

The Mental Universe of the English Nonjurors

by

John William Klein

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Auburn University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Auburn, Alabama
10 May 2015

Copyright 2015 by John William Klein

Approved by

Donna J. Bohanan, Chair, Joseph A. Kicklighter Professor of History
Christopher J. Ferguson, Assistant Professor of History
Joseph A. Kicklighter, Professor of History
Kathryn H. Braund, Hollifield Professor of Southern History
T. Randall Beard, Professor of Economics

Abstract

The Glorious Revolution of 1688, which pushed James II from the throne of England, was not glorious for everyone; in fact, for many, it was a great disaster. Those who had already taken an oath of allegiance to James II and “to his heirs and lawful successors” now pondered how they could take a second oath to William and Mary. Those who initially refused to swear the oath were called Nonjurors. In 1691, Archbishop Sancroft, eight bishops, and four hundred clergy of the Church of England, as well as a substantial number of scholars at Oxford and Cambridge, were deprived, removed from their offices and their license to practice removed, for their refusal.

This nonjuring community over time adopted hybridized ideas, long-embraced and called out by the times and circumstances. Five paradigms shaped the English Nonjurors’ mental universe: a radical obedience, a Cyprianist mentality, using printing presses in place of the pulpits they had lost, a hybridized view of time, and a global ecumenical perspective that linked them to the Orthodox East. These patterns operated synergistically to create an effective tool for the Nonjurors’ survival and success in their mission. The Nonjurors’ influence, out of proportion to their size, was due in large measure to this mentality; their unique circumstances prompted creative thinking, and they were superb in that endeavor. Those five ideas constituted the infrastructure of the Nonjurors’ world. This study helps us to see the early eighteenth century not only as a time of rapid change, but also as an era of persistent older religious mentalities adapted to new circumstances.

Acknowledgments

J.R.H. Moorman once wrote, “All history that is worthy of the name is biased, because every writer who is a true historian and not a mere annalist, must have a point of view which will inevitably reveal itself in his pages.”¹ I must acknowledge that I write as an Anglican Christian with over forty years in the priesthood, having served as a curate in the Church of England, as rector or vicar of six parishes in the Episcopal Church, and as an army chaplain. I began this project at sixty-one years of age. My past experience is never far from my writing in the pages of this work. I have strived to let the documents speak for themselves, but am constantly aware that the narrative that I have constructed contains an inevitable subjectivity.

In the forefront of all my acknowledgments is Dr. Donna Bohanan, my major professor, for whom kindness is a natural instinct. She directed my work throughout this dissertation and was my teacher for over eight years. It was from her that I learned of Lucien Febvre, Fernand Braudel, Pierre Goubert and other *Annales* historians, whose notions of the persistence of ideas over time – the almost imperceptible slowness of *longue durée*, the slow speed of social changes, *conjunctures*, and the rapid pace of political events, *événements* – are so much a part of this dissertation. The chapter on William Bowyer sprang from her idea and was finished exclusively under her direction. The chapter on “Time in the Nonjurors’ Worldview” is also largely an inspiration drawn

¹ J.R.H. Moorman, *A History of the Church in England*, third ed. (Harrisburg, PA: Morehouse Publishing, 1980), v.

from ideas that I learned from her. This entire dissertation grew out of a separate essay on “The Mental Universe of Ambrose Bonwicke,” which she both inspired and directed.

Dr. Christopher J. Ferguson was my primary guide through eighteenth-century Britain. The dynamics of change at the turn of that century were all taught me by him. The structure of this entire work was his idea and every chapter shows his teaching. He introduced me to J.C.D. Clarke, whose perspective differs from his own, but for me captured the idea of persisting religious ideas that are central to my thesis. Dr. Ferguson’s near photographic memory and his command of the historiography were invaluable.

Professor Joseph A. Kicklighter was instrumental in my admission to Auburn University and the beginning of this work. He originally suggested I study the Nonjurors. On the occasion of our first meeting, he grasped the fact that I was doing this “for the love of learning,” and at every difficult turn I knew he was there as my patron.

Professor Kathryn H. Braund, who assisted my colleague Paul Fox in the writing of his dissertation, was no stranger to the British Nonjurors. As an accomplished historian of the Southern United States, she brought broader perspectives to the entire work. She also had the good fortune, like me, to have married a veterinarian.

Frank Smith toiled without reward editing my work. His analytical mind, honed by years of practicing the law, coupled with invaluable literary understanding, produced a far better result than I alone could have accomplished.

My wife, Linda, DVM, MFT, is not only the joy of my life, but equally, my perennial encourager. Her strength and academic experience convinced me that it was not brilliance but perseverance that would bring this work to completion. Dr. Paul Fox, already mentioned, was both my colleague and dear friend throughout graduate school.

He advised me from the beginning, and his advice, usually over lunch, was always correct.

Professor Daniel Szechi, with whom I hoped to study, left for the University of Manchester before I had the opportunity. Nevertheless, he suggested the chapter on the Eastern Orthodox overture and his *George Lockhart of Carnath* was the model for my concept of a nonjuring “mental universe.” Dr. Abigail Swingen was my professor through three years of this study, and her instruction and constructive criticism challenged my understanding and articulation of the English Nonjurors. Under her direction I also did considerable work investigating the women of the nonjuroring community. Dr Rupali Mishra labored hard to refine both my research and my writing skills and spent many hours directing my essay on “Francis Cherry, Patronage, and the Shottesbrooke Nonjurors,” which, while not included in this dissertation, was instrumental in shaping it.

History involves the telling of a story, a task that is both art and science. Dr. Tiffany Sippial, my Latin American History professor, taught me the art of history. Dr. Ralph Kingston, my modern European professor, taught me its science. Their influence is felt in every chapter. None of my professors are responsible for my errors and omissions; all are equally to be thanked for the best of these pages. And, the English Nonjurors have been my constant companions on this way. I have learned much from them. Finally, I must with Will Durant confess: “Education is a progressive discovery of our own ignorance.”² There is so much I have not understood; I have learned most of humility.

² *Time Magazine*, "Books: The Great Gadfly", October 8, 1965.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----|
| Abstract..... | ii |
| Acknowledgments..... | iii |
| Introduction | 1 |
| Chapter 1: Historiography of the Nonjurors..... | 24 |
| Chapter 2: “Neither from any want of Duty and Obedience”..... | 57 |
| Chapter 3: A Cyprianist Mentality..... | 111 |
| Chapter 4: William Bowyer: Publishers, Printers, and Priests..... | 163 |
| Chapter 5: Time in the Nonjurors’ Worldview..... | 200 |
| Chapter 6: “The Orthodox and Catholic Remnant of the British Churches”..... | 276 |
| Conclusion..... | 306 |
| Bibliography..... | 321 |

Figures

1. The Medal: “Trial of the Seven Bishops” by G. Bower, 1688, British Museum, Department of Coins and Medals, No. 273.....84
2. Ambrose Bonwicke’s Self-Examination.....312
3. The Nonjurors’s Liturgy, 1718.....317

Tables

| | |
|---|-----|
| 1. Nonjuring Fellows at Cambridge and Oxford..... | 14 |
| 2. Nonjuring Schoolmasters..... | 17 |
| 3. Congregations of Nonjurors..... | 21 |
| 4. The Usagers, Non-Usagers and their writings..... | 158 |
| 5. George Hicke's published works..... | 175 |
| 6. Nathaniel Spinckes's published works..... | 177 |

Introduction

The Nonjuring schism was the clerical counterpart of Jacobitism. The Nonjurors believed the Established Church born of the Revolution of 1689, was as illegitimate as the new political regime. They stood beyond the pale of the Revolution and cherished a self-image of martyrdom to a purer Anglicanism, now perverted by an Erastian state. And yet their energetic churchmanship was not to run into the sands of the wilderness, for they exerted a profound intellectual influence over Augustan England. Time after time they traversed the boundary between the conformists and themselves and lent massive scholarly and polemical support to Anglican, Tory, and Country causes.

Mark Goldie

This dissertation is about the English Nonjurors; it is about their mentality, how they conceived their world, and what they sought to do about it. In understanding the dynamics of our ancestors, as Daniel Szechi says, it is necessary that we ask at least three questions: What principles mattered most to them? How did they reconcile their ideals with their reality? Whose conduct did they admire and seek to imitate?¹ This work is such an investigation. The history of the Nonjurors was constructed layer upon layer in an interrelated and synergistic manner over time. Their time and place were very different from ours, and from the century before them and the one that followed. The Nonjurors faced decisions under very specific conditions set in situations not of their own choosing.

In order to see their worldview more clearly, this exploration examines five key perspectives, all of which are central to the Nonjurors' mentality. First is the notion of obedience, particularly the doctrine of Passive Obedience. This core value largely

Mark Goldie, "The Nonjurors, Episcopacy, and the Origins of the Convocation Controversy," in *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1759*, ed. Eveline Cruicjshanks (Edinburgh: John McDonald Publishers, Ltd., 1982), 15.

¹ Daniel Szechi, *George Lockhart of Carnath 1689-1727, A Study in Jacobitism* (East Linton, Scotland: Tuckwell Press, 2002), 157.

separated them from Jacobites who took up arms in the Great Jacobite Rebellion of 1715. They also believed this idea was the antidote to anarchy and chaos. Arguably, these most hierarchical of all subjects also held a workable doctrine that, at least in times of relative peace, preserved the conscience, promoted obedience to God, to the King, and to their parents, including those *in loco parentis*. Passive Obedience had as a corollary the idea that one should suffer — as did the early Christian martyrs — for decisions obediently held in conscience. Allied with this notion of obedience was the Nonjurors' appeal to Cyprian of Carthage and his thinking particularly about ecclesiology, which gave them both authority and model for their own church. A third conception grew stronger with deprivation; deprived of their own pulpits they used the printing press to promulgate their beliefs to a nation eager to read about the latest conflicts discussed and argued in coffeehouses and homes. The powerful influence of the Nonjurors was due largely to their integrity in suffering for obedience sake and their use of print culture. A fourth perspective involved the hybridized conception of time. The medieval world and Church conceived things in sacred time that recounted religious history often aligned with the agrarian calendar. The modern world emphasized time as chronological, with mathematical increments employed in an increasingly commercial and scientific age. This dissertation argues that the Nonjurors negotiated time in both environments and in so doing preserved their ancient core values in the early eighteenth century. Finally, the Nonjurors, though deprived of their places in national life and restricted to the local and particular, never ceased to think globally. A global perspective was key to their vision. The ecumenical overtures to the Eastern Orthodox Churches are examined here as a case in point. Thus, Obedience, Print Culture, Time, and Global Perspective comprise the five

chapters that follow. The conclusion reached here is that these five notions interacted synergistically and created a powerful and influential mindset that challenged Augustan England.

An Undaunted People

George Hickes lay dying. It was September 1696, seven years since he had refused to take the oath of allegiance to William and Mary. He and his wife Frances had left the deanery in Worcester five years before, and their lives had assumed the trappings of an escapade from an espionage novel. An act of Parliament had declared that all clergymen who refused to take the oath before 1 February 1690 should be deprived of their benefices. Hickes refused and on 2 May 1691 nailed his protest of this action to the chancel of Worcester Cathedral, calling upon the sub-dean to support him, but to no avail.² George Hickes had waited to the last minute, unwilling to accept deprivation. He was declared an outlaw on 11 August 1691 and barely escaped arrest.³

George and Frances fled to London. At some point, Lady Packington at Westwood in Worcestershire sheltered them.⁴ William Sancroft, the deprived Archbishop of Canterbury, through his deputy the deprived Bishop Lloyd of Norwich, sent Hickes to the court of James II at Saint-Germaine-en-Laye in France. Successful in securing permission to consecrate new bishops to continue the apostolic succession in the

² Thomas Lathbury, *A History of the Nonjurors: Their Controversies and Writings, with remarks on some of the Rubrics in the Book of Common Prayer* (London: William Pickering, 1845), 87.

³ Theodor Harmsen, "Hickes, George (1642-1715)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 6. [Hereafter, *ODNB*]

⁴ J. H. Overton, *The Nonjurors: Their Lives, Principles, and Writings* (London: Smyth, Elder, and Co., 1902), 97.

nonjuring line, Hickee was one of the two men consecrated on 24 February 1694.⁵ He was ordained with the title Suffragan Bishop of Thetford, and Thomas Wagstaff became Suffragan Bishop of Ipswich.⁶ Consecration provided neither money nor rest from flight; he and Frances were fugitives, living in poverty, fleeing from a royal warrant of high misdemeanor. Early in 1696 they hid in Bagshot where Colonel Grymes, a Jacobite, harbored them. When news of the Assassination Plot to murder William III broke out in February 1696, and the Hickees thought it prudent to flee again.⁷

Next came concealment with Nonjurors at Shottesbrooke, Berkshire. He narrowly escaped capture in the middle of the night while staying at the eleventh-century Smewyns' manor house with the nonjuring lay theologian Henry Dodwell.⁸ Another Nonjuror, Thomas Hearne, the antiquarian, recalled Hickee's flight from the sheriff's trap, how he escaped out the back door at midnight and fled "through the Gardens into the

⁵ For the Court of James II at Saint-Germain see Edward Corp, *A Court in Exile: The Stuarts in France, 1689-1718* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2004), and Eveline Cruickshanks and Edward Corp, eds., *The Stuart Court in Exile and the Jacobites* (London: The Hambelton Press, 1995).

⁶ See F. L. Cross, ed., "Suffragan Bishops" in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (London: Oxford University Press, 1958). Suffragan bishops were assistants to the diocesan bishop. An act of Henry VIII in 1534 named twenty-six places where such appointments might be made; among these were Thetford and Ipswich. However the office of Suffragan, repealed under Mary I and restored by Elizabeth I, was allowed to lapse after 1592. The Canons of 1603 assumed such positions still canonical. The Nonjurors creatively employed this mechanism for the consecration of Hickee and Wagstaff. However, see J. H. Overton, *The Nonjurors*, 90-91, for a critique of the use of this office by the nonjuring bishops.

⁷ George and Frances Hickee stayed at Bagshot with the Jacobite Colonel Grymes (James Grahme or Graham) and worked on an answer to Gilbert Burnet's *Reflections on ... 'Some Discourses'* (1696), with which Burnet had continued his argument against the deprived bishops, until in February the assassination plot broke out and they were forced to leave Bagshot. Grahme was arrested 3 March 1696. See Thomas Hearne, *Remarks*, 10.237

⁸ David Nash Ford, "Smewyns Manor," Royal Berkshire History, http://www.berkshirehistory.com/castles/smewyns_manor.html

Church Yard" on his way back to Colonel Grymes's house in Bagshot. Frances followed him there.⁹

By the summer of 1696, the Hickeses were in the small Oxfordshire village of Ambrosden just southeast of Bicester living with the vicar, White Kennett. Ambrosden was a parish adjacent to Shottesbrooke, and Kennett was vicar of both parishes; his patron was the Nonjuror Francis Cherry.¹⁰ Cherry had rescued the Hickes couple, afraid they would be recognized in his home, Shottesbrooke Park, judged the vicarage at Ambrosden safer. Ironically, Kennett, a Low Churchman and Whig, the bane of whose existence was the nonjuring congregation within his parish at Shottesbrooke, befriended Hickes. They shared scholarly interests in Anglo-Saxon linguistics, and Kennett encouraged Hickes in the creation of his great *Thesaurus* of Anglo-Saxon literature. Kennett was a country parson and Oxford scholar with High Church sympathies, who haltingly supported the 1688-1689 Revolution Settlement. Whig preferment eventually placed him as Archdeacon of Huntingdon, subsequently Dean of Peterborough, and ultimately Bishop of the same see. For the Hickeses there was no preferment, and after the brief respite at Ambrosden, they took refuge in a house at Sanford-on-Thames just outside Oxford City.¹¹

Life on the run took its toll, and by September 1696 Hickes was in Gloucester Green, Oxford near Lincoln College preparing to die. John Fell had once nominated Hickes for the Rectorship of Lincoln, and he had many friends there, having been both a

⁹ Theodor Harmsen, "Hickes, George (1642-1715)," *ODNB*. If indeed he returned to Bagshot, it is not clear with whom he stayed, for Colonel Grymes was imprisoned by this date.

¹⁰ G.V. Bennett, *White Kennett 1660-1728, Bishop of Peterborough* (London: S.P.C.K., 1957), 9, 17.

¹¹ Probably Sanford-on-Thames Oxfordshire, near Littlemore and Iffley, just outside Oxford City.

fellow and tutor in the college from 1664 -73. Perhaps he stayed with one of them, possibly Thomas Turner, President of Corpus Christi College who was always a friend of Nonjurors, or Samuel Parker, a Nonjuror and known friend of Hickes.¹² In any case, at Gloucester Green Hickes wrote: *A Declaration Concerning the Faith and Religion in which he lived and Intended to Die*. Only he did not die and would not for another nineteen years.¹³

Finally, in 1698, some semblance of stability returned to their lives; that year they moved to Ormond Street in London where they remained the rest of their lives. There Hickes established his oratory; from there he organized his pastoral plan for the nonjuring community; there he constructed his opus magnum, *The Thesaurus*; and there they ceased their flight. This settling in London was an extraordinary change, and, given their straitened circumstances, a relatively happy ending. How did it happen? The answer once again came from friends in high places, this time the powerful Whig politician John, Baron Somers of Evesham, Lord Chancellor of England - who incidentally completely disagreed with Hickes's positions on almost everything. He had been legal counsel for Worcester Cathedral beginning in 1681, and Hickes had served as Dean of Worcester beginning in 1683. Somers had been educated at the Cathedral School in Worcester; his father, also named John Somers, had been a prominent lawyer in the shire. In 1688 Somers faced the challenging, fortuitous role as defense counsel for the famous Seven

¹² Richard Sharp, 'Parker, Samuel (1681–1730),' *ODNB*.

¹³Theodor Harmsen, "Hickes, George (1642-1715)," *ODNB*; Julia J. Smith "Hopton [nee Harvey], Susanna (1627-1709)", *ODNB*. Sometime after his recovery at Oxford, in 1696-97, he and Frances lived in Herefordshire. There it was probably the antiquarian William Brome of Ewithington, and also Susanna Hopton of Kington, who sheltered them; Brome and Hopton were both Nonjurors and friends of the Hickeses. Susanna was the widow of Sir Richard Hopton who died on 28 November 1696. Smith argues, "By this date Susanna was a nonjurist sympathizer and a close friend of the nonjuring bishop George Hickes, who spent some time hiding at her home."

Bishops accused and imprisoned by James II for failure to read his Second Declaration of Indulgence. It seems that Somers remembered his old friend, the Dean of Worcester, and his loyal colleagues the Seven Bishops, for in 1699 he obtained a writ *nolle prosequi* on behalf of George Hickes that effectively ended his prosecution and all legal proceedings against him. It was a big favor, by a powerful man.¹⁴

Who were these Nonjurors, these Christians like George and Frances Hickes, willing to risk all, who saw themselves as true members of the Church of England, albeit deprived of their former offices? The Glorious Revolution of 1688-89 was not glorious for everyone; in fact, for many, it was a great disaster. Almost immediately some churchmen were faced with a serious dilemma of conscience. Those who had already taken an oath of allegiance to James II and “to his heirs and lawful successors” were now pondering how they could take another oath to William and Mary of Orange. To swear the oath of allegiance was “to jure.”¹⁵ Those who initially refused to swear the oath were called Nonjurors. James II’s death in 1701 did not relieve them of their vow either, for they had sworn “to his heirs and lawful successors.”¹⁶

Problem for Nonjurors were exacerbated by an act of Parliament in 1701 requiring them to “abjure” the Pretender, James Edward son of James II, and acknowledge William III and his successor Queen Anne as “rightful and lawful”

¹⁴ Stuart Handley, "Somers, John, Baron Somers (1651-1716)," *ODNB*. It is interesting that Heneage Finch was also legal counsel at the trial of the Seven Bishops with John Somers. Finch later became a great supporter of the Nonjurors and was present when Hickes consecrated Collier, Spinckes and Hawes in 1713.

¹⁵ Charles F. Mullet, “Religion, Politics, and Oaths in the Glorious Revolution” *The Review of Politics* 10, no. 4 (1948):462-474; Caroline Robbins, “Selden’s Pills: State Oaths in England, 1558-1714” *The Huntington Library Quarterly* (1972): 303-321.

¹⁶ See Gerald M. Straka, *Anglican Reaction to the Revolution of 1688* (Madison: The State Historical Society of Wisconsin for The Department of History, University of Wisconsin, 1962), 27, 38-42, 59, 105, 128.

monarchs. At the accession of George I in 1714 another act required all subjects to acknowledge the new monarch as the “rightful and lawful king, and that the person pretending to be Prince of Wales had not any right or title whatsoever.” In each of these instances, those who refused to take the oaths were deprived of their posts.¹⁷ Over time, the title “Nonjuror,” initially applied only to those who refused the oaths, was applied to those who agreed with them, even those having no oaths to swear.

With the passage of time, two doctrines central to High-Church and Nonjuror thought came into conflict: Passive Obedience and indefeasible divine right.¹⁸ The Nonjurors’ dilemma in 1689 was caused partly by the nature of the oath itself. Originally, at the accession of William and Mary, the oath omitted the phrase denoting the Prince and Princess of Orange as the “rightful and lawful” monarchs, a problematic description for many subjects. Instead, it simply said: “I, A. B., do sincerely promise and swear to bear true allegiance to their Majesties King William and Queen Mary.”¹⁹ This form facilitated taking the oath for many who had scruples. Some took the oath as a simple statement of *de facto* reality, not as an acknowledgment of right *de jure*. William and Mary *were* in fact on the throne no matter what one thought of the process that placed them there. Thus, many High Church Anglicans remained in the Church of England, while others in conscience were compelled to leave.

¹⁷ For a general treatment see Thomas Lathbury, *A History of the Nonjurors: Their Controversies and Writings; With Remarks on some of the Rubrics in the Book of Common Prayer*. (London: William Pickering, 1845); Overton, *The Nonjurors*; J.W.C. Wand, *The High Church Schism: Four Lectures on the Nonjurors*. (London: Faith Press, 1951).

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ Wand, *The High Church Schism*, 9, and Lathbury, *History of the Nonjurors*, 45.

Daniel Szechi notes an important group that he calls "crypto-Nonjurors." These were individuals who took the oaths nonchalantly, without believing in the new order, convinced that they could better overthrow the 1688-89 Revolution from within the establishment.²⁰ No doubt many persons were convinced they had more power to accomplish this if they retained positions of influence, rather than by scrupulously obeying a strict construction of their conscience. Thomas Turner, the President of Corpus Christi College, Oxford was a perfect illustration. His preeminent position, links to patrons, and nonjuring solidarity proved immensely helpful to those more troubled by the oaths.²¹

Nonjurors Everywhere

In 1691 nine bishops - Sancroft of Canterbury, Ken of Bath and Wells, Turner of Ely, Frampton of Gloucester, Lloyd of Norwich, White of Peterborough, Thomas of Worcester, Lake of Chichester, and Cartwright of Chester - and more than four-hundred clergy of the Church of England, not to mention a substantial number of scholars at Oxford and Cambridge, were deprived of their cures.²² Thomas, Cartwright, and Lake died within the year, within the interval between August 1 and February 1, and thus were never actually deprived, however J.H. Overton noted that contemporaries regarded them as “Confessors in will, but not in deed.”²³ These deprived bishops represented over one-

²⁰ Daniel Szechi, *1715: The Great Jacobite Rebellion* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006), 54-55.

²¹ His brother was Francis Turner, the deprived Bishop of Ely, one of the original nine bishops.

²² For the number deprived see Overton *The Nonjurors*, 467-496. Roger Turner, “Bonds of Discord: Alternative Episcopal Oversight Examined in the Light of the Nonjuring Consecrations” *Ecclesiastical Law Journal* 3, no. 17 (1995): 399, gives the number at between five and six hundred.

²³ Overton, *The Nonjurors*, 73.

third of the diocesan episcopate of the Church of England, a staggering loss of leadership all at once. In the Diocese of York alone no less than twenty-nine priests were deprived of their livings and became Nonjurors. We know that at least fourteen of these were the subjects of charitable aid.²⁴ Five of the nine nonjuring bishops were among the famous Seven Bishops imprisoned by James II, who had achieved the status of national heroes for refusing to read the second Declaration of Indulgence in 1688. Ironically, the same bishops' acts of conscience in 1689-91, in refusing to take the oath of allegiance to William and Mary, resulted in their banishment.

Every diocese of the Church of England had resident Nonjurors; some had a significant number. Norwich, where Bishop Lloyd exerted considerable influence, had forty-three. The numbers in large dioceses like York, with twenty-nine, and Lincoln with twenty-three can be explained because of their size, but even relatively small Chester had at least twenty-four Nonjurors deprived. By comparison London had only twenty-nine and Canterbury twelve. Far distant Hereford on the Welsh border had seventeen compared to Salisbury with ten. Ely, Worcester, and Bath and Wells each had fourteen. Litchfield and Peterborough had thirteen, Chichester ten, and Durham nine. There were Nonjurors everywhere, and these figures represent only clergymen. There were many others, including women with no oaths to take who identified with the Nonjurors.²⁵

The Church in Wales had Nonjurors too. The Diocese of Saint Asaph had at least four, Saint David's four, Llandaff three, and Bangor at least one. The number of

²⁴ W. H. Bates, "Fourteen Nonjuring Clergymen in the Archdiocese of York," *Northern History*, XLII, no. 1 (March, 2005): 193-199.

²⁵ The following names of Nonjurors are compiled from several sources, in Overton, *The Nonjurors*, 471-496. Overton's list is the most complete list assembled to date.

nonjuring sympathizers was probably much greater. At least three dioceses of the Church of Ireland had nonjuring priests deprived: Connor, Dublin, and Lismore and Waterford. Scottish Nonjurors were numerous including virtually all Scottish Episcopal Bishops. The precise numbers of priests and laymen in Scotland who were Nonjurors remains very much in question.²⁶ Even the Isle of Wight had a Nonjuror, Edward Worsley, Rector of Gatcomb.

