious institutions and matters of order, but he believed that both should be adhered to where possible.³¹ Consequently, he always tried to persuade moderate Nonconformists to put aside their differences and join a comprehensive established Church.³² At the same time he urged ecclesiastical governors to develop a more tolerant Church.³³ As we have seen, the Bishop constantly argued against the unfairness of the Test and Corporation Acts.³⁴ Furthermore, Hoadly continued to argue that lawful resistance had been used in 1688, even when the resistance theory became unpopular amongst Whigs.³⁵ The only notable change appears to have been that by the mid 1730s he would have granted civil rights to Roman Catholics, although it was under conditions that most of them could not accept.³⁶

It is however important to appreciate that although Hoadly did not change his principles, he did alter the emphasis placed on his ideas in order to combat the arguments of different opponents. In debates with the Deists he maintained that a religion supported by revelation and reason was far superior to one known by reason alone.³⁷ When Hoadly was dealing with the Nonconformists he did not dwell on the role of the individual but discussed the benefits of order, unity, episcopacy and Church tradition.³⁸ In disputes with High Churchmen he played down the visible aspects of the Church and

³¹ Debate with Calamy - Works, i, p 481, 483. Bangorian controversy - Works, ii, p 453, 490.

³² Works, i, p 260, 261; ii, p 615.

³³ Works, i, p 210; ii, p 497.

³⁴ Works, ii, p 810, 984; iii, p 858, 881, 892, 900.

³⁵ Kenyon, Revolution Principles, p 202. Works, iii, p 219-229.

³⁶ Works, ii, p 788; ii, p 982.

³⁷ Works, i, 156, 57.

³⁸ Works, i, p 205, 210, 407, 477.

stressed the spiritual nature of Christianity.³⁹ Finally, when he wrote against Nonjurors he continually questioned their loyalty to the Protestant Church and the Protestant succession.⁴⁰

Hoadly has been recognised as one of the leading Latitudinarian divines of this period.⁴¹ So what has this work revealed about his Latitudinarian churchmanship? This research challenges the opinion of contemporary opponents and some later commentators that the Bishop used his considerable abilities against his own Church.⁴² We should not forget that Hoadly was a Latitudinarian AND a Churchman. The Church of England was, in his view, the greatest bulwark against popery and the Bishop did not want to destroy but reform and expand the Church.⁴³ He therefore tried to persuade moderate Nonconformists to interpret subscriptions with breadth and latitude and join the established Church.⁴⁴ At the same time he urged ecclesiastical leaders to be as flexible as possible.⁴⁵ The Bishop could not accept that Church governors possessed divine authority and consistently argued against excessive Church discipline.⁴⁶ Nevertheless, he did support moderate episcopacy for pragmatic reasons; it was traditional and it appeared to work.⁴⁷ Ceremonies were also useful, but only as long as they did not lead to mysticism and superstition.⁴⁸ Along with other Churchmen, Hoadly backed an authorised ministry, although he recognised that their education and training

³⁹ Works, ii, p 561.

⁴⁰ Works, i, p 632, 636.

⁴¹ For example Perry, History, iii, p 285, 286. Clark, English Society, p 302.

⁴² Cassan, Salisbury, p 210. Overton & Relton, History, p 14, 15. Sykes, 'Hoadly', p 146, 147.

⁴³ Works, ii, p 590.

⁴⁴ Works, i, p 236, 237, 225-228, 198.

⁴⁵ Works, i, p 210.

⁴⁶ Works, ii, p 471, 423.

⁴⁷ Works, i, p 477.

⁴⁸ Works, i, p 205, 209, 210; iii, p 845.

sometimes required improvement.⁴⁹

As we have seen, contemporary opponents and some later writers have maintained that Latitudinarianism was the product of weak Christian sentiment.⁵⁰ For Hoadly, good churchmanship and individual piety went hand in hand.⁵¹ The Church provided guidance and pastoral care, but he made it clear that salvation was primarily a personal struggle.⁵² Individual Christians were continually urged to turn to the Bible for Christ's message. Furthermore, he encouraged them to read with latitude, dwell on the meaning, rather than the letter, and most importantly to live by it.⁵³ Hoadly's emphasis on latitude was partly epistemological, he did not believe that fallible men could achieve certain knowledge.⁵⁴ However, latitude was, in Hoadly's view, an essential ingredient of Christianity because it represented extensive charity towards the interpretations of others.⁵⁵

Hoadly was not only a Latitudinarian Churchman he was also the foremost Whig propagandist of his generation. So what has this research revealed about his political writings? The most notable feature was the sheer volume of Hoadly's work for the Whig cause, together with the tenacity with which he attacked all Tory platforms. (See Appendix B for a list of his writings). He was a committed Whig and never deserted the party. Even in 1710, when the Whigs had lost support and failure in the election was almost a certainty, he

⁴⁹ Works, i, p 243-5

⁵⁰ Brett, True Scripture Account, p 169. Law, A Demonstration, p 99, 102. Ridley, Christian Passover, p 4. Anon MS in Bodleian, MS Rawl, 394 fols 46-48. Cocksworth, Eucharistic Thought, p 61.

⁵¹ Works, i, p 238.

⁵² Works, i, 238; ii, p 490; iii, p 879.

⁵³ Works, i, p 224; iii, p 882.

⁵⁴ Works, ii, p 492.

⁵⁵ Works, ii, p 617-618

wrote twelve pro-Whig pamphlets.⁵⁶ Hoadly was undoubtedly promoted for his services to the Whig cause but there is no evidence to suggest that he betrayed his religious principles. The Bishop was absolutely convinced that the Protestant Church and state, together with individual religious and political liberties, could only be secure under a Whig administration.⁵⁷

Numerous authors, including J G A Pocock, have emphasised the influence of the classics on eighteenth-century political ideas.⁵⁸ It was according to Pocock, the most classical minded of the English centuries.⁵⁹ In Political and Constitutional Ideas of the Court Whigs (1982) Reed Browning maintained that the political concepts employed by Hoadly and other Whigs were to a large extent Ciceronian.⁶⁰ Indeed, even though the Protestant succession was the *raison d'être* of the Whigs, the religious aspects of their political propaganda have been somewhat neglected. This present study has found that Hoadly successfully synthesised classical and Christian methods and ideas.⁶¹ As we have seen, the Bishop made natural rights theories completely consistent with the principles of Christianity and the Reformation.⁶² Moreover, Hoadly's belief in a functional approach to government, appeals to the common good and claims for civil rights were more frequently supported by the authority of St Paul rather than Cato or Cicero.⁶³

What is the broader significance of this research? Some writers have stressed

⁵⁶ Works, i, 601 ff.

⁵⁷ Works, i, 675, 678, 681-682,

⁵⁸ Pocock, Politics. Machiavellian Moment. Virtue.

⁵⁹ Pocock, Politics, p 127.

⁶⁰ Browning, Court Whigs, especially chapters 3 & 8.

⁶¹ Works, i, p 178, 174-5.

⁶² Works, ii, p 54, 61, 64, 131, 135, 138, 139, 361.

⁶³ Works, ii, p 18, 38, 118, 332.

the differences between the seventeenth and eighteenth-century Latitudinarians. For John Spellman “the Latitudinarian moment” belonged firmly to the seventeenth century and the revolutionary changes which made that moment possible.⁶⁴ Martin Griffin argued that “orthodoxy” was the hallmark of seventeenth-century Latitudinarianism but that eighteenth-century Latitudinarianism sheltered the heterodoxy of Benjamin Hoadly and Richard Watson (Bishop of Llandaff).⁶⁵ But Griffin’s comment assumes that seventeenth-century Latitudinarianism was indeed orthodox, despite the fact that Latitudinarians encouraged freedom in philosophy and divinity which presumably resulted in many diverse tendencies. Moreover, this present study has demonstrated that Hoadly was not a Deist, nor were his ideas as extreme as some of his critics have suggested.⁶⁶ The research has shown that the Bishop drew on the sacramental views of John Hales and the epistemology of William Chillingworth, all of which suggests that there was probably more continuity between seventeenth and eighteenth-century men of latitude than is often appreciated. This general observation can, however, only be confirmed after more work has been carried out on the religious ideas of Arthur Ashley Sykes, John Jackson, Daniel Whitby, Thomas Pyle and other eighteenth-century Latitudinarians.

This thesis has also emphasised the very close relationship between religion and politics during this period. It has, in particular, drawn attention to the use of Reformation rhetoric in the disputes of the day. Tony Claydon has provided a detailed analysis of the way in which Gilbert Burnet (1643-1715) harnessed

⁶⁴ Spellman, Latitudinarians, p 10.

⁶⁵ Martin Griffin, Latitudinarianism in the Seventeenth Century Church of England, Leiden, 1992, p 46.

⁶⁶ Griffin, Latitudinarianism, p 46, 47. Sykes, ‘Hoadly’, p 148-150. Sykes, Church and State, p 293.

the ideas of the Reformation to promote William III's new regime.⁶⁷ Studies by Rosemary O'Day, A G Dickens and John Tonkin have also described briefly the way in which Burnet, John Strype (1643-1737) and other celebrated authors interpreted the Reformation at the end of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth-century.⁶⁸ However, this research into Hoadly's polemic has revealed that it was not only eminent writers like Burnet, Strype and Hoadly who appealed to the authority of the Reformation. The rhetoric of the Reformation was used by a wide range of writers on all sides of the religious and political spectrum. High Churchmen, Low Churchmen, Deists, Whigs and Tories all used the language and ideas of the Reformation to support their own religious and political views. At one extreme the Reformation signified religious and political liberty, at the other it represented absolute obedience and submission. Indeed, during the period covered by this thesis, the rhetoric of the Reformation was so pervasive and the meanings attached to Reformation principles were so varied that the topic could undoubtedly benefit from more extended research.

⁶⁷ Claydon, William.

⁶⁸ O'Day, Debate, chapter 2. Dickens and Tonkin, Reformation chapter 6.

Appendix I

Brief biographical details of Benjamin Hoadly (1676-1761)¹

Born 14 November 1676 in Westerham, Kent. Benjamin Hoadly was the 6th child of the Reverend Samuel Hoadly and his second wife Martha Pickering. They had nine children, three were boys - Samuel (1675-1692), Benjamin (1676-1761) and John (1678-1746). Samuel died while studying at Oxford. John began his clerical career as chaplain to Bishop Burnet who made him a prebendary of Salisbury in February 1705/6. Like Burnet, John Hoadly became known for his Latitudinarian views.² In 1742 he was appointed Archbishop of Armagh.

Both Benjamin and John were educated by their father who was a clergyman, and also schoolmaster at Westerham (1671), Tottenham High Cross (1678), Hackney (1686) and Norwich (1700). When in Norwich he taught Samuel Clarke who later became a close friend of Benjamin Hoadly.

18 February 1691 Benjamin was admitted as a pensioner to Catherine Hall Cambridge. At that time Cambridge was a seed bed for Latitudinarian ideas.³ He was under the tutorship of Dr John Leng, a staunch Whig who was a Boyle lecturer 1717/18 and became Bishop of Norwich in 1723. Hoadly lost seven terms through ill health. Sadly, he had contracted smallpox and was crippled for the remainder of his life. He used a cane in public and crutches in private. Disability meant that Hoadly was unable to stand for any length of time and

¹ Based primarily on John Hoadly's article in the Supplement to Biographia Britannica in Works, i, p v-xiii.

² Leslie, A View, i, numbers 241-248 September, 1707.

³ See Gascoigne, Cambridge.

was forced to preach in a kneeling position. Opponents frequently ridiculed him on account of his physical deformity. However, by mid-life economic circumstances allowed Hoadly to 'ride-out' in a carriage each day and this improved his general health.

January 1695/6 Hoadly was awarded a BA. On 23 August 1697 he was elected a fellow of Catherine Hall and gained an MA in 1699.

18 December 1698 he took orders as a deacon and on 22 December 1700 as a priest.

30 May 1701 Hoadly married Sarah Curtis (b 1676). They had five children (but two were born dead). Sarah was a fine artist and painted portraits of both her husband and Bishop Gilbert Burnet.

1701 Hoadly gained the lectureship of St Mildred's in the Poultry, London, where he was well placed to become involved in the religious and political debates of the day.

1702 he published a Letter to the Reverend William Fleetwood concerning miracles. (See chapter 2 of this thesis).

1703 Hoadly's son Samuel was born (but lived for only ten months).

1703-1707 he wrote tracts to encourage the moderate Nonconformists to join the established Church. (See chapter 1 of this thesis)

1704 Hoadly was appointed Rector of St Peter le Poor in Broadstreet, London.

10 February 1705/6 his son Benjamin was born. (1705/6-1757). (The younger Benjamin became a fellow of the Royal Society and physician to the royal household in 1742. In 1747 he wrote a comedy The Suspicious Husband).

29 September 1705 Hoadly preached a sermon on the text of Romans xiii-1 ("Let every Soul be Subject to the Higher Powers") which defended the lawfulness of resistance to a magistrate who did not work for the good of the people. Between 1705-1710 he preached and wrote on the terms of political allegiance. (See chapter 3 of this thesis).

1709 he published a letter to Sir Richard Bulkeley attacking the religious enthusiasm of the Camisards. (See chapter 2 of this thesis).

14 December 1709 Hoadly was applauded by the Whig House of Commons for his services to Church and state.

As far as Tories and High Churchmen were concerned Hoadly epitomized Whig and Low Church values. Consequently, in 1710 Henry Sacheverell's supporters burnt effigies of Hoadly and threw his books into the flames.⁴

1710 Mrs Howland, who was a Whig and grandmother to the Duke of Bedford, presented Hoadly with the Rectory at Streatham, Surrey. He was also appointed chaplain to the Duke of Bedford.

⁴ Holmes, Sacheverell, p 169, 234-5, 247.

8 October 1711 Hoadly's son John was born. (1711-1776) (John Hoadly took a degree in Law. On 29 November, 1735 his father installed him as Chancellor of the Diocese of Winchester. In 1773 he published Hoadly's Works).

1713 Benjamin Hoadly wrote against what he considered to be the unchristian methods of the Deists. (See chapter 2 of this thesis).

1714 accession of (Lutheran) George I and return of the the Whigs to office. From the time of her arrival in England Princess Caroline showed a keen interest in the Church and religious affairs and gathered around her a wide circle of clergymen including Latitudinarians and Tory High Churchmen.⁵ Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough was influential in appointing Mrs Clayton (later Lady Sundon - d. 1742) as woman of the bedchamber to the Princess. Charlotte Clayton used her friendship with Caroline to promote Latitudinarians including Alured Clarke, Samuel Clarke and Benjamin Hoadly. Hoadly and Charlotte became firm friends and corresponded for approximately twenty years (certainly as early as August 1715 until at least 26 May 1735).

Hoadly also exchanged letters with Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, and over the years became a frequent visitor to Blenheim. Indeed, the Duchess claimed that she had been instrumental in promoting Hoadly. "This man I made a Bishop, by my perpetual solicitation after King George came into England".⁶

25 January 1715/16 Hoadly was awarded the Lambeth degree of Doctor of Divinity by William Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury.⁷

⁵ Taylor, 'Queen Caroline', p 86, 100.

⁶ British Library, Blenheim Papers, Add MS 61464 f 163 (no date)

⁷ Lambeth Act Book VB/1/vi, p 201.

16 February 1715/16 he became a king's chaplain.

March 1715/16 Hoadly was consecrated Bishop of Bangor. The Bishop was allowed to hold both his livings and remained in London.⁸

Hoadly attended court regularly at this time. On one occasion in the summer of 1716 the Bishop spent two to three hours in private discussions with Princess Caroline. On 23 August 1716 he wrote to Charlottle Clayton, "The first thing is I am grown a great courtier - very Impudent - or at least, very absurd, and harden'd - but I hope not false".⁹

31 March 1717 he preached a sermon before the King on the nature of the kingdom or church of Christ. This sermon caused a furore and the Bangorian controversy, as it became known, continued for the following three years. (See chapter 4 of this thesis).

1720 - Hoadly resigned the Rectory of St Peter le Poor.

November 1721 he was confirmed as Bishop of Hereford.

September 1722 - March 1724/25 as author of the 'Britannicus Letters' in The London Journal the Bishop supported Walpole's Whig administration. (See chapter 5 of this thesis).

October 1723 Hoadly was confirmed as Bishop of Salisbury. On his

⁸ Note the dates which John Hoadly gave for his father's consecration and subsequent translations (Works, i, p ix-x) varies from the dates given in Lambeth Act books VB/1/vi p 201, 209, 382, 385 although they agree on the month.

⁹ 'Impudent' because he had asked for a London living for his brother John. Lady Sundon's letterbook, Orborn MSS fc.110 vol.II, letter 23 August, 1716.

translation to Salisbury he resigned the Rectory of Streatham.

1727 Accession of George II and Queen Caroline.

1730. When a vacancy occurred at Durham in 1730 Edmund Gibson (Bishop of London) ensured that Hoadly was by-passed in favour of Bishop Chandler of Lichfield.¹⁰ He revealed his bitter disappointment in a letter to Lady Sundon.¹¹

August, 1734 Lord Hervey (a personal friend of Hoadly's who supported the Whigs and was a favourite at court), was informed that Richard Willis Bishop of Winchester had suffered an apoplectic fit and was extremely ill. Although the Queen and Walpole had already promised Hoadly preferment, Hervey advised him not to rely on court promises but to make a direct application to the King. At the same time Hervey worked for Hoadly's translation to Winchester.¹²

September 1734 Hoadly was confirmed as Bishop of Winchester one of the richest sees in England.

1735 he published A Plain Account of the Nature and End of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper (See chapter 6 of this thesis). In a private letter to Horatio Walpole (Ambassador at the Hague), 9/20 September, 1735 Lord Hervey complained, "When I reproached the Bishop of Winchester for publishing this book without ever saying one word to me about it beforehand, his answer was that he would not tell me of it, because he knew I should advise him against it,

¹⁰ Sykes, Gibson, p 137, 138.

¹¹ Yale, Beinecke Library, Lady Sundon's letterbook, Osborn MSS fc.110. vol II (no date)

¹² Robert Halsband, Lord Hervey, London, 1973, p 173.

and he was determined to do it".¹³

Sarah Curtis died in 1743 and on 23 July 1745 Hoadly married his second wife Mary Newey (b 1708) daughter of Dr John Newey, Dean of Chichester.

17 April, 1761 at the age of 84 Benjamin Hoadly died peacefully at his palace (Winchester House) in Chelsea.

¹³ Earl of Ichester, editor, Lord Hervey and His Friends, London, 1950, p 227-228.

Appendix II

List of the publications of Benjamin Hoadly and location in the Works.

Anonymous. A Letter to the Reverend Mr Fleetwood, occasioned by his late Essay on Miracles. London, (published in London unless stated otherwise) 1702¹. Position in collected Works, i, p 5 - 18.

The Reasonableness of Conformity to the Church of England represented to the Dissenting Ministers. Part 1 & 2, 1703. Works, i, p 183 - 299.

A Serious Admonition to Mr Calamy, occasioned by the First Part of his Defense of moderate Nonconformity. 1703. (According to John Hoadly 1705. A second edition was published in 1705) Works, i, p 300 - 315.

Anonymous. A Letter to a Clergyman in the Country, concerning the Votes of the Bishops upon the Bill against Occasional Conformity. (dated 12 November, 1703) 1704. Works, i, p 19 - 32.

A Persuasive to Lay Conformity, or the Reasonableness of constant Communion with the Church of England represented to the Dissenting Laity. 1704. Works i, p 316 - 332.

A Defense of the Reasonableness of Conformity to the Church of England, in Answer to the Objections of Mr Calamy, in his Defense of moderate Nonconformity; with a Reply to his Postscript in answer to the Serious Admonition. 1705. Works, i, 333 - 394.

An Accession Sermon, preached March 8, 1704-5. 1705. Works, ii, p 103 - 108.

A Sermon preached before the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor, ... September 29, 1705. 1705. Works, ii, p 18 - 25.

The Measures of Submission to the Civil Magistrate considered. In a Defense of the Doctrine delivered in a Sermon preached before the Right honourable the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of London, September 29, 1705. 1706. Works, ii, p 3 - 102.

Anonymous. A Letter to the Reverend Dr Francis Atterbury, occasioned by the Doctrine delivered by him in a Funeral Sermon on 1 Cor xv 19. August 30, 1706. 1706. Works, i, p 48 - 60.

¹ Dates checked with ESTC & British Library Catalogue of Printed Books.

A brief Defense of Episcopal Ordination, To which are added a Reply to the Introduction of the Second Part, and a Postscript relating to the Third Part, of Mr Calamy's Defense of Moderate Nonconformity. 1707. Works, i, 395 - 528.

The Happiness of the present Establishment, and Unhappiness of absolute Monarchy, a Sermon preached at the Assizes at Hertford, March, 22, 1707-8. 1708. Works, ii, p 109 - 117.

St Paul's Behaviour towards the Civil Magistrate, a Sermon preached at the Assizes at Hertford, July 26, 1708. 1708. Works ii, p 118 - 125.

Anonymous. A second Letter to the Reverend Dr Francis Atterbury, in Answer to his large Vindication prefixed to his Volume of Sermons; with a Postscript relating to his Doctrine concerning the Power of Charity to cover Sins. 1708. Works, i, p 61 - 106.

Anonymous. A Brief Vindication of the Ancient Prophets from the Imputations and Misrepresentations of such as adhere to our present Pretenders to Inspiration, in a Letter to Sir Richard Bulkeley. 1709. Works, i, p 107 - 142.

Some Considerations humbly offered to the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Exeter, occasioned by his Lordship's Sermon preached before Her Majesty, March 8, 1708. 1709. Works, ii, p 126 - 139.

An humble Reply to the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Exeter's Answer; in which the Considerations offered to his Lordship are vindicated, and an Apology is added for defending the Foundation of the present Establishment. 1709. Works, ii, p 140 - 181.

The Original and Institution of Civil Government discussed, viz. 1. An Examination of the Patriarchal Scheme of Government. 2. A Defense of Mr Hooker's Judgement, ... against the Objections of several late Writers. To which is added, a large Answer to Dr F Atterbury's Charge of Rebellion; in which the Substance of his late Latin Sermon is produced, and fully examined. 1710. Works, ii, p 182 - 380.

Anonymous. The true genuine Tory Address. 1710. Works, i, p 601 - 605.

Anonymous. The Voice of the Addressors 1710. Works, i, p 606 - 614.

Anonymous. Serious Advice to the good People of England, shewing them their true Interest and their true Friends. 1710. Works, i, p 615 - 622.

Anonymous. The Thoughts of an honest Tory upon the present Proceedings of that Party; in a Letter to a Friend in Town. 1710. Works, i, p 623 - 630.

Anonymous. The Jacobites Hopes revived by our late Tumults and Addresses; or some necessary Remarks upon a new modest Pamphlet, of Mr Leslie's against the Government, intituled, The Good Old Cause, or Lying in Truth. 1710. Works, i, p 631 - 642.

Anonymous. The French King's Thanks to the Tories of Great Britain. 1710. Works, i, p 643 - 647.

Anonymous. A Letter concerning Allegiance, written by the Lord Bishop of London, to a Clergyman in Essex, presently after the Revolution, never before published; to which are added some Queries occasioned by the late Address of his Lordship, and the Clergy of London and Westminster; published in the Gazette of August 24, 1710. 1710. Works, i, p 648 - 654.

Anonymous. Reasons against receiving the Pretender, and restoring the Popish Line; together with some Queries of the utmost Importance to Great Britain. 1710. Works, i, p 655 - 661.

Anonymous. The Fears and Sentiments of true Britons, with respect to national Credit, Interest, and Religion. 1710. Works, i, p 662 - 669.

Anonymous. A Letter of Advice to the Freeholders of England, concerning the Election of Members to serve in the ensuing Parliament. 1710. Works, i, p 670 - 674.

Anonymous. The Election Dialogue between a Gentleman and his Neighbour in the Country, concerning the Choice of good Members for the next Parliament. 1710. Works, i, 675 - 685.

Anonymous. The Case of a British General, collected from several late celebrated papers, and laid down in two plain Propositions, to his Grace the Duke of Marlborough. 1710. Works, i, p 686 - 688.

Several Discourses Concerning the Terms of Acceptance with God. 1711. Works, iii, p 496 - 622.

Anonymous. Queries recommended to the Authors of the late Discourse of Free-thinking. 1713. Works, i, p 143 - 151.

Anonymous. A Letter to a Friend in Lancashire, occasioned by a Report concerning Injunctions and Prohibitions by Authority, relating to some Points of Religion now in debate. 1714. Works, i, p 529 - 533.

Four Sermons on the Duty of Enquiry, and the Extremes of implicit Faith and Infidelity, preached January 1712-13. 1715. Works, i, p 152 - 182.

The present Delusion of many Protestants considered, a Sermon preached at St Peter's Poor, November 5, 1715. 1715. Works, iii, p 623 - 631.

Two Sermons, concerning the Evils of which Christianity hath been made the Occasion. (preached 1702) 1715. Works, i, p 33 - 47.

Claimed by Richard Steele but attributed to Hoadly. A large Dedication to the present Pope (Clement XI), giving him a particular Account of the State of Religion amongst Protestants, and of several other Matters of Importance relating to Great Britain. 1715. Works, i, p 534 - 556.

The Restoration made a Blessing to us by the Protestant Succession; a Sermon preached before the King, May 29, 1716. 1716. Works, iii, p 632 - 637.

A Preservative against the Principles and Practices of the Nonjurors both in Church and State, or an Appeal to the Consciences and Common Sense of the Christian Laity. 1716. Works, i, p 557 - 600.

The Nature and Duty of a publick Spirit; a Sermon preached at St James's, Westminster, on St David's Day, March 1, 1716 -1717. 1717. Works, iii, p 638 - 644.

The Nature of the Kingdom, or Church of Christ; a Sermon preached before the King, March 31, 1717. 1717. Works, ii, p 402 - 409.

An Answer to the Reverend Dr Snape's Letter to the Bishop of Bangor. 1717. Works, ii, p 410 - 428.

Advertisements in the Daily Courant of June 28, 1717 - and in the Evening posts of June 29. 1717. Works, ii, p 429 - 447.

A Preface to Francis de la Pillonniere's Answer to Dr Snape's Accusation by the Lord Bishop of Bangor. 1717. Works, ii, p 588 - 597.

A Postscript to the Reverend Dr Sherlock, Dean of Chichester by Benjamin Lord Bishop of Bangor printed after a Second Letter to Sherlock ... by A Ashley Sykes. 1717. Works, ii, p 583 - 587.

An Answer to the Representation drawn up by the Committee of the Lower House of Convocation, concerning several dangerous Positions and Doctrines contained in the Bishop of Bangor's Preservative and Sermon. 1717. Works, ii, p 448 - 582.

A Letter to Dr Snape, by the Lord Bishop of Bangor, - prefixed to Francis de la Pillonniere's Reply to Dr Snape's Vindication. 1718. (John Hoadly dates this 1717) Works, ii, p 598 - 628.

Some few Remarks on Dr Snape's Letter before Mr Mills's Book, by the Bishop of Bangor, prefixed to Francis de la Pillonniere's Third Defense. 1718. (John Hoadly - 1717) Works, ii, p 629 - 632.

An Answer to a Calumny cast upon the Bishop of Bangor by the Reverend Dr Sherlock, at the Conclusion of his new Book, intituled, a Vindication of the Corporation and Test Acts. 1718. Works, ii, p 633 - 642.

An Answer to a late Book written by Dr Sherlock, intituled, The Condition and Example of our blessed Saviour vindicated. 1718. Works, ii, p 643 - 696.

The Common Rights of Subjects defended, and the Nature of the Sacramental Test considered, in answer to the Dean of Chichester's Vindication of the Corporation and Test Acts. 1719. Works, ii, p 697 - 811.

A Sermon preached at the Funeral of Mrs Elizabeth Howland, in the Parish Church of Streatham in Surry, (sic) May 1, 1719. 1719. Works, iii, p 645 - 652.