By the year of the Great Jacobite Rebellion, 1715, Great Britain had amassed a substantial worldwide empire and was on the way to an even greater one, and it comes as no surprise that Nonjurors were part of that empire. In 1715, just before the rebellion, an act of the Assembly of the Caribbean Leeward Islands was passed entitled *An Act to prevent the increase of Papists and Nonjurors in this Island and for better governing those who are already settled here*. The legislation, dated 2 March 1715, concerned the island of Antigua. No doubt fears of rebellion, already present before the "1715," greatly increased the unease of the Governor General and planter aristocracy who were always worried about French invasions and loss of their lucrative sugar plantations.²⁷

English elites often employed chaplains to suit their religious tastes, and those choosing Nonjurors as chaplains did so knowingly and approvingly. Their choices represented heartfelt sympathies, if not open political convictions. Thomas Aston was chaplain to Henry Hyde the second Earl of Clarendon, Simon Cayley chaplain to the Earl of Aylesbury, and Jonathan Cope chaplain to Sir J. Egerton. Other members of the

²⁶ See Paul Joseph Fox, "The Scottish Episcopal Church: Religious Conflict in the Late Stuart Period" (PhD diss., Auburn University, 2013).

²⁷ *Acts of Assembly, passed in the Caribbean Leeward Islands, from 1690 to 1730*. (London, 1734),157.

peerage and gentry acted likewise, and many Nonjurors were chaplains to lesser families.²⁸

No fewer than ten English peers were Nonjurors. These were, according to Monod, the Duke of Beaufort, the Earls of Gainsborough, Huntingdon, Salisbury, Thanet, and the Earls of Chesterfield, Clarendon, Exeter, Winchelsea, and Yarmouth, “as well as sixty present and former Members of the House of Commons.”²⁹ Monod estimates there were about one hundred gentry families in the 1690s, who may have attended their own parish churches, but were barred from public office.³⁰

A great number of Nonjurors were scholars associated with the two ancient universities. The nonjuring community was, as evidenced by its extraordinary percentage of academicians, one of the best-educated groups in English history. Some were scholars recognized for their academic achievements. Roger Altham was Regius Professor of Hebrew in Oxford University; Joseph Crowther was Principal of St. Mary Hall, Oxford; Henry Dodwell was the Camden Reader (Praelector) of History at Oxford; Thomas Hearne of St. Edmund Hall, Oxford was Assistant-Keeper of the Bodleian Library; Middleton Massey of Brasenose College was the Assistant-Keeper of the Ashmolean

²⁸ See Overton, *The Nonjurors*, especially Chapter V. Others included: John Creyk to Heneage Finch, Earl of Winchelsea; the Rev. Mr. Hall to the Countess of Kent; Henry Hall to the Duke of Ormonde in Madrid; George Harbin to Lord Weymouth; Samuel Hawes to Lord Griffin; John Heron to Lord Preston; the Rev Mr. Hilyard to the Countess of Yarmouth; Nathaniel Holferd to the Duchess of Buckingham; John Hughes to the Turkish Embassy; Charles King to Mr. Chetwynd; Richard King and William Osbourne to Lord Weymouth; William Law to Edward Gibbon, father of the famous historian; John[?] Lindsay to Lady Fanshaw, widow of Sir Thomas Fanshaw M.P. for Essex; Anthony May to Lord Ferrars of Chartley; the Rev. Mr. Oldham to the Earl of Chesterfield; John Shrawly to Lord Lexington; Henry Wall to the Countess of Kent; William Whatton to the Earl of Rutledge; Henry Wood to Mr. Cholmondeley of Holford who was M.P. for Chester.

²⁹ Paul Kléber Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People 1688-1788* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 142.

³⁰ *Ibid.*

Museum in Oxford; Samuel Parker, a layman, was a patristics scholar and theologian at Oxford who translated Eusebius; William Thornton was Principal of Hart Hall in Oxford, and there were many others.

The largest group of Nonjurors, after parish and cathedral clergymen, were those identified as fellows or scholars of a particular college, many of whom were also clergymen. Fellows were technically those who were incorporated members of the governing body of a particular college. In some colleges they were entrusted with the choice of the Head or Master. They exerted considerable influence.

Since the reception of degrees required membership in the Church of England as well as allegiance to the monarch attested by the solemn oaths, it was remarkable that so many Nonjurors were fellows or scholars after the Revolution. Remarkably, St. John's College, Cambridge was a hotbed of Nonjurors. Corpus Christi, Oxford with no Nonjurors recorded had an openly crypto-Nonjuror as President and welcomed Nonjuring students in what was regarded as a safe haven.

Table 1: Nonjuring Fellows at Cambridge and Oxford

| College | Fellows | Number |
|----------------------------------|---|-------------------|
| St John's College, Cambridge | Thomas Alleyne, Robert Appleford, Thomas Baker, Hilkiah Bedford, John Billers, Thomas Brown, Thomas Cooke, John Creyk, Richard Headlam, Joshua Hobson, Robert Jenkin, Roger Kenyon, Thomas Johnson, Thomas Leche, William Lake, John Naylor, Mathew Pearson, Francis Roper, Thomas Thomkinson. Thomas Verdon, Thomas Wright | 21 |
| Caius College, Cambridge | Bartholomew Wortley | 1 |
| Christ Church College, Cambridge | Thomas Hobart | 1 |
| Emmanuel College, Cambridge | William Law | 1 |
| Jesus College, Cambridge | William Griggs and John Killingbecke. | 2 |
| Magdalene College, Cambridge | John Mauliverer, James Peake, Isaac Sharp. | 3 |
| Pembroke Hall, Cambridge | John Nash and Henry Scrivener. | 2 |
| Peterhouse, Cambridge. | Christopher Armytage, Miles Barnes, John Perne, Samuel Sandys, John Talbot, and John Woodward | 6 |
| Queen's College, Cambridge | Ephraim Howard and Arthur Pert. | 2 |
| St. Catherine's Hall, Cambridge. | Adam Buddle and William Phillips. | 2 |
| Trinity Hall, Cambridge | Michael Bold | 1 |
| Trinity College, Cambridge | Thomas Boteler and Peter Redmayn. | 2 |
| All Souls' College, Oxford | Thomas Gardiner | 1 |
| Balliol College, Oxford; | William Bishop, Theophilus Downs, John Hughes, and William Strachan | 4 |
| Brasenose College, Oxford | John Adee, James Acres Hall, and William Pincocke | 3 |
| Christ Church College, Oxford | John Ball | 1 |
| Jesus College, Oxford | John Lewis | 1 |
| Lincoln College, Oxford | Edward Hopkins | 1 |
| Oriel College, Oxford | Henry Gandy | 1 |
| Merton College, Oxford | John Bateman | 1 |
| Magdalene College, Oxford | Thomas Bayley, John Fitzwilliam, and Thomas Smith. | 3 |
| Pembroke college, Oxford | Walter Harte | 1 |
| Peter House, College, Oxford | Christopher Armytage and Miles Barnes | 2 |
| Queen's College, Oxford | Thomas Crestwaite | 1 |
| St. Edmund Hall, Oxford | Thomas Hearne | 1 |
| St. John's College, Oxford | Samuel Downes and Francis Lee. | 2 |
| Trinity College, Oxford | Thomas Enfield | 1 |
| Total numbers: | A total of 27 colleges | 68 fellows |

These names, compiled from several lists by J. H. Overton, are the best record we have, albeit almost certainly incomplete.³¹ Particularly noteworthy is the absence of Corpus Christi College, Oxford from this list, where as previously seen, there were none recorded, and yet many crypto-Nonjurors, including the Master, were present.

Some undergraduates of the universities also became Nonjurors. This underscores the personal choice involved; even if ones family were Nonjurors the undergraduate still had to decide. Individual agency was always a component for second-generation Nonjurors. The most famous of these undergraduate students were undoubtedly Ambrose Bonwicke and William Bowyer of St. John's College Cambridge.³²

A substantial number of physicians became Nonjurors,³³ and some physicians like Thomas Deacon and P. J. Brown both of Manchester became nonjuring clergymen. Thomas Wagstaffe, consecrated with George Hickee to continue the nonjuring succession, was previously a medical doctor. The practice of medicine apparently proved a good way to support one's family and ministry once deprived.³⁴

³¹ Overton, *The Nonjurors*, 471-496.

³² Others, less well known, were: Mr. Andrews of University College, Oxford; Mr. Bolton and Samuel Bowdler of Brasenose College, Oxford; Mr. Pinsent, and Francis Rokesby of St. John's College, Cambridge; William Brown of Balliol, Oxford; John Urry of Christ Church College, Oxford and many others who quietly held Nonjuring views. One who was not so quiet was (the Rev.?) Mr. Wingfield of Canterbury who refused his M.A. degree. Most who openly identified with the Nonjuring cause also forfeited their degrees.

³³ These included: Patrick Blair; William Beach; P. J. Brown of Manchester; William Hanby of Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Dr. Hanbury of Balliol College, Oxford; Thomas Hobart of Oxford; Samuel Jebb of Peterhouse, Cambridge; and his son Sir Richard Jebb, Licentiate of the College of Physicians; Roger Kenyon and Francis Lee of St John's College, Cambridge; Henry Parman of Canterbury; and Nicholas Robinson.

³⁴ Overton, *The Nonjurors*, 112-113, 266-268.

Not every Nonjuror was professionally trained. One sea captain, named Jenkins, was avowedly nonjuring. William Lee was a dyer in Spitalfields. James Millington was a Shrewsbury draper. Another Shrewsbury Nonjuror was Thomas Podmore, Master of Millington's Hospital. Thomas Martyn, a London merchant and George Bewe, an apothecary presumably of London, were also prominent Nonjurors. Country gentlemen like Ralph Lowndes of Lea Hall, Middlewich, Cheshire, Sir Thomas Yarborough of Snaith Hall, Yorkshire, Sir Francis Cherry of Shottesbrooke, and John Port of Ilam in Shropshire were included among the Nonjurors' patrons. Edward Pownell of Shottesbrooke, presumably a layman, was included in the Nonjurors rolls as well. It is hard to know how many farmers or tradesmen were also Nonjurors. Only those legally deprived left a written record with the exception of those few who openly professed their position like Henry Dodwell and Heneage Finch, Earl of Winchelsea.

There are sad accounts of the many schoolmasters who were removed from their positions. Whole communities were sometimes deprived of the best educational leadership by their removal. Among the remembered names are those in the table below. Most of these were also clergymen, a demonstration of how pervasive the Church's influence was in education.

Table 2: Nonjuring Schoolmasters

| School | Headmaster | Location |
|----------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| Merchant Taylors' School | Ambrose Bonwicke | London |
| Preston School | Richard Crofton | Cheshire |
| Thistleworth School | James Ellis | Isleworth, Middlesex |
| Haberdashers' School | William Horton | London |
| Epping School | Lawrence Howell | Lincoln |
| The Free School, Coleshill | Thomas Jacomb | Lincoln |
| Wandsworth School | Henry Johnson [and perhaps Henry Jones?] | Winchester |
| The King's School | Richard Johnson | Canterbury |
| Long Melford School | Jonathan Moore | Norwich |
| Middlewich School | John Pickering | Cheshire |
| Butterwick School | Martin Pinchbrook | Lincoln |
| Ruthin School | Henry Price | St. Asaph |
| Wantage School | William Sloper | Berkshire |
| The School in St. Mary Axe | George Speed | London |
| Bath School | _____ Street | Bath |
| Evesham School | John Worthington | Evesham, Worcestershire |

Some Nonjurors were powerful men by virtue of their employment. Sir Roger L'Estrange was Licenser of the Press. Richard Newcourt was Registrar of the Bishop's Court, London. Roger North, son of the 4th Lord North, was Steward to the See of Canterbury. Several lawyers were Nonjurors: Charles Ottway, Doctor of Laws, and Mr. Pearce of Took's court, London were among that profession. Francis Cholmondeley served as M.P. for Chester.³⁵

The Nonjurors, as is generally noted, produced liturgists of the first-order. They also numbered gifted musicians like: Tudway, Organist of King's College, Cambridge; Leigh, Choirmaster of St. Mary Overy, Bristol; Robert Wilson and John Yorke, both Vicars-Choral of York Minster; and Andrew Yapp, Precentor of Durham. And they

³⁵ Overton, *The Nonjurors*, 268-270, 271.

included at least three poets: Edward Holdsworth of Magdalen College, Oxford, Elijah Fenton of Headley School, Surrey, and Anne Finch, Countess of Winchelsea.³⁶

Soldiers too, were sometimes Nonjurors or Jacobites. Nonjurors were always Anglicans; Jacobites were most commonly Roman Catholics. Nonjurors were committed to the doctrine of passive obedience; Jacobites often committed to military action. Officers serving in the regiments were faced with the dilemma of taking oaths to their commander, the king. Many lent their arms to the various Jacobite rebellions, while others, particularly the Nonjuring Anglican soldiers, simply dropped out. In 1694 John Kettlewell, a nonjuring priest, lamented there being no charitable fund to help such soldiers, and Bishop Ken left forty pounds in his will to assist deprived nonjuring officers.³⁷

Strikingly absent from this demographic overview are nonjuring women. Because they lived in an age when men spoke for the family, church and nation, and because they were not privileged to hold positions requiring oaths, women do not appear in any lists of the Nonjurors. We can nevertheless assume that many women who were married to Nonjurors were themselves nonjuring in their faith and politics. We know only a few.

Frances Hickes, with whom we began this story, is exemplary. Much the same can be said of Charles Leslie's wife, Jane Griffith Leslie, the daughter of the Dean of Ross in the Church of Ireland. She also fled into hiding with her husband. Invited to St. Germaine by James III, Jane Leslie probably died there about 1712 from exhaustion and

³⁶ Overton, *The Nonjurors*, 258, 484, 494 -496,

³⁷ Overton, *The Nonjurors*, 263-64.

fatigue.³⁸ Her commitment to the nonjuring cause was unquestioned. Elizabeth Finch Cherry, the wife of Francis, lord of the manor of Shottesbrooke, opened her house to the Nonjuring community, and it became a house church for Nonjurors. One of the feistiest of nonjuring women was Barbara Blackmore, "a widow, who lived with 'Mr. Soulby, a druggist at the upper end of Holborn'."³⁹ It seems Thomas Brett carried on a correspondence with her in 1741, during the efforts at reuniting the two factions of Nonjurors initially divided by the Usagers controversy. She was apparently attracted by the positions of Bishops Laurence and Deacon and given to expressing her own firmly held convictions to Bishop Brett in no uncertain terms. There were undoubtedly other women with strongly held opinions as well. William Law's colleagues in his girls' school at King's Cliffe, Mrs. Archibald Hutcheson and Hester Gibbon, must also be reckoned in the forefront of nonjuring women. The largesse and patronage of several Nonjuring noblewomen should also be noted: the Countess of Kent, the Countess of Yarmouth, and the Duchess of Buckingham are noteworthy.⁴⁰

The most important nonjuring woman, the most published, and the closest female ally of George Hickes was Susanna Hopton. Her correspondence with Hickes, her conversion to Roman Catholicism, return to Anglicanism, and finally to nonjuring principles placed her in the forefront of theological dialogue. Her authorship of devotional manuals and her support of suffering Nonjuring clergymen made a lasting legacy.⁴¹

³⁸ Robert D. Cornwall, "Leslie, Charles (1650-1722)" in *ODNB*, 4.

³⁹ Henry Broxap *The Later Nonjurors* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1924), 188.

⁴⁰ For Mrs. Blackmore see Broxap, *The Later Nonjurors*, 188.

⁴¹ Julia J. Smith, 'Hopton, Susanna (1627-1709)', *ODNB*.

The public house was a perennial favorite gathering place for Englishmen of all classes. It also served frequently as a forum for debate and on occasion those over-served became disruptive of public order. In 1716 the Middlesex Quarter Session passed legislation to require the customary oaths of allegiance and abjuration for publicans, or innkeepers, and those who owned public houses before a license could be issued. Thus, it was possible for a nonjuring tavern owner or bartender to be deprived of his living. There is, of course, no way of counting how many patrons of such establishments were nonjuring in their sympathies, and one might argue that those angry with the government generally, particularly when drunk, might echo language similar to that of Nonjurors while simply venting feelings of frustration. The authorities, however, took no chances and passed the following statute.

THAT the better to prevent Papists, Nonjurors, and others Persons Disaffected to his Majesty's Person and Government, from keeping Ale-houses, or selling Beer, Ale, Brandy, or other Liquors by Retail, we hereby they have an Opportunity to debauch the Minds, and alienate the Affections of many of His Majesty's Subjects, That the Justices of the Peace of this County, before they grant any License, be desir'd to inquire into the Character of the persons applying for such Licenses, as also to the Characters of the Persons who offer themselves as Security, and that before any Licenses be granted, that the Justices of the Peace do tender the Oaths of *Allegiance*, *Supremacy*, and *Abjuration*, as well to the Person to whom the License is granted, as also to the Security.⁴²

The act also provided for the same procedure for renewal of licenses already granted, so it would appear the problem of nonjuring publicans already existed. We will never know exactly how many ordinary pub-goers, including tradesmen, farmers, mechanics, and

⁴² Middlesex Quarter Session, *Ad General Session' Pacis Domini Regis tent' pro Com Middlesexiae; apud Hicks Hall in St. John-Street, in Com' praedict' per adjorn' Die Jovis scilt' Sexto Die Deceembris, Anno Regni Georgii, nunc Regis Magnae Britanniae...*(London, 1716).

common laborers or their wives, were Nonjurors. Clearly there were enough for such a law to be enacted.

Where were the Nonjurors' congregations? Where did they habitually assemble for worship? The overwhelming majority of Nonjurors were in London, and several other important centers existed in major towns especially in the north of England. And, country houses — large ones like Longleat, and small communities like Shottesbrooke, Berkshire — contributed greatly to a countrywide network. Nonjurors were everywhere. We know the location of the following:

Table 3: Congregations of Nonjurors

| Oratory or Chapel | Clergyman-in-charge | Location |
|--|---|-----------------------|
| Ormonde Street Oratory | George Hickes, bishop | London |
| Scroop's Court Oratory | Henry Gandy & Samuel Grascombe, priests | London |
| Ely House, Chapel of the Bishop of Ely | Francis Turner, bishop [until removed before 1691] | London |
| College Hill Oratory | Roger Hill, priest & Roger Laurence, bishop | London |
| Trinity Chapel, Aldersgate | Henry Gandy, bishop, with John Lindsay & Robert Orme, priests | London |
| An "Upper Room" in Broad Street | Jeremy Collier, bishop & Samuel Carte, priest | London |
| Oratory in Gray's Inn | Richard Rawlinson, & John Blackbourne, both bishops | London |
| Goodman's Fields Chapel in Whitechapel | Richard Welton, priest | London |
| A chapel in Savoy | ? | London |
| Bedford Court in Holborn | Matthias Earbery, priest | London |
| Dunstan Court Oratory in Fleet Street | [Matthew?] Bryan, priest | London |
| Chapel in Theobald's Road | Robert Gordon, bishop | London |
| Ashbourne chapel | Thomas Bedford, bishop | Ashbourne, Derbyshire |
| Congregations in Chester | Ministered to by Thomas Bedford, bishop, episcopal | Chester |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | visitor | |
| Congregations in York | Ministered to by Thomas Bedford, bishop, episcopal visitor | Yorkshire |
| Oratory at Spitalfields | William Lee, layman | Spitalfields, ? |
| Shottesbrooke Manor | Francis Brokesby, priest | Shottesbrooke, Berkshire |
| A chapel in Bristol | [?] Bisse [sp.?) | Bristol |
| Fennel Street Oratory | Thomas Deacon, bishop | Manchester |
| Trinity Chapel | ? | Manchester |
| A chapel at Shrewsbury | Thomas Cartwright, bishop | Shrewsbury |
| Newcastle-upon-Tyne, several congregations | John Griffin, bishop, with George Smith & William Fothergill, priests | Newcastle-upon-Tyne |
| Little Calworth, chapel | Moses Soame, priest | Little Calworth, Hampshire |
| Longleat House, private chapel of Thomas Thynne, 1 st Viscount Weymouth. | Robert Jenkin and George Harbin, priests, successively chaplains. Thomas Ken, bishop, close family friend. | Horningsham, Wiltshire |
| Burghley House, private chapel of John Cecil, 6 th the Earl of Exeter. | Robert Jenkin, priest and chaplain | Cambridgeshire, 10 miles NW of Peterborough |
| Eastwell Park, private chapel of Heneage Finch, 5 th Earl of Winchilsea, Nonjuror | Samuel Hawes, bishop and chaplain | Eastwell, Kent |
| Vale Royal, private chapel of Francis Cholmondeley, MP for Chester, Nonjuror | John Oakes, priest and chaplain | Cheshire |
| Cambridge numerous rooms | Fellows of St. John's College & Jesus College | Cambridge |
| Oxford | Numerous priests might officiate. | Mr. Sheldon's chambers, in Christ Church College. |

These chapels are all remembered because they were associated with prominent Nonjurors, usually clergymen, noblemen, or noblewomen. Great country houses normally welcomed many from the estate and certainly Nonjurors from the whole region might consider these great houses as nonjuring churches. Less prominent nonjuring parsons, like Moses Soame, retired to the country; there in relative obscurity he opened a chapel at Little Calworth, Hampshire. Thomas Hearne, the antiquarian, recalled how

many Oxford Nonjurors met to receive the Sacrament at Mr. Sheldon's chambers in Christ Church College. Abraham de la Pryme of St John's College, Cambridge noted in his diary that the twenty or so fellows in the college set up services "all over" Cambridge, where worship was often broken up by the Vice Chancellor of the University.⁴³ Nonjuring congregations were represented, albeit by small numbers generally, all over England, and their influence was felt, to a greater or lesser degree, almost everywhere

⁴³ For Moses Soame's chapel, see Thomas Hearne's *Reliquiae Hearianae*, I, 32, and de la Pryme's *Diary*, for the Cambridge situation, both are cited in Overton, *The Nonjurors*, 288-289.

Chapter 1

A Historiography of the Nonjurors

Perhaps the time has come when we may venture, without offence or loss of intellectual caste, to challenge the vulgar verdict upon the Nonjurors, and may at least call on their censors to name any English sect so eminent, in proportion to its numbers, alike for solid learning and for public as well as private virtues.

J.E.B. Mayor, 1870¹

The history of the Nonjurors can be told in many different ways. Born of a political moment, the 1688-89 Glorious Revolution, the story of the Nonjurors can readily be seen in a political context. As church history it looks very different to historians either sympathetic or antagonistic to the Nonjurors' theological claims. Social historians see issues of class and conflict inherent in the accounts. Some have viewed the Nonjurors as simply the ecclesiastical side of Jacobitism, a chaplaincy for those intent upon restoring the Stuart dynasty by force of arms. Apologists for the Nonjurors' theology, ecclesiology, liturgy or considerable devotional contributions have presented the history almost as hagiography.

The Historiography of the Nonjurors in Larger Context

The nonjuring schism was merely an eccentric, off-center event to many of the great historians eager to capture the longer and grander trajectory of British history. A Whig historian, like Macaulay, tracing the development of constitutional monarchy and English liberties saw the Nonjurors as a historical sidebar. Nevertheless, most of the great historians have placed greater importance on the place of the Nonjurors in the bigger

¹ J.E.B. Mayor (ed) *Life of Ambrose Bonwicke*, by his Father. From the preface: "To the Reader" by the editor 1870.

picture. How then does the micro-story of the Nonjurors fit into the grand macro-histories of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, more specifically how is it seen by historians of the Glorious Revolution and early eighteenth century?

The historiography of the Glorious Revolution is complicated, albeit necessary, at least as prelude, to that of the Nonjurors. J. P. Kenyon remarked in 1989, "The historiography of the Revolution of 1688 could best be described as being in a state of luxuriant confusion."² What did the proponents of the Revolution actually intend? For that matter, what did James II intend?³ How have historians traced the trajectory of its consequences? Four grand theories attempt to answer these questions.

First, the Whig account began as a justification of the actions of the Glorious Revolution and the Whig ascendancy after 1714. Thomas Babington Macaulay is its most acclaimed exponent.⁴ Macaulay was the son of a noted evangelical family. His grandfather a Scottish Presbyterian minister, his father a staunch evangelical layman, and his mother, from a Quaker family, had been both student and colleague of Hannah More in Bristol.

Macaulay was trained at Trinity College, Cambridge in classics and literature. Later he studied at Lincoln's Inn and Cambridge for the bar. He served several times as a Whig member of parliament, and was convinced of the value of education in promoting

² Eveline Cruickshanks, ed., *By Force or By Default? The Revolution of 1688-1689*. (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers Ltd, 1989), 1.

³ For James II's absolutist intentions see J. R. Western, *Monarchy and Revolution: The English State in the 1680s* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1984), and Tim Harris, *Revolution: The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy 1685-1720* (London: Penguin Books, 2007), especially the chapter "Catholic Absolutism in England."

⁴ Thomas Babington Macaulay, *The History of England from the Accession of James II* (Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1849).

the ideals of progress. Always more interested in literature than law, he applied his skills of rhetoric and his knowledge of literature to his historical writing. In *The History of England from the Accession of James II* in five volumes, the first published in 1848, as continental revolt fomented, he was convinced that England had been spared a similar fate because of the triumphs of the Glorious Revolution.

Macaulay said little good about the Nonjurors. In his view, in 1689 two groups were not celebrating: the Army and the Church. Both of them had been utterly loyal to James II, and he had let them down. The Church had long taught Passive Obedience and the Army had faithfully served its commander and king.⁵ The Nonjurors simply could not accept the change that moved England toward greater constitutional liberties.