An Answer to the Reverend Dr Hare's Sermon, intituled, Church Authority vindicated, ... with a Postscript occasioned by the Lord Bishop of Oxford's [Potter] late Charge to his Clergy. 1720. Works, ii, p 812 - 917.

Anonymous. The Dean of W ----- r still the same, or his new Defense of the Lord Bishop of Bangor's Sermon, ... considered as the Performance of a great Critick, a Man of Sense, and a Man of Probity. 1720. Works, ii, p 918 - 970.

A Sermon preached before the House of Lords at St Peter's Westminster, on January 30, 1720-21, being the Anniversary of the Martyrdom of King Charles I. 1720/21 Works, iii, p 653 - 658.

Anonymous. 'Britannicus Letters' in The London Journal from September 1722 to March 1724-25. Works, iii, p 3 - 395.

A Charge to the Clergy of the Diocese of Salisbury at the Primary Visitation. 1726. (and also two other charges) Works, iii, p 473 - 495.

Anonymous. An Enquiry into the Reasons of the Conduct of Great Britain, with Relation to the present State of Affairs in Europe. 1727. Works, iii, p 396 - 437.

Anonymous. A Defense of the Enquiry into the Reasons of the Conduct of Great Britain, ... occasioned by the Paper published in the Country Journal, or Craftsman, on Saturday, January 4, 1728/9. 1729. Works, iii, p 438 - 454.

An Account of the Life, Writings, and Character of Dr Samuel Clarke. 1732. Works, iii, p 455 - 472.

Anonymous. A Plain Account of the Nature and End of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, ... To Which are added Forms of Prayer. 1735. Works, iii, p 843 - 926.

Anonymous. The Objections against the Repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts considered; being an Answer to a Pamphlet lately published, intituled, The Dispute Adjusted by Edmund Gibson, D D Lord Bishop of London. 1736 (According to John Hoadly - first edition 1736, second edition 1739. ESTC record a second edition in 1739) Works, ii, p 971 - 990.

Sixteen Sermons formerly printed, now collected into one Volume, To which are added Six Sermons upon publick Occasions, never before printed. 1754. Works, iii, p 623 - 699.

Twenty Sermons, the first Nine of them preached before the King in Lent. 1755. Works, iii, p 700 - 842.

A Letter from the Bishop of Winchester to Clement Chevallier, Esq. 1757. Works, iii, p 932 - 970.

Bibliography

Manuscripts

British Library

Add. MS. 4310, ff.102-106. Letters from Hoadly to the Rev. Mr. Birch, 14 July - 28 October 1752.

Add. MS. 5791, ff.50-61. Anon. Letter to the Bishop of Bangor relating to his sermon, 8 August 1717.

Add. MS. 5841, p 17. Anecdote relating to Bishops Hoadly and Sherlock, copied from Cambridge Chronicle of 1 September 1764.

Add. MS. 6116, p 32, 96, 79, 100, 102, 103-106, 111-113. Letters from Bishop William Nicolson of Carlisle (sic) to Archbishop William Wake with allusions to Hoadly's work, 2 February 1709/10 - 21 November 1717.

Add. MS. 6117, p 27-41. Letters from William King, Archbishop of Dublin to Archbishop Wake relating to Bishop Hoadly's sermon, 10 May - 13 June 1717.

Add. MS. 6117, p 66. Letter from Edward Synge, Archbishop of Tuam to Archbishop Wake, 15 January 1716/17.

Add. MS. 6210, f.7. Dedication from Philaretus to the Bishop of Winchester. (No date)

Add. MS. 6216, f.34. List of works published in the controversy with Dr Sherlock, concerning the Test Act. (No date)

Add. MS. 32,311, f.88. Letter from Hoadly to Archbishop Secker, 28 May 1759.

Add. MS. 32,556, ff.159, 231. Letters from Hoadly to the Rev. Dr. Macro at Norton, 2 December 1725 and 20 September 1735.

Add. MS. 32,689, f.425; 32,695, f.311; 32,891, f.244; 32,901, f.495, f.499. Correspondence between the Duke of Newcastle and Hoadly, 24 September 1734 - 26 January, 1760.

Add. MS. 35,386, ff.287, 289; Add. MS. 35,588, f.83; Add. MS. 35,589, ff.191, 348; Add. MS. 35,598, f.299. Correspondence between Hoadly and the first Lord Hardwicke, 21 August 1740 - 28 October 1747.

Add. MS. 35,637, f.83. Catalogue of Hoadly's writings by his son, 1764.

Add. MS. 37,222, f.65. Letter from Hoadly to the Rev. Mr. Morant at Colchester, 9 June 1750.

Add. MS. 61360. Hoadly's prologue for the play All for Love, acted at Blenheim, 1719.

Add. MS. 61426. Narrative relating to the Duchess of Marlborough, compiled by Hoadly, 1715?

Add. MS. 61464, ff.161-185. Letters from Hoadly to the Duchess of Marlborough, 1719-[1734?]

Add. MS. 61464, ff.163, 182. Comments on Hoadly, written by the Duchess of Marlborough. (Unsigned and undated).

Add. MS. 61496, f.79; 61604, f.49; 61612, f.218; 61650, ff.42-47. Letters from Hoadly to Lord Sunderland, 1719-27?

Add. MS. 61603, ff.108-109b. Recommendation to Lord Stanhope from Hoadly.

Add. MS. 61612, f.219. Draft of a letter from the King to the Archbishops regarding Popery. (No date)

Eg. 1954, f.109. Letter from Hoadly to Mr Knapton, 23 May 1753.

Sl. 4054, f.259. Letter from Hoadly to Sir H. Sloane, 25 June 1736.

St. 750, f.19. Letter from Hoadly to Lord Chief Justice Parker, 9 August 1716.

Bodleian Library, Oxford

MS Cherry 23, p 119. Letter from Dr Henry Dodwell to Hoadly, 19 June 1703.

MS Cherry 23, p 131. Letter from Dr Henry Dodwell to Hoadly, 29 July 1703.

MS Eng. misc. c. 116. Memo. book probably written by Nathaniel Brooke, includes verse on Hoadly, fol. 6 v. (No date)

MS Don. b. 20 fol. 12. - Letter from John Tucker to Hoadly, 1761.

MS Don. c. 102 fol. 7. Letter from Benjamin Hoadly to John Tucker, 27 March 1746.

MS Rawl. 394 fols 46, 48. Draft to preface of a book against Hoadly's Last Supper. (No date)

MS Rawl. c. 908 fol. 1. Nathaniel Spinckes' answer to Measures of Submission. (No date)

MS. Rawl. D. 923 fol 238. certificate signed by Hoadly.

MS Tanner 114 fol 37. Letter from Hoadly to Dr John Wynne, 7 September 1716.

Christ Church, Oxford.

Letters to William Wake

Vol. 9, no. 207. Letter from Hoadly to William Wake, 4 June 1722.

Vol. 23, no. 15. Letter from Hoadly to Wake, 8 June 1725.

Vol. 20, no. 407. Letter from Edmund Gibson, Bishop of Lincoln to Wake, 13 July 1717.

Vol. 20, no. 410. Letter from Gibson to Wake, 15 July 1717.

Vol 20, no. 411. Letter from Gibson to Wake, 20 July 1717.

Vol 20, no. 480. Letter from Gibson to Wake, 22 November 1717.

Vol. 20, no. 402. Letter from White Kennett, Dean of Peterborough to Wake, 1 July 1717.

Vol. 20, no. 439. Letter from William Nicolson, Bishop of Carlisle to Wake. (No date)

Vol. 12, no. 256/257. Letter from Edward Synge, Archbishop of Tuam to Wake, 29 April 1718.

Vol. 12, no. 105. Letter from Timothy Godwin, Bishop of Kilmore to Wake, 31 December 1716.

Vol. 12, no. 126. Letter from Godwin to Wake, 7 February 1716/17.

Vol. 12, no. 145. Letter from Godwin to Wake, 13 April 1717.

Vol. 12, no. 150/151. Letter from Godwin to Wake, 27 April 1717.

Vol. 12, no. 185. Letter from Godwin to Wake, 2 July 1717.

Vol. 12, no. 361. Letter from Godwin to Wake, 21 March 1717/18.

Vol. 12, no. 335. Letter from William King, Archbishop of Dublin to Wake, 26 April 1716.

Vol. 12, no. 160. Letter from Wm. King to Wake, 6 May 1717.

Vol. 12, no. 165. Letter from Wm. King to Wake, 18 May 1717.

Vol. 12, no. 183 & 184. Letter from Wm. King to Wake, 6 July 1717.

Vol. 21, no 130. Letter from Francis Hare, Dean of Worcester to Wake, 27 May 1719.

Cambridge University Library

Add. MS. 5. 236. Letter from Hoadly to John Strype. (No date)

Add. MS. 7901/9/1 Episcopal Acta.

Add. MS. 8286/14. Letter from John Woodward to Hoadly, 3 April 1718.

Cholmondeley-Houghton MS. 1022. Letter from Robert Walpole to Hoadly, 26 August 1723.

Cholmondeley-Houghton MS. 1166. Letter from Hoadly to Robert Walpole, 7 October 1724.

Cholmondeley-Houghton MS. 1746. Letter from Hoadly to Robert Walpole, 15 August 1730.

Henry Taylor MS. Add. 7901/5/2. Letter from Hoadly to his son John, 18 October 1740.

Henry Taylor MS. Add. 7901/5/3. Letter from Hoadly to his son John, June, 1753.

Henry Taylor MS. Add. 7901/5/4. Letter from Hoadly to the Rev. Mr Taylor at Whitfield, 25 January 1743/4.

Henry Taylor MS. Add. 7901/5/5. Letter from Hoadly to Rev. Mr Taylor at Whitfield, 28 December 1745.

Lambeth Palace Library.

VB/1/vi & viii. Act Books.

2028, p 132. Letter from Hoadly to Rev. Dr Alured Clarke. 11 November 1732.

1741, p 118 & 119. Letter from Francis Hare, Bishop of Chichester to Edmund Gibson, 29 July 1735.

Public Record Office, Kew

SP35/44/16. Letter from 'Britannicus' [Benjamin Hoadly] to Sir [Robert Walpole] 4 July 1723.

Yale University Library (Beinecke Library)

40 letters from Hoadly to Lady Sundon 1715-1732. Osborn MS fc.110 Vol II.

Printed Material

Anon. An Answer to the Dispute Adjusted. London: 1732.

Anon. (sometimes attributed to Benjamin Hoadly) An Apologetical Defence, or a Demonstration of the Usefulness and Expediency of A Late Book entitled A Plain Account of the Nature, and End, of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. London: 1735.

Anon. Brief Remarks upon the Dispute adjusted. London: 1733.

Anon. The Case of Moderation and Occasional Communion Represented by way of Caution to the True Sons of the Church of England. London: 1705.

Anon. The Case of the Admission of Occasional Conformists to the Holy Communion Before they Renounce their Schism Considered. London: 1705.

Anon. Christian Exceptions to the Plain Account of the Nature and End of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. London: 1736.

Anon. Chuse which you Please. London: 1710.

Anon. The Clergyman's Petition for a Repeal of the Sacramental Test. London: 1736.

Anon. A Conciliatory Letter Relating to the Late Proceedings at Salter's Hall. London: 1719.

Anon. (sometimes attributed to Benjamin Hoadly) A Defence of the Plain Account ... Against the Objections obtained in the Remarks ... Being two Letters originally published in the Independent London Journal to which is added A Tract concerning the Sacrament by ... John Hales. London: 1735.

Anon. The Divine Rights of the British Nation and Constitution vindicated. London: 1710.

Anon. An Enquiry Into the Nature of the Liberty of the Subject, And of Subjection to the Supreme Powers. London: 1706.

Anon. An Entire Confutation of Mr Hoadly's Book of the Original of Government; Taken from the London Gazette. London: 1710.

Anon. The Establish'd Church of England Vindicated From the Imputation of Schism. London: 1716.

Anon. (sometimes attributed to Hoadly) A Farther Defence of the Plain Account of the Nature and End of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. London: 1735.

Anon. Farther Remarks on the Rev Dr Snape's Second Letter to the R R Lord Bishop of Bangor. London: 1717.

Anon. The Great Work of our Redemption by Christ, And the Several Branches of it. London: 1735.

Anon. Guess at my Meaning. Geneva. (no date)

Anon. The History of the Lutheran Church: or, The Religion of our Present Sovereign King George Agreeable to the Tenets of the Church of England. London: 1714.

Anon. The Judgment of Whole Kingdoms and Nations, concerning the Rights, Power, and Prerogative of Kings, and the Rights, Priviledges and Properties of the People. London: 1710.

Anon. A Layman's Lamentation on the 30th January for the Horrid, Barbarous, and Never to be Forgotten Murder of Charles the First. London: 1710.

Anon. A Letter to a Clergyman: Concerning Mr Hoadly's Doctrine about the Homilies and Resistance. London: 1711.

Anon. A Letter to a Friend Occasioned by the Contest between the Bishop of Exeter and Mr Hoadly. London: 1709.

Anon. A Letter to a Noble Lord, About his Dispersing Abroad Mr Hoadly's Remarks upon the Bishop of Exeter's Sermon Before the Queen. Humbly Recommending to his Lordship's Perusal an ANSWER to it; Entitul'd; The Best Answer Ever was Made. London: 1709.

Anon. (Student of the University of Cambridge). The Life, Birth, and Education of the Reverend Benjamin Hoadly. London: 1710?

Anon. A Modest Reply to the Unanswerable Mr Hoadly. London: 1709.

Anon. Mr Chillingworth's Judgement of the Religion of Protestants ... Printed for the Information of the Committee. London: 1717.

Anon. A Muster Roll of the Bishop of Bangor's Seconds. London: 1720.

Anon. A New Defence of the Bishop of Bangor's Sermon on John xviii 36. By an Impartial Hand. London: 1720.

Anon. Obedience to Civil Government Clearly Stated: Wherein the Christian Religion is rescued from the false Notions pretended to be drawn from it; and Mr Hoadly's New Scheme, in his last Book Of the Origin and Form of Government is fully consider'd. London: 1711.

Anon. The Occasional Paper. London: 1735 & 1736.