George Macaulay Trevelyan presented the story in a more condensed form for the twentieth century.⁶ Still, the Whig account traced a trajectory of progress toward constitutional monarchy and the guarantee of the rights of freeborn Englishmen. In his book G.E. Aylmer called it *The Struggle for the Constitution*.⁷ J.H. Plumb, trained by Trevelyan, put forward this argument: "The universality that permeates the Revolution of 1688 arose not only because of James II's specific attacks on the Anglican monopoly of the Church, the Army, Navy, and universities, or from his determination to secure toleration, but also because of his outright onslaught on the very basis of political power, which if successful would have made the Stuarts as absolute as their French or Spanish

⁵ Thomas Babington Macaulay, *The History of England from the Accession of James II* (Philadelphia: Henry T. Coates & Co, n.d.), 3:15-19.

⁶ George Macaulay Trevelyan, *History of England* (London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1934).

⁷ G.E. Aylmer, *The Struggle for the Constitution 1603-1689* (London: Blandford Press, 1963).

cousins."⁸ Plumb's Anglican monopoly ran throughout the land, in every parish and hamlet. He believed the "natural leaders of society in their country neighbourhoods" had been attacked and their essential liberties also challenged. This, according to Plumb, was the cause of the Revolution. More nuanced views of Spanish and French absolutism have been given,⁹ but the thrust of the argument is that at the decisive moment English "natural leaders" chose their liberties and the rule of law over absolutism and divine right monarchy. There is a teleological dimension to Whig history. Somehow the progress toward greater Constitutional Monarchy and English liberties was inevitable.

The Nonjurors do not fare well in this trajectory. They were tragic reactionaries who failed to grasp progress and backed a trivial, losing cause long after the political nation had passed them by. However, the churchmen were needed, and, "the collective power of the rectors and vicars of England was immense; and it was much better that they should swear for the most flimsy reason which could be devised by a sophist that they should not swear at all."¹⁰ For men like Hickes who could not swear it was proven that "his servility had sprung neither from fear nor cupidity, but from mere bigotry."¹¹ Jeremy Collier's mind was "narrow", his reasoning "singularly futile and inconclusive," and his brain was "turned by pride."¹² "The moral character of the Nonjurors as a class did not stand high:" they were a "sect of preachers without hearers," most became "beggars and

⁸ J. H. Plumb *The Origins of Political Stability: England 1675-1725*. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1967), 62.

⁹ For European absolutism see Paul Kléber Monod, *The Power of Kings, Monarchy and Religion in Europe, 1589-1715*. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999; John Miller, ed. *Absolutism in Seventeenth-Century Europe* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1990).

¹⁰ Macaulay, *History of England*, 3: 404

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 412.

¹² *Ibid.*, 413.

loungers," and "considering themselves as martyrs suffering in a public cause, they were not ashamed to ask any good churchman for a guinea."¹³ Macaulay suggested that most of them were not very intelligent: "scarcely one can be named, who was qualified to discuss any large question of morals or politics, scarcely one whose writing does not indicate either feebleness or extreme flightiness of mind."¹⁴ Most historians today would judge these latter claims preposterous.

Marxist historians have articulated a second argument. If Whigs trivialized the Nonjurors, then Marxist historians demonized them. Christopher Hill is singularly astute at presenting this position. The so-called Glorious Revolution, and the Nonjurors' position following it, cannot be seen apart from the Civil War and the trajectory of class struggle throughout the long seventeenth century that culminating in the Whig triumph of 1714.¹⁵ In this view three groups contended: the poorest or unfree (Hill's "many headed monster"), the landed gentry and people of property, and the monarch and aristocracy. People who hoped to level the social and political order fought the Civil War; the Restoration of 1660 aimed at putting down these lower classes and reasserting the rights of free property owners. The events of 1688-1689 brought the triumph of the propertied classes over monarchical and aristocratic attempts to control the nation.¹⁶ Hill's revolution was long in coming and 1688-1689 was but one moment in a longer story.

¹³ Ibid., 418

¹⁴ Ibid., 409.

¹⁵ Christopher Hill, *Intellectual Origins of the English Revolution* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965).

¹⁶ Christopher Hill, *The Century of Revolution 1603-1714* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1980), 160.

Hill concludes his book, *The Century of Revolution 1603-1714*, by contrasting two very different world views: one from 1684 held by George Hickes, Dean of Worcester, the other by an anonymous contemporary man on his way to the scaffold. Hickes stated that the "the poor are the hands and feet of the body politic... No commonweal can subsist without the poor." Hill saw this statement as Hickes's justification "necessary for the establishment of superiority and subjection in human society, a *reductio ad absurdum* of demands for civil equality." The man to be executed, however, "defeated in a last attempt at revolt, died on the scaffold proclaiming human equality in traditional Leveller phrases."¹⁷ Hickes genuinely believed in a divinely ordained hierarchy in human society; he also believed that Christians should recognize and embrace their place within it. This for Hill was an old world order soon challenged and none too soon gone. The Nonjurors were reactionary defenders of an unjust society, justly rebelled against by those who fought for civil equality.

For Hill the long seventeenth century concerned the struggle between those who wanted England to follow the path of French absolute monarchy or develop more like the Dutch Republic.¹⁸ The Nonjurors in this context are seen as reactionaries whose time had come to an end. Most churchmen accepted the new order as *de facto* if not *de jure*, and the Nonjurors were simply left behind. Hill said, "This is the age of the Vicar of Bray. By the end of queen Anne's reign the Non-Juror schism was virtually over."¹⁹ The Vicar of Bray, as the anecdote records it, held his living in Berkshire through the reigns

¹⁷ Ibid., 265.

¹⁸ Ibid., 4.

¹⁹ Hill, *The Century of Revolution 1603-1714*, 249.

of Charles II, James II, William and Mary, Anne, and George I, and was accused of inconsistency. "Not so" was his reply, "for I have always kept my principle, which is this, to live and die the Vicar of Bray."²⁰ No doubt many, like the Vicar, swallowed their conscience, accepted the present reality, and kept their livings. The Nonjuror schism, however, was hardly over.

A third account is given by those who portray 1688-1689 as no revolution at all. It was a *coup d' état*, argues Stephen Saunders Webb in *Lord Churchill's Coup: The Anglo-American Empire and the Glorious Revolution Reconsidered*.²¹ And how do the Nonjurors fit into this account? The answer: not at all. Webb's analysis allows almost no room for the impact of faith. Change came through the power of the gun. Force won the Revolution; religion had little to do with it.²²

Or were the English "natural leaders" merely *reactors* to events sweeping them along rather than proponents of a new social and political order? W. A. Speck describes the English elites as, "reluctant revolutionaries" who never intended a revolution but were swept along in their unpremeditated response. "England became recognized not as an *ancien régime* but as a nation of shopkeepers." According to Speck, "The last thing Sancroft and his colleagues wanted was what happened in the winter of 1688 to 1689.

²⁰ See "Bray, The Vicar of" *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, F. L. Cross ed. (London: Oxford University Press, 1958), 193.

²¹ Stephen Saunders Webb, *Lord Churchill's Coup: The Anglo-American Empire and the Glorious Revolution Reconsidered* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1998).

²² *Ibid.*, 166-68.

They desired nothing more than to cement the old alliance of king and bishops under James II."²³

J.C.D. Clark has stresses the continuity of the English "Confessional State." He contends "from the Reformation to the nineteenth century ... Christianity was characterized by a drive to engage with and work through the material realm in a way which implied no essential difference of kind between the two." Lawyers and clergymen were but two sides of a very practical union of Crown and Church. ²⁴ Clark's account accents "contingency" events; when they happened, the confessional state responded. With regard to the events that produced the 1688-89 crisis Clark comments on their quick convergence. In a period of three months beginning in April 1688, James II issued his Second Declaration of Indulgence, the Seven Bishops petitioned the King opposing the Declaration, and the four bishops appointed by the Pope to minister to English Roman Catholics issued a pastoral letter guaranteed to polarize the Established Church. The Seven Bishops were imprisoned on June 8; two days later James II's queen gave birth to a son and heir, threatening a Roman Catholic succession. The acquittal of the Seven Bishops on June 29 resulted in great rejoicing and inspired much of the nation to stand against the king. That same evening the Bishop of London and six other nobles sent their written appeal to William of Orange to intervene.²⁵ In recounting the events from April to June 1688, Clark demonstrates the rapid changes that compelled a response. That

²³ W.A. Speck, *Reluctant Revolutionaries: Englishmen and the Revolution of 1688*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 251, 238

²⁴ J.C.D. Clark, *English Society 1660-1832*, 2nded. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 29.

²⁵ Clark, *English Society 1660-1832*, 74.

response of the confessional state to these contingencies produced what has popularly, but less than accurately, been called the Glorious Revolution.

Clark's treatment of the Nonjurors is congruent with his overarching trajectory. The Nonjurors were among the most faithful adherents of the doctrines of "passive obedience" and "indefeasible divine right" which were in one form or another essential ingredients in the development of the confessional state. At the time of the 1688-89 revolution two possibilities presented for obedient churchmen. First, the path taken by the Nonjurors who literally interpreted the indefeasible divine right to be by direct descent through genealogical inheritance. Given this interpretation the Nonjurors' response was completely understandable. Others, most notably Whigs but many Tories as well, saw the doctrine of divine right fulfilled by Providence — God acted to preserve Protestantism, and the nation, by replacing a papist with William and Mary. In both cases the confessional state responded, and the majority eventually accepted the lawful succession as defined by Parliament. That modification did not lessen the commitment or belief of the Nonjurors. The doctrine of Passive Obedience became "the defining symbol of the Anglican middle ground between Rome and Geneva, and the ideological keystone of the most stable and coherent state form in Europe."²⁶

Furthermore, there was an interlocking relationship between the monarchy, the patrician elite, and the Church based not upon nationalism but allegiance, not on class but on patron-client relationships, and not upon secular democracy but upon the "confessional state." The authority in "Church, State and society was primarily established through a line of succession, a succession which at the same time was held to

²⁶ Ibid., 58.

prove its divine appointment."²⁷ This contention recounts precisely what the Nonjurors had said about the indefeasible divine right of monarchs and apostolic succession of bishops. This notion never died out, and the "Nonjuror doctrine [of Passive Obedience] was reformulated to apply to George III, with no sense that any problem lay in the transference."²⁸ At one point, Clark quotes a passage from Robert Southey excusing the Nonjurors: "Their offence consisted only in adhering to the principle without which no government can be secure."²⁹ Only eight illustrations adorn his 580 page *English Society 1660-1832*, and the second full page illustration is a facsimile of the nonjuring Bishop of Chichester, John Lake's, Deathbed Declaration on 27 August 1689. Lake received communion with those closest to him and declared in part: "Whereas that Religion of the Church of England taught me the Doctrine of on Non-resistance and Passive Obedience, which I have accordingly inculcated upon others, and which I took to be the distinguishing Character of the Church of England." For Clark, this statement, "summed up the central message of Nonjuror doctrine."³⁰ I would argue that Clark's observation is truer for the original Nonjurors than for developments within the nonjuring community at the beginning of the reign of George I. The Nonjurors are for Clark not eccentric but rather adherents of the core values of the confessional state, whose conscience at the moment of crisis prohibited them from making the accommodation that Parliament enacted. The Nonjurors, and not John Locke, were illustrative of the core values that

²⁷ Ibid., 175.

²⁸ Ibid., 266

²⁹ Robert Southey, *The Book of the Church* (1824), cited in Clark, *English Society 1660-1832*, 433.

³⁰ Ibid.

survived the rather non-revolutionary events of 1688-89, and their ideas would survive for much longer.

The fourth position considers that what happened in 1688-1689 was intentional, world changing, and truly a watershed point in British history. Recently Steve Pincus has argued that the English intentionally created "the first modern revolution." The events of the 1640s and 1650s unleashed ideological debates that made possible new ways of thinking about state, religion, and society. In the seventeenth century the people of England were divided and never united against the monarch. James II furnished the "sensible people of England" an opportunity to collaborate and "to rid themselves against an irrational monarch."³¹ The profound changes in the national economy, from a pattern of recession and retrenchment, to an expanding commercial and imperial enterprise, made possible the transformation of England's state institutions. "The creation of the bank of England, war against France, and religious toleration were all explicit goals of many of the revolutionaries."³² However, for Pincus, the revolution was "violent, popular and divisive," not bloodless at all, and not simply a political transfer of power with economic consequences. He concludes, that 1688 was not a fundamental break in English history: "Early Modern England did not end in 1688, nor did Modern England begin then. It would be fair to say that the character of English state and society relations was fundamentally transformed."³³

Real revolutions require real opponents and this fact is not lost on Pincus. The Nonjurors influence "should not be underestimated," largely because they drew members

³¹ Steve Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 8.

³² *Ibid.*

³³ *Ibid.*

of the gentry and common people with them.³⁴ Jacobites, and Nonjurors generally, did not disappear after the Revolution because they "constituted a culturally vibrant and socially significant minority" that met regularly all over England in coffeehouses, clubs, taverns, and conventicles for worship.³⁵ The Jacobites disseminated their opinions through "pamphlets, poems, and scaffold speeches" that were "sophisticated, internally consistent, and committed to the notion that the revolution had dramatically altered and deformed English politics, religion, and society."³⁶ The Established Church's Williamite bishops on the other hand praised increased toleration and a new era, while arguing that the "protestant Jacobites and their supporters desired an outmoded and inferior Church of England."³⁷ The Nonjurors and Jacobites articulated a powerful and often threatening message that was not lost on the Crown, Established Church, or Parliament. Pincus sees the Nonjurors as central to the revolutionary conflict and openly engaged in public rhetoric both political and ecclesiastical — they were not to be underestimated.

Church Historians

J. B. Bury described historical writing as constructing a grand edifice in which the individual labors of historians were the bricks and mortar in the larger creation.³⁸ Employing that analogy one can observe that the prominent historians already discussed were all dependent upon the bricks and mortar research of three church historians who

³⁴ Ibid., 288

³⁵ Ibid., 444

³⁶ Ibid., 445.

³⁷ Ibid., 457.

³⁸ J.B. Bury , "The Science of History," in *Selected Essays of J. B. Bury*, ed. Harold Temperley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1930), 17.

wrote in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries: Thomas Lathbury, J. H. Overton, and Henry Broxap. The contemporary historian Richard Sharp has observed, "an adequate new study of the nonjuring movement is badly needed." He goes on to say that the "best works" on the subject are still Lathbury, Overton, and Broxap.³⁹

The first history of the Nonjurors was Thomas Lathbury's (1798-1865) *A History of the Nonjurors* written in 1845.⁴⁰ It has been the starting point for many, if not all, modern histories of the schism. It was published one hundred years after the Jacobite Rebellion of 1745 and stood alone as a comprehensive account until 1902. His work is an essential resource, and certainly the earliest attempt to record the history of the Nonjurors from inception to demise.

Lathbury was a liturgical scholar, an antiquarian, and a priest of the Church of England. He was educated at St Edmund Hall, Oxford and subsequently took holy orders in the Church of England, holding numerous assistant curacies, including Bath Abbey, during his career. His preferment to the perpetual curacy of St. Simon and St. Jude, Bristol in 1848 gave him a permanent income and pastoral oversight of a congregation for the rest of his life.⁴¹

³⁹ Richard Sharp, "'Our Common Mother, the Church of England': Nonjurors, High Churchmen, and the Evidence of Subscription Lists" in *Loyalty and Identity: Jacobites at Home and Abroad*, eds. Paul Monod, Murray Pittock, and Daniel Szechi. (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 178, n. 4.

⁴⁰ Thomas Lathbury, *A History of the Nonjurors: Their Controversies and Writings; With Remarks on some of the Rubrics in the Book of Common Prayer* (London: William Pickering, 1845).

⁴¹ See F. L. Cross, ed., "Perpetual curate," *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1958), 1046. The concept of perpetual curacy is complicated. Essentially it referred to a priest who functioned in a parish, generally one closed by Henry VIII in 1536 and 1539, whose patron was the lay rector and thereby required to nominate some clergyman to the bishop for license to serve the cure. By the time of Lathbury the concept simply meant that he ministered without Institution or Induction and was probably styled vicar.

His churchmanship might best be described as a very moderate High Churchman. A later generation might have described him as one of those "High and Dry" churchmen who emerged from the eighteenth century, completely orthodox Anglicans possessed with the usual suspicion of both Dissenters and Tractarians. He was known for his fierce anti-Roman Catholic rhetoric, especially as the events of the 1830s — the Reform Act of 1832 and Keble's Assize Sermon of 1833 — came to a head.⁴² He praised the Martyrs Memorial project at Oxford's High Street that commemorated Thomas Cranmer, Nicholas Ridley, and High Latimer all martyred during the reign of Mary I, and this action brought him criticism from High Churchmen.⁴³ Neither ceremonialist nor Latitudinarian, he was an avowed apologist for the Church of England, critical of Oliver Cromwell and Dissenters generally, and all under the papal obedience. Deeply suspicious of the Oxford Movement, he was a strong apologist for the Anglican *Via Media*. In this context it is somewhat surprising that he wrote two books about the Nonjurors: *A History of the Nonjurors* (1845) and his edition of the Nonjuror Jeremy Collier's *Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain* (1858).

His treatment of the nonjuring schism was not without criticism of those who caused it. Lathbury was deeply empathetic to the bishops deprived in 1691, but not to those later Nonjurors after 1710. He wrote, "Our sympathies, however, cannot be of the same character with the later Nonjurors, who continued the separation on principles, which were later repudiated by such men as Ken, Frampton, Dodwell, Nelson and Brokesby." Lathbury had no doubt that "...the Nonjurors, who persisted in continuing the

⁴² Thomas Lathbury, *Protestantism the Old Religion, Popery the New* (1838)

⁴³ See Peter B. Nockles, "Lathbury, Thomas (1798-1865)," *ODNB*.

separation, acted on principles different from those by which that section, who returned to the Church had been guided from the period of the Revolution to the year 1710.”⁴⁴ His astute observation goes to the central questions of why the later Nonjurors continued the schism, how they did so, and what were their methods. There can be little doubt that Lathbury observed a decided development in belief and practice taken by the later Nonjurors. His prodigious recovery of detail, otherwise lost, is invaluable; but, his style, always interesting, was nevertheless more apologetic than analytical.

J. H. Overton’s 1902 book *The Nonjurors: Their Lives, Principles, and Writings*⁴⁵ was heavily dependent on Lathbury’s research.⁴⁶ He attempted to separate the ecclesiastical history from the political and “trace the history of the Nonjurors, as a religious community.”⁴⁷ It is difficult, if not impossible, to tell the story apart from politics, a reality never far from nonjuring minds. Overton tried, “to give the reader a clear and definite impression of the personalities of all the chief actors; and, finally, to bring into prominence the later phase of the movement, which appears to be little known.”⁴⁸ He succeeded, but perhaps at times, writing hagiography more than history.

Overton was a Lincolnshire man, graduate of Rugby and Lincoln College, Oxford, captain of his college rowing club, avid cricketer, and a priest first ordained to the curacy of Quedgeley, Gloucestershire. After several curacies, he eventually held the

⁴⁴ Lathbury, *A History of the Nonjurors*, 217, 224.

⁴⁵ Overton, *The Nonjurors*.

⁴⁶ Ibid. “Mr. Lathbury’s History of the Nonjurors has stood alone for many years as the one book which deals exclusively with the subject and, I desire to acknowledge my great indebtedness to it.”

⁴⁷ Ibid., v.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

rectorship of Epworth, Lincolnshire, the home of John and Charles Wesley, and developed a deep appreciation for the Wesleys and the Evangelical Revival. John Wesley owed much to the Nonjuror William Law and that connection was surely not lost on Overton. He subsequently became rector of Gumley Leicestershire and residentiary canon of Peterborough Cathedral. With his close friend from college, Charles John Abbey, rector of Checkendon, Oxfordshire, he wrote *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century*, a book read by Anglican seminarians well into the twentieth-century. Abbey and Overton's book was flawed by its failure to notice the considerable achievements of the eighteenth-century Church and by a categorical dismissal of the Whig appointments as lacking both faith and practice. William Gibson, and others, have now largely discredited this position.⁴⁹ The truth is some Church Whigs were High Churchmen and as orthodox and diligent as their Tory counterparts.

Overton was unreservedly High Church and a member of the English Church Union, yet with a corresponding appreciation for the Evangelical Revival and John Wesley.⁵⁰ He considered Anglicanism rescued from the Latitudinarians by the two complimentary movements: the Evangelical Revival and the Oxford Movement, each in his mind, thoroughly Anglican.

Overton wrote two works directly concerned with the Nonjurors: *William Law: Nonjuror and Mystic* (1881) and *The Nonjurors: their Lives, Principles and Writings* (1902). Both provided a corrective of much prevailing prejudice, without which we would be largely left, Lathbury excepted, with the dismissal of a community by Whig

⁴⁹ See William Gibson, *The Achievement of the Anglican Church, 1689-1800: The Confessional State in Eighteenth Century England* (Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1995).

⁵⁰ See Overton, *The Evangelical Revival*.

historians glad to see it go. His writing was at times apologetic, often biographical, and always detailed and well researched.

With regard to the continuation of the schism he contended that the consecration of Hickes and Wagstaff in 1694 was for one reason only, "to prevent the succession from dying out." He saw the death of Wagstaff on 17 October 1712, leaving only Hickes and he an invalid, as the moment of decision to continue the schism. Hickes acted quickly to ordain three new bishops, an action he had to take if the succession was to continue.⁵¹ "And as Hickes also held in the most uncompromising form the view that a Church governed by usurping bishops (as he still deemed those of the Established Church to be) was no Church at all, he was conscientiously bound to have recourse to extreme measures, if necessary, to avert the catastrophe."⁵² Overton was writing in a different world and century from Lathbury. Arguably, Lathbury reflected the end of the long eighteenth century and Overton the nineteenth with the effects of Evangelical Revival and Oxford Movement in full view.

Henry Broxap's *The Later Nonjurors* (1924)⁵³ took advantage of several newly discovered archives.⁵⁴ Broxap contended that previous historians of the Nonjurors "have been compelled to undertake their task without complete and reliable information, and have of necessity substituted more or less probable conjectures for certainly established

⁵¹ J. H. Overton, *The Nonjurors*, 118.

⁵² *Ibid.*

⁵³ Henry Broxap, *The Later Non-Jurors* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1924).

⁵⁴ These archives are: Dr. Thomas Brett's manuscripts at the John Ryland's Library, Manchester, which had only been revealed to the public in 1916, the Scottish Episcopal Church's manuscripts in Edinburgh, and a collection of the papers of Thomas Hearne at the Oxford Historical Society.

facts."⁵⁵ Broxap also wrote a biography of the famous Manchester Nonjuror Thomas Deacon that is very helpful in developing a picture of Nonjurors in the shires.⁵⁶

By the time Broxap was writing, the trajectory of High Church development had moved through several formative periods; it had progressed from the confident High Churchmen of the Restoration, the noisy "Church in Danger" churchmen of Queen Anne's reign, through the quietly orthodox High Churchmen of the eighteenth century. The Oxford Movement Tractarians followed, awakened by Keble's 1833 "National Apostasy" sermon, then came the latter phase Anglo-Catholics and "ritualism" with advanced ceremonial and ministry in the slums, and finally to the respectable triumph of the Anglo-Catholic Congresses that began in 1920. Writing during this last phase, Broxap's history of the Nonjurors appeared in 1924, and it is clear that he regarded the Nonjurors as the precursors of the Oxford Movement.

Broxap presented as accurate an account as possible. Others, he believed, would realize that the problems the Nonjurors faced and the national issues of 1924 were very similar, and might find it "a matter of necessity to 'restate' (to use a word which is popular at the moment) the beliefs of the Non-Jurors in language suitable for this generation."⁵⁷ The relationship of church and state, issues of disestablishment of the Church, the Church's revision of the *Book of Common Prayer* rejected by Parliament in 1927 and 1928, as well as the need for domestic missions in modern, urban England prompted Broxap's remarks: "It is idle to think that the Elizabethan Settlement can be made to

⁵⁵ Broxap, *The Later Non-Jurors*, vii.

⁵⁶ Henry Broxap, *A Biography of Thomas Deacon, the Manchester Nonjuror* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1911).

⁵⁷ Broxap, *Biography of Thomas Deacon*, 308.

continue in the new age on which we are entering, and the same remark may certainly be made with regard to the services of the Church which have remained unaltered since 1662."⁵⁸ The Nonjurors own struggle, argued Broxap, would be of considerable value when the time came to revise these "anachronisms."

Henry Broxap was a layman of the Church of England, and a graduate of Owens College, which later became the University of Manchester, as was his brother Ernest, also an able historian. Ernest wrote *The Great Civil War in Lancashire (1642-51)*, (1910), perhaps his greatest among many studies of Manchester and Civil War history. Both Henry and Ernest were trained by able historians including Professor Thomas Frederick Tout, Professor James Tait, and Sir Charles Harding Firth. The Broxaps became industrialists, partners in one of Manchester's important yarn businesses. Amazingly, both found time to research and write several extensive histories⁵⁹

Henry Broxap's specific concern was for the later phase of the Nonjuring movement. His starting point was the year 1710, a year marked by the death of Lloyd and the call of Ken and Dodwell to end the schism. He argued that there were several church factions in direct contention: the Whigs represented by Archbishop Tennison and Bishop Burnet; the political Jacobites such as Bishop Francis Atterbury and Charles Leslie; a group represented by lesser known clergymen like Thomas Bell and John Lewis who wanted the Church of England to embrace all shades of Protestant opinion; and last was the group represented within the Established Church by priests like John Johnson, Vicar

⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁹ Chethams Library Manchester Archive Ref No GB 418 Collection of notes, letters, press cuttings and illustrations connected with Ernest Broxap's book *The Great Civil War in Lancashire (1642-51)*, first published in 1910 by Manchester University Press. [<http://archiveshub.ac.uk/data/gb-418-brox>].

of Cranbook, and among the Nonjurors by George Hickes. This latter group believed the Church was a “distinct spiritual society ... whose object was to revive the practices of the primitive and undivided Church” as it existed before the Great Schism between the Eastern and Western Churches in 1054.⁶⁰

Two more recent church historians, J.W.C. Wand and Robert D. Cornwall, add to this historiography, as heirs of Lathbury, Overton, and Broxap. They write in the spirit of these earlier scholars, and both are directly engaged with the ecclesiology and theology of the Nonjurors. Wand was Bishop of London in 1951 when he delivered *The High Church Schism: Four Lectures on the Nonjurors* as the Lenten series for his diocese. Wand argued that what began as an act of conscience developed through a long spiritual and intellectual discourse to reassert a primitive and catholic understanding of the Church. The Nonjurors gave the Anglican Church a profound and lasting lesson, one that eventually was taken over by the Established Church and, in 1833, became the foundational doctrine of the Oxford Movement. This was neither an original nor radical thought in 1951 London. He contended that the Nonjurors eventually came to consider the Church as independent of the state. After the nonjuring schism, the ideas of Richard Hooker and the Elizabethan Settlement became impossible for them to embrace, and “they inevitably built up a doctrine of the Church as a separate entity — as Law did in his controversy with Hoadly. This of course was in fact the original doctrine of the Church during the age of persecution.”⁶¹ In this context, Wand contended, that Hickes concluded that the consecrations of 1713 were essential for two reasons: first, the Established

⁶⁰ Broxap, *A Biography of Thomas Deacon*, 4.

⁶¹ J. W. C. Wand, *The High Church Schism: Four Lectures on the Nonjurors* (London: Faith Press, 1951).

Church was in schism, not the Nonjurors. Hickes, “was therefore determined that what he considered a true episcopal succession should be at all costs maintained.”⁶² Second, “it was still the imposition of the oaths which made this step advisable and even necessary” in 1713.⁶³ Wand argued that the Nonjurors provided some of the best theological thinking for the High Church Party within the Established Church. More contemporary theologians such as Mark Goldie have picked up this last argument.⁶⁴

Robert D. Cornwall is an ordained minister of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) and trained both for the M.Div. and Ph.D. in Historical Theology at Fuller Theological Seminary in Pasadena, California. His book *Visible and Apostolic: The Constitution of the Church in High Church Anglican and Non-Juror Thought* (1993) is the most recent and best exposition of the ecclesiology and the historical context in which the nonjuring schism was shaped. Incorporating social, political and ecumenical dimensions of the movement, Cornwall sees the Nonjurors as never completely separated from the ongoing Anglican saga. His extensive use of well documented primary sources is an immense help to the researcher.⁶⁵ Cornwall largely agrees with Wand: Hickes believed the schism of the Established Church unrectifiable, that the acts of deprivation and usurpation had created a situation only reversible by the schismatics — and he meant the Established Church — joining the Nonjurors. Since this was not likely to happen, and

⁶² Ibid., 41.

⁶³ Ibid., 44.

⁶⁴ See Mark Goldie, "The Nonjurors, Episcopacy, and the Origins of the Convocation Controversy" in *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1759*, Eveline Cruickshanks, ed. (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers Ltd, 1982), 15-35.

⁶⁵ Robert D. Cornwall, *Visible and Apostolic: The Constitution of the Church in High Church Anglican and Non-Juror Thought* (Newark: University of Delaware Presses, 1993).

because “Hickes believed the church could not exist without bishops, Hickes made certain that the Non-Juror’s episcopal succession could continue.”⁶⁶ Cornwall traces these convictions to a prior and continuing High Church tradition which he suggests has been trivialized by J. G. A. Pocock who stated “...that the stress on divine-right monarchy and the Anglo-Catholic implications of an apostolic church only found expression among a ‘handful of extremists on the fringe of the Nonjuring secession’.”⁶⁷ Cornwall disagrees, and argues instead, that the Nonjurors represented a continuous High Church tradition. The historic episcopate in Apostolic Succession was a *sine qua non* of the Church for the Nonjurors. In the final analysis, Cornwall concludes, that for Nonjurors and eventually most High Churchmen as well, “Apostolic succession, not a royal decree, formed the basis for the Church of England....”⁶⁸ This was particularly true for the later phase of the movement, and Cornwall convincingly traces a development in ecclesiological thinking that emerged after the schism between Church and State.

Distinct Historiographical Dimensions

The historiography of the nonjuring schism includes many particular aspects that have been analyzed from specific political, legal, ecclesiological, theological, liturgical, cultural, or economic positions. Many of these tremendously illuminate the story.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 87-88.

⁶⁷Ibid., n.11, 150 citing J.G.A. Pocock, “Post Puritan England and the Problem of the Enlightenment,” in *Culture and Politics from Puritanism to the Enlightenment*, ed. Perez Zagorin, 91-111. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980), 100-101.

⁶⁸ Cornwall, *Visible and Apostolic*, 93.

Virtually all of the original Nonjurors were the offspring of the Restoration Church and many remembered firsthand the struggles of the Civil War. The question "Who were the Nonjurors?" can be answered only by reference to the Restoration of the Crown and Church in 1660. John Spurr's research sets the Nonjurors' beginnings securely within the Anglican establishment. His book *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689* is an expansion of his 1985 Oxford doctoral dissertation *Anglican Apologetic and the Restoration Church*. Since completing that thesis he has done additional research and revised much of what he had previously written. In 1988, he published two articles, demonstrate a continuing interest in the Latitudinarians: "Latitudinarianism and the Restoration Church" and "Rational Religion in Restoration England."⁶⁹ His *English Puritanism, 1603-1689* published in 1998, expands his research in a different direction in the same period.⁷⁰ *The Post-Reformation: Religion, Politics and Society 1603-1714* (2206) expands the trajectory traced in *The Restoration Church of England 1646-1689* where he argues that Anglican identity — as a *via media* distinct from the Puritans on one side and the Roman Catholics on the other — was "invented," as he put it, in the Restoration period. Whether it was invented or simply reclaimed is a moot point. Beyond debate is the fact that many of the key leaders of the High Church Party during the Reconstruction era became Nonjurors after the accession of William and Mary.

⁶⁹ John Spurr, "Latitudinarianism and the Restoration Church," *The Historical Journal* 31 (March 1988): 61-82, and "Rational Religion in Restoration England," *The Journal of the History of Ideas*, 49, No. 4 (October 1988): 563-585.

⁷⁰ John Spurr, *English Puritanism, 1603-1689* (London: Palgrave-Macmillan, 1998).

Professor Spurr's primary thesis maintains that: "The Restoration Church of England was the creation of one revolution [The English Civil War] and the victim of another [The Glorious Revolution of 1689-9]."⁷¹ His central argument puts forth the idea that during the Interregnum following 1646 the Church of England did not die, but was formed in the crucible of persecution into a powerful entity, not entirely underground, waiting the day of return.⁷² When that moment came, it seized the opportunity presented, with powerful leadership largely from the bishops. During the Interregnum, the Church of England grappled with self-understanding, ecclesiology, and theology. At the Restoration these ideas were refined and came into focus; Anglicanism was brought, much like one of Sir Christopher Wren's churches, into the light and restored as the National Church. Of course, the Church of England perceived the events of 1688-89, seen by so many Whig historians as the triumph of religious toleration and parliamentary democracy, as an enormous blow. The Act of Toleration was a defeat. Spurr says the result was the demotion of the Church from her role as "the National Church" to merely "the Established Church."⁷³

Spurr is completely aware that the Church was engaged in a continuing search for its own identity over succeeding generations. The Church of England was "particularly dependent upon her 'occasion', she has no irreducible doctrinal core, no confession of faith nor petrine rock, upon which to rest, but must go out, armed only with her Bible, liturgy, Articles and traditions, to do battle with each new set of political, social, and

⁷¹ Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England 1646-1689*, 376. The parenthetical remarks are mine.

⁷² See Linda S. York, "In Dens and Caves: The Survival of Anglicanism during the Rule of the Saints, 1640-1660" (Ph.D. diss., Auburn University, 1999).

⁷³ Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England 1646-1688*, 4.

cultural circumstances."⁷⁴ He makes the case for the Restoration church being particularly adept at self-definition, an identity that has persisted with modifications in each subsequent generation.

Part of this self-definition dealt with an emerging understanding of episcopacy, an episcopate that was the central building block of the Church. Key to this development had been the effort not to lose the historic episcopate during the Interregnum. Theologically, the scholarship of the pre-1640 Church and its dependence upon the Apostolic Fathers and Patristic sources was stressed. The Puritans, and other protestant reformers, stressed personal conversion, the Bible as the sole authority in faith and morals, presbyterian or congregation church governance, small group classes or cells, lay-witness, utter simplicity in worship, and moral purity in public places. The more catholic direction of Restoration Anglicanism stressed the corporate nature of the Church, the authority of the Tradition as interpreter of the Bible, the apostolic succession of bishops in the historic episcopate, the divine nature of the ordained ministry, the liturgy of the *Book of Common Prayer*, the aesthetic elaboration of the ecclesiastical arts, and the importance of Passive Obedience in public life. In these respects, the Restoration Church was clearly moving in a more catholic direction while never losing its identity as reformed. "Catholic" here clearly comprehended the Church of St. Cyprian's day and never excluded the prevailing anti-papal apologetics of Restoration Anglicanism. In other

⁷⁴ Ibid., xiii-xiv.

words, Catholic did not equal Roman Catholic.⁷⁵ Further, Spurr argues, that at this time in Anglican ecclesiology bishops had become even more important than the sovereign.⁷⁶

Not only the episcopate defined Anglicanism. Because the Church of England lacked a strong definition of identity its adherents came to appreciate how piety as much as theology, both faith and practice, were self-defining. Spurr places Anglican piety alongside episcopacy, moral theology, the campaign against national sin, and the ever-present quest for national religious uniformity, to describe more fully Restoration Anglicanism.⁷⁷ All of this was a balancing act that included a wide spectrum of faith and practice. The notion of *lex orandi, lex credendi*, what we pray is what we believe, was paramount to a church with great latitude and an absence of "irreducible doctrine." Thus, Spurr unfolds an Anglican balancing act involving episcopacy, liturgy, piety, morality, and creativity in the ecclesiastical arts, all employed to bring together one very divided Nation in one Church.

This balancing act crashed down with the Revolution of 1688-9. William III's "exercise of naked royal power" and the deprivation of the Nonjurors pushed many churchmen to new conclusions about authority in the church. As a consequence, "the Nonjurors took refuge in the principle that the church relied solely on the independent succession of the episcopate and accordingly began to consecrate their own bishops... soon this conception of the bishops' 'spiritual monarchy' and ecclesiastical autonomy

⁷⁵ I use the words Catholic, Catholic Church, Church Catholic, and Universal Church in the sense employed by Nonjurors like George Hickes in *The Constitution of the Catholick Church* and never in the modern sense to refer to the Roman Catholic Church alone.

⁷⁶ Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1688*, 119.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 373.

began to filter back into the disillusioned 'High Church' ranks of the national church..."⁷⁸

Thus, Spurr sets the emergence of the Nonjurors into the longer and greater history of the Restoration High Church Party with its Tory alliance.⁷⁹ The Nonjurors soon became politically irrelevant, but their genius was revealed in theologians like Dodwell and Leslie, spiritual directors such as Kettlewell and Law, and liturgists like Johnson, Nelson and Brett.⁸⁰

Three unpublished theses also lend credible scholarship to the Nonjurors' historiography. John Findon's, "The Nonjurors and the Church of England, 1689-1716" is perennially quoted. Guy Martin Yould's thesis presents an explication of Hicke's role in the schism. Walter Creston Pugh's, "The Usagers Controversy" served as the inspiration for Broxap's *The Later Non-Jurors*.⁸¹

The largest pamphlet war of the eighteenth century was begun by an argument between Nonjurors and the Latitudinarian Bishop of Bangor. The posthumous publication of George Hicke's papers sparked the firestorm that we know as The Bangorian Controversy. Andrew Starkie's *The Church of England and the Bangorian Controversy, 1716-1721* is an extensive treatment of these debates that are critically important to understanding the Nonjurors' mindset and their attempts to actively engage the political nation. Starkie's book is particularly useful in retracing their intellectual networks and

⁷⁸ Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1688*, 164.

⁷⁹ Ibid.

⁸⁰ John Spurr, *The Post Reformation 1603-1714* (Harlow: Pearson, Longmans, 2006), 207.

⁸¹ John Findon, "The Nonjurors and the Church of England 1689-1716" (D.Phil diss. Oxon, 1977); Guy Martin Yould, "The Origins and Transformation of the Non-Juror Schism, 1670-1715" (Ph.D. diss. University of Hull, 1979), and Walter Creston Pugh, "The Usagers Controversy" (M.A. thesis, Philadelphia Divinity School, 1919).

relationships with High Churchmen and Tories in the Established Church.⁸² William Gardner's unpublished Ph.D dissertation on Hickes and his essay "George Hickes and the Origins of the Bangorian Controversy" are invaluable for an understanding of the Nonjurors' decisions at the point of continuing the separation.⁸³ Gardiner argued convincingly that Hickes's posthumous papers, *The Constitution of the Catholic Church*, began the Bangorian Controversy.

Paralleling the Nonjurors' initiative in the Bangorian Controversy was the earlier stance of the Nonjurors in the Convocation Controversy, convincingly argued by Mark Goldie in his 1982 essay, "The Nonjurors, Episcopacy and the Origins of the Convocation Controversy." In it he contends that the Nonjuror Henry Dodwell and not Francis Atterbury began the Convocation Controversy.⁸⁴ The Nonjurors' contention that they were the True Church was a considerable threat to the establishment, and they relished the role of Socratic gadfly.

Little has been published on the subject of patronage, and how the Nonjurors sustained their work remains a largely unplowed field. Jeffrey S. Chamberlain's *Accommodating High Churchmen: The Clergy of Sussex, 1700-1745* demonstrates a way forward. He finds a definite network of patronage and protection, compromise and

⁸² Andrew Starkie, *The Church of England and the Bangorian Controversy, 1716-1721* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2007).

⁸³ William B. Gardner, "The Life and Some Account of the Works of George Hickes" (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1946). W. B. Gardner, "George Hickes and the Origins of the Bangorian Controversy," *Studies in Philology* 39 (1942):65-78.

⁸⁴ Mark Goldie, "The Nonjurors, Episcopacy and the Origins of the Convocation Controversy" in *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1759*, ed. Eveline Cruickshanks (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1982), 15-35.

accommodation, for High Churchmen in this period, and his research model shows great promise in application to the case of the Nonjurors.⁸⁵

An effort of the nonjuring divines two centuries ahead of its time was the ecumenical outreach made to the Eastern Orthodox Churches. Henry Sefton wrote on the overtures of the Nonjurors to the Eastern Orthodox, and investigated the Jolly Kist Archive in Edinburgh. His essay addresses only the Scottish bishops role in the overture, and does not speak to the larger networks involved.⁸⁶ More recently, Judith Pinnington has written, from the perspective of Eastern Orthodoxy, the most important work to date on the Anglican-Orthodox ecumenical endeavors. It captures the spirit of the Nonjurors' quest brilliantly.⁸⁷

The subject of Nonjuring women has been left largely unaddressed with the notable exception of Hannah Smith's riveting 2001 essay entitled "English 'Feminist' Writings and Judith Drake's 'An Essay in Defense of the Female Sex' (1696)." ⁸⁸ George Hickes was one of the first Englishmen to argue for women's colleges at Oxford and Cambridge, and Smith shows that his concern was for improving Anglican Christian formation in the family. Educated, faithful Anglican women were critical to the success of this task. While not her primary focus, Smith shows the interrelationship of Hickes's theology and his social agenda for women.

⁸⁵ Jeffrey S. Chamberlain, *Accommodating High Churchmen, The Clergy of Sussex, 1700-1745* (Urbana, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1997).

⁸⁶ Henry Sefton, "The Scottish Bishops and Archbishop Arsenius" in *The Orthodox Churches and the West: Papers Read at the Fourteenth Summer Meeting and the Fifteenth Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society*, ed. Derek Baker (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1976).

⁸⁷ Judith Pinnington, *Anglicans and Orthodox: Unity and Subversion, 1559-1725* (Leominster: Gracewing, 2003).

⁸⁸ Hannah Smith. "English 'Feminist' Writings and Judith Drake's 'An Essay in Defense of the Female Sex' (1696)." *The Historical Journal* 44 (September, 2001): 727-747.

Studies of the Nonjurors mean little without an understanding of Jacobite history. Daniel Szechi's work in this area is magisterial. His 1984 book, *Jacobitism and Tory Politics 1710-14*, and later works, "Constructing a Jacobite: The Social and Intellectual Origins of George Lockhart of Carnwath," and *George Lockhart of Carnwath 1689-1727: A Study in Jacobitism*, augmented by his most recent book, *1715, The Great Jacobite Rebellion*, provide an invaluable picture of the interconnectedness of politics, motives, and religious zeal.⁸⁹ Szechi, vis-à-vis the Scottish Jacobites contends, "What analysis of the political thought of George Lockhart suggests was different about the *mentalité* of the Scottish episcopalian Jacobite elite (by contrast with those elite episcopalians who kept out of active Jacobitism) is the intensity of their religiosity."⁹⁰ Might the same *mentalité* also be found among later English Nonjurors?

P.K. Monod's research in *Jacobitism and the English People, 1688-1788* has also proven invaluable.⁹¹ Bruce Lenman's "The Scottish Episcopal Clergy and the Ideology of Jacobitism," equates Scottish episcopalian clergy with Jacobites and suggests they were the key articulators of Jacobite ideology in Scotland. Ironically, the immensely influential position of the predominantly Jacobite episcopal clergy in Scotland in 1715 was due in part to the considerable aid they had received from supporters in England. In Scotland their support lay with the great lairds and the Scottish Universities that since 1662 taught divinity students royalist, conservative and episcopalian ideas. Lenman argues that after

⁸⁹ Daniel Szechi, *Jacobitism and Tory Politics 1710-14* (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, Ltd, 1984), *George Lockhart of Carnwath 1689-1727: A Study in Jacobitism* (East Linton, Scotland: Tuckwell Press, 2002), and *1715, The Great Jacobite Rebellion* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006).

⁹⁰ Daniel Szechi, "Constructing a Jacobite: The Social and Intellectual Origins of George Lockhart of Carnwath" *The Historical Journal* 40, no. 4 (1997), 996.

⁹¹ P. K. Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People, 1688-1788* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

1689 the Scottish Episcopalian clergy occupied a position analogous to that of the Nonjurors in England.⁹²

Paul Monod, Murray Pittock and Daniel Szechi have recently edited a book that directly informs research on the pervasive nature of Nonjuring networks.⁹³ Richard Sharp's essay "Our Common Mother, the Church of England: Nonjurors, High Churchmen and the Evidence of Subscription Lists" convincingly demonstrates by use of the subscription lists to two nonjuring books - John Lindsay's 1728 translation and updating of Francis Mason's 1613 *A Vindication of the Church of England*, and Thomas Bedford's 1732 translation of a twelfth-century monk, Symeon's, history of the Church of Durham - how the cooperation and support by clergymen and laity of both the established and nonjuring churches remained strong for at least forty years beyond the original schism of 1691. There was a joint endeavor, from within the Established Church and from Nonjurors as well, to publish books and pamphlets that supported orthodox Anglican doctrine and devotional and liturgical practice. Lindsay's *Vindication* had 428 individuals and one library subscribe, while Bedford's volume claimed 260 people and two libraries as subscribers. Sharp's research shows that laymen and women, not just the clergy, enthusiastically supported this effort, and central to the survival of the Nonjuring

⁹² Bruce Lenman, "The Scottish Episcopal Clergy and the Ideology of Jacobitism," in *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1759*, ed. Eveline Cruickshanks (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers Ltd., 1982):36-48. Also see Paul Fox, "The Scottish Episcopal Church: Religious Conflict in the Late Stuart Period" (PhD diss. Auburn University, 2013).

⁹³ Paul Monod, Murray Pittock, and Daniel Szechi, *Loyalty and Identity: Jacobites at Home and Abroad* (Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).

movement was what Sharp calls "personal associations and friendships."⁹⁴ His extensive research on the congregation of Nonjurors in Newcastle stands alone in the field.⁹⁵

A Modest Position

I situate myself in the tradition of Spurr and Cornwall and owe much to their insights and extensive research. Few have grasped the Nonjurors' theological integrity in historical context as they have. I write in appreciation of Clark whose macro-trajectory of a confessional state I believe fundamentally accurate. I also think that Pincus is correct in noting that a revolution did occur in 1688 and following. I present, however, a nuanced view somewhere between both Clark's and Pincus's arguments. The Nonjurors disrupted the confessional state conception articulated by Clark and the Via Media balancing act described by Spurr. They articulated a persistent Anglicanism that complicates Pincus' revolution. The deprived Nonjurors became major, faithful articulators of their ideas outside the establishment, and built networks to articulate them in ways that were highly effective in influencing those within. However, increasingly after Hickes chose to continue the schism in 1713, the notion of a confessional state was largely replaced by the notion of an independent church grounded in a Cyprianist mentality. Clark's argument about the Nonjurors is, I believe, more true of the earlier than the later phase of the movement. The Nonjurors were more disruptive of society than Clark's thesis

⁹⁴ Richard Sharp, " 'Our Common Mother, the Church of England': Nonjurors, High Churchmen, and the Evidence of Subscription Lists," in *Loyalty and Identity: Jacobites at Home and Abroad*, eds. Paul Monod, Murray Pittock, and Daniel Szechi (Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 167-177.

⁹⁵ Richard Sharp, "100 Years of a Lost Cause: Nonjuring Principles in Newcastle from the Revolution to the Death of Prince Charles Edward Stuart," *Archaeologia Aeliana*, 5th series, viii (1980), 35-55.

allows. Many of their ideas anticipated the future. This study is not a mere narrative about a persecuted minority that ultimately failed to convince a nation, but rather a record of how a community under persecution effectively organized to narrate its story, to articulate the truth as they perceived it. This is a story that enlightens our understanding of how similar groups of people — Anglican and others, before and after 1713 — managed to employ networks to simultaneously tell their tale, strengthen their faithful, and accomplish their mission. In the Nonjurors' case this mission was to reconvert England to the truth. My research enhances our understanding of how networks worked not just with the Nonjurors but also in the eighteenth century generally. In the final analysis, this is less a story about the past than about the future. This is a history that reveals how human beings employ their sacred stories for purposes of identity and survival. The Nonjurors influenced a nation even while being deprived by it. They left a legacy embraced by their descendants in the Oxford movement of the nineteenth century and by present day Anglican Churches in a state of separation from the Archbishop of Canterbury. The entire Anglican Communion owes a debt to their passionate articulation of an ecclesiology and theology that challenged the Church of England to recover its roots. Their history is the fascinating story of constructed community identity organized by networks of bishops, oratories, patronage, academic institutions, articulated by print culture, with ecumenical overtures to the Eastern Orthodox Churches, and led by bold, audacious, risk taking men and women who devoted all for their cause. These were truly paradigm shifts of the first magnitude for early modern Britain.

Chapter 2

“Neither from any want of Duty and Obedience”

The bishops managed their public image remarkably well. In prints and medals they were depicted as saintly men facing the same persecution as the Protestant martyrs under the last Catholic ruler, ‘Bloody Mary’ ... The way in which the Glorious Revolution became a national revolution was through the trial of the bishops. Sancroft, a firm adherent to the cult of King Charles I as martyr, welcomed the tribulations of 1688 as a contemporary echo of that martyrdom.

William Gibson in *James II and the Trial of the Seven Bishops*

The creation of the Nonjurors' mindset took place long before 1688-89. Those men and women who on grounds of conscience stood for the cause of the Stuarts and the Church of England did so, J. H. Overton argued, because of persistent, carefully formed religious values.¹ Nonjurors, like William Law, placed obedience to God first. On the occasion of his deprivation, he wrote to his brother: “The benefits of my education seem partly at an end, but that same education had been more miserably lost if I had not learnt to fear something more than misfortunes.”² Nonjurors were the heirs of Restoration High Churchmen who first developed Cyprian of Carthage’s notion of episcopacy as constituting the Church Catholic. They adopted a practical, largely non-speculative moral theology shaped by devotional manuals like *The Whole Duty of Man*. This heritage enabled Nonjurors to unite sacred and secular worlds, and to practice obedience to three parents: the civil, the spiritual, and the natural.³ Accompanying this idea of obedience

William Gibson, *James II and the Trial of the Seven Bishops* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 16.

¹ J. H. Overton, *The Nonjurors: Their Lives, Principles and Writings* (London: Smith, Elder, and Co., 1902), 6-8.

² See Law’s letter quoted at the conclusion of Overton’s, *The Nonjurors*, 465-466.

³ See Richard Allestree, *The Practice of Christian Graces, or The Whole Duty of Man* (1658), I am using the 1703 edition throughout this chapter: *The whole duty of man, laid down in a plain and familiar way for the use of all, ... with Private devotions ...* (London : printed by William Norton, for E. Pawlet, 1703). John

was a decided shift in emphasis from the early to the later Nonjurors and a corresponding development of ecclesiology. The later Nonjurors increasingly defined the Church Catholic not only as all baptized Christians, but all those in communion with their rightful bishops throughout the world. Such an understanding condemned papal notions of authority, and virtually unchurched Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and all other Nonconformists in England. When the Nonjurors thought of obedience to the Church, they meant to their own rightful bishops. They also developed the notion that obedience to the Tradition of the undivided universal Church was of paramount importance.