Anon. The Plea of Publick Good Not sufficient to Justify the Taking up Arms against our Rightful and Lawful Sovereigns, in a Letter to the Rev. Mr Hoadly, 13 March, 1705/6. London: 1706.

Anon. A Proper Answer to a Late Abusive Pamphlet Entitled, The Winchester Converts. Oxford: 1735.

Anon. Pulpit War: London: 1710.

Anon. The Reasonableness of Applying for the Repeal or Explanation of the Corporation and Test Acts, Impartially Consider'd... London: 1736.

Anon. Reasons for Applying to Parliament, the ensuing session, for the Repeal of so much of the Corporation and Test Acts, as affects the Protestant Dissenters; addressed to the Gentlemen of the Committee. London: (no date)

Anon. Reasons Offer'd against Pushing For the Repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts. London: 1732.

Anon. Reasons Offer'd, for unanimously pushing for the Repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts (no date or place)

Anon. Remarks on the History of the Test. London: 1733.

Anon. Remarks upon the Truth, Design and Reasonableness of Sir Richard Steele's Dedication to the Pope. To which is Prefixed a Dedication to the said Knight. London: 1715.

Anon. The Revolution no Rebellion. By a Citizen of London. London: 1709.

Anon. The Rights and Liberties of Subjects Vindicated: In Answer to the Adjuster of the Dispute. London: 1732.

Anon. (sometimes attributed to Benjamin Hoadly) A Serious Enquiry into the Present State of the Church of England: or, The Danger of the Church from the Rashness of the Clergy. London: 1711.

Anon. Some Necessary Considerations Relating to all future Elections of Members to Serve in Parliament. (second edition) London: 1702.

Anon. Spinoza Reviv'd. London: 1709.

Anon. St Paul No Mover of Sedition: or, A Brief Vindication of that Apostle, From the False and Disingenuous Exposition of Mr Hoadly. London: 1706.

Anon. A Submissive Answer to Mr Hoadly's Humble Reply to My Lord Bishop of Exeter. By a Student at Oxford. London: 1709.

Anon. The Thirteenth Chapter to the Romans Vindicated from the Abusive Senses put upon it. London: 1710.

Anon. Tom of Bedlam's Answer to His Brother Ben Hoadly. London: 1709.

Anon. A True Account of the Doctrine of Christ and of the Primitive Church. London: 1736.

Anon. The True Character of a Churchman, Shewing the False Pretences to that Name - Together with the Character of a Low Church-Man Drawn in Answer to it with Remarks. London: 1702.

Anon. A True Churchman's Reasons for repealing the Corporation and Test acts. London: 1732.

Anon. View here the Pourtrait of a Factious Priest. Amsterdam: 1710.

Anon. (sometimes attributed to Benjamin Hoadly or William Sherlock) A Vindication of Dr Sherlock, Dean of St. Pauls - In Answer to Mr Nathaniel Taylor's late Treatise, entitul'd, Dr Sherlock's Case of Church Communion and his Letter to Anonymous, consider'd. Together with his Vindication of the Dissenters from the Charge of Schism. London: 1702.

Anon. A Vindication of the Church of England from the Aspersions of a late Libel Intituled, Priestcraft in Perfection. London: 1710.

Anon. A Vindication of the Right Reverend Lord Bishop of Exeter, occasioned by Mr Benjamin Hoadly's Reflections on his Lordship's Two Sermons of Government. London: 1709.

[Atterbury, Francis]. A Letter to a Convocation-Man. London: 1697.

Atterbury, Francis. Fourteen Sermons Preach'd on Several Occasions. Together with A large Vindication of the Doctrine contain'd in the Sermon preach'd at the Funeral of Mr Thomas Bennet. London: 1708.

[Atterbury, Francis]. Some Proceedings in the Convocation, A.D. 1705 Faithfully represented. London: 1708.

Atterbury, Francis. A Sermon preach'd before the London Clergy at Saint Alphage, May 17, 1709. London: 1710. (Translated from Latin)

Bennet, Thomas. The Non Jurors Separation from the Public Assemblys of the Church of England Examin'd, And Prov'd to be Schismatical, upon their own Principles. (second edition) London: 1716.

[Bentley, Richard]. Remarks upon a Late Discourse of Free-Thinking. London: 1713.

[Berkely, George]. Alciphron: or, The Minute Philosopher. Dublin: 1732.

[Biscoe, Richard]. Remarks on a Book lately published, Entitled, A Plain Account of the Nature and End of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. (second edition) London: 1735.

[Biscoe, Richard]. A Second Letter to the Author of a Book, entitled, A Plain Account. London: 1735.

Blackall, Offspring. The Divine Institution of Magistracy, and the gracious Design of its Institution. London: 1709.

Blackall, Offspring. The Lord Bishop of Exeter's Answer to Mr Hoadly's Letter. London: 1709.

Blount, Charles. Anima Mundi: or, An Historical Narration of the Opinions of the Ancients concerning Man's Soul After this Life. London: 1679.

Blount, Charles, Mr Gildon and others. The Oracles of Reason. London: 1693.

[Boyer, Abel]. The History of the Reign of Queen Anne, Digested into Annals. vol. II London: 1704.

Brett, Thomas. A Review of the Lutheran Principles. London: 1714.

Brett, Thomas. A True Scripture Account of the Nature and Benefits of the Holy Eucharist, In Answer to a Book Intitled A Plain Account. London: 1736.

Burnet, Gilbert. An Enquiry Into the Measures of Submission to the Supream Authority. London: (1688) 1693.

Burnet, Gilbert. The Bishop of Salisbury's Speech in the House of Lords, upon the Bill against Occasional Conformity. London: 1704.

Burnet, Gilbert. The History of the Reformation. London: (i - 1679, ii - 1681, ii - 1714) 4th edition, 1715.

Burnet, Gilbert. A Sermon Preach'd in the Cathedral Church of Salisbury on 29 May, 1710. London: 1710.

Burnet, Gilbert. The Bishop of Salisbury. His Speech in the House of Lords on the first article of the Impeachment of Dr Henry Sacheverell. London: 1710.

Burnet, Gilbert. Two Sermons Preached in the Cathedral Church of Salisbury: The First on 5 November and second on 7 November. London: 1710.

Burnet, Thomas editor, Burnet's History of His Own Time. 6 volumes, Oxford: 1833.

Butler, Joseph. The Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed. ...and two brief dissertations I - Of Personal Identity, II - Of the Nature of Virtue. London: 1736.

Calamy, Edmund. An Abridgment of Mr Baxter's History of His Life. London: 1702.

Calamy, Edmund. A Defence of Moderate Non-Conformity. Part I - London: 1703, Part II - 1704, Part III - 1705.

Calamy, Edmund. Sir Richard Bulkeley's Remarks on the Caveat against New Prophets Consider'd. London: 1708.

Calamy, Edmund. A Caveat against New Prophets in two Sermons. London: 1708.

Calamy, Edmund. An Historical Account of My Own Life, edited by John Towell Rutt, 2 vols, London: 1829.

Chandler, Richard. The History and Proceedings of the House of Commons from the Restoration to the Present Time. London: 1742.

[Chandler, Samuel]. The Dispute Better Adjusted. London: 1732.

Chandler, Samuel. The History of Persecution. London: 1736.

Chillingworth, William. The Religion of Protestants. (Oxford: 1638). New York: 1972.

Chubb, Thomas. Four Tracts ... II Some Short Remarks on Britannicus Letters Published in the London Journal 4 and 11 April, 1724. London: 1724.

[H C]. A True Account of the Doctrine of Christ, and of the Primitive Church, with Respect to the Eucharist. London: 1736.

Clarke, Samuel, Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity. London: 1712.

Clarke, Samuel. An Exposition of the Church Catechism. London: 1729.

Clarke, Samuel. The Works of Samuel Clarke, 4 vols, introduction by Benjamin Hoadly, London: 1738.

Cockburn, John. Answers to Queries concerning Some Important Points of Religion. London: 1717.

Cockburn, John. A Short and Impartial Review of the Lord Bishop of Bangor's Sermon, at St James's Chapel, March 31, 1717. London: 1718.

[Collins, Anthony]. Priestcraft in Perfection. London: 1710.

[Collins, Anthony]. A Discourse of Free-Thinking. London: 1713.

Convocation - A Report of the Committee of the Lower House of Convocation, Appointed to draw up a Representation to be Laid before the Arch-Bishop and Bishops of the Province of Canterbury concerning several Dangerous Positions and Doctrines contained in the Bishop of Bangor's preservative and his Sermon Preach'd March 31, 1717. (5th edition) London: 1717.

[Curll, Edmund]. Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Matthew Tindall. (sic) London: 1733.

Dalrymple, Gilbert. A Letter from Edinburgh to Dr Sherlock Rectifying the Committee's Notion of Sincerity. Defending the whole of the Bishop of Bangor's doctrine. In which is An Apology for the English Dissenters. (third edition) London: 1718.

D'Avenant, Charles. Essays upon Peace at Home and War Abroad (in two parts) Part I - London: 1704.

[Defoe, Daniel]. The Shortest-Way with the Dissenters. London: 1702.

[Defoe, Daniel]. The Report Reported: Or, the Weakness and Injustice of the Proceedings of the Convocation in their Censure of the Lord Bishop of Bangor, Examin'd and Exposed. London: 1717.

[Delany, Patrick]. A Letter to a Lord, In Answer to his late Book entitled, A plain Account of the Nature and End of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. London: 1736.

[Disney, John]. A Rational Christians Assistant to the Worthy Receiving of the Lord's Supper. London: 1773.

Disney, John. Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Anthony Ashley Sykes. London: 1785.

Dodwell, Henry. An Epistolary Discourse, Proving from the Scriptures ... That the Soul Is a Principle Naturally Mortal. London: 1706.

[Drake, James]. The Memorial of the Church of England, Humbly Offer'd to the Consideration of all True Lovers of our Church and Constitution. London: 1705.

Egmont. Manuscripts of the Earl of Egmont. H.M.C. London: 1923.

[Fiddes, Richard]. An Answer to Britannicus, Compiler of the London Journal by the compiler of Cardinal Wolsey's Life. London: 1725.

Filmer, Robert. Patriarcha: or the Natural Power of Kings. London: 1680.

Fleetwood, William. An Essay upon Miracles. London: 1701.

[Fleetwood, William]. A Short Discourse Concerning Miracles. London: 1702.

Fleetwood, William. A Sermon on the Queen's Accession to the Throne Preached at St Austin's, in 1703, in Four Sermons. London: 1712.

Fleetwood, William. A Letter to the Reverend Dr Snape, Wherein the Authority of the Christian Priesthood is Maintain'd. London: 1718.

Fleetwood, William. Letter published in the Flying Post, 8 January, 1718/19.

[Fleetwood, William]. Papists Not excluded from the Throne Upon the Account of Religion. Being a vindication of the ... Bishop of Bangor's Preservative. (1717) in A Complete Collection of the Sermons, Tracts and Pieces of all kinds that were written by the R. R. Dr William Fleetwood, late Ld Bishop of Ely. (editor unknown). London: 1737.

Gauden, John. The Whole Duty of a Communicant. (1686) London: 1701.

Gibson, Edmund. Codex. London: 1713.

Gibson, Edmund. Of Visitations Parochial and General ... To which are added Tracts relating to the Government and Discipline of the Church of England. London: 1717.

[Gibson, Edmund]. The Dispute Adjusted about the Proper Time of Applying for a Repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts: By Showing, that No Time is Proper. Oxford: 1732.

[Gibson, Edmund]. An Answer to a Late Pamphlet, Entitl'd .. An Apologetical Defence, or a Demonstration of the Usefulness and Expediency of a late Book, entitled, A plain Account of the Nature, and End, of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. London: 1735.

[Gordon, Thomas]. An Apology for the Danger of the Church. London: 1719.

[Gordon, Thomas]. The Character of an Independent Whig. (5th edition) London: 1720.

[Gordon, Thomas]. Britannicus - The Conspirators; or The Case of Catiline. London: 1721.

[Gordon, Thomas]. Britannicus - Francis, Lord Bacon: or, The Case of Private and National Corruption, and Bribery, Impartially Consider'd ... London: 1721.

[Grascombe, Samuel]. Occasional Conformity A Most Unjustifiable Practice. London: 1704.

Hales, John. A tract on the sacrament of the Lord's Supper; and concerning the church's mistaking itself about fundamentals (1635) in the Works of John Hales, vol i, edited by David Dalrymple, Lord Hailes. Glasgow: 1765.

Hales, John. Golden Remains of the Ever Memorable, Mr John Hales introduced by John Pearson (second edition) London: 1673.

[Hare, Francis]. Letter to a Young Clergyman - The Difficulties and Discouragements which attend the Study of Scriptures in the Way of Private Judgement. London: (1714), 1719 & 8th edition 1721.

Hare, Francis. Church-Authority Vindicated, in a Visitation Sermon Preach'd at Putney, May, 1719. London: 1719.

Hearne, Thomas. The Remains of Thomas Hearne, edited by John Buchanan Brown. London: 1966.

[Herne, Thomas]. Phileleutherus Cantabrigiensis. The False Notion of a Christian Priesthood, and the Pretences to Sacerdotal Obligation, Intercession, Benediction, and Authoritative Absolution. Being an Answer to Mr Law's Second Letter to the Bishop of Bangor. London: 1718.

[Herne, Thomas]. Phileleutherus Cantabrigiensis. Three Discourses - One, A Defence of Private Judgement; the Second, Against the Authority of the Magistrate over conscience; the Third, Some Considerations concerning the Reuniting of Protestants. London: 1718.

[Herne, Thomas]. Philanagnostes Criticus. An Account of the Pamphlets on either side in the Bangorian Controversy. London 1719. Also published in The Works of Benjamin Hoadly, Vol. ii, London: 1773.

Hickes, George. Three Short Treatises ... In Defense of the Priesthood, and True Rights of the Church. London: 1709.

Hickes, George. The Constitution of the Catholick Church and Nature and Consequence of Schism. London: 1716.

Higden, William. A View of the English Constitution, with Respect to the Sovereign Authority of the Prince, And the Allegiance of the Subject. (1709) 5th edition, London: 1716.