They continued to uphold the "indefeasible divine right" of the Stuart dynasty without resorting to the bloodshed of the 1715 Great Jacobite Rebellion or participating in the "45." Instead they practiced "Passive Obedience," assured that the proper order of society would one day be restored by God, if not in this world then in the next.⁴ Behind these commitments was a strenuous practice of self-examination aimed at obedience, sacrifice and holiness.⁵ This piety — described as "Holy Living" by John Spurr—at times appeared hypervigilant and overly scrupulous, and nowhere was it more seriously observed than in giving one's oath to God.⁶ This resulted in an attitude of martyrdom, with Nonjurors identifying with the early Church in the age of persecution before

Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991), especially chapter six, is the best commentary on this emphasis.

⁴ See J.C.D. Clark, *English Society 1660-1832: Religion Ideology and Politics during the Ancien Regime* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 58; Overton, *The Nonjurors*, 6-7.

⁵ Ambrose Bonwicke, *A Pattern for Young Students in the University, set forth in the Life of Mr. Ambrose Bonwicke, sometime Scholar of St. John's College in Cambridge* (London: William Bowyer, 1729).

⁶ Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England*, 308.

Constantine.⁷ It also publicly identified Nonjurors as a religious community willing to sacrifice all for their beliefs.⁸

The formation of a Nonjuror was not primarily political; it was religious, as C.D.A Leighton and Daniel Szechi contend, but was directly involved with things political.⁹ The persistence of Anglican religious mentalities and the breakdown of the alliance between church and crown, as W.A. Speck argues, charted the trajectory of what happened in 1688 and beyond.¹⁰ The resistance, marked by passive obedience of the Seven Bishops in 1688 and other loyal churchmen who followed them, was clearly instrumental in the creation of the Glorious Revolution. As William Gibson puts it: “The seven bishops may not have been the progenitors of the Glorious Revolution, but they were its midwives.”¹¹ Tim Harris convincingly suggests that the Magdalen College, Oxford episode, in which High Church Anglicans were willing to suffer deprivation for their stand against James II and his attempt to install Roman Catholic leaders, was a

⁷ C.D.A. Leighton, "Ancienneté among the Non-Jurors: a study of Henry Dodwell." *History of European ideas* 31, no. 1 (2005): 1-16; C.D.A. Leighton, "The religion of the Non-Jurors and the Early British Enlightenment: A Study of Henry Dodwell." *History of European Ideas* 28, no. 4 (2002), 247-262. C.D.A. Leighton, "William Law, Behmenism, and counter-enlightenment" *Harvard Theological Review* 91.3 (1998), 301; C.D. A. Leighton, "The Non-Jurors and their History", *The Journal of Religious History*, Vol. 29, No. 3 (October 2005), 241- 256. For the notion of martyrdom among Jacobites see Daniel Szechi, *The Jacobites: Britain and Europe, 1688-1788* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994), 36-38.

⁸ Lathbury, *A History of the Nonjurors*, 162-168.

⁹ See John Spurr, *The Post-Reformation 1603-1714* (Harlow: Longman, 2006), 186-190; Geoffrey Holmes, "Religion and Party in Late-Stuart England" in *Politics, Religion and Society in England, 1679-1742* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1986), 181-215. For the formation of a Jacobite see Daniel Szechi, *George Lockhart of Carnath 1689-1727, A Study in Jacobitism* (East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 2002).

¹⁰ W. A. Speck, *Reluctant Revolutionaries: Englishmen and the Revolution of 1688* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 243.

¹¹ William Gibson, *James II and the Trial of the Seven Bishops* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 203.

“classic example” of their practice of the doctrine of Passive Obedience.¹² In fact, George Hickes had written in May 1687, in the context of the Magdalen College affair, “non-r[esistance] is always a duty, and noncomp[liance] very often is.”¹³ The fellows of Magdalen demonstrated before the nation the power of Passive Obedience.¹⁴

It was the most loyal who were also the most deprived,¹⁵ and the doctrine of Passive Obedience most supportive of the monarchy became the most subversive.¹⁶ The same stance was adopted by jurors as well, and J.C.D. Clark writes, “Passive Obedience became the defining symbol of the Anglican middle ground between Rome and Geneva, and the ideological keystone of the most stable and coherent state form in Europe.”¹⁷

The mindset of the Nonjurors who rebelled against the new regime of William and Mary was characterized by obedience above all other characteristics. In their view, they were not rebels; their response was simply obedience to God and the divine order their consciences conceived.¹⁸ Obedience, loyalty, and duty were intertwined concepts

¹² Tim Harris, *Politics under the Later Stuarts: Party Conflict in a Divided Society 1660-1715* (London: Longmans, 1993), 130.

¹³ Bodleian Library, MS Tanner 12, fol. 25, quoted in Harris, *Politics under the Later Stuarts*, 130.

¹⁴ Falconer Madan, *Magdalen College and King James II, 1686-1688: a series of documents* (Oxford: Oxford historical society at the Clarendon Press, 1886).

¹⁵ See Craig Rose, *England in the 1690s: Revolution, Religion and War* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1999), 157-159.

¹⁶ Thomas Babington Macaulay, *The History of England from the Accession of James II*, Volume II, (Philadelphia: Henry T. Coates, n.d.), 312-356; John Miller “James II and Toleration” in *By Force or By Default? The Revolution of 1688-1689* ed. Eveline Cruickshanks, (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers Ltd., 1989), 8-27. See Barry Coward, *The Stuart Age, England, 1603-1714* (London: Longman, 1994), 342-344, for the interaction of the principles of passive obedience and non-resistance vis-à-vis the intervention of William III; Harris, *Politics under the Later Stuarts*, 128.

¹⁷ Clark, *English Society 1660-1832*, 58.

¹⁸ See Mark Goldie, “The Political Thought of the Anglican Revolution,” in *Revolutions of 1688*, ed. Robert Beddard, 102-136.

learned early, and no second or third generation Nonjuror questioned concepts of duty to God and neighbor. There was no duty higher than obedience to God and conscience.¹⁹

This chapter argues against the scholarship that portrays the Nonjurors as rebels against legitimate authority. More compelling is the argument put forth by Lucy Mary Hawkins who wrote, “The Non-Jurors were not the conservative defenders of a forsaken belief, but were pioneering in the attempt to save the church from Erastianism.”²⁰ Erastianism was the supremacy of the State over the Church. In some forms of this idea the Church was an arm of the State. The Nonjurors rejected this notion completely. They did so by developing the older doctrines of obedience in new ways.

I present a notion of obedience not dissimilar to that argued by Clark and Robert Cornwall,²¹ but with a heightened emphasis on the synergistic effect of developing hybrid notions of obedience. This reinforced with historical appeal to the Patristic literature, especially Cyprian of Carthage’s understanding of episcopacy, united and identified them as a community and made them more effective in influencing the nation. The argument presented here is closer to that of Paul Monod, and insists the Nonjurors saw the monarchy as “sacrificed to self-serving principles” Nonjurors appealed to the “moral foundations of sovereignty” that contrasted with both the “illegality and weakness” of the 1688-89 revolution.²²

¹⁹ See Bonwicke, *A Pattern for Young Students in the University*, 73.

²⁰ Lucy Mary Hawkins, *Allegiance in Church and State: The Problem of the Nonjurors in the English Revolution* (London: G. Routledge & Sons, 1928), 167.

²¹ Clark, *English Society 1660-183*; Robert D. Cornwall, *Visible and Apostolic: The Constitution of the Church in High Church Anglican and Non-Juror Thought* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1993).

²² Paul Kleber Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People, 1688-1788* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 16.

Steve Pincus by contrast argues: “Those who overthrew James II in 1688 and shaped the new regime in the following decade were necessarily revolutionaries.”²³

Pincus is reacting to Whig historians Macaulay and Trevelan.²⁴ and to more recent revisionists like Robert Bedard, John Miller, Mark Goldie, J. R. Western, Eveline Cruickshanks, and Tim Harris.²⁵ He particularly stresses that there was no such thing as an “Anglican Revolution” – the phrase is that of Goldie.²⁶

The position presented here argues that those who stood with and for the Anglican Church in 1688 and subsequently became Nonjurors very much preferred the outcome be an “Anglican Revolution.” They were in no sense revolutionaries, nor were the events of 1688-89 the “first modern revolution” as Pincus contends. Gibson is convincing when he writes: “The Revolution was undoubtedly an Anglican Revolution first and foremost. People chose their Church over their King.”²⁷ The Anglican establishment, certainly those who later became Nonjurors, were, however, far more “reluctant revolutionaries,” to use W. A. Speck’s phrase.²⁸ The argument I present here is consistently more in line

²³ Steve Pincus, *1688 the First Modern Revolution* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 7.

²⁴ Macaulay, *History of England*; George Macaulay Trevelyan, *The English Revolution 1688-1689* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1938).

²⁵ Robert Bedard, *A Kingdom without a King: The Journal of the Provisional Government in the Revolution of 1688* (Oxford: Phaidon Press, 1988), John Miller, *James II* (London: Methuen, 1978), 126-128; Mark Goldie, “James II and the Dissenter’s Revenge,” *Historical Research* 66 (February 1993): 53; J. R. Western, *Monarch and Revolution: The English State in the 1680s* (London: Blandford, 1972), 186, 190; Eveline Cruickshanks, *The Glorious Revolution*, (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 2000), 19-21; Tim Harris, *Revolution: The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720* (London: Allen Lane, 2006), 195.

²⁶ Pincus, *1688*, 179-180, 197-198; Mark Goldie, “The Political Thought of the Anglican Revolution” in *The Revolutions of 1688* ed. Robert Bedard (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 107-8, 111, 117-118. See also William Gibson, *The Church of England 1688-1832: Unity and Accord* (London: Routledge, 2001), especially chapter 2: “The Anglican Revolution.”

²⁷ Gibson, *James II and the Trial of the Seven Bishops*, 18.

²⁸ W. A. Speck, *Reluctant revolutionaries: Englishmen and the Revolution of 1688* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989).

with these revisionist historians to whose number I would add Clark, Cornwall, Holmes, Leighton, and Spurr and to their conclusions.

Another historian, Scott Sowerby, presents a picture of James II as far more “tolerant” than those enshrined in Whig historiography or in my argument here. Anglican churchmen became Nonjurors, in my view, because of deeply held religious convictions enhanced by an intense scrupulosity, not because of any political agenda. Conversely, Sowerby contends: “To be a certain kind of high tory was to oppose exclusion, rebellion, and revolution and to reject explicitly the anti-popish tropes that underpinned these political maneuvers. ... This form of critique helps to explain ... their tendency to become Nonjurors and Jacobites in the 1690s.”²⁹ Sowerby’s contention is accurate as far as it goes; however, the Nonjurors were opposed to “Papal Usurpation,” in George Hickes’s phrase, largely because of their Cyprianist mentality, their understanding that the international college of bishops formed the core authority and unity of the Church Catholic.³⁰ The Nonjurors’ stance was a far more positive, less reactive, and religious response than that seen by either Pincus or Sowerby. This chapter underscores the Nonjurors’ unique situation, stresses their moral and theological convictions, and challenges the modernist, secular narrative, while signposting, much like Goldie, the fact that many contemporaries recognized the Nonjurors’ personal integrity and credibility that gave them such great authority among High Churchmen and Tories.³¹ The

²⁹ Scott Sowerby, *Making Toleration, The Repealers and the Glorious Revolution* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2013), 85.

³⁰ George Hickes, *The Constitution of the Catholick Church* (London: 1716), 118.

³¹ Mark Goldie, “The Nonjurors, Episcopacy and the Origins of the Convocation Controversy” in *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1759*, ed. Eveline Cruickshanks (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers Ltd., 1982), 15-35.

Nonjurors, in my view, were the Anglican remnant of both the Caroline Divines³² and the Restoration Church. They continued that tradition as the true Church of England, and when jurors left, as they saw it, it was into schism. Their positions hardened and developed further following 1688-89, and continued to exert profound influence on the establishment, which they considered illegitimate. This persistence of an older Anglican, now nonjuring, mentality makes the Nonjurors' notion of obedience tremendously important in understanding the development of Anglican thinking and English politics in the long eighteenth century.

The Seven Bishops

Among the Nonjurors' concepts in case of royal disobedience was the doctrine they called Passive Obedience. This doctrine characterized the High Churchmen, and it embraced the all-important response of non-resistance in cases that were contrary to the divine order. Harris wrote, "Anglicans had always allowed for passive resistance, in the sense of non-compliance with the ungodly commands of the sovereign, so long as one peacefully accepted the punishments for one's disobedience."³³ Trevelyan described this Passive Obedience succinctly:

For the doctrine of non-resistance demanded only passive, not active, obedience to a tyrannical King. According to the High Church divines, St. Paul had taught that the Christians should submit to Nero, but not that they should fly to arms to defend their persecutor against a conspiracy of the Praetorian Guard."³⁴

³² For the Caroline Divines see J.R.H. Moorman, *A History of the Church of England* (London: A & C Black, 1986), 233-237; for the Restoration churchmen see Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England*.

³³ Harris, *Politics under the Later Stuarts*, 129-130.

³⁴ George Macaulay Trevelyan, *The English Revolution 1688-1689* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1938), 96-97.

In short, loyal Anglicans were never to rebel openly against lawful authority; neither were they to support evil. However, had Nonjurors never acted openly and publicly, the integrity of their position would never have been known by an entire nation. G. V. Bennett wrote in this regard: “The Nonjurors were few in number, but their effect on the great body of conforming Anglicans was profound: they were like a ghost of the past, confessors who stood in the ancient ways, devout, logical and insistent.”³⁵

Monod has argued that the word “passive” in this context does not translate well in modern use. A better phrase, for contemporary readers, might be “passive resistance,” which is precisely the action taken by the Seven Bishops in 1688. Monod sees this as the first way in which Nonjurors practiced Passive Obedience: “They failed to comply with King James’s orders regarding the Declaration of Indulgence, but they did not see themselves as resisters.”³⁶ He notes a second practical application of their cardinal doctrine as well, quoting Jeremy Collier: “though the Supreme Magistrate is unaccountable, yet his Ministers are not.”³⁷ Or, more simply put by Monod, “Everything objectionable in a monarch’s behaviour could be represented as the fault of bad advice from wicked counselors.”³⁸ The Nonjurors showed respect and obedience to the king

³⁵ G. V. Bennett, “Conflict in the Church,” in *Britain after the Glorious Revolution 1689-1714*, ed. Geoffrey Holmes (London: Macmillan and company, 1969), 159-160.

³⁶ Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People*, 19.

³⁷ Jeremy Collier *Vindiciae Juris Regii* (London: 1689), 40.

³⁸ Monod *Jacobitism and the English People*, 19.

while refusing in conscience to actively promote his illegal or immoral laws. In their minds, no crown minister of any rank was infallible or absolute.³⁹

The practical application of Passive Obedience resulted in the Nonjurors being “promoters of ‘Freedom’.”⁴⁰ Monarchy, argues Monod, was for the Nonjurors the best protection against anarchy and popular tyranny. Charles Leslie made this point in his nonjuring bi-weekly news journal *The Rehearsal*, published from 1704-1708: “To cure the *tyranny of a king*, by setting up the *people*, is setting 10000 *tyrants* over us instead of *one*.”⁴¹ The Nonjurors had no illusion about the mistakes of monarchs; they simply believed any other system was chaos.⁴² All authority came from God; the king derived his authority from God; all other authority in the state came from the king.⁴³ The bishops were an exception because their authority came directly from God by consecration; their appointment was, however, from the crown.⁴⁴ Leslie again wrote: “neither *lords*, nor *commons*, nor any *other* have any *authority*, but what they derive *wholly* and *solely* from the *crown*; and the *crown* holds of none but God.”⁴⁵ This, however, did not mean for Leslie, or other Nonjurors, that the king could act arbitrarily.

³⁹ Overton, *The Nonjurors*, 6-7, wrote: “The epithet ‘passive’ does not intensify, but mitigates the force of the word obedience, and the term ‘resistance’ is taken in its literal sense of opposing by actual – one might almost say physical – force.”

⁴⁰ Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People*, 19.

⁴¹ Charles Leslie, *A View of the Times, their Principles and Practices: in the ... Rehearsals* (London: , 1750), vol i, no. 51 (21 July 1705), 313.

⁴² *Ibid.*

⁴³ See Harris, *Politics under the Later Stuarts*, 96-97.

⁴⁴ Perhaps the best nonjuring exposition of this is Hickee, *The Constitution of the Catholick Church*.

⁴⁵ Charles Leslie, *A View of the Times, their Principles and Practices: in the ... Rehearsals* (London: , 1750), vol. I, no. 37, 7 April 1705, 227-8. Quoted in Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People*, 18.

He is *bound* by his *oath* to God at his *coronation*, as well as *promise* to his *people*. He is *bound* by all the *laws* of *justice* and *honor*. And I will add, that he is *bound* by his *interest* too ... For it cannot be his *interest* to *provoke* his *people*, lest factions should arise: of which there have been frequent and fatal *examples*.⁴⁶

Charles Leslie was arguably the most advanced nonjuring thinker with regard to the indefeasible divine right of the monarch.⁴⁷ His bi-weekly journal put Nonjurors right on equal footing with their opponents, who were championed by Daniel Defoe in his *Review* and John Tutchin in the *Observer*.⁴⁸ Even more radical thinkers like John Toland, John Dennis, Robert Molesworth, John Trenchard and Thomas Gordon formed an antithesis to Nonjurors' positions.⁴⁹ Both orthodox Nonjurors and their radical opponents were each moving away from Erastianism, but in exactly opposite directions. J. A. I. Champion's assessment is precise: "While non-jurors like George Hickes and Charles Leslie premised their clericalist vision on a defence of an independent and superior *sacerdotium*, the radicals extended the originally mild language of the royal supremacy into a fully blown denial of *sacerdos* and the absorption of the clerical body into the civil state."⁵⁰ The radical thinkers adopted the language of Erastianism and employed it to move toward a developed national Church as a civil religion. The Nonjurors took the opposite tack; the emphasis upon the apostolic succession with the divine authority of bishops and an episcopally consecrated priesthood - *sacerdotium* -

⁴⁶ Leslie, *A View of the Times*, vol. II, no. 140, 18 September 1706, 356.

⁴⁷ Hawkins, *Allegiance in Church and State*, 131-159.

⁴⁸ For the explosion of print culture see Roy Porter, *The Creation of the Modern World: The Untold Story of the British Enlightenment* (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 2000), 72-95.

⁴⁹ See J.A.I. Champion, *The Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken: The Church of England and its Enemies 1660-1730* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 178.

⁵⁰ Champion, *The Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken*, 180. For the Nonjurors' notion of *sacerdotium* undergirded by Apostolic Succession, see Cornwall, *Visible and Apostolic*, 12.

were foundational for nonjuring notions of authority. Leslie had argued that he began *The Rehearsal* to defend the Church;⁵¹ Champion's argument vis-à-vis the Church's opponents is thus thoroughly consistent with Leslie's stated purpose. Leslie went too far for the government, and *The Rehearsal* was closed in 1709; subsequently he went into hiding at Shottesbrooke and finally exile at the Jacobite court in France in 1711.⁵²

The Nonjurors promoted the rule of law as long as it was God's law. They revered the king and expected him to obey his coronation oath to God. And they thought the bishops — whose authority derived directly from God — were able to judge accurately if a king's ministers and policies missed the mark of divine obedience.

Passive Obedience had a long history. One of the earliest occurrences, if not by name then by action, was Robert Grosseteste (c. 1175-1253), Bishop of Lincoln's defiance of papal orders. In an oft-quoted line, "It is out of filial reverence and obedience that I disobey, resist, and rebel" he demonstrated a kind of passive resistance based on obedience to what he believed the proper authority of the Holy See. It is reasonable to assume that his conscience sought to obey God by passively resisting Pope Innocent IV.⁵³

At a later time James I wrote of obedience to royal authority and kingship by divine right.⁵⁴ Archbishop William Laud had done likewise: "These three, God, the King, and the Church, that is God, his Spouse, and his Lieutenant upon Earth, are so near allied

⁵¹ Charles Leslie *A Letter from A Gentleman in the City to his Friend in the Country, Concerning the threaten'd Prosecution of the Rehearsal, put into the News-Papers*. (London, 1708), 4.

⁵² See Robert D. Cornwall, "Leslie, Charles (1650–1722)," in *ODNB*.

⁵³ F. S. Stevenson, *Robert Grosseteste* (London, 1899), 311; Robert Grosseteste, *The Letters of Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln*, translated and annotated by F.A.C. Mantello and Joseph Goering (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010); R. W. Southern, "Grosseteste, Robert (c.1170–1253)," in *ODNB*.

⁵⁴ James I, *Basilikon Doron*, 1603; *The True Laws of Free Monarchies*, 1603; *The Duty of a King in his Royal Office*, 1642. See Hawkins, *Allegiance in Church and State*, especially chapter 1.

... that no man can serve any one of them truly but he serves all three.”⁵⁵ New ecclesiastical canons were promulgated for the Church of England in 1640. Canon I, “Concerning the Regal Power,” expressed the Anglican position.

The most high and sacred order of kings is of divine right, being the ordinance of God himself, founded in the prime laws of nature, and clearly established by express texts both of the Old and New Testaments. A supreme power is given to this most excellent order by God himself in the scriptures, which is, that kings should rule and command in their several dominions all persons of what rank or estate soever, whether ecclesiastical or civil, and that they should restrain and punish with the temporal sword all stubborn and wicked doers. ... For any person to set up, maintain, or avow in any of their said realms or territories respectively, under any pretence whatsoever, any independent coercive power, either papal or popular, (whether directly or indirectly) is to undermine their great royal office, and cunningly to overthrow that most sacred ordinance which God himself hath established; and so is treasonable against God as well as against the king. For subjects to bear arms against their kings, offensive or defensive, upon any pretence whatsoever, is at least to resist the powers which are ordained of God; and though they do not invade, but only resist, St. Paul tells them plainly they shall receive to themselves damnation.⁵⁶

These *Constitution and Canons Ecclesiastical, 1640*, reflected the high point of Laud’s influence. They were issued two years before the Civil War began, five years before the archbishop’s beheading, and nine years before the king’s execution, which Nonjurors always saw as martyrdom. The chaos during and following the Civil War convinced most High Churchman that rebellion could not be of God’s will, and at the

⁵⁵ William Laud, *Sermon preached at the opening of Parliament*, 6 February 1625,

⁵⁶ Canon I, “Concerning the Regal Power” from the *Constitution and Canons Ecclesiastical of 1640*, in Edward Cardwell, *A Collection of Articles of Religion, Canons, and Proceedings of Convocations in the Province of Canterbury from the Year 1547 to the Year 1717. With Notes Historical and Explanatory*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1842), 1:389-390.

Restoration, the concept of Passive Obedience reached an even fuller form of expression.⁵⁷

The Nonjurors in the 1690s sought to continue this doctrine and articulated it despite wholesale rejection by large segments of the political establishment.⁵⁸ This rejection was understandable when analyzed in the light of James II's attempts to rule without parliament and his vast extension of the royal prerogative, including the king's dispensing power, that virtually nullified laws of the realm. What was intended as an individual exception to particular laws for the welfare or safety of the realm became under James II license not to enforce laws universally, with the result that he supplanted the legitimate role and rejected the authority of parliament.⁵⁹

The crisis point came in the spring of 1688 when the monarch decided by royal prerogative to reissue his *Declaration for Liberty of Conscience* – usually referred to as the Second Declaration of Indulgence – with an order in council requiring all bishops to instruct their clergy by godly admonition to read it in the Diocese of London churches on the last two Sundays of May, 1688, and in other dioceses of the kingdom on the first two Sundays of June.⁶⁰ This requirement forced the hand of Archbishop Sancroft who summoned his diocesan bishops to Lambeth Palace to defend the Church. James's plan, in the bishops's minds, was a virtual disestablishment of the Church of England. Though

⁵⁷ See J.P. Kenyon, *Revolution Principles: The Politics of Party 1689-1720* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 65-66; Clark, *English Society 1660-1832*, 52-66; G. J. Warnock, "On Passive Obedience." *History of European Ideas* 7, no. 6 (1986), 555-562.

⁵⁸ Hawkins, *Allegiance in Church and State*, 55. Hawkins wrote, "They developed the doctrines which they found to hand in a manner determined by the circumstances of their day, but the faith was not of their making, it was their inheritance."

⁵⁹ See Craig Rose, *England in the 1690s, Revolution, Religion and War* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999), especially chapter 1.

⁶⁰ *London Gazette*, May 7, 1688, cited in Macaulay, *History of England*, 2:13.

not inherently intolerant of other Christians, they did believe the Established Church the one true expression of the Church Catholic in England. This was made clear in the coronation oath that the king had broken.⁶¹ To this end, Sancroft, had devised an ecumenical plan with which to approach the more moderate nonconformists.⁶²

The Nonjurors' concept of Passive Obedience was shaped by the ordeal of the Seven Bishops imprisoned and tried by James II in June 1688.⁶³ The Seven had achieved the status of national heroes for refusing to read the second Declaration of Indulgence earlier that year. The impact of their trial and imprisonment can scarcely be overestimated. Trevelyan described the trial of the Seven Bishops as "the greatest historical drama that ever took place before an authorized English law court."⁶⁴ G.E. Aylmer claimed, "This was the first really major law case to go against the executive under either monarchy or republic" ... "In a sense it marks the emancipation of the judiciary."⁶⁵

⁶¹ See William Gibson, *James II and the Trial of the Seven Bishops*, 19. Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People*, 18.

⁶² Harris, *Politics under the Later Stuarts*, 128-129; Agnes Strickland, *The Lives of the Seven Bishops committed to the Tower in 1688 Enriched and Illustrated with Personal Letters, now first published, from the Bodleian Library* (London: Bell and Daldy, 1866), 72. See also Gibson, *James II and the Trial of the Seven Bishops*, 198, and John Spurr, *The Post Reformation: Religion, Politics and Society 1603-1714* (Harrow: Pearson Longman, 2006), 178-179.

⁶³ The Seven Bishops were: William Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury, William Lloyd, Bishop of St. Asaph, Francis Turner, Bishop of Ely, John Lake, Bishop of Chichester, Thomas Ken, Bishop of Bath and Wells, Thomas White, Bishop of Peterborough, and Sir Jonathan Trelawney, Bart., Bishop of Bristol. Five of the Seven later became the first Nonjurors - Sancroft, Turner, Lake, Ken, and White. Lake died within the year, during the interval between 1 August and 1 February 1690-91, and thus was never actually deprived.

⁶⁴ Trevelyan, *The English Revolution 1688-1689*, 93-94.

⁶⁵ G. E. Aylmer, *The Struggle for the Constitution: England in the Seventeenth Century* (London: Blandford Press, 1963), 205.

Popular support for the bishops was immense. Many questioned why these clergymen who had been absolutely loyal to the king were imprisoned? Pincus writes, “Everyone in England was obsessed with the Seven Bishops and their trial in late May and June 1688.”⁶⁶ The public vision of the Seven Bishops, standing in the dock and imprisoned in the Tower of London, united the English people across party lines as nothing else could have done.⁶⁷ The Seven Bishops, according to Gibson, “became heroes for the people of London.”⁶⁸

The imprisoned bishops acted out of conscience shaped by their notion of Passive Obedience. Passive Obedience resembled somewhat the modern notion of civil disobedience. Craig Rose writes: “The Church of England defied the King at every turn, resisting him not by force — this remained anathema to a Church which prided itself on its loyalty to the Crown — but through a campaign of civil disobedience.”⁶⁹ Spurr also calls the Seven Bishops’s actions “civil disobedience.”⁷⁰ There is, however, one significant difference; civil disobedience generally implies an overt, deliberate action that openly engages in the disobedience of law as the lesser of two evils or the active response to injustice.⁷¹ Passive Obedience involved the posture of non-resistance including non-compliance with that which one could not in conscience do. The first *Declaration of*

⁶⁶ Pincus, *1688*, 196.

⁶⁷ Trevelyan, *The English Revolution 1688-1689*, 93-94.; Pincus, *1688*, 197.

⁶⁸ William Gibson, *The Church of England 1688-1832: Unity and Accord* (London: Routledge, 2001), 31.

⁶⁹ Rose, *England in the 1690s*, 2. See also Tim Harris, *Politics under the Later Stuarts: Party Conflict in a Divided Society 1660-1715* (Harlow, 1993), 123-128.

⁷⁰ Spurr, *The Post-Reformation* 178. Spurr is correct in stating that “It was this petition ... which became a symbol of the church’s resistance to royal policy.”

⁷¹ See Daniel B. Stevick, *Civil Disobedience and the Christian* (New York: Seabury Press, 1969), especially chapter four “The Tradition of Christian Dissent (2).”

Indulgence issued by James in 1688 had not required the clergy do anything, though most thought the King's actions illegal and reprehensible to the Church of England. They were, however, not required to act. Conversely, the second *Declaration of Indulgence* directed the clergy to read the document from their pulpits, and required active support of that which they believed wrong, and they refused. They did not see themselves disobeying God, King, or the laws of the realm for the order was contrary to all three.⁷² Bennett called the bishops posture a "protest" albeit, in their mind, a passive one. Bennett wrote "as reports came up to them [the bishops] from the dioceses of the full extent of the ecclesiastical revolution [effected by James II], they found themselves moved, however unwillingly, to protest." Furthermore, "The famous petition of the Seven Bishops was an uneasy bid by a group of Court loyalists to save the authority of their Church by warning the King and calling him back to the path of moderate authoritarianism."⁷³ "The petition itself," as Spurr describes it, "was at pains to explain that the clergy were neither disobedient to the monarch nor lacking in 'due tenderness to Dissenters,' ... but they simply understood the dispensing and suspending power to be illegal."⁷⁴ Goldie is clear that it was on grounds of "conscience" that those who resisted James II did so.⁷⁵

When the Archbishop summoned his suffragans to Lambeth in May of 1688, it was essentially to draft a petition that would subsequently be hand-delivered to the king.

⁷² See Spurr, *The Post-Reformation*, 178.

⁷³ G. V. Bennett, "Conflict in the Church" in *Britain after the Glorious Revolution 1689-1714*, ed. Geoffrey Holmes (London: Macmillan, 1969), 159.

⁷⁴ Spurr, *The Post-Reformation*, 178.

⁷⁵ Goldie, "The Political Thought of the Anglican Revolution," 112,117.

This solidarity reinforced their refusal in conscience to do as their sovereign lord required, but also in their minds showed their loyalty and obedience to his person.⁷⁶

The letter was written in Sancroft's own hand, presumably with suggestions from the bishops gathered around him. The Archbishop, Lloyd, Turner, Lake, Ken, White, and Trelawny signed it. The six co-signers carried it to the king's court without Sancroft, who was exhausted and in declining health.⁷⁷ The letter read:

The humble petition of William, Archbishop of Canterbury, and of divers suffragan bishops of that province now present with him, in behalf of themselves and others of their absent brethren, and of the clergy of their respective dioceses, Humbly sheweth, That the great averseness they find in themselves to the distributing and publishing in all their churches your Majesty's late declaration for liberty of conscience proceedeth neither from any want of duty and obedience to your Majesty, our Holy Mother, the Church of England, being both in her principles and constant practice unquestionably loyal nor yet from any want or due tenderness to dissenters, in relation to whom they are willing to come to such a temper as shall be thought fit when that matter shall be considered and settled in parliament and Convocation, but among many other considerations from this especially, because that declaration is founded upon such a dispensing power as hath often been declared illegal in parliament, and particularly in the years 1662, 1672, and in the beginning of your Majesty's reign, and is a matter of so great moment and consequence to the whole nation, both in Church and State, that your petitioners cannot in prudence, honour or conscience so far make themselves parties to it as the distribution of it all over the nations, and the solemn publication of it once and again even in God's house and in the time of His divine service, must amount to in common and reasonable construction. Your petitioners therefore most humbly and earnestly beseech your Majesty that you will be graciously pleased not to insist upon their distributing and reading your Majesty's said declaration.⁷⁸

⁷⁶ See R. Thomas "The Seven Bishops and their Petition" 18 May 1688" *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* xii (1961), 56-70; G. V. Bennett "The Seven Bishops: a Reconsideration" in *Religious Motivation: Biographical and Sociological Problems for the Church Historian*, ed. D. Baker (Oxford: Blackwell, 1978), 267-287.

⁷⁷ Gibson, *James II and the Trial of the Seven Bishops*, 87.

⁷⁸ "The Seven Bishop's Letter" quoted in *Sources of English Constitutional History*, ed. Carl Stephenson and Frederick George Marcham (New York: Harper & Row, 1937). 583-84.

The king's response was telling. He immediately recognized Sancroft's handwriting, and upon reading the document, exclaimed, "This is a great surprise to me; here are strange words. I did not expect this from you. This is a standard of rebellion."⁷⁹ It was obvious that the crown and church were operating under different paradigms. Gibson writes, "A bruising interview between James and the seven bishops emphasized that the bishops did not regard themselves as disloyal or as triggering a rebellion."⁸⁰

The Church of England had always been the Stuarts's greatest defender – Laud and Charles I died for the same cause. Bishop Lake of Chichester had been a soldier who fought two years for Charles I, received many wounds, and distinguished himself at Basing House and again at Wallingford, one of the very last army garrisons that stood for the Stuarts. His loyalty and obedience were unimpeachable. As Lake described this relationship to James II, he recalled more recent loyalty: "We put down the last rebellion [the Duke of Monmouth's], we shall not raise another."⁸¹ Bishop Lloyd, who had presented the petition, stated, "We would lose the last drop of our blood, rather than lift a finger against your Majesty." The king replied, "I tell you this is a standard of rebellion." Bishop Trelawny knelt before the king and protested, "Rebellion Sir! I beseech your Majesty not to say so hard a thing of us. For God's sake do not believe we are, or can be, guilty of rebellion. It is impossible that I, or any of my family, should do so."⁸² Trelawney, also had served the king in putting down the Duke of Monmouth's

⁷⁹ Strickland, *Lives of the Seven Bishops*, 61; Gibson, *James II and the Trial of the Seven Bishops*, 88.

⁸⁰ Gibson, *The Church of England 1688-1832*, 31. There were only six bishops present at the initial interview. The letter was from all seven and at subsequent meetings all seven were present.

⁸¹ Gibson, *The Church of England 1688-1832*, 88.

⁸² Strickland, *Lives of the Seven Bishops*, 61; Gibson, *James II and the Trial of the Seven Bishops*, 89.

rebellion. Bishop Turner firmly stated, ““We are ready to die at your Majesty’s feet.””
Turner may have been kneeling as he spoke.⁸³

Clearly the notions of obedience radically differed between the two parties. The bishops believed it possible to be obedient and not to act as the king demanded. Arguably, the king believed his every idea should be the belief of the bishops. The discussion subsequently turned on the nature of the dispensing power. Bishop White told James, ““what we say of the dispensing power refers only to what was declared in parliament.”” He meant the royal prerogative to dispense was to be applied only to individuals in particular cases, but did not include the power to nullify the laws enacted by parliament. The king challenged this position and proclaimed, ““The dispensing power was never questioned by the men of the Church of England.”” This was correct, but, no sovereign had ever used the power to dispense wholesale as did James II. Bishop Ken who provided the bishops’ summation: ““I hope that you will grant to us that liberty of conscience which you remit to all mankind ... We are bound to fear God and honour the king. We desire to do both. We will honour you; we must fear God.””⁸⁴ James wrath continued unabated, and he insisted that the only true obedience for the bishops was to publish his declaration, the very thing they were committed not to do.⁸⁵

This narrative was recounted by Sancroft who was not present at the meeting. The bishops presumably returned to Lambeth to give him their report, and the archbishop made notes and later constructed the narrative. This raises suspicions about the verbatim

⁸³ Strickland, *Lives of the Seven Bishops*, 61.

⁸⁴ Sancroft’s Narrative printed from the Tanner MSS; See Strickland, *The Lives of the Seven Bishops*, 62; Macaulay, *History of England*, 2: 318-319.

⁸⁵ Gibson, *James II and the Trial of the Seven Bishops*, 85-90.

nature of Sancroft's record. It does show us how those who became the first Nonjurors thought. No doubt the king would have written it differently. All of the bishops, according to Sancroft, genuflected before the king and rendered all due deference. The author pointed out the record of obedient service in time of war, both the Civil War in Lake's case, and Monmouth's Rebellion in Trelawny's. Sancroft noted Turner's pledge of his own life in obedience to the king. Bishop White, according to Sancroft, raised an issue of constitutional law, one that the king may have thought settled by the recent case of *Godden versus Hales* (1686) in which a majority of eleven out of twelve judges allowed James II to dispense individuals from the Test Acts.⁸⁶ The bishops seemed to argue that the royal prerogative in dispensing one person for reasons important to the nation was very different from nullifying laws of parliament. Finally, the archbishop relates Ken's argument, basic to their whole stance; obedience is due both king and God, but God comes first. The point is none of the bishops thought they were being disobedient, rather they were practicing passive obedience, convinced it was a hallmark of their church. James II had a radically different understanding.⁸⁷

Matters worsened that evening, when press hawkers on the streets of London began circulating the bishops' petition in print.⁸⁸ Strickland called the speed of publicity "without precedent" and, in her account, within two hours it "was bawled about the streets," then followed by the evening papers.⁸⁹ This was a striking illustration of the

⁸⁶ See Barry Coward, *The Stuart Age England 1603-1714* (London: Longman, 1994), 339.

⁸⁷ See William Gibson, *James II and the Trial of the Seven Bishops*, 137; Steven C. A. Pincus, "James II, Thoughts on the Revolution, 1690s" in *England's Glorious Revolution 1688-1689, A Brief History with Documents* (New York: Bedford-St. Martin's, 2006), 87-90.

⁸⁸ Gibson, *James II and the Trial of the Seven Bishops*, 90-92.

⁸⁹ Strickland, *The Lives of the Seven Bishops*, 62-63.

power and speed of the press at the time. This incident was not forgotten by the Nonjurors or their opponents in years to come.⁹⁰ The king's efforts to use the bishops and their parochial clergy to publish his Second Declaration were to have taken weeks. Conversely, the printers managed to make public the Seven Bishops's Letter within hours. It became, in Pincus's words, "an immediate sensation."⁹¹ The difference in venue was important. The king thought the parishes of the Church of England were the center of communication, a largely medieval idea. The printers knew gossipmongers and coffee house patrons would buy their printed broadsheets and pamphlets much more rapidly than churchgoers on Sunday mornings, a modern notion that would be the norm in the eighteenth century. James II was quick to learn, and soon published his own pamphlet, creating, in Gibson's phrase, "a propaganda war."⁹² At this time, another anonymous letter was printed and sent to every clergyman of the Church of England by post. It described the danger posed by not reading the king's declaration, but warned of the far greater danger in actually reading it: "If we read the Declaration, we fall to rise no more ... We fall amidst the curses of a nation whom our compliance will have ruined."⁹³ The speed with which the printed news traveled was crucial. Virtually none of the clergymen countrywide read the *Declaration* on the appointed Sundays.⁹⁴

⁹⁰ See Gibson, *James II and the Trial of the Seven Bishops*, 199.

⁹¹ Pincus, *1688*, 193.

⁹² Gibson, *James II and the Trial of the Seven Bishops*, 92-96.

⁹³ Macaulay, *History of England*, 2:320.

⁹⁴ Macaulay, *History of England*, 2:321-325, gives the numbers of clergymen reading the Declaration as about one in fifty: in London only four, in Chester three, Norwich four, and the Bishop of Worcester refused to distribute the Declaration to his clergy at all. See Gibson, *James II and the Trial of the Seven Bishops*, 97-98, 100-105.

The king delayed action against the bishops for nine days. During that interval five more bishops – the Bishops of Norwich, Gloucester, Salisbury, Winchester and Exeter – signed the petition knowing full well the danger in doing so. It is important to note that in these nine days the news had spread to, and been acted upon by five bishops, in essentially rural dioceses far from the metropolis.⁹⁵ “As diocesan bishops,” William Gibson wrote, “they brought a territorial actuality to their persecution; the people of Canterbury, Ely, Chichester, Bristol, St. Asaph, Bath and Wells, and Peterborough found their religious leaders gaoled and on trial.”⁹⁶ It was now rapidly becoming nationwide news. The king’s dictate had been challenged privately by the bishops, and publicly by the press.

Nine days later, on 8 June 1688 at five in the afternoon, the Seven Bishops appeared before the king in his council chamber. Sancroft was wary of the king’s intent and far too prudent to say anything incriminating. The interrogation of the clergymen apparently began with the lord chancellor asking if the petition was indeed theirs? Sancroft answered, ““If your Majesty lays your command upon us, we shall answer it in trust upon your Majesty’s justice and generosity that we shall not suffer for our obedience as we must if our answer should be brought in evidence against us.””⁹⁷

Finally, after the bishops acknowledged their signatures, the king and lord chancellor bound them over for trial at Westminster Hall because they had published a seditious libel; Sancroft protested that as peers of the realm they should be tried before

⁹⁵ Macaulay, *History of England*, 2:324. It is possible that some of these bishops may have been resident in London during this interval.

⁹⁶ Gibson, *James II and the Trial of the seven Bishops*, 18.

⁹⁷ Strickland, *The Lives of the Seven Bishops*, 64-65; Gibson, *James II and the Trial of the seven Bishops*, 105-109.

the House of Lords. The king did not want them to await trial in prison and offered them "recognizances" — what we today call bond — in order that they might return home. The bishops refused the offer, and the king ordered them taken to the Tower.⁹⁸

Meanwhile, outside the Privy Council thousands of people gathered waiting news of the Seven. When they appeared on the Whitehall steps under guard and were taken by barge down the Thames to the Tower of London, sympathetic Londoners passionately expressed their support with cheers for the prisoners. Soldiers knelt and asked their benediction.⁹⁹ It must be remembered that Sancroft had done much for London's poor, built the new cathedral after the fire, and seen the diocese through plague and poverty. The cheering continued from both banks and at the Traitors' Gate where they disembarked, they once again were shown respect by the soldiers, some of whom knelt asking their blessing, others toasted their good health. The Seven went quickly to the chapel for evensong after which they were given freedom the freedom to move about the Tower. The next day "a concourse of the nobility and persons of distinction" visited them.¹⁰⁰ Their imprisonment lasted only seven days; on June 15 they were taken with a writ of habeas corpus to the Court of King's Bench where they were seated in chairs, a dignity rarely given those prosecuted by the crown. This time, the Seven accepted the offer of recognizances and were bound over for trial on 29 June 1688 at Westminster Hall.¹⁰¹

⁹⁸ Gibson, *James II and the Trial of the seven Bishops*, 109-113.

⁹⁹ Gibson, *James II and the Trial of the Seven Bishops*, 109-110.

¹⁰⁰ Strickland, *The Lives of the Seven Bishops*, 67.

¹⁰¹ Gibson, *James II and the Trial of the Seven Bishops*, 114-123.

“England’s most prominent nobles and gentlemen,” writes Pincus, “came from all across the country to attend the bishops’ trial.”¹⁰² Over thirty peers of the realm were in attendance and the highest level of publicity attended the case.¹⁰³ The jury was kept cloistered during the night, unable to decide; early the next morning the foreman, Sir Roger Langley, notified the Lord Chief Justice that they had arrived at a verdict. As the not guilty finding was announced, the Marquis of Halifax reputedly waved his hat in the air and cried “Huzza,” and, if the legends are correct, this cry filled the hall instantly and spread, “to the Palace Yard and round Westminster Abbey, from whence, like the roll and roar of thunder, it was carried in and through the streets of London, and thence, as fast as it could fly, over the whole kingdom.”¹⁰⁴

The prosecution of the trial is beyond the scope of this work, but the acquittal of the Seven and the celebration that accompanied it are not.¹⁰⁵ Pincus writes, “Commentators across the political spectrum later claimed that after the Seven Bishops’ case the entire political nation turned against James II and his regime.”¹⁰⁶ That night many houses of London displayed seven candles in their windows, votive lights for the Seven Bishops. These were, according to Gibson, not just symbolic of the Seven Bishops, but also apocalyptic, “a clear allusion to the sacred candlesticks in the Book of

¹⁰² Pincus, 1688, 196.

¹⁰³ Strickland, *The Lives of the Seven Bishops*, 70-71; Gibson, *James II and the Trial of the Seven Bishops*, 123.

¹⁰⁴ Strickland, *The Lives of the Seven Bishops*, 70-71; Gibson, *James II and the Trial of the Seven Bishops*, 132-133.

¹⁰⁵ *The proceedings and tryal in the case of the Most Reverend Father in God, William Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, ... in the Court of King's-Bench at Westminster, in Trinity-Term, in the fourth year of the reign of King James the Second annoque [sic] dom. 1688* (London, 1735).

¹⁰⁶ Pincus, 1688, 197.

Revelation.”¹⁰⁷ The Lord Mayor tried to stop the lighting of bonfires, but to little avail.¹⁰⁸ The Seven upon release walked into the sunlight with the church bells pealing for St. Peter’s Day, and the bishops immediately entered the Chapel Royal at Whitehall.¹⁰⁹ The bells would have been ringing for Morning Prayer and, if the proper lessons for St. Peter’s Day were used, the epistle for the feast was, and still is today, Acts 12:1-11, the story of Peter’s miraculous deliverance from prison. The parallels were too obvious to go unnoticed. The entire celebration took on the aura of miraculous deliverance from an oppressor and divine providence in action.¹¹⁰ As Gibson concludes, “What ensured that James was spurned as a tyrant and William welcomed as a saviour was the imprisonment and trial of the seven bishops.”¹¹¹

This was arguably James II’s worst decision ever. Trevelyan pronounced him “obstinate in the belief his father [Charles I] had fallen because he made concessions,” and James, surrounded by “flatterers who deceived him in order to cling to their offices,” simply “flung into the loaded mine the lighted match of the trial of the Seven Bishops.”¹¹² Some modern historians have suggested much the same; for Gibson: “The trial of the seven bishops was James’s El Alamein; before it he had not been defeated;

¹⁰⁷ Gibson, *James II and the Trial of the Seven Bishops*, 134.

¹⁰⁸ Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution*, 196.

¹⁰⁹ The day of their trial was in fact St. Peter’s Day; it was actually 30 June 1688 when they were acquitted.

¹¹⁰ Strickland, *The Lives of the Seven Bishops*, 67. Strickland describing this defining moment, which by her time in 1866 had assumed legendary authority, wrote, “Such a scene was never witnessed there before, and probably never will again. Love for the Church of England was the prevailing sentiment, and these seven bishops were regarded as its champions.”

¹¹¹ Gibson, *James II and the Trial of the Seven Bishops*, 18.

¹¹² Trevelyan, *The English Revolution 1688-1689*, 86-87.

after it he had no successes.”¹¹³ With regard to the Seven Bishops’s acquittal, Mark Kishlansky wrote, “James bristled: ‘So much the worse for them.’ In fact he had written his own epitaph.”¹¹⁴ To make matters worse for the King, the Archbishop of Canterbury was not available to witness the birth of the Prince of Wales on 10 June 1688. Unfortunately, for the crown, the trial “upstaged,” as Harris writes, “what for James was the most momentous event of that summer.”¹¹⁵

Faithful, loyal Anglicans carried bronze coins depicting the Seven Bishops because they saw the imprisoned prelates as champions of freedom or defenders of the Church.¹¹⁶ Even Nonconformists saw the Seven as heroes and believed the king's action would destroy the nation's laws and the Protestant religion.¹¹⁷ The press engaged the wider public in the propaganda of the revolution; “There was a material culture, and willingness to use it,” according to Gibson, “that brought the Glorious Revolution into people’s homes.”¹¹⁸ Historians will continue to debate the 1688-89 Revolution, but one

¹¹³ Gibson, *James II and the Trial of the Seven Bishops*, 19.

¹¹⁴ Mark Kishlansky, *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain 1603-1714* (London: Allen Lane: The Penguin Press, 1996), 265.

¹¹⁵ Tim Harris, *Revolution: The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720* (London: Penguin Books, 2007), 268f.

¹¹⁶ Gibson, *James II and the Trial of the Seven Bishops*, 16.

¹¹⁷ Macaulay, *History of England*, 2: 314; Harris, *Revolution 1685-1720*, 263; Pincus, 1688, 197. For an account of Comprehension as a High Church policy in 1688 largely led by Sancroft, see George Every, *The High Church Party, 1688-1718* (1956), ch. 2; Norman Sykes, *From Sheldon to Secker: Aspects of English Church History 1660-1768* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1959), 89, argued that “Comprehension indeed faded out of the realm of practical politics with the Non-juror Schism.” Tony Claydon, *William III and the Godly Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 164, argued that Sancroft’s position was: “Anglicans might consider concession [to Dissenters] as the price of strengthening themselves in the battle with James’s popery.”

¹¹⁸ Gibson, *James II and the Trial of the Seven Bishops*, 199.

thing above argument is the symbolic importance, albeit employed in different ways for different purposes, of the Seven Bishops.



Figure 1: The Medal: “Trial of the Seven Bishops” by G. Bower, 1688,
British Museum, Department of Coins and Medals, No. 273

George Bower¹¹⁹ wasted no time following the Seven Bishops acquittal on 30 June 1688 to design a memorial coin and to create the die by which it would be cast.¹²⁰

¹¹⁹ W. W. Wroth, “Bower, George (d. 1690),” rev. Stuart Handley, in *ODNB*.

The likenesses were recognizable and the symbolism of the coin readily understood.¹²¹

On the obverse of this sterling silver coin Bower placed a bust of Archbishop Sancroft with the inscription:

GUIL.SANCROFT.ARCHIEPISC.CANTVAR.M.D. C.L.XXXVIII.

At the bottom center of the medal was “GB F[ecit]” — that is, made by George Bower.

On the reverse were the other six bishops with Bishop Compton of London, who had been inhibited previously, and had not signed the petition to the King.¹²² This casting was Bower’s action in openly memorializing a recent event that had assumed such popularity that profit from the coin’s sale was assured. Bower would later cast another memorial coin commemorating William and Mary’s accession.¹²³

Different makers eventually struck other medals. The visitor to the British Museum will find seven different ones on display — five English, one Dutch, and one French — in the Department of Coins and Medals.¹²⁴ One interesting example struck in 1688 had on the reverse the Seven Bishops, as in Bower’s medal, but with the inscription “Wisdom hath builded her house - She hath hewn out her Seven Pillars” from Proverbs

¹²⁰ “Trial of the Seven Bishops” by G. Bower, 1688, British Museum, Department of Coins and Medals, No. 273, Obverse, Bust of Sncrift r., in robes and skell cap. GVIL. SANCRIFT ARCHIEPISC. 1688. Reverse, Medallions with portraits of the six Bishops ; in center another of Bishop of London: stars in field. G.B.F.; on edge, SI FRACTUS ILLABATVR ORBIS IMPAUDOSFERIENT RUINAE. (Hor. Car. III. 3. 8.) Silver. Size 2. Struck. By G. Bowyer.

¹²¹ Strickland, *The Lives of the Seven Bishops*, 72. The portrait from which the likenesses were taken was in the collection of Walter Strickland, Esquire of Cokethorpe Hall, Oxfordshire.

¹²² All of the bishops were in oval portraits, vesting in rochet and chimere, with six stars to symbolize those who accompanied Sancroft to prison. Sancroft, Ken, Lake, Turner, and Compton also wear skullcaps.