Hoadly, Benjamin. The Measures of Submission to the Civil Magistrate considered. In a Defense of the Doctrine delivered in a Sermon preached before the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor, Aldermen and Citizens of London, September, 29, 1705. London: (1706) second edition 1708.

Hoadly, Benjamin. The Nature of the Kingdom, or Church, of Christ. A Sermon Preached before the King, At the Royal Chapel of St. James's, On Sunday, March 31, 1717. London: 1717 (third edition) 1717.

Hoadly, Benjamin. The Works of Benjamin Hoadly D D. 3 folio volumes, published by John Hoadly. London: 1773.

Hoadly, John. Article 'Hoadly', in the supplement to the Biographia Britannica in The Works of Benjamin Hoadly, vol. i - London: 1773.

Holloway, Benjamin. The Commemorative Sacrifice. Oxford: 1737.

Hooker, Richard. The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity. (1593, 1597, 1648, 1662) 2 vols, London: 1907.

Horneck, Anthony. The Crucified Jesus: or A full Account of the Nature, End, Design and Benefits of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. (second edition) London: 1689.

[Howell, Laurence]. The Case of Schism in the Church of England truly stated. (no date or place of publication)

Hughes, John. The Correspondence of John Hughes and Several of His Friends. 2 vols. London: 1773.

Hume, David. 'Of Miracles' in Essays and Treatises on Several Subjects. London: 1768.

Ignatus. A Letter of Advice Presented to Mr Hoadly. London: 1709.

Jackson, John. The Grounds of Civil and Ecclesiastical Government Briefly Consider'd. To which is added, A Defence of the Bishop of Bangor against the Objections of Mr Law. London: 1718.

Johnson, John. The Unbloody Sacrifice, and Altar, Unvail'd and Supported. (vol i London 1714, 1724 edition, vol ii 1718). Oxford: 1847.

Johnson, Samuel. An Argument Proving, That the Abrogation of King James by the People of England from the Regal Throne, and the Promotion of the Prince of Orange, one of the Royal Family, to the Throne of the Kingdom in his stead, was According to the Constitution of the English Government, and Prescribed by it... (5th edition) London: 1693.

Journals of the House of Lords

[Kennett, White]. A Compassionate Enquiry into the Causes of the Civil War. London: 1704.

[Kennett, White]. A Letter to the Lord Bishop of Carlisle, Concerning one of his Predecessors Bishop Merks, On Occasion of a New Volume for the Pretender Intituled, The Hereditary Right of the Crown of England Asserted. (second edition) London: 1713.

[Kennett, White]. A Second Letter to the Lord Bishop of Carlisle ... (second edition) London: 1716.

[Kennett, White]. A Third Letter to the Lord Bishop of Carlisle ... London: 1717.

Law, William. The Bishop of Bangor's Late Sermon, and His Letter to Dr Snape in Defence of it. Answer'd, And the Dangerous Nature of some Doctrines in his Preservative set forth in a Letter to his Lordship. (4th edition) London: 1717.

Law, William. A Second Letter to the Bishop of Bangor; wherein his Lordship's Notions of Benediction, Absolution, and Church-Communion Are prov'd to be Destructive of every Institution of the Christian Religion. London: 1717.

Law, William. A Practical Treatise upon Christian Perfection. London: 1726.

Law, William. A Demonstration of the Gross and Fundamental Errors of a late Book called A Plain Account... London: 1737.

Leland, John. A View of the Principal Deistic Writers. London: 1754.

[Leslie, Charles]. The New Association. London: 1702.

[Leslie, Charles]. The Case of the Regale and Pontificat Stated. London : 1702.

[Leslie, Charles]. The Wolf Stript of His Shepherd's Clothing. In Answer to a Late Celebrated Book Intitled Moderation a Vertue. London: 1704.

[Leslie, Charles]. The Best Answer Ever was Made. By a Student of the Temple. London: 1709.

[Leslie, Charles]. Best of All. London: 1709.

[Leslie, Charles]. A View of the Times. (The Rehearsal in book form) London: 1708/9

[Leslie, Charles]. The Constitution, Laws and Government of England Vindicated. London: 1709.

[Leslie, Charles]. The Good old Cause, or Lying in Truth. London: 1710.

[Leslie, Charles]. The Good Old Cause, Further Discuss'd in a Letter to the Author of the Jacobites Hopes Reviv'd. London: 1710.

[Leslie, Charles]. The Finishing Stroke. London: 1711.

[Leslie, Charles]. A Battle Royal Between Three Cocks of the Game. London: 1711.

L'Estrange, Roger. Two Cases Submitted to Consideration. London: 1709.

[Locke, John]. A Letter Concerning Toleration, (1689) edited and introduced by J. W. Gough, Oxford, 1946.

Locke, John. Two Treatises of Government. (1689) introduction and notes by Peter Laslett. London: 1960 amended 1963.

Locke, John. Two Treatises of Government (1689) edited and introduced by Mark Goldie. London: 1993.

Locke, John. A Paraphrase and Notes on the Epistles of St Paul. Vol. II, 1705 - 1707 edited by Arthur W. Wainwright. Oxford: 1987.

The London Journal, (6 July - 28 December, 1723)

[Lowman, M]. A Collection of Occasional Papers (1716-18) London: 1716-1719.

M. (A. J. A. M.) An out of the Road Visit to the Lord Bishop of Exeter: or A Better Answer than The Best Answer ever was made. London: 1709.

[Moss, Robert]. The Report Vindicated from Misreports: Being a Defence of my Lords the Bishops, As well as the Clergy of the Lower House of Convocation. London: 1717.

[Newton, William]. The Principles of the Low-Church-Men. (second edition) London: 1718.

O'Bedlam, Bess. Bess O'Bedlam's Love to her Brother Tom: With a Word in behalf of Poor Brother Ben Hoadly. London: 1709.

O'Bedlam, Tom. Tom of Bedlam's Answer to His Brother Ben Hoadly. London: 1709.

[Oldisworth, William]. A Dialogue Between Timothy and Philatheus. London: 1709.

[Oldisworth, William]. A Vindication of the Right Rev. Lord Bishop of Exeter, Occasioned by Mr Benjamin Hoadly's Reflections on his Lordships Two Sermons of Government. London: 1709.

Ollyffe, John. A Defence of Ministerial Conformity to the Church of England. In Answer to the Misrepresentations of the Terms thereof by Mr Calamy. London: 1702.

Ollyffe, John. A Second Defence of Ministerial Conformity to the Church of England. London: 1705.

Ollyffe, John. A Third Defence of Ministerial Conformity to the Church of England. London: 1706.

[Owen, James]. Moderation a Vitue. London: 1703.

Peirce, James. The Dissenters Reasons For not writing in behalf of Persecution. Design'd For the satisfaction of Dr Snape, in a A Letter to Him. (third edition) London: 1718.

Peirce, James. Some Reflections upon Dean Sherlock's Vindication of the Corporation and Test Acts. London: 1718.

Pillonniere, Francis De la. A Reply to Dr Snape's Vindication of a Passage in his Second Letter to the Bishop of Bangor Relating to Mr Pillonniere. London: 1718.

Place, Conyers. Remarks on a Treatise Entitled A Plain Account. London: 1735.

The Postman; and the Historical Account (newspaper) London: 1710.

Proculator. The Proculator's Answer to a Letter from a Member of the Lower House of Convocation; Entitled, The Report Vindicated from Misreports. London: 1718.

Pyle, Thomas. A Farther Vindication of the Lord Bishop of Bangor ... with Respect to the Doctrine of Sincerity ... In Answer to Mr Stebbing's Remarks upon his Lordship's position. (no date or place of publication)

R. (A. R.) Jura Regiae Majestatis: Or, The Rights of the English Monarchy, with Reflections On Mr Hoadly's Book. London: 1711.

Ridley, Gloster. The Christian Passover. London: 1736.

Rogers, John. Discourse of the Visible and Invisible Church of Christ, (4th corrected edition). London: 1719.

S. (M. S.) A Letter to a Friend Occasion'd by the contest Between the Bishop of Exeter and Mr Hoadly. London: 1709.

Sacheverell, Henry. The Political Union. A Discourse Shewing the Dependence of Government on Religion in General and of the English Monarchy on the Church of England in Particular. Oxford: 1702.

Sacheverell, Henry. The Communication of Sin: A Sermon Preach'd at the Assizes held at Derby, August 15th 1709. London: 1709.

Sacheverell, Henry. The Perils of False Brethren, both in Church, and State; set forth in a Sermon preach'd before the Right Hon. Lord Mayor ... at the Cathedral Church of St Paul, 5 November, 1709. London: 1709.

[Seller, Abednego]. The History of Passive Obedience since the Reformation. Amsterdam: 1689.

Sherlock, Thomas. A Sermon Preach'd before the Queen at St James's, on Monday 31 January, 1703/4. London: 1704.

Sherlock, Thomas. A Sermon Preach'd Before the Right Honourable the Lord-Mayor, Aldermen and Citizens of London, at the Cathedral-Church of St Pauls, on November 5th, 1712. London: 1712.

Sherlock, Thomas. Some Considerations Occasioned by a Postscript from the R. R. the Lord Bishop of Bangor to the Dean of Chichester. London: 1717.

Sherlock, Thomas. The Condition and Example of our Blessed Saviour Vindicated: In Answer to the Bishop of Bangor's Charge of Calumny Against the Dean of Chichester. London: 1718.

Sherlock, Thomas. A Vindication of the Corporation and Test Acts In Answer to the Bishop of Bangor's Reasons for the Repeal of Them. To which is added: A Second Part, concerning the Religion of Oaths. London: 1718.

Sherlock, Thomas. An Answer to the Lord Bishop of Bangor's Late Book; entituled, The Common Rights of Subjects defended. London: 1719.

[Sherlock, Thomas]. The History of the Test Act: In which the Mistakes in some late writings against it are rectified, and the Importance of it to the Church explain'd. London: 1732.

[Skelton, Philip]. A Vindication of the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Winchester. London: 1736.

Snape, Andrew. A Letter to the Bishop of Bangor, Occasion'd by his Lordship's Sermon Preach'd before the King at St James's, March 31, 1717. London: 1717.

Snape, Andrew. A Second Letter to the Lord Bishop of Bangor, in Vindication of the Former. London: 1717.

Snape, Andrew. A Vindication of a Passage in Dr Snape's Letter to the Lord Bishop of Bangor Relating to Mr Pillonniere. London: 1717.

Stebbing, Henry. A Defence of the First Head of the Charge of the Committee of the Lower House of Convocation Against the R. R. Lord Bishop of Bangor, (second edition). London: 1718.

Stebbing, Henry. Remarks upon a Position of the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Bangor concerning Religious Sincerity. London: 1718.

Stebbing, Henry. The True Meaning and Consequences of a Position of the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Bangor concerning Sincerity. London: 1719.

Stebbing, Henry. An Appeal to the Word of God for the Terms of Christian Salvation. London: 1720.

Steele, Richard. The Tatler. (newspaper launched April, 1709) edited by Donald F Bond. Oxford. 1987.

Steele, Richard. An Account of the State of the Roman Catholick Religion Throughout the World. London: 1715.

[Steele, Richard]. Memoirs of the Life of Philip, late Duke of Wharton. London: 1731.

Stephens, William. A Sermon Preach'd Before the Honourable House of Commons, January 30 1699/1700. London: 1700.

[Stephens, William.] A Modest Reply to the Unanswerable Answer to Mr Hoadly. With some Considerations of Dr Sacheverell's Sermon before the Lord Mayor, November 5, 1709. London: 1709.

Stubs, Philip. For God or for Baal; or No Neutrality in Religion. London: 1702.

Sturges, John. Reflections on the Principles and Institutions of Popery. London: 1799.

[Swift, Jonathan]. Mr C n's Discourse of Free-Thinking, Put into plain English by way of Abstract, for the Use of the Poor. London: 1713.

[Sykes, Arthur Ashley]. An Answer to the Non jurors Charge of Schism upon the Church of England. London: 1716.

[Sykes, Arthur Ashley]. The External Peace of the Church. London: 1716.

Sykes, Arthur Ashley. The Difference between the Kingdom of Christ and the Kingdoms of this World. Sermon Preached at the Arch-Deacon's Visitation in St Michael's Church, Cambridge, December 13, 1716. London: 1717.

Sykes, Arthur Ashley. Some Remarks on Mr Marshall's Defense of our Constitution in Church and State. London: 1717.

[Sykes, Arthur Ashley], signed A. V. A Letter to the Reverend Dr Sherlock, One of the Committee of Convocation, appointed to draw up a Representation concerning the Bishop of Bangor's Preservative and Sermon. London: 1717.

Sykes, Arthur Ashley. A Second Letter to the Reverend Dr Sherlock, Being a Reply to his Answer. London: 1717.

Sykes, Arthur Ashley. A Third Letter to The Reverend Dr Sherlock. London: 1717.

Sykes, Arthur Ashley. A Fourth Letter to the Reverend Dr Sherlock, Being an Answer to his late Book, entitled, the Lord Bishop of Bangor's Defence of his Assertion consider'd. London: 1718.

Sykes, Arthur Ashley. An Answer to the Remarks upon Dr Clarke's Exposition of the Church Catechism. London: 1730.

[Sykes, Arthur Ashley]. The Corporation and Test Acts proved to be of no importance to the Church of England. London: 1736.

[Tenison, Thomas]. An Argument for Union. London: 1683.

Tillotson, John. The Works of the Most Reverend John Tillotson, (3rd edition). London: 1722.

[Tindal, Mathew]. The Rights of the Christian Church Asserted, Against the Romish, and all other Priests who claim an Independent Power over it. With a Preface concerning the Government of the Church of England as by Law established (1706). Third edition, London: 1707.

Toland, John. Christianity not Mysterious. Second edition enlarged, London: 1696.

Toland, John. Amyntor, or a Defence of Milton's Life. (1699). London: 1761.

Toland, John. Letters to Serena. London: 1704.

[Tovey, Thomas]. The Winchester Converts. London: 1735.

Trapp, Joseph. The Real Nature of the Church or Kingdom of Christ. London: 1717.

[Trenchard, John and Walter Moyle]. An Argument Shewing, that a Standing Army is inconsistent with a Free Government. London: 1697.

[Trenchard, John and Thomas Gordon]. The Independent Whig. London: 1720 & 1721.

Trenchard, John and Thomas Gordon. Cato's Letters, London: 1724 and third edition, 1733.

Turner, John. A Vindication of the Rights and Privileges of the Christian Church. London: 1707.

[Wake, William]. A Vindication of the Realm, and the Church of England From the Charge of Perjury, Rebellion and Schism, Unjustly laid upon them by the Non-Jurors. London: 1716.

[Warburton, William]. The Alliance between Church and State, or the Necessity and Equity of an Established Religion and a Test Law Demonstrated. London: 1736.

Warren, Richard. An Answer to a Book Intituled A plain Account of the Nature and End of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. (parts 2 & 3) Cambridge: 1736.

Waterland, Daniel. A Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist. Cambridge: 1737.

Waterland, Daniel. The Christian Sacrifice explained. London: 1738.

Weekly Journal or Saturday Post, printed by Nicholas Mist, London, 1720 and 1721.

West, Richard. A Sermon Preached before the Honourable House of Commons, At St Margaret's Westminster, on Monday 30 January, 1709/10. London: 1710.

Whaley, Nathaniel. The Graduation of Sin both in Principles and Practice. London: 1710.

Whiston, William. Historical Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Dr. Samuel Clarke. London: 1730.

Whiston, William. The Primitive Eucharist reviv'd. London: 1736.

Whiston, William. Memoirs of the Life and Writings of William Whiston. London: 1749.

Whitby, Daniel. The Protestant Reconciler, Humbly pleading for Condescention to Dissenting Brethren, in Thngs Indifferent and Unnecessary; For the Sake of Peace: And Shewing, How Unreasonable it is to make Such Things Necessary Conditions of Communion. London: 1683.

[Whitby Daniel]. A Disuasive from Enquiring into the Doctrine of the Trinity, or, the Difficulties and Discouragements which attend the Study of that Doctrine. In a Letter to a Friend. (1714). Second edition London: 1719.

Whitby, Daniel. A Defense of the Propositions Contain'd in the Lord Bishop of Bangor's Sermon p xi to p xvii and also what is said in the Preservative concerning Real Sincerity. London: 1718.

Whitby, Daniel. Sermons Preached on Several Occasions. (Dedicated to Benjamin Hoadly) London: 1720.

Whitby, Daniel. A Sermon Proving that Reason is to be our Guide in the Choice of our Religion. Published with additions, London: 1724.

Wilkins, John. Of the Principles and Duties of Natural Religion. (1678) 6th edition, London: 1710.

[Wingfield, T.] A Discourse on the Nature and End of the Lord's Supper: wherein is shewn, In opposition to Dr W. that It neither is, nor can be, of the Nature of A Feast on the Sacrifice. London: 1738.

Wynne, Robert. Unity and Peace the Support of Church and State. London: 1704.

Secondary Sources

Books

Abbey, Charles J. The English Church and Its Bishops 1700-1800, 2 vols. London: 1887.

Ashcraft, Richard. Locke's Two Treatises of Government. London: 1987.

Ashcraft, Richard. 'Latitudinarianism and Toleration: historical myth versus political history' in Philosophy, Science and Religion in England 1640-1700, edited by Richard Kroll, Richard Ashcraft and Perez Zagorin, Cambridge: 1992.

Ashcraft, Richard. 'Anticlericalism in Lockean political thought' in The Margins of Orthodoxy, edited by Roger D Lund, Cambridge: 1995.

Atkinson, Nigel. Richard Hooker and the Authority of Scripture, Tradition and Reason, Carlisle: 1997.

Bailyn, Bernard. Pamphlets of the Americal Revolution 1750-1776, vol i, Cambridge, Mass: 1965.

Bailyn, Bernard. The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution, Cambridge, Mass: 1967.

Baker, Derek, editor, Renaissance and Renewal in Christian History. Oxford: 1977.

Barker, Ernest. The Political Thought of Plato and Aristotle. New York: 1959.

Bennett, G. V. White Kennett 1660-1728 Bishop of Peterborough. London: 1957.

Bennett, G. V. 'Conflict in Church and State' in Britain After the Glorious Revolution, edited by G. Holmes, London: 1969.

Bennett, G. V. 'Jacobitism and the Rise of Walpole' in Historical Perspectives edited by Neil McKendrick, London: 1974.

Bennett, G. V. The Tory Crisis in Church and State 1688-1730: The Career of Francis Atterbury Bishop of Rochester. Oxford: 1975.

Bennett, G. V. 'Loyalist Oxford and the Revolution' in The History of the University of Oxford, edited by L. S. Sutherland and L. G. Mitchell, Oxford: 1986.

Bennett, G. V. 'University, Society and Church 1688-1714' in The History of the University of Oxford, edited by L. S. Sutherland and L. G. Mitchell, Oxford: 1986.

Bennett, G. V. 'The Era of Party Zeal' in The History of the University of Oxford, edited by L. S. Sutherland and L. G. Mitchell, Oxford: 1986.

Berman, David. A History of Atheism in Britain. London: 1988.

Berman, David. 'Disclaimers as Offence Mechanisms in Charles Blount and John Toland' in Atheism from the Reformation to the Enlightenment, edited by Michael Hunter and David Wootton, Oxford: 1992.

Bethell, S. L. The Cultural Revolution of the Seventeenth Century. London: 1951.

Bibliothèque National Catalogue, vol 72, 1929.

Black, Jeremy, editor, Britain in the Age of Walpole. London: 1984.

Black, Jeremy. The English Press in the Eighteenth Century. London: 1987.

Black, Jeremy. Robert Walpole and the Nature of Politics in Early Eighteenth Century Britain. London: 1990.

Black, Jeremy and Jeremy Gregory, editors, Culture, Politics and Society in Britain, 1660-1800. Manchester: 1991.

Black, Jeremy. 'Ideology, history, xenophobia and the world of print in eighteenth-century England' in Culture, Politics and Society in Britain, 1660-1800, edited by Jeremy Black and Jeremy Gregory, Manchester: 1991.

Black, Jeremy. 'Confessional state or elect nation?' in Protestantism and National Identity, edited by Tony Claydon and Ian McBride, Cambridge: 1998.

Booty, John E. 'Hooker and Anglicanism' in Studies in Richard Hooker, edited by W. Speed Hill, London: 1972.

Bradley, James E. Religion, Revolution and English Radicalism. Cambridge: 1990.

Browning, Reed. 'Benjamin Hoadly (1676-1761) The Court Whig as a Controversialist', chapter III of his Political and Constitutional Ideas of the Court Whigs. London: 1982.

Broxap, H. 'Jacobites and Non-Jurors' in Social and Political Ideas of Some English Thinkers of the Augustan Age 1650 - 1750, edited by F. J. C. Hearnshaw, London: 1928.

Burns, R. M. The Great Debate on Miracles. London: 1981.

Burt, Shelley. Virtue Transformed. Political Argument in England 1688-1740. Cambridge: 1992.

Burt, Shelley. 'The Societies for the Reformation of Manners: between John Locke and the devil in Augustan England' in Margins of Orthodoxy, edited by Roger D Lund, Cambridge: 1995.

Cannon, John. Samuel Johnson and the Politics of Hanoverian England. Oxford: 1994.

Cardwell, Edward. Synodalia. Vols. I & II, London: 1842.

Carpenter, Edward. Thomas Sherlock (1678-1761). London: 1936.

Carpenter, S. C. Eighteenth Century Church and People. London: 1959.

Cassan, Stephen Hyde. Lives and Memoirs of the Bishops of Sherborne and Salisbury from 105-1824. Salisbury: 1824.

Cassan, Stephen Hyde. Lives of the Bishops of Winchester from Birinus the first Bishop of West Saxons to the present Time, 2 vols. London: 1827.

- Champion, J. A. I. Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken - The Church of England and its Enemies 1660-1730. Cambridge: 1992.
- Clark, Francis. Eucharist Sacrifice and the Reformation. London: 1960.
- Clark, J. C. D. English Society 1688-1830. Cambridge: 1985.
- Clark, J. C. D. Revolution and Rebellion. Cambridge: 1986.
- Clark, J. C. D. 'On Moving the Middle Ground: The Significance of Jacobitism in Historical Studies' in The Jacobite Challenge, edited by Eveline Cruickshanks and Jeremy Black, Edinburgh: 1988.
- Clark, J. C. D. The Language of Liberty 1660-1832. Cambridge: 1994.
- Clark, J. C. D. Samuel Johnson. Cambridge: 1994.
- Claydon, Tony. William III and the Godly Revolution. Cambridge: 1996.
- Claydon, Tony and Ian McBride, editors, Protestantism and National Identity. Cambridge: 1998.
- Cobbett, William. Parliamentary History of England. London: 1811.
- Cocksworth, Christopher J. Evangelical Eucharistic Thought in the Church of England. Cambridge: 1993.
- Colley, Linda. In Defiance of Oligarchy - The Tory Party 1714-60. Cambridge: 1982.
- Colley, Linda. 'Radical Patriotism in eighteenth century England' in Patriotism, edited by Raphael Samuel, vol i, 1989.
- Colley, Linda. Britons. Forging the Nation 1707-1837. New Haven & London: 1992.
- Collinson, Patrick. The English Puritan Movement. London: 1967.
- Collinson, Patrick. The Religion of Protestants. Oxford: 1982.
- Collinson, Patrick. English Puritanism. London: 1987.
- Collinson, Patrick. The Birthpangs of Protestant England. New York: 1988.
- Cragg, G. R. Reason and Authority in the Eighteenth Century. Cambridge: 1964.

Cragg, G. R. 'The Churchman' in Man versus Society in Eighteenth-Century Britain, edited by James L Clifford, Cambridge: 1968.

Crockett, William R. 'Holy Communion', in The Study of Anglicanism, edited by Stephen Sykes and John Booty, London: 1988.

Cruickshanks, Eveline. Political Untouchables - The Tories and the '45. London: 1979.

Cruickshanks, Eveline. 'The Political Management of Sir Robert Walpole, 1720-42' in Britain in the Age of Walpole, edited by Jeremy Black, London: 1984.

Cruickshanks, Eveline and Jeremy Black, editors, The Jacobite Challenge. Edinburgh: 1988.

Cumming, G. J. A History of Anglican Liturgy. London: (1969) 1982.

Cunningham, Hugh. 'The language of patriotism' in Patriotism, vol i, edited by Raphael Samuel, London & New York: 1989.

Davies, J. G. 'Manichaeism' in Encyclopedia of Religion, vol. 9, edited by Mircea Eliade, London & New York: 1987.

D'Entreves, A. P. Aquinas. Oxford, 1970.

Dickens, A. G. The English Reformation. London: (1964) 1989.

Dickens, A. G. Reformation Studies. London: 1982.

Dickens, A. G. & John Tonkin. The Reformation in Historical Thought. Cambridge, Mass: 1985.

Dickinson, H. T. Walpole and the Whig Supremacy. London: 1973.

Dickinson, H. T. Liberty and Property: Political Ideology in Eighteenth Century Britain. London: 1977.

Dickinson, H. T. The Politics of the People in Eighteenth-Century Britain. London: 1994.

Ditchfield, G. M. David Hayton and Clyve Jones, editors, British Parliamentary Lists 1660-1800. London: 1995.

Downie, J. A. 'Walpole, the Poet's Foe' in Britain in the Age of Walpole, edited by Jeremy Black, London: 1984.

- Dugmore, C. W., editor. Studies in the Reformation. London: 1980.
- Dunn, John. The Political Thought of John Locke. Cambridge: 1969.
- Egmont, Report of the Manuscripts of the Earl of Egmont. London: 1905.
- Eliade, Mircea, editor, The Encyclopaedia of Religion. New York and London: 1987.
- Ellis, F. H., editor, Poems on Affairs of State. Vol. 7, 1704 - 1714. Yale: 1975.
- Elson, James Hinsdale. John Hales of Eton, New York: 1948.
- Emerson, Roger L. 'Deism' in Dictionary of History of Ideas, edited by Philip P. Weiner, New York: 1968.
- Emerson, Roger L. 'Latitudinarianism and the English Deists' in Deism, Masonry, and the Enlightenment, edited by J. A. Leo Lemay, Newark: 1987.
- Evans, A. W. Warburton and the Warburtonians. London: 1932.
- Every, George. The High Church Party. London: 1956.
- Ferguson, J. P. An Eighteenth Century Heretic, Dr Samuel Clarke. Kineton: 1976.
- Fitzpatrick, Martin. 'Latitudinarianism at the parting of the ways: a suggestion' in The Church of England 1689-1833, edited by John Walsh et al Cambridge: 1993.
- Foord, A. S. His Majesty's Opposition 1714-1830. Oxford: 1964.
- Foot, Michael. The Pen and the Sword. London: 1957.
- Force, James E. William Whiston, Honest Newtonian. Cambridge: 1985
- Fritz, Paul S. English Ministers and Jacobitism between the Rebellions of 1715 and 1745. Toronto: 1975.
- Gascoigne, John. Cambridge in the Age of Enlightenment. Cambridge: 1989.
- Gaskin, J. C. A. Varieties of Unbelief. New York: 1989.
- Gay, Peter. The Enlightenment: An Interpretation. London: 1966.
- George, Edward Angus. Seventeenth Century Men of Latitude. London: 1908.

Goldie, Mark. 'The Nonjurors, Episcopacy, and the Origins of the Convocation Controversy' in Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism 1689-1759, edited by Eveline Cruickshanks, Edinburgh: 1982.

Goldie, Mark. 'The Theory of Religious Intolerance in Restoration England' in From Persecution to Toleration, edited by Ole Peter Grell, Jonathan I. Israel, and Nicholas Tyacke, Oxford: 1991.

Goldie, Mark. 'John Locke, Jonas Proast and religious toleration 1688-1692' in The Church of England 1689-1833, edited by John Walsh et al, Cambridge: 1993.

Greaves, R. 'The Working of the Alliance' in Essays in Modern English Church History, edited by G V Bennett and J D Walsh, London: 1966.