¹²³ W. W. Wroth, “Bower , George (*d.* 1690),” rev. Stuart Handley, in *ODNB*.

¹²⁴ The British Museum, Department of Coins and Medals, catalogue numbers 1167, 1168, 1169, 1170, 1171, 1172, and 1173.

9:1; on the reverse it had a Jesuit with a pickaxe and James II with a shovel striking at the Church with this inscription circling: “The Gates of Hell shall not Prevaile”.¹²⁵

The National Portrait Gallery has a portrait of *The Seven Bishops Committed to the Tower in 1688* by John Smith who died in 1743.¹²⁶ The picture has the seven imprisoned without Compton, each with a single burning taper and a bishop’s miter surmounts each oval portrait. Clark chose as the frontispiece for his *English Society 1660-1832* the painting, *The Seven Bishops*, subsequently reproduced as a print. Similar in style, it has the seven miters, but with the Four Evangelists in the corners of the print, and the eye of God looking down upon the Seven. Clark maintains this was the “most important image produced during the Revolution of 1688, it marked men’s perception that the survival of the Church had been the central issue.” He asserts it is possible by internal evidence to date this particular image as late as 1740.¹²⁷

Others, of course, appropriated the story, and some Whigs told it as if their own.¹²⁸ High Churchmen and Tories, with perhaps more justification, claimed the Seven as well. Thomas Lathbury wrote of the Seven Bishops’s action and imprisonment, “By the overruling Providence of Almighty God, this step proved the most eventful in its

¹²⁵ *Medallic Illustrations*, vol. I, 42, 625; Christopher Eimer, *British Commemorative Medals and their Values*, 289 (London, 2010), 289.

<http://www.londoncoins.co.uk/?page=Pastresults&auc=137&searchlot=1095&searchtype=2>

¹²⁶ *The Seven Bishops Committed to the Tower in 1688* possibly published by John Smith, after Unknown artist, mezzotint, 1688, 7 1/2 in. x 5 3/8 in. (189 mm x 138 mm) plate size, small margins, Purchased, 1944, Reference Collection, National Portrait Gallery, NPG D11942.

<http://www.npg.org.uk/collections/search/portrait.php?search=ap&npgno=D11942>

¹²⁷ Clark, *English Society 1660-183*, frontispiece.

¹²⁸ Clark, *English Society 1660-1832*, 87.

consequences of all the measures adopted by his Majesty.”¹²⁹ Their courage and integrity in following their conscience were woven into the fabric of the eighteenth century.¹³⁰ As late as 1902 John Ryle could write of the seven bishops: “They [the bishops] are of unspeakable importance. They stand out ... in the landscape of English history, like Tabor in Palestine, and no Englishmen ought ever to forget them. To the trial of the Seven Bishops we owe our second deliverance from Popery.”¹³¹

While different parties and parishioners might understand the symbolism of the Seven Bishops’s ordeal differently, for the Nonjurors it meant an unswerving obedience to God and king, in that order. It embraced a notion of Passive Obedience as well as indefeasible divine right, and ultimately revealed their deep seated conviction of obedience to Scripture, to the Tradition, and to the Crown. It also thrust the bishops into the forefront of national life and underscored their importance for High Churchmen. The five who later became Nonjurors and those who followed them comprised as Julian Hoppit writes, “a small force to be reckoned with well into the eighteenth century” and, “a potent reminder to the church of England of how severely tested its principles had been in the crisis of 1688-9 and of how many had, ultimately, sacrificed those principles at the altar of pragmatism.”¹³² It was always as Bishop Ken reputedly said to James II,

¹²⁹ Thomas Lathbury, *A History of the Nonjurors: Their Controversies and Writings, With Remarks on Some of the Rubrics in the Book of Common Prayer* (London: William Pickering, 1845), 6 .

¹³⁰ For the persistence of the power of Passive Obedience well into the long eighteenth century see J. C.D. Clark, *The Language of Liberty 1660-1832: Political Discourse and Social Dynamics in the Anglo-American World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994),188.

¹³¹ J.C. Ryle, “James II and the Seven Bishops” in *Light from Old Times* (London: Charles J. Thynne, 1902).

¹³² Julian Hoppit, *A Land of Liberty? England 1689-1727* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 217.

“We are bound to fear God and honour the king. We desire to do both. We will honour you; we must fear God.”¹³³

Bishop John Lake’s Dying Profession

Bishop Lake died on 30 August 1689 and was not deprived, although Overton claimed, the Nonjurors “gladly recognized” him as a “confessor for their cause.”¹³⁴ In August he had executed a formally witnessed and widely circulated deathbed confession that J.C.D. Clark says, “...summed up the central message of Nonjuror doctrine.”¹³⁵ The declaration was carefully constructed to witness to a community’s values, and the witnesses were representative of the nonjuring community. Robert Jenkins, the bishop’s chaplain, went on to be Master of St John’s College Cambridge, a major stronghold for Nonjurors. After Lake’s death George Hickes became the central leader of the Nonjurors who chose to continue the schism in 1713. None had forgotten the bishop’s message.

¹³³Sancroft’s Narrative printed from the Tanner MSS; Strickland, *The Lives of the Seven Bishops*, 62 , Macaulay, *History of England from the Accession of James II*, 318-319.

¹³⁴ Overton, *The Nonjurors*, 25.

¹³⁵ Clark, *English Society 1660-1832*, 85.

DECLARATION
Of the Right Reverend Father in God
JOHN
Late Lord Bishop of Chichester
UPON HIS
DEATH-BED

Being called by a Sick (and I think a Dying) Bed, and the good hand of God upon me in it, to take the Last and Best *Viaticum*, the Sacrament of my dear Lord's Body and Blood, I take my self obliged to make this short Recognition and Confession, That whereas I was baptized into the Religion of the Church of *England*, and sucked it in with my Milk, I have constantly adhered to it thorough the whole Course of my Life, and now, if it so be the will of God, shall dye in it, and had resolved, through God's grace assisting me, to have dyed so, though at a Stake. And whereas that Religion of the Church of *England* taught me the Doctrine of Non-resistance and Passive Obedience, which I have accordingly inculcated upon others, and which I took to be the distinguishing Character of the Church of *England*, I adhere no less firmly and steadfastly to that; and in consequence of it have incurred a Suspension from the Exercise of my Office, and expected a Deprivation. I find in so doing much inward Satisfaction; and if the Oath had been tendered at the Peril of my Life, I could only have obeyed by Suffering.

I desire you my worthy Friends and Brethren to bear Witness of this upon Occasion, and to believe it as the Words of a dying man, and who is now engaged in the most Sacred and Solemn Act of Conversing with God in this World, and may, for ought he knows to the contrary, appear with these very Words in his Mouth at the Dreadful Tribunal.

Aug. 27, 1689

Manu propria subscripsit
Jo. Cicestrensis

This Declaration was read and subscribed by the Bishop

In the Presence of:

Dr. Green, *the Parish Minister*.

Dr. Hickes, *Dean of Worcester*.

Mr. Jenkins, *his Lordship's Chaplain*.

Mr. Powell, his Secretary.

Mr. Wilson, *his Amanuensis*.

*Who all communicated with him.*¹³⁶

¹³⁶ Reproduced in Clark, *English Society 1660-1832*, 85.

This formal and deliberately constructed statement embodied every aspect of the Nonjurors' worldview. First, it is set in the context of the Eucharist – central to Nonjurors' practice – and all present received Communion with him. It included the bishop's reference to his baptism, upbringing, lifelong adherence to, and hopefully death within, the Church of England. The parish priest was the first witness. He “had resolved, through God's grace assisting me, to have dyed so, though at a Stake.” The martyr theme, so prevalent in Nonjuring thought, was evident here and continued, “if the Oath had been tendered at the Peril of my Life, I could only have obeyed by Suffering.” Stressed too was “the Doctrine of *Non-resistance* and *Passive Obedience*, which I have accordingly inculcated upon others, and which I took to be the distinguishing Character of the Church of *England*.” Suspension and Deprivation did not deter the bishop's steadfast adherence to the Church and his Faith, and, he felt an “inward satisfaction” in the course he had pursued. The fact that he was dying, in the author's view, lends heightened veracity to his statement. Ultimately, the statement was intended to encourage others, especially Nonjurors, just as the bishop had always “inculcated upon others” this same obedience. Finally, the *Declaration* was printed and distributed.

William Thomas, Bishop of Worcester was a close colleague of the Seven and particularly of Ken. At the restoration he had been given the parish of Lamoeter-Velfrey in Pembrokeshire and made chaplain to the Duke of York, later James II. In 1665 he became dean of Worcester, in 1677 bishop of St David's, and in 1683 bishop of Worcester.¹³⁷ When the Seven presented their petition to the king, Thomas refused to

¹³⁷ Overton, *The Nonjurors*, 74-78.

distribute to the clergy of Worcester diocese the Second Declaration of Indulgence. He wrote this letter to Sancroft's chaplain:

In a cordial compliance with his Grace's pious conduct in the late Petition presented to the King I have retained in my custody the packet of the printed copies of the Royal Declaration of Indulgence which I could not transmit to the clergy of my diocese committed to my pastoral charge (*salvâ conscientiâ, salvo honore Ecclesiae Anglicanae*). It is a piercing, wounding affliction to me to incur his Majesty's displeasure, to be misinterpreted guilty of the least degree of disloyalty or ingratitude (which my soul abhors) towards my inexpressibly obliging master and benefactor, patron and sovereign...¹³⁸

The Latin means to save or preserve my conscience and without prejudice to the Church of England. The King was Thomas's friend and patron; he had been his chaplain. The depth of the Passive Obedience acted on, was scarcely "passive" in the modern sense of that word, and the pain it caused the author is manifest.

Thomas like Lake died before he could be deprived but was nevertheless a Nonjuror in heart and spirit. His dying declaration, written in a letter, to George Hickes, the soon to be deprived Dean of Worcester, on 23 June 1689 also expressed this view.

Mr. Dean,
I was glad when I heard you was come home, for I longed to speak with you before I dyed; for I perceive that I have but a short time to live. I bless God that I have twice suffered in the same righteous cause, and it is time for me now to dye, who have outlived the honour of my religion and the liberties of my country. It hath been a great comfort to me in this general apostacy of my Clergy, whom I have endeavoured to keep upright and steady to their principles, that you have not forsaken me, but keep constant with me to the same principles. I have read all the books written for taking the oath; in which I find the authors more Jesuit than the Jesuits themselves: and if my heart deceive me not, and the grace of God fail me not, I think I could burn at the stake before I took this new oath. I pray God bless you, and reward your constancy. I desire your daily prayers.¹³⁹

¹³⁸ Quoted in Overton, *The Nonjurors*, 76

¹³⁹ Quoted in Hugh A. L. Rice, *Thomas Ken, Bishop and Nonjuror* (London: SPCK, 1958), 162.

The principles to which Thomas alludes are the oft-repeated three: Passive Obedience, indefeasible divine right, and non-resistance. The “twice suffered in the same cause” refers to the earlier deprivation he had at the hands of the Cromwellian regime when he was evicted from his Welsh parish of Laugharne in Carmarthenshire and forced to teach at the village school to survive.¹⁴⁰ This nexus of Civil War and Glorious Revolution was not an uncommon thought among Nonjurors. “I could burn at the stake” captured succinctly the thought that the Nonjurors saw themselves as martyrs much like those of the Pre-Constantinian era or “Bloody Mary’s” time. The anti-Roman Catholic rhetoric applied to the new Latitudinarian clergy and their “books for taking the oath” is typical of the strong sense that these bishops felt that they alone were the Catholic Church in England. Finally, the letter was significantly written to Hicke who surely never forgot his bishop’s words as he carried the schism into its later phase.

Jeremy Collier was the first Nonjuror to write against the 1688-89 Revolution and in support of James II and those who remained obedient to him. In his *The Desertion Discuss'd. In a letter to a Country Gentleman*, he put forward the thought that the king had every reason to be apprehensive of danger, that leaving any representatives of the monarchy behind him was impractical at the time, and that no grounds existed either in law or nature to declare the throne vacant under such circumstances. This argument accompanied indefeasible divine right; James simply could not give away the crown. Furthermore, Ireland and Scotland would not be affected by this flight of the king from Whitehall in any case. Then Collier pressed his *ad hominem* attack against those who welcomed the revolution:

¹⁴⁰ See Overton, *The Nonjurors*, 74-78.

We are now fallen upon Times in which the most extravagant and almost impossible Things are swallowed without chewing, and the plainest Truths outfaced and denied; as if Evidence was an Argument against Proof, and absurdities the only motives of Credibility: So that now, if ever, we seem fit for Transubstantiation. Had not some men believed this true, in a great Measure, they would never have disputed against matter of fact, which was done almost in the face of the whole Kingdom.¹⁴¹

There is a feeling of disbelief and denial in these early words of Collier. Events were irrational, illegal, and bordered on superstition as, in Collier's judgment, much like transubstantiation. He suggested that those who have believed the impossible have done so knowingly and against all reason and religion. He concluded the letter, with the idea, obvious to him, that "those who were the Occasion of His Majesty's Departure should (one would think) have waited on Him, and Invited Him Back...I leave the world to Judge now, but God will do it afterwards."¹⁴² Collier, the first to write, was also one of the last to write. His thoughts about obedience in the Usagers Controversy show marked development, and I include his earlier words here to illustrate this transition, which we shall see below.

Hilkiah Bedford, another nonjuring bishop, wrote an apologia for the original deprived bishops in 1717 entitled *A Vindication of the late Archbishop Sancroft*.¹⁴³ William Bowyer, the leading Nonjuring printer, published it. They believed it still important twenty-nine years after the Seven were imprisoned to tell the story accurately. For Bedford and other Nonjurors an accurate accounting showed that the same values

¹⁴¹ Jeremy Collier, *The Desertion Discuss'd. In a letter to a Country Gentleman* (London: n.p.,1689), 2.

¹⁴² Collier *The Desertion Discuss'd*, 8.

¹⁴³ Hilkiah Bedford, *A vindication of the late Archbishop Sancroft, and of his brethren the rest of the depriv'd bishops, from the reflections of Mr. Marshal in his Defence of our constitution in church and state: Particularly with regard to their Refusing to publish an Abhorrence of the Prince of Orange's Invasion; their Meeting at Guild-Hall, and their Endeavours for a Regency. In a letter to a friend* (London : 1717).

Lake had witnessed to on his deathbed remained the core values of a community that had never taken the requisite oaths nor lifted a finger in revolt. The Nonjuring Bishops, in Bedford's mind, had practiced non-resistance and Passive Obedience no matter what the personal cost to themselves, and he concluded his vindication with hope for all the clergymen who suffered deprivation in England and Scotland.

The Nonjurors took no novel reactions to 1688-89, but rather upheld a firmly grounded position, which they believed the core of Anglican belief.¹⁴⁴ Consider George Herbert's beginning to the first chapter of *A Priest to the Temple, or The Country Parson His Character, and Rule of Holy Life*: "A PASTOR is the Deputy of Christ for the reducing of Man to the Obedience of God. This definition is evident, and contains the direct steps to Pastoral Duty and Authority."¹⁴⁵ This recalled what Bishop Ken had said before James II.¹⁴⁶ Inculcating obedience to God was the foundational principle of ministry; the doctrine of Passive Obedience, with indefeasible divine right, and non-resistance to the monarch were simply a way of expressing *both* honor to the king and fear of God. These concepts were, in their minds, in accord with The First Epistle of St. Peter 2:17: "Honour all men. Love the Brotherhood. Fear God. Honour the King." This verse could also have served as the outline for the most influential spiritual guide in the Restoration Church: Richard Allestree's *The Whole Duty of Man*.

¹⁴⁴ Hawkins, *Allegiance in Church and State*, 55.

¹⁴⁵ George Herbert, *The Country Parson, The Temple* 1652 (New York: The Paulist Press, 1981), 55.

¹⁴⁶ Strickland, *The Lives of the Seven Bishops*, 62.

The Whole Duty of Man

The Whole Duty of Man, first published anonymously in 1658, was probably the work of Richard Allestree (1619-1681) professor Divinity at Oxford.¹⁴⁷ The book became a quasi-official text of the Restoration Church of England and was found in one out of every ten homes.¹⁴⁸ The basic supplemental manual for Anglicans of every class and age, it became the most popular devotional manual in the Church of England and continued to be so well into the eighteenth century. As John Spurr describes it, "*The Whole Duty* epitomized the commonsensical, non-controversial brand of theology on offer in the Restoration Church of England. It was typical of a certain practical ethos which had emerged in reaction to a speculative and 'experiential' religion of the Interregnum."¹⁴⁹

The argument presented here is not that *The Whole Duty of Man* was the basis of later Nonjurors' thinking, or that it was their exclusive possession, but that it typified the type of spirituality to which they were heirs. In that regard it was foundational for their understanding of obedience in English society. "The salient fact for the social historian of eighteenth-century England," according to Clark, "is that Christian belief is initially almost universal, a belief calling attention to the history of a chosen nation conceived as a family or group of families with a Holy Family as its culmination; a faith whose

¹⁴⁷ Richard Allestree [?], *The Whole Duty of Man, laid down in a plain and familiar way for the use of all, ... with Private devotions ...* (London, 1703). Elmen, Paul. "Richard Allestree and *The Whole Duty of Man*." *The Library* 5, no. 1 (1951), 19-27.

¹⁴⁸ Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England, 1645-1689*, 282.

¹⁴⁹ Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England, 1645-1689*, 283-84.

Established Church taught obedience, humility and reverence to superiors with unanimity and consistency down the decades....”¹⁵⁰ *The Whole Duty of Man* is illustrative of the Restoration Church’s thinking, a mentality the Nonjurors — “that long-suffering remnant of the Restoration Church” in Monod’s words — persisted in embracing.¹⁵¹ Interestingly, Robert Bosher claimed much the same thing; in his opinion, the Restoration High-Churchmen, whom he regarded as heirs of the Laudian tradition, regarded themselves as “the faithful remnant of a persecuted Church, from which all others had fallen away.”¹⁵² The Nonjurors later took up the “long-suffering” and “faithful remnant” idea inasmuch as they claimed themselves as the heirs of both the Caroline and the Restoration churchmen.

Anglicanism of the Restoration period did not renounce the Reformation, but maintained severe reservations about what they saw as a lack of human agency in Calvinism, and they remained utterly convinced that works of righteousness did not save one. Rather, “the Restoration Church of England,” as Spurr contends, “forged a ‘middle way’, a primitive, Catholic, way in her theology.... As the Church of England had to recover for herself the Catholic doctrine of salvation, so had she to create the ethical system which answered to that doctrine.”¹⁵³ Gone was speculation about Calvinism and Arminianism; in came a practical moral theology that stressed the cooperation of believers in growth in grace. Ecclesiology and moral theology were now greatly stressed.

¹⁵⁰ Clark, *English Society 1688-1832*, 87.

¹⁵¹ Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People 1688-1788*, 17.

¹⁵² Robert S. Bosher, *The Making of the Restoration Settlement. The Influence of the Laudians 1649-1662* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1951), xv; Kenneth Hylson-Smith, *High Churchmanship in the Church of England: From the Sixteenth to the Late Twentieth Century* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993), 41.

¹⁵³ Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England, 1645-1689*, 304-305.

By ecclesiology I mean that part of dogmatic theology that teaches the structure of the Church as divinely created, rather than merely the study of ecclesial structures for church governance. This was immensely important to the Nonjurors who made the divine institution of the uninterrupted Apostolic Succession the basic building block of their existence.¹⁵⁴ Moral theology was almost as important, and in daily life arguably more so. Moral theology shifted the emphasis from systematic theology and its theories to the practical application of God's laws for Holy Living. At the same time Restoration Churchman saw historical theology rise with ecclesiology to supplant the more speculative theology of Calvinism. Calvinism, of course, did not go away, it simply, practically left the Church of England with dissenters and Nonconformists.

As a consequence, Restoration Anglicans created a *via media* position between Rome and Geneva. In this Anglican middle way the mortal-venial sin distinctions of Rome's casuistry were perceived as too focused on law. Conversely the perceived antinomianism of Geneva's notion of "imputed righteousness," whereby it seemed only Christ's action was necessary, was often seen as lawlessness. It seemed to many Anglicans that predestination, particularly of the "double" variety in which both election and damnation were predetermined, was a discouraging doctrine. The spiritual life took practical planning and considerable effort on the believer's part for Anglicans. They took a middle position and replaced both Roman casuistry and Calvinist predestination with practical, careful moral instruction. This moral emphasis was like a race, like Christian warfare, a severe ascetic, a "holy living;" as Spurr described it, "Far from demoting religion to the mere pursuit of virtue, 'holy living' required a rigorous pursuit of Christian

¹⁵⁴ See Cornwall, *Visible and Apostolic*, 12, 16, 25, 63-66, 78-79, 106-112.

perfection while asserting the impossibility of overcoming sin."¹⁵⁵ In other words, the Christian was to try hard, depending on God's grace, but to realize the final victory would not be humanly possible in this life. But seriousness in this life led to a fulfillment only attained in heaven. That was the whole purpose of *The Whole Duty*.

The Whole Duty was not a book to be once read and then shelved; rather it was a training manual that filled a big void in Anglican lives. The Church of England had effectively dropped sacramental confession except in the Prayer Book's office of Visitation of the Sick. Thus the confessional was ruled out as a formation tool. The Puritan and Dissenters' small groups, models later so powerfully used by the early Methodists, were missing in most parishes. The Church of England depended heavily upon formal worship—Word and Sacrament including preaching—and catechetical instruction for Confirmation prior to admission to Communion. The Prayer Book's catechism provided an outline, supplemented by the parson's own exposition. Very troubling was the failure of parents to teach their children. The author of *The Whole Duty* lamented:

But alas! It is too sure that Parents have much neglected this Duty, and by that means it is that such multitudes of Men and Women that are called Christians, know no more of Christ, or any thing that concerns their own Souls, than the merest Heathen.¹⁵⁶

A supplement was needed to augment that instruction and to continue it as a life-long learning experience.

¹⁵⁵ Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England, 1645-1689*, 310.

¹⁵⁶ Richard Allestree [?], *The Whole Duty of Man* (London, 1703), 21.

The Whole Duty did just that; it was a manual intended to be kept in hand and read over and over again according to its structured scheme. There were seventeen chapters, each intended to be read on Sundays, so that the entire book would be read through three times in every year. Every indication is that Ambrose Bonwicke, for example, followed that pattern every year he was at Cambridge encouraged in part perhaps by his father's description of the *Whole Duty of Man*'s creator as "that incomparable Author."¹⁵⁷

Allestree's preface began with the first covenant, "GOD created the first man Adam without sin, and indued his Soul with the full knowledge of his Duty; and with such a strength that he might, if he would, perform all that was required of him..."¹⁵⁸

Allestree's conviction was that Christians have power to act, and that, "belief must bring forth Obedience, that what we believe thus fit to be done, be indeed done by us..."¹⁵⁹

Here we see the first popularly articulated rationale for passive and active obedience: "The submission to his will is also of two sorts, the submission either of obedience or patience; that of obedience is our ready yielding ourselves up to do his will, so that when God hath, by his command, made known to us what his pleasure is, cheerfully and readily to set about it."¹⁶⁰

Particularly illustrative of how one became a Nonjuror was the chapter entitled "Sunday XIV: Of Duty to Parents" that taught a tri-parent obedience: to the Civil Parent,

¹⁵⁷ Ambrose Bonwicke, *A Pattern for Young Students in the University*, 7, 66. Bonwicke the father wrote that his son acted "in Conformity to that excellent Advice of the Author of the *Whole Duty of Man* ... of which he had often been a Reader or Auditor."

¹⁵⁸ Allestree, *The Whole Duty of Man*, preface.

¹⁵⁹ Allestree, *The Whole Duty of Man*, 6.

¹⁶⁰ Allestree, *The Whole Duty of Man*, 31.

to the Spiritual Parent, and to the Natural Parents. "The Civil Parent is he whom God hath established the Supreme Magistrate, who by a just right possesses the Throne in a Nation. This is the common Father of all those that are under his authority." This Father was owed honour, reverence, paying tribute [i.e. taxes], our prayers, and obedience and these are all clearly taught in the Scriptures. St. Peter (I Peter 2:13) and St. Paul (Romans 13:1) both urged obedience to the state authorities even "when those powers were Heathen, and cruel Persecutors of Christianity."¹⁶¹

The Whole Duty taught that obedience is of two sorts: active and passive. Active obedience is to be given when the magistrate commands something that is lawful and not contrary to God's commands. However, when the state makes demands contrary to those of God, Passive Obedience is the Christian's duty.

But when he [magistrate, king, etc] enjoyns any thing contrary to what God hath commanded, we are not then to pay him this Active Obedience; we may, nay, we must refuse thus to act (yet here we must be very well assured that the thing is so contrary, and not pretend Conscience for a cloak of stubbornness) we are in that case to *obey God rather than man*. But even this is a season for the Passive Obedience, we must patiently suffer, what he inflicts on us for such refusal, and not to secure our selves, rise up against him. *For who can stretch his hand against the Lord's anointed, and be guiltless? Says David to Abashai, I Sam. 26.9.* and that at a time when *David* was under great persecution from *Saul*, nay, had also the assurance of the kingdom after him; and St Paul's sentence in this case is most heavy, *Rom. 13.2. They that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.*¹⁶²

This was written in 1658, on the eve of the Restoration to be sure, but at a time when the rightful king and Church had been thrust out. "Even this is a season of Passive Obedience" may refer to the Interregnum, and it certainly captured the feelings and hopes of many churchmen; just as David suffered under Saul, he nevertheless was anointed and

¹⁶¹ Allestree, *The Whole Duty of Man*, 107-108.