Greaves, R. 'Religion in the University 1715-1800', in The History of the University of Oxford, edited by L. S. Sutherland and L. G. Mitchell, Oxford: 1986.

Greenberg, J. R. and C. C. Weston. Subjects and Sovereigns. Cambridge: 1981.

Greene, Donald. 'The Via Media in an Age of Revolution: Anglicanism in the Eighteenth Century', in The Varied Pattern: Studies in the Eighteenth Century, edited by P. Hughes and D. Williams, Toronto: 1971.

Gregg, Edward. Queen Anne. London: 1980.

Gregory, Jeremy. 'Anglicanism and the arts: religion, culture and politics in the eighteenth-century', in Culture, politics and society in Britain, 1660-1800, edited by Jeremy Black and Jeremy Gregory, Manchester: 1991.

Gregory, Jeremy. 'The eighteenth-century Reformation: the pastoral task of Anglican clergy after 1689', in The Church of England 1689-1833, edited by John Walsh et al, Cambridge: 1993.

Gregory, Jeremy. 'The making of a Protestant nation: "success" and "failure" in England's Long Reformation', in England's Long Reformation 1500-1800, edited by Nicholas Tyacke, London: 1998.

Grell, Ole Peter. Jonathan I. Israel and Nicholas Tyacke, editors, From Persecution to Toleration. Oxford: 1991.

Griffin, Martin I. J. Latitudinarianism in the Seventeenth-Century Church of England. Leiden: 1992.

- Gunn, J. A. W. Politics and the Public Interest in the Seventeenth Century. Toronto and London: 1969.
- Gunn, J. A. W. Beyond Liberty and Property. Kingston: 1983.
- Haakonssen, Knud editor, Enlightenment and Religion. London: 1996.
- Halsband, Robert. Lord Hervey. London: 1973.
- Hanson, Laurence. Government and the Press 1695-1763. London: 1936.
- Hardelin, Alf. The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist. Uppsala: 1965.
- Harris, Michael. 'The structure, ownership and control of the press, 1620-1780' in Newspaper History, edited by George Boyce, James Curran and Pauline Wingate. London: 1978.
- Harris, Michael. 'Print and Politics in the Age of Walpole', in Britain in the Age of Walpole, edited by Jeremy Black. London: 1984.
- Harris, Michael. London Newspapers in the Age of Walpole. London: 1987.
- Harris, Tim. Paul Seaward and Mark Goldie, editors, The Politics of Religion in Restoration England. Oxford: 1990.
- Harth, Phillip. Contexts of Dryden's Thought. Chicago: 1968.
- Haydon, Colin. Anti-Catholicism in eighteenth-century England, c.1714-80. Manchester: 1993.
- Hayton, David. 'The Country interest and the party system, 1689-1720' in Party Management in Parliament 1660-1784, edited by Clyve Jones, New York: 1984.
- Hawkins, L. M. Allegiance in Church and State. London: 1928.
- Hearnshaw, F. J. C., editor, The Social and Political Ideas of some English Thinkers of the Augustan Age A.D.1650-1750. London: 1928.
- Helm, Paul. Faith and Reason. Oxford: 1999.
- Henriques, Ursula. Religious Toleration in England 1787-1833. London: 1961.
- Herrick, James A. The Radical Rhetoric of the English Deists. Columbia: 1997.

Hervey, John Lord. Some Materials Towards Memoirs of the Reign of George II, edited by Romney Sedgwick, London: 1931.

Hill, Christopher. 'The English Revolution and patriotism' in Patriotism, vol i, edited by Raphael Samuel, London & New York: 1989.

Holmes, Geoffrey. British Politics in the Age of Anne. London: 1967.

Holmes, Geoffrey. The Trial of Dr Sacheverell. London: 1973.

Holmes, Geoffrey. Politics, Religion and Society in England 1679-1742. London: 1986.

Holmes, Geoffrey and Daniel Szechi. The Age of Oligarchy - Pre-Industrial Britain 1722-1783. London: 1993.

Hugh, Martin. Puritanism and Richard Baxter. London: 1954.

Hughes, Philip. The Reformation in England. London: 1953.

Hunt, J. Religious Thought in England from the Reformation to the end of the last century. (2 vols) London: 1870-73.

Hunt, N. C. Two Early Political Associations. Oxford: 1961.

Hunter, Michael and David Wootton. Atheism from the Reformation to the Enlightenment. Oxford: 1992.

Ilchester, Earl of. Lord Hervey and His Friends. London: 1950.

Jacob, M. & J., editors, The Origins of Anglo-American Radicalism. London: 1984.

Jacob, M. C. The Newtonians and the English Revolution 1689-1720. Hassocks: 1976.

Jacob, M. C. The Radical Enlightenment: Pantheists, Freemasons and Republicans. London: 1981.

Jacob, W. M. Lay People and Religion in the Early Eighteenth-Century. Cambridge: 1996.

Jones, Clyve and Geoffrey Holmes, editors, The London Diaries of William Nicholson, Bishop of Carlisle 1702-1718. Oxford: 1985.

Jones, Clyve and David Lewis Jones, editors, Peers, Politics and Power 1603-1911. London: 1986.

Jones, Clyve, editor, Britain in the First Age of Party 1680-1750. London: 1987.

Keeble, N. H., editor, The Autobiography of Richard Baxter. London: 1931.

Kenyon, J. P. 'The Revolution of 1688: Resistance and Contract'. Historical Perspectives, Studies in English Thought and Society, edited by Neil McKendrick, London: 1974.

Kenyon, J. P. Revolution Principles: The Politics of Party 1689-1720. Cambridge: (1977) 1990.

Kramnick, Isaac. Bolingbroke and His Circle. Cambridge Mass. & London: 1968.

Kroll, Richard. Richard Ashcraft and Perez Zagorin, editors, Philosophy, Science and Religion in England 1640-1700. Cambridge: 1992.

Lake, Peter. Anglicans and Puritans? London: 1988.

Langford, Paul. The Excise Crisis. London: 1975.

Langford, P. 'Tories and Jacobites 1714-1751', in The History of the University of Oxford, edited by L. S. Sutherland and L. G. Mitchell, Oxford: 1986.

Langford, Paul. A Polite and Commercial People: England 1727-1783. Oxford: 1989.

Laski, Harold. Political Thought in England from Locke to Bentham. New York: 1920.

Loades, David. The Revolution in Religion: The English Reformation 1530-1570. Cardiff: 1992.

Lund, Roger D, editor, The Margins of Orthodoxy. Cambridge: 1995.

Manuel, Frank E. The Religion of Isaac Newton. London: 1974.

Manuel, Frank E. Isaac Newton. London: 1980.

Marshall, Dorothy. Eighteenth Century England. London: 1962.

Marshall, John. 'John Locke and Latitudinarianism', in Philosophy, Science and Religion in England 1640-1700, edited by Richard Kroll, Richard Ashcraft and Perez Zagorin, Cambridge: 1992.

Marshall, John. John Locke, Resistance, Religion and Responsibility. Cambridge: 1994.

Marshall, John S. Hooker and the Anglican Tradition. London: 1963.

Mather, F.C. High Church Prophet. Bishop Samuel Horsley (1733-1806) and the Caroline Tradition in the Later Georgian Church. Oxford: 1992.

Matthews, A. G. Calamy Revised. London: 1934.

McAdoo, H. R. The Spirit of Anglicanism. London: 1965.

McGrath, Alistair E. Reformation Thought. Oxford: 1988.

McMahon, Marie P. The Radical Whigs, John Trenchard and Thomas Gordon. New York and London: 1990.

Miller, Peter N. Defining the Common Good. Cambridge: 1994.

Milton, Anthony. Catholic and Reformed. The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600-1640. Cambridge: 1995.

Monod, Paul Kleber. Jacobitism and the English people, 1688-1788. Cambridge: 1989.

Munz, Peter. The Place of Hooker in the History of Thought. London: 1952.

Murray, Alexander. Reason and Society in the Middle Ages. Oxford: 1978.

New, J. F. H. Anglican and Puritan. London: 1964.

Nockles, Peter B. The Oxford Movement In Context - Anglican High Churchmanship 1760-1857. Cambridge: 1994.

O'Day, Rosemary. The Debate on the English Reformation. London: 1986.

Orr, Robert R. Reason and Authority. The Thought of William Chillingworth. Oxford: 1967.

Overton. J. H. William Law, Nonjuror and Mystic. London: 1881.

Overton, J. H. and Relton, F. A History of the Church from the Accession of George I to the end of the Eighteenth Century 1714-1800. London: 1906.

Patterson, M. W. History of the Church of England. London: 1909.

Perry, George G. The History of the Church of England. (3 vols) London: 1864.

Pincus, Steven. 'To protect English liberties': the English nationalist revolution of 1688-1689', in Protestantism and National Identity, edited by Tony Claydon and Ian McBride, Cambridge, 1998.

Platt, Frederick. 'Arminianism', in Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, edited by James Hastings, vol. i, Edinburgh & New York: 1908.

Plumb, J. H. Sir Robert Walpole I - The Making of a Statesman. London: 1956.

Plumb, J. H. Sir Robert Walpole II - The King's Minister. London: 1960.

Pocock, J. G. A. Politics, Language and Time. (1971) London: 1972.

Pocock, J. G. A. The Machiavellian Moment. Princeton: 1975.

Pocock, J. G. A. Virtue, Commerce and History. Cambridge: 1985.

Popkin, Richard H. 'The Deist Challenge', in From Persecution to Toleration, edited by Ole Peter Grell, Jonathan I. Israel and Nicholas Tyacke, Oxford: 1991.

Porter, Roy and Mikulas Teich, editors, The Enlightenment in National Context. Cambridge: 1981.

Reardon, Bernard. Religious Thought in the Reformation. London: 1981.

Redwood, J. Reason, Ridicule and Religion: The Age of Enlightenment in England 1660-1750. London: (1976) 1996.

Reedy, Gerald. The Bible and Reason - Anglicans and Scripture in late Seventeenth Century England. Philadelphia PA: 1985.

Rivers, Isabel. Reason, Grace and Sentiment, vol I. Cambridge: 1991.

Robbins, Caroline. The Eighteenth Century Commonwealthman: Studies in the Transmission, Development and Circumstances of English Liberal Thought from the Restoration of Charles II until the war with the Thirteen Colonies. (1959) New York: 1968.

Rogers, G. A. J. 'Locke and the latitude-men: ignorance as a ground of toleration', in Philosophy, Science and Religion in England 1640-1700, edited by Richard Kroll, Richard Ashcraft and Perez Zagorin, Cambridge: 1992.

- Rupp, E. G. and Benjamin Drewery. Martin Luther. London: 1970.
- Rupp, Gordon. Religion in England 1688-1791. Oxford: 1986.
- Sabine, George H. A History of Political Thought. London: (1937) 1961.
- Samuel, Raphael, editor, Patriotism. vol i, London & New York: 1989.
- Schochet, Gordon J. Patriarchalism in Political Thought. Oxford: 1975.
- Schwartz, Hillel. The French Prophets. California: 1980.
- Schwoerer, Lois G. No Standing Armies. Baltimore & London: 1974.
- Sedgwick, Romney. Lord Hervey's Memoirs. London: 1952.
- Shapiro, Barbara J. John Wilkins 1614-1672. London: 1969.
- Shapiro, Barbara J. Probability and Certainty in Seventeenth Century England. Princeton: 1983.
- Skeats, H. S. and C. S. Miall. History of the Free Churches of England 1688-1891. London: 1891.
- Skinner, Quentin. 'The Principles and Practice of Opposition: The Case of Bolingbroke versus Walpole', in Historical Perspectives, edited by Neil McKendrick, London: 1974.
- Skinner, Quentin. The Foundations of Modern Political Thought. 2 volumes, Cambridge: 1978.
- Skinner, Quentin. Machiavelli. Oxford: 1981.
- Skinner, Quentin. 'Quentin Skinner on Interpretation' and 'Afterword' in Meaning and Context, edited by James Tully. Cambridge: 1988.
- Spadafora, David. The Idea of Progress in Eighteenth Century Britain. Yale: 1990.
- Sparks, Jared. A Collection of Essays and Tracts in Theology. vol. i, Cambridge: 1823.
- Speck, W. A. Tory and Whig - The Struggle in the Constituencies 1701 - 1715. London: 1970.
- Speck, W. A. Stability and Strife. London: 1977.

Speck, W. A., editor, F. F. Madan: A Critical Bibliography of Dr Henry Sacheverell. Kansas: 1978.

Speck, W. A. Society and Literature in England 1700-1760. Dublin, 1983.

Spellman, W. M. The Latitudinarians and the Church of England 1660-1700. London: 1993.

Spurr, John. 'Virtue, Religion and Government': the Anglican Uses of Providence', in The Politics of Religion in Restoration England, edited by Tim Harris, Paul Seaward and Mark Goldie, Oxford: 1990.

Spurr, John. The Restoration Church of England 1646-1689. London: 1991.

Stephen, Leslie. History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century. vol i & ii. London: (1876) 1962.

Stephen, Leslie and Sidney Lee, editors, Dictionary of National Biography. London: 1908-1917.

Stevens, David H. Party Politics and English Journalism 1702-1742, Menasha, Chicago: 1916.

Stephens, W. P. Zwingli. Oxford: 1992.

Stone, Darwell. A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, 2 volumes, London: 1907.

Stromberg, Ronald N. Religious Liberalism in Eighteenth Century England. Oxford: 1954.

Sullivan, R. E. John Toland and the Deist Controversy. Cambridge, Mass.: 1982.

Sykes, Norman. Edmund Gibson, Bishop of London (1669-1748). London: 1926.

Sykes, Norman. 'Benjamin Hoadly, Bishop of Bangor' in Social and Political Ideas of Some English Thinkers of the Augustan Age 1650-1750, edited by F. J. C. Hearnshaw, London: 1928.

Sykes, Norman. Church and State in England in the Eighteenth Century. Cambridge: 1934.

Sykes, Norman. Old Priest and New Presbyter. Cambridge: 1956.

Sykes, Norman. William Wake - Archbishop of Canterbury 1657 - 1737. 2 vols. Cambridge: 1957.

Sykes, Norman. From Sheldon to Secker: Aspects of English Church History 1660-1768. Cambridge: 1959.

Szechi, Daniel. Jacobitism and Tory Politics 1710 - 1714. Edinburgh: 1984.

Taylor, Stephen. ' "Dr Codex" and the Whig "Pope": Edmund Gibson, Bishop of Lincoln and London, 1716-1748', in Lords of Parliament, Studies 1714-1914, edited by R. W. Davis, Stanford: 1995.

Taylor, Stephen. 'Queen Caroline and the Church of England', in Hanoverian Britain and Empire, edited by Stephen Taylor, Richard Connors and Clyve Jones, Woodbridge: 1998.

Taylor, Stephen. 'Bishop Edmund Gibson's proposals for church reform', in From Cranmer to Davidson, edited by Stephen Taylor, Woodbridge: 1999.

Thompson, Mrs. Memoirs of the Viscountess Sundon. 2 vols. London: 1847.

Thompson, W. D. J. Cargill. 'Luther and the Right of Resistance to the Emperor', in Studies in the Reformation, edited by C. W. Dugmore. London: 1980.

Todd, Margo. Christian Humanism and the Puritan Social Order. Cambridge: 1987.

Trevelyan, G. M. editor, Select Documents for Queen Anne's Reign. London: 1929.

Trueman, Carl R. Luther's Legacy. Oxford: 1994.

Tulloch, John. Rational Theology and Christian Philosophy in England in the Seventeenth Century, vol i, London: 1872.

Tully, James editor, Meaning and Context. Cambridge: 1988.

Turberville, A. S. English Men and Manners in the Eighteenth Century. Oxford: 1926.

Turberville, A. S. The House of Lords in the Eighteenth Century. Oxford: 1927.

Tyacke, Nicholas. Anti-Calvinists - The Rise of English Arminianism c1590-1640. Oxford: 1987.

Tyacke, Nicholas, editor England's Long Reformation 1500-1800. London: 1998.

van Leeuwen, Henry G. The Problem of Certainty in English Thought. The Hague: 1963.

van Mildert, William. 'A Review of the Author's Life and Writings' in The Works of Daniel Waterland, vol. i, Oxford: 1823.

Virgin, Peter. The Church in an Age of Negligence. Cambridge: 1989.

Viroli, Maurizio. For Love of Country. New York: 1995.

Walsh, John. Colin Haydon and Stephen Taylor, editors, The Church of England 1689-1833. Cambridge: 1993.

Waring, E. Graham. Deism and Natural Religion. New York: 1967.

Watts, Michael R. The Dissenters. Oxford: 1978.

Weinbrot, Howard D. Augustus Caesar in "Augustan" England. Princeton: 1978.

Wood, Allen W. 'Deism' in Encyclopedia of Religion, edited by M. Eliade, New York: 1968.

Woodhouse, H. F. The Doctrine of the Church in Anglican Theology 1547-1603. London: 1954.

Young, B. W. Religion and Enlightenment in Eighteenth-Century England. Oxford: 1998.

Articles

Albritton, Robert. 'The Politics of Locke's Philosophy', Political Studies, 24, 1976.

Ashcraft, Richard and M. M. Goldsmith, 'Locke, Revolution Principles and the Formation of Whig Ideology,' The Historical Journal, 26 (4), 1983.

Bennett, G. V. 'English Jacobitism, 1710-1715; Myth and Reality', Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 32, 1982.

Bingham, Edwin R. 'The Political Apprenticeship of Benjamin Hoadly', Church History, 16, 1947.

- Bosher, J. F. 'The Franco-Catholic Danger, 1660-1715,' History, 79, 1994.
- Colley, Linda. 'Britishness and Otherness', Journal of British Studies, 31, 1992.
- Corfield, Penelope. 'Georgian England: One State, Many Faiths,' History Today, 45 (4), 1995.
- Cornwall, Robert D. 'The Church and Salvation: An Early Eighteenth-Century High Church Anglican Perspective', Anglican Episcopal History, 62, 1993.
- Cruickshanks, Eveline. 'Charles Spencer, Third Earl of Sunderland and Jacobitism', English Historical Review, CXIII, 1998.
- Dickinson, H. T. 'Benjamin Hoadly', History Today, 25, 1975.
- Dickinson, H. T. 'The Eighteenth Century Debate on the Glorious Revolution', History, 61, 1976.
- Downie, J. A. and Thomas A Corns, 'Introduction - Telling People What to Think', Prose Studies, 16, 1993.
- Duffy, Eamon. 'Whiston's Affair: The trials of a Primitive Christian 1709-14', Journal of Ecclesiastical History, 27 (2), 1976.
- Duffy, Eamon. 'Primitive Christianity Revived: Religious Renewal in Augustan England' in Studies in Church History, 14, 1977.
- Flaningam, John. 'The Occasional Conformity Controversy: Ideology and Party Politics, 1697-1711', Journal of British Studies, 17, 1977-78.
- Gascoigne, John. 'Politics, Patronage and Newtonianism: The Cambridge Example', Historical Journal, XXVII, 1984.
- Gascoigne, John. 'Anglican Latitudinarianism and Political Radicalism in the late eighteenth century', History, 71, 1986.
- Goldie, Mark. 'The Revolution of 1689 and the Structure of Political Argument', Bulletin of Research in the Humanities, 83, 1980.
- Goldie, Mark. 'The Roots of True Whiggism 1688-94', History of Political Thought, 1, 1980 .
- Goldie, Mark. 'John Locke and Anglican Royalism', Political Studies, XXXI, 1983.

Goldsmith, M. M. 'Public Virtue and Private Vices', Eighteenth Century Studies, 9, 1975-76.

Goldsmith, M. M. 'Our Great Oracle, Mr Lock': Locke's Political Theory in the early eighteenth-century', Eighteenth-Century Life, 16, 1992.

Greene, Robert A. 'Whichcote, Wilkins, "Ingenuity", and the Reasonableness of Christianity', Journal of History of Ideas, 42, 1981.

Gregg, Edward. 'Was Queen Anne a Jacobite?' History, 57, 1972.

Greig, Martin, 'Heresy Hunt: Gilbert Burnet and the Convocation Controversy of 1701', The Historical Journal, 37 (3), 1994.

Harris, Frances. 'Accounts of the Conduct of Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, 1704-1742', The British Library Journal, 8, 1982.

Hayton, David. 'Moral Reform and Country Politics in the late Seventeenth Century House of Commons', Past and Present, 1990.

Hunt, N. C. 'Sir Robert Walpole, Samuel Holden, and the Dissenting Deputies', 11th Lecture, Friends of Dr Williams's Library, Oxford: 1957.

Isaacs, Tina. 'The Anglican Hierarchy and the Reformation of Manners 1688-1738', Journal of Ecclesiastical History, 33 (3), July 1982.

Jones, Clyve. 'Communications. Debates in the House of Lords on 'The Church in Danger', 1705 and on Dr Sacheverell's impeachment, 1710', The Historical Journal, 19 (3), 1976.

Kendrick, T. F. J. 'Sir Robert Walpole, The Old Whigs and the Bishops, 1733-36: A Study in Eighteenth Century Parliamentary Politics', The Historical Journal, XI (3), 1968.

Lenman, Bruce P. 'Political Identities and the Languages of Liberty', British Studies, 35 (3), 1996.

Marshall, John. 'The Ecclesiology of the Latitude-men 1660-89 Stillingfleet, Tillotson and "Hobbism"', Journal of Ecclesiastical History, xxxvi, 1985.

Marshall, William M. 'Episcopal Activities in the Hereford and Oxford Dioceses 1660-1760', Midland History, viii., 1983.

Miller, E. Arnold, 'Some Arguments used by English Pamphleteers, 1697-1700, Concerning a Standing Army', Journal of Modern History, 18, 1946.

Moore, J. T. 'Locke's Analysis of Language and the Assent to Scripture', Journal of the History of Ideas, 37, 1976.

Napthine, D. and W. A. Speck, 'Clergymen and Conflict 1660-1763', Studies in Church History, 20, 1983.

Pocock, J. G. A. 'Enthusiasm: The Antiself of Enlightenment', in Huntington Library Quarterly, 60 (1 & 2), 1998.

Rack, Henry D. "Christ's Kingdom not of this World:' The Case of Benjamin Hoadly versus William Law Reconsidered', Studies in Church History, 12, 1975.

Realey, Charles B. 'The Early Opposition to Sir Robert Walpole 1720-1727', Humanistic Studies of the University of Kansas, iv, 1932.

Realey, Charles B. 'The London Journal and Its Authors, 1720-23', Humanistic Studies of the University of Kansas, v, 1936.

Robinson, Andrew. 'Identifying the Beast: Samuel Horsley and the Problem of Papal AntiChrist', Journal of Ecclesiastical History, 43, 1992.

Rosa, Susan. 'Religion in the English Enlightenment: A Review Essay', in Eighteenth Century Studies, 28 (1), 1994.

Snyder, Henry L. 'The Defeat of the Occasional Conformity Bill and the Tack,' Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, 41, 1968.

Speck, W. A. 'Political Propaganda in Augustan England', Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 5th series, 22, 1972.

Speck, W. A. 'Religion's Role in the Glorious Revolution', History Today, 38, 1988.

Spurr, John. 'Latitudinarianism and the Restoration Church', The Historical Journal, 31 (I), 1988.

Spurr, John. 'Rational Religion in Restoration England', Journal of History of Ideas, 49, 1988.

Spurr, John. 'The Church of England, Comprehension and the Toleration Act of 1689', English Historical Review, 104, 1989.

Spurr, John. 'Schism in the Restoration Church', Journal of Ecclesiastical History, 41 (3), 1990.

Straka, Gerald. 'The Final Phase of Divine Right Theory in England 1688-1702', The English Historical Review, 77, 1962.

Sykes, Norman. 'Queen Anne and the Episcopate', English Historical Review, 50, 1935.

Targett, Simon. 'A Pro-Government Newspaper During the Whig Ascendency: Walpole's London Journal 1722-1738', Journal of History and Politics, vii, 1989.

Targett, Simon. 'Government and Ideology during the Age of Whig Supremacy: The Political Argument of Sir Robert Walpole's Newspaper Propagandists', The Historical Journal, 37 (2), 1994.

Taylor, Stephen. 'Sir Robert Walpole, the Church of England and the Quakers Tithe Bill of 1736', The Historical Journal, 28 (1), 1985.

Taylor, Stephen. 'William Warburton and the Alliance of Church and State', Journal of Ecclesiastical History, 43 (2), 1992.

Thomas, D. O. 'Benjamin Hoadly: The Ethics of Sincerity', Enlightenment and Dissent, 15, 1996.

Thompson, P. 'The Reception of Locke's Two Treatises of Government 1690-1705', Political Studies, 24, 1976.

Townend, G. M. 'Religious Radicalism and Conservatism in the Whig Party under George I: The Repeal of the Occasional Conformity and Schism Acts', Parliamentary History, 7 (1), 1988.

Tyacke, Nicholas. 'The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered,' Past and Present, 115, 1987.

Varey, Simon. 'The Craftsman', Prose Studies, 16, 1993.

Wheeler, David. 'Hoadly, Henley, and the Dunciad', Scriblerian and the Kit-Cats, 16 (1), 1983.

White, Peter. 'A Rejoinder', Past and Present, 115, 1987.

Willman, Robert. 'The Origins of 'Whig' and 'Tory' in English Political Language', Historical Journal, XVII (2), 1974.

Winton, Calhoun. 'The Tatler: From Half-sheet to Book', Prose Studies, 16, 1993.

Wykes, David L. "To Revive the Memory of Some Excellent Men:' Edmund Calamy and the Early Historians of Nonconformity". 50th Lecture, Friends of Dr Williams's Library. London: 1997.

Theses

Claydon, Anthony Michael. 'Courtly Reformation: Williamite Propaganda after the Glorious Revolution in England'. PhD. London: 1993.

Findon, John C. 'The Nonjurors and the Church of England 1689-1716'. DPhil. Oxford: 1978.

Goldie, Mark Adrian. 'Tory Political Thought'. PhD. Cambridge: 1977.

Gregory, W. Jeremy. 'Archbishop, Cathedral and Parish: The Diocese of Canterbury 1660-1805'. DPhil. Oxford: 1993.

Greig, Martin. 'The Thought and Polemic of Gilbert Burnet ca. 1673-1705'. PhD. Cambridge: 1991.

Haydon, Colin Mark. 'Anti-Catholicism in Eighteenth Century England c1714 - c1780'. DPhil. Oxford: 1985.

Hessert, P. B. 'The Bangorian Controversy'. PhD. Edinburgh: 1951.

Kendrick, T. F. J. 'The Church-Whig Alliance. The Anti-clericalists and the Government of Sir Robert Walpole'. PhD. Toronto: 1961.

Marshall, William M. 'The Administration of the Dioceses of Hereford and Oxford 1660-1760'. PhD. Bristol: 1978.

Scholes, Patricia Margaret. 'Parliament and the Protestant Dissenters 1702-1719'. M. A. London: 1962.

Spivey, James Travis. 'Middle Way Men, Edmund Calamy, and the Crisis of Moderate Non-Conformity (1688-1732)'. DPhil. Oxford: 1986.

Targett, Simon. 'Sir Robert Walpole's Newspapers 1722-42. Propaganda and Politics in the age of Whig Supremacy'. PhD. Cambridge: 1991.

Taylor, S. J. C. 'Church and State in England in the Mid-Eighteenth Century - The Newcastle Years 1742-62'. PhD. Cambridge: 1987.

Warner, Rebecca Louise. 'The Bangorian Controversy: The Problem of Ecclesiastical Authority'. M. A. Reading: 1996.

Warner, Rebecca Louise. 'Early Eighteenth Century Low Churchmanship: The Glorious Revolution to the Bangorian Controversy'. PhD. Reading: 1999.

Young, Brian Walter. 'Orthodoxy Assail'd: An Historical Examination of some Metaphysical and Theological Debates in England from Locke to Burke'. DPhil. Oxford: 1990.

Research notes on Benjamin Hoadly compiled by Thomas F. J. Kendrick (who at the time of his death was a Professor at the City University of New York). Located at Cambridge University Library.