¹⁶² Allestree, *The Whole Duty of Man*, 108.

crowned as the king of God's own choosing. If Anglicans could just patiently suffer while engaged in Passive Obedience, God would restore the rightful king and order, which in their minds he did in 1660. Thus suffering while being passively obedient was a present reality for Anglicans who remembered the Interregnum, and an established virtue for Nonjurors who patiently waited the rightful king's return..

The second parent, according to *The Whole Duty*, was Spiritual — the Church of England. For the Nonjurors, Passive Obedience applied here as well. They knew firsthand how their religious leaders had been thrust out following the Civil War and again after 1688. Unable to follow or actively obey the new regime, passively obeyed by suffering deprivation, and continued actively obedient to their own faith and practice.

The religious instruction of Nonjurors began in the home with their third or natural parent. Their fathers and mothers taught them the faith. Nonjurors learned that society was intertwined; all three parents were essential. Natural parents were due: love, prayer, and obedience.¹⁶³

John Kettlewell

John Kettlewell gave his parishioners at Coleshill copies of *The Whole Duty of Man*.¹⁶⁴ Hicke and Nelson in turn collected and published all of his writings for the Nonjurors following his death in 1695.¹⁶⁵ Kettlewell's treatise *The Measures of*

¹⁶³ Allestree, *The Whole Duty of Man*, 111.

¹⁶⁴ Jane Frances Mary Carter, *The Life and Times of John Kettlewell: with Details of the History of the Nonjurors* (Longmans, Green, & co., 1895); William E. Burns "Kettlewell, John (1653–1695)," in *ODNB*.

¹⁶⁵ John Kettlewell, *A compleat collection of the works of the Reverend and learned John Kettlewell, B. D. Formerly Vicar of Coles-Hill in Warwick-Shire. In two volumes. The several treatises printed from copies revis'd and improv'd by the author, a little before his death. To which is prefix'd, the life of the author. Wherein are contained many Remarkable Transactions of his Time; compiled from the Collections of*

Christian Obedience began with these words: “THAT *Condition which the Gospel indispensably requires of us, and which is to meet out our Doom of Bliss or Misery, is in the General our Obedience.*”¹⁶⁶ Here he makes clear, in much the same fashion as *The Whole Duty of Man*, that the core value of Christianity was obedience. This work went through six editions by 1714 and is foundational in understanding the Nonjurors’ concept of obedience.

Kettlewell examined the nature and use of religious language and concluded that its effect was often by “*metonymie*,” that is, the effect of something is contained within the naming of its cause – the “transferring of a Word, which is the particular Name of one thing, to express another.”¹⁶⁷ Kettlewell uses as example the action of trusting one’s own physician; trusting here means not only to give him credit, but to act obediently according to his counsel. So too, for Kettlewell, God’s instruction to humankind — words like faith, repentance, study, or love — directly indicate the action of the will in obeying. Kettlewell wrote of obedience in actions:

Thus when he [God] promiseth *Pardon and Salvation* to our *Knowledge and Belief of his Gospel*, to our *Repentance from our Sins*, to our *Love and Fear of God*, which, with several others are those preparatory Dispositions, that fix and determine our Minds, Wills, and Passions indifferent in themselves to effect Obedient Actions; he doth not in any wise intend that these shall save us, and procure Pardon for us without Obedience, but only by signifying it.¹⁶⁸

Salvation was dependent upon obedience to God. For Kettlewell the Gospel’s form of speaking was “*metonymical*, and more was meant by it than was expressed” for

George Hickes, D.D. and Robert Nelson, Esq; and Completed by a Friend of the Author at the Desire both of Dr. Hickes and Mr. Nelson. With an appendix of several original papers. (London, 1719).

¹⁶⁶ Kettlewell, *The Measures of Christian Obedience*, 5

¹⁶⁷ Kettlewell, *The Measures of Christian Obedience*, 8.

¹⁶⁸ Kettlewell, *The Measures of Christian Obedience*, 9.

“Obedience is ever requisite to Pardon.” The notion of obedience was central to salvation and to Christian discipleship; indeed, the actions of faith, study, repentance, love, and worship of God all imply obedience as integral.

In the public realm, Christian religion, “can never give *Protection* to any *Disobedience* ... for Religion needs no Defence from *Times of Suffering*; it can live in them, it is *improved* by them...” The Christian cause was advanced by obedience, perhaps especially in times of suffering, and no excuse whether in the name of public liberty, freedom of expression, or order, justified disobedience. At one point Kettlewell sought to disprove the “odd belief,”

That *Christ is a Temporal and Secular King in Sion*, (i.e.) the Church on Earth... And as for *Earthly Kings*, since they are but Deputies and Delegates of Christ the Supreme King of all, *that they are no further to be submitted to, that they act Serviceably and Subordinately under him*; but that *they may, yea, ought to be persecuted as Enemies and Apostates of King Jesus, if in anything they oppose and act against him*. Now when men have once imbibed this Principle, they run on furiously, as every man must who understands it, into all the mischiefs of Rebellion and Bloodshed.¹⁶⁹

In the Nonjurors’ worldview that is what happened at the time of the Civil War and also in 1688. The sin was a disobedience of the plain laws of honor, reverence, submission and obedience to governors, that resulted in a lack of justice, charity, mercy, and peace.

170

Ten years before the 1688-89 revolution Kettlewell had written:

“Obedience is so *essential* and *Supereminent* a Part of its Nature [i.e Religion], and so preferable to any idle Profession or ineffective Belief; that to transgress *Christian Laws*, for the Maintenance of an *undisturbed liberty* in *professing Christian Opinions*, were not to strengthen and preserve Religion, but *dangerously to wound* , if not *wholly to destroy* it.”¹⁷¹

²⁹¹ Kettlewell, *The Measures of Christian Obedience*, Bk. IV, 394.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid.

¹⁷¹ Kettlewell, *A compleat collection*, 163.

Remarkably these words were *not* written in 1688 or afterwards, but rather in 1677 or 1678. They referred to the English Civil War and Interregnum and to the turmoil that accompanied the Restoration. How relevant, even prophetic, they must have appeared to Nonjurors following 1688. Religious liberty as expressed by the emerging Latitudinarian narrative after the Glorious Revolution no doubt remained for the author, merely “Christian Opinions” professed in the new climate of “undisturbed liberty.” For the church and state to embrace this level of toleration was to “transgress Christian Laws” with the resulting destruction of true religion as had happened previously. This is the contrast that he later drew between the Nonjurors, who suffered for their “obedience” and those who compromised for the sake of “undisturbed liberty.”

In 1691, one year after his deprivation, he wrote in *Christianity, a doctrine of the Cross, or, Passive Obedience under any pretended invasion of legal rights and liberties*.

PASSIVE OBEDIENCE to Sovereign Powers is *keeping under their Obedience when we suffer wrongfully at their hands*. If they command Things against the Law of God or of the Land, we ought not; or if against the inviolable Liberties, which Laws have secured against the Prerogative in their respective Kingdoms, we need not ordinarily be *Active* in doing what we are bidden. In other Things: a Just and Lawful Authority must have *Active Obedience*: But when they come to punish against Laws, or for such Things as with a safe Conscience their Subjects could not act in; they are still to continue under their Obedience, and in a state of Subjection.¹⁷²

In the chapters following, Kettlewell described the example of the martyrs in the early church during times of persecution, a position he considered analogous to his own. Once again the sense of the Nonjurors as present day martyrs was always present. Mark Goldie

¹⁷² Kettlewell, *A compleat collection*, 143.

notes that the Nonjurors “cherished a self-image of martyrdom to a purer Anglicanism, now perverted by an Erastian state.”¹⁷³ That was only part of their mindset as they increasingly came to identify themselves with the Church in the age of persecution. They were themselves martyrs, and akin to the Church before Constantine that had been persecuted by Caesar. This position was completely consistent with their reforming goal to return to a pure and more primitive Christianity. Kettlewell’s worldview did not change, and his earlier writings provide evidence that the Nonjurors’ notion of Passive Obedience was already fully developed in the Restoration Church of England. Later, Hickes and Robert Nelson published Kettlewell’s work for the nonjuring community.

Central to this matter were two contrasting views of obedience. Was Christian obedience an act of single-minded adherence to the revealed truth of the Gospel as the Church had always held, even in the face of suffering and deprivation? Or was it sincerity and love in the Name of Christ shown in tolerance toward those who saw things differently, even if falsely? If this was a false dichotomy, it was nevertheless often the way the debate discourse tended.¹⁷⁴

Inherent in Kettlewell’s words was a concept radically challenged by bishops like the Latitudinarian Gilbert Burnett of Salisbury. In 1713 he wrote of the beliefs of Low Churchmen, which were his beliefs as well:

They lay the foundation of all they believe in the Christian religion in the Scriptures.... They think that in matters declared to be indifferent, no harm could follow on it, if some regard were had to the scruples of those who divide from us, in order the fortifying the whole by uniting us among ourselves. ... The pretending to an independency of the Church on the state, is not only in their opinion a plain attack made on the supremacy vested by law in the Crown, and a casting disgrace on our reformers, and on every step made in the Reformation,

¹⁷³ Mark Goldie, “The Nonjurors, Episcopacy and the Origins of the Convocation Controversy,” 15-35.

¹⁷⁴ See Champion, *The Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken*.

which are openly owned by the chief promoters of this new conceit: but it is a direct opposition to serve other purposes, in the 13th of the *Romans*, *let every soul be subject to the higher powers*, ... They dare not un-church all the bodies of the Protestants beyond sea; nor deny to our Dissenters at home, the federal rights common to all Christians. ... They know of no power in a priest to pardon sin, other than the declaring the Gospel pardon... They know of no sacrifice in the Eucharist, other than the commemorating that on the cross, with the oblations of the prayers, praise, and almsgiving, prescribed in the office. They are far from condemning private judgment in matters of religion: this strikes at the root of the whole Reformation, which could never have been compassed, if private men have not a right to judge for themselves.¹⁷⁵

Burnett's position was overtly protestant, and he judged the legitimate position of the Church of England as largely determined by the state. High Churchmen and Nonjurors, for Burnett, were lapsing backwards into medievalism. For Low Churchmen, men like Kettlewell, Hickes, and Collier threatened every gain of the English Reformation. Christianity, according to Burnett, was a matter of private judgment and notions of a church independent of and superior to the state were the absolute antithesis of the Reformation. The sacramental and traditional emphasis of the Nonjurors seemed little more than superstition. The fact is that Latitudinarians, Low Churchmen such as Burnet, were sick and tired of the seventeenth century with its wars of religion and class struggles. They were tired of intolerance and the hatred it bred. They were fed up with what they considered superstition.¹⁷⁶

¹⁷⁵ Gilbert Burnet, *A Discourse of the Pastoral Care* (London: Daniel Midwinter and Benjamin Cowse, 1713) in Pincus, *England's Glorious Revolution, 1688-1689*, 128-131.

¹⁷⁶ Gilbert Burnet, *The Bishop of Salisbury's new preface to his pastoral care, consider'd, with respect to the following heads, viz. I. The qualifications of the clergy. II The distinction of high and low church. III. The present posture of affairs.* The third edition corrected. (London, 1713), especially 40-43; Gilbert Burnet, *The abridgment of The history of the reformation of the Church of England. By Gilbert Burnet, D. D. Late Lord Bishop of Sarum.* (London, 1719), preface and 29. Gilbert Burnet, *An answer to Mr. Law's letter to the Lord Bishop of Bangor, in a letter to Mr. Law.* (London, 1717).

Keith Thomas argues that the Elizabethan reformers took the magic out of religion but the sectarians of the Interregnum brought it back in the form of ecstasy, prophecies and miraculous healing. Thus, after religion gradually excluded magic, post-Reformation English Christianity began to take on a magic of its own. However, by the late seventeenth century religion had become "Natural Theology" and a "providence which . . . obeyed natural laws accessible to human study." In the end religion triumphed largely because it had a church, a community, and a greater explanation for eternity — a “general social importance . . . which enabled it to outlive magic.”¹⁷⁷ Burnet's *Discourse* was a good illustration of that development and surely contrasted with the ideas of Henry Dodwell.

Henry Dodwell

Henry Dodwell of Shottesbrooke was a brilliant apologist for the Nonjurors' cause. Dodwell was an Irish layman who in the 1680s was working closely with John Fell, Dean of Christ Church and Bishop of Oxford. Fell encouraged Dodwell to write *Dissertationes Cyprianicae* (1682), a work subsequently bound and published with copies of Fell's famous edition of St. Cyprian that came out the same year. This combined effort was part of a revival in patristic studies that contended apologetically for the unity of the episcopal polity and the order of Anglicanism with the church of primitive Christianity.¹⁷⁸

¹⁷⁷ Keith Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic: Studies in Popular Beliefs in Sixteenth and Seventeenth-Century England* (London: Penguin, 1971), 765-766.

¹⁷⁸ See Theodor Harmsen, “Dodwell, Henry (1641–1711).” *ODNB*, and John Spurr, “Schism and the Restoration Church” *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 41 (1990), 408-424.

Dodwell's scholarship was magisterial. His *The Case in View* and *The Case in View now in Fact* were the rationale for the return of many earlier Nonjurors to the Established Church. His view was respected, in large measure because he articulated the Nonjurors' sacramentology and ecclesiology that undergirded their confident stance vis-à-vis the emerging Enlightenment and Latitudinarian thinkers.¹⁷⁹ This is precisely the point underscored by Leighton in his treatment of Dodwell.¹⁸⁰ Dodwell, according to Leighton, early on developed a "Counter-Enlightenment" critique of dissenting "British Calvinists" whom he saw as employing an "individualistic rationalism."¹⁸¹ He criticized them, "...for expounding the scriptures only by themselves especially in matters doctrinal', making use of their own 'modern systems' of theology."¹⁸² Dodwell's approach employed the Tradition of the undivided Church, especially its first four centuries, as authoritative and he used the best tools of scholarship to that end. The principle of *sola scriptura* was not adequate alone. He particularly sought answers to present conflicts by research into the literature of the Cyprianist Age. Leighton has argued that the Nonjurors as a community were the preeminent Counter-Enlightenment apologists.¹⁸³ Certainly, in the debates between orthodox Christians and the emerging

¹⁷⁹ See R.D. Cornwall, "Divine Right Monarchy: Henry Dodwell's Critique of the Reformation and Defense of the Nonjuror Bishops," *Anglican and Episcopal History* 68 (1999), 37-66.

¹⁸⁰ C.D.A. Leighton, "The Religion of the Non-Jurors and the Early British Enlightenment: A Study of Henry Dodwell." *History of European ideas* 28, no. 4 (2002), 247-262.

¹⁸¹ C.D.A. Leighton, "'Anciennete' among the Non-Jurors: A Study of Henry Dodwell, *History of European Ideas* 31, (2005), 1-16.

¹⁸² Henry Dodwell, *Separation of Churches from Episcopal Government ... Proved Schismatical ...* (London, 1679), xix; and Henry Dodwell, *Occasional Conformity Fundamentally Destructive of the Discipline of the Primitive Church ...* (London, 1705), 12-16.

¹⁸³ See Leighton, "'Anciennete' among the Non-Jurors," 1-16; Leighton, "The religion of the Non-Jurors and the Early British Enlightenment," 247-262. C.D.A. Leighton, "William Law, Behmenism, and counter-

pro-Enlightenment thinkers, between revelation and unaided reason, and likewise in the contest between *ancienneté* and *modernité*, Nonjurors in general, and Dodwell in particular, were unquestionably devoted to orthodoxy, to revelation, and to *ancienneté*. Dodwell's goal was to establish the principles of the primitive Church as normative. In so doing Dodwell provided valuable insight into the ways he shaped Anglican history toward a view of an infallible and normative past that extended scriptural authority into the Patristic period. Leighton writes that Dodwell "...maintained the need for a diligent historical reconstruction and application of the mind of the early church, which had produced these scriptures."¹⁸⁴ This is the same line followed later by the Usagers who were undoubtedly heavily influenced by Dodwell's scholarship. This notion of obedience to Tradition provided the Nonjurors, and High Churchmen in general, with an important, perhaps the most important, apologetical tool against their Latitudinarian and dissenting opponents. In one sense, the Nonjurors were the preeminent Counter-Enlightenment group, and their locus outside the Established Church commanded a certain schismatic identity that made their views arguably more distinct. So, with no room for "comprehension," "occasional conformity," or private philosophical opinion, it was easy for establishment High Churchmen to adopt the Nonjurors' apologetics without losing their parishes.

After the 1688-89 Revolution the doctrine of Passive Obedience in the hands of Nonjurors and High Church Tories became subversive to the government, whereas before it was a stabilizing support for the Stuarts. With the Nonjurors continuing to hold that

enlightenment" *Harvard Theological Review* 91, No. 3 (1998), 301; C.D. A. Leighton, "The Non-Jurors and their History", *The Journal of Religious History*, 29, No. 3 (October 2005), 241- 256.

¹⁸⁴ Leighton "Ancienneté among the Non-Jurors," 6.

doctrine together with non-resistance and indefeasible divine right, the same ideas employed by the Seven Bishops and that were important in toppling James II, now proved threatening to William III, Anne, and certainly to George I. This made Dodwell's earlier interpretation of Passive Obedience still tenable to many even as he argued for the return to the Established Church in 1710.¹⁸⁵ In *The Case in View Now in Fact* he wrote, "When we could *not* enjoy *both* Communions, we did not *chuse*, but *bore* with our deprivation of our *National Communion*, not as a thing any way *desirable*, but as a *less Evil* of the *two*."¹⁸⁶ According to Dodwell, those continuing the schism were "*striving* their excellent *Wits* to find new pretences, every Day, for *continuing* the *new schism*."¹⁸⁷ The principles upon which Hickes and his followers acted were, for Dodwell, "Indeed so *new* as that they are destitute of any *Precedents* in the *Primitive Catholick Church*."¹⁸⁸ This argument carried great authority among the Nonjuring community and ultimately divided it in two, in large measure over the interpretation and application of commonly held notions of obedience. What Dodwell bequeathed to the later Nonjurors as a lasting legacy was a Cyprianist mentality.

¹⁸⁵See Henry Dodwell, *Cautionary Discourse of Schism ...in The works of the learned Mr. Henry Dodwell abridg'd: with an account of his life. By Francis Brokesby, B.D. To which is added, an abstract of Mr. Dodwell's book De cyclis; by Edm. Halley, LL. D. Astron. Reg. Geom. Prof. Savil. & R.S.S.* (London, 1723), 231.

¹⁸⁶ Henry Dodwell,, *The case in view, now in fact, proving, that the Continuance of a separate communion, without substitutes in any of the late invalidly-deprived sees, since the death of William late Lord Bishop of Norwich, is schismatical.* (London : printed for S. Keble at the Turks-Head in Fleet-Street, and M. Atkins at the Golden-Ball in St. Paul's, 1711); and Henry Gandy, *A Conference between Gerontius and Junius. In which Mr. Dodwell's Case in view now in fact is consider'd.* (London, 1711).

¹⁸⁷ Dodwell,, *The case in view, now in fact*, 3.

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*

Chapter 3: A Cyprianist Mentality

The church, for nonjurors, was precisely as Cyprian had described it: *plebs Sacerdoti aduanta et Pastori suo grex adherens*, a people united to their bishop, and a flock adhering to their pastor. The church was, then, a polity not unlike the state, albeit not one constituted by coercion, but by, as the nonjuring clergyman John Kettlewell wrote, “a spiritual subjection and dependence of people to their bishops.”

Brent S. Sirota in *The Christian Monitors*

St. Cyprian was the Bishop of Carthage from c. 248 until his martyrdom on 14 September 258.¹ His accession to the see of Carthage was soon followed, in January 250, by the ferocity of the Decian Persecution, in which context his teaching on both ecclesiology and pastoral care should be viewed.² Dodwell embraced Cyprian’s teaching as his standard for both authority and model for the one, universal Church. It was not unusual for Christians to look backwards for a pure, primitive Christianity, and the age of Cyprian was the Nonjurors’ paradigm. C.D.A. Leighton put it succinctly, “The circumstances and pen of Cyprian of Carthage provided sources of unparalleled value for those who wished to assert the identity of the primitive and the Anglican concepts of the Episcopal office.”³ Earlier Norman Sykes had written: “There remained yet another [in addition to Ignatius of Antioch] of the Fathers, Cyprian of Carthage, for whom English

Brent S. Sirota, *The Christian Monitors: The Church of England and the Age of Benevolence, 1680-1730* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014), 156. The quotation is from John Kettlewell, *Of Christian Communion*, Part 3, 11.

¹ Arthur Cushman McGiffert, *A History of Christian Thought, Volume II, The West from Tertullian to Erasmus* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1954), 24-38.

² W. H. C. Frend, “The Failure of the Persecutions in the Roman Empire” *Past & Present*, No. 16 (November, 1959), 10-30.

³ C. D. A. Leighton, “Ancienneté among the Non-Jurors: a study of Henry Dodwell,” *History of European Ideas* vol. 31 (July 2005), 10

churchmen of the seventeenth century had a particular penchant, because his exposition of episcopacy seemed to concur with that of their own church.”⁴ Robert D. Cornwall notes, “There was Cyprianic, episcopal exclusivity in the high-church program, one that had been defended throughout the seventeenth century by leading divines, including Joseph Hall, Henry Hammond, William Laud, Lancelot Andrewes, and Jeremy Taylor.”⁵ Conversely, J. C. Findon argues that there was increasingly in the eighteenth century a tendency to relegate to minor posts churchmen – like Nathaniel Marshall, William Higdon, and John Johnson – who professed a Cyprianic position.⁶ The Nonjurors, however embraced the teachings of the Cyprianic Age as normative and relied on it for their own more conservative apologetic. Two overarching Cyprianic themes lent credibility to the Nonjurors’ claims: Cyprian’s ecclesiology and the importance he assigned to martyrdom.

In 1704 Dodwell wrote:

... Christ the invisible Bishop delegates his Power to the visible Bishop, and invisibly obliges him as much, as if he were present upon the place. For by this means the Sentences past by them are likewise supposed to be past by Christ, and reckon’d of equal Validity. And by this means likewise, the Bishop was only subject to God and Christ, not to be judged by the college any more, than Christ himself. And this in short was the opinion of St. *Cyprian’s* Age.⁷

⁴ Norman Sykes, *From Sheldon to Secker: Aspects of English Church History 1660-1768* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), 111.

⁵ Robert D. Cornwall, *Visible and Apostolic* (Newark: University of Delaware Presse, 1993), 106.

⁶ J. C. Findon, “Non-Jurors and the Church of England,” (D.Phil thesis, Oxford University,), 182-183.

⁷ Henry Dodwell, *A admonitory discourse concerning the late English schism, address’d to those of the reformed, as well as Roman religion abroad: wherein the ancient rights of bishops and their independency of the secular magistrate, are asserted and recommended. By Henry Dodwell, A.M. of Dublin. Written originally in Latin, and now faithfully done into English* (London, 1704), 155.

Dodwell was making an enormous point about the nature of the Church. His claimed authority was “the opinion of St. Cyprian’s Age.” Why was the Cyprianic Age of such magisterial influence? Three reasons are historically discernible: First, it represented the One, Undivided Church that Dodwell calls “Catholic;” second, Cyprian’s view of each bishop possessing equal authority received directly from Christ and not dependent upon the college of bishops or the state, seemed to Dodwell the Anglican ideal if not the de facto norm; third, Cyprian’s position was considered proven by the blood of the martyrs and Dodwell also saw the Nonjurors as martyrs of a sort. Thus, Dodwell easily claimed Cyprian and “St. Cyprian’s Age” as his authority.⁸

Speaking of the individual authority of each and every equal bishop and the obedience due their authority, Dodwell wrote:

Now the reason of this universal Obligation ariseth from hence; that there was only one Church in the whole World, one Altar, one Bishop, and one Episcopate, a portion whereof was intirely possess’d by every Bishop in particular, as St. *Cyprian, de Unit. Eccl*, expresses himself; so that whatever was done by any one particular Bishop, was imputed to the whole Episcopal College, and upon that account was to be confirm’d by it, as if it had been Decreed by the unanimous suffrages of all. This is call’d the Catholick Church by Ignatius [of Antioch].⁹

A careful analysis reveals the unique authority that both Cyprian and Dodwell assigned to the undivided Church. In their understanding, Christ gave his authority to the bishops each of whom was equal, and this is the authority of the Church. The papal, presbyterian, and congregational systems are thus illegitimate in Dodwell’s view. The Catholic Church was the only one possible; all others were schismatics. The Catholic Church was neither Roman nor Protestant but was a body of those in union with the worldwide fellowship of

⁸ Leighton, “‘Ancienneté’ among the Non-Jurors,” 10.

⁹ Dodwell, *A admonitory discourse concerning the late English schism*, 155.

bishops. Dodwell and his fellow Nonjurors thought they were that rightful Church in England, and after the replacement of the original deprived Nonjuring bishops they judged their replacements by the state to be schismatics. Their appeal was to the undivided Church and Tradition, with a capital "T," of the Cyprianic Age.¹⁰ In Cyprian's day the Novatian Persecution, arguments over the apostates who fled persecution, the baptism and rebaptism of those who were in schism, and disagreements between Stephen the Bishop of Rome and Cyprian Bishop of Carthage created the divisions in the Church.¹¹ In Dodwell's day, and in the Nonjurors' view, separatists, nonconformists, puritans, the Civil War and the 1688-89 Revolution created the divisions.¹²

Emphasis on the unity of the Church was paramount for both Cyprian and Dowell. They both lived in times when Christian unity was threatened. They both thought having more than one Church was impossible. Cyprian wrote, with reference to the heretic Novatian, "In spite of God's Tradition, in spite of the combined and everywhere compacted unity of the Catholic Church, [Novatian] is endeavoring to make a human church, and is sending his new apostles through very many cities, that he may establish some new foundations of his own appointment."¹³ Dodwell thought the deprivations following the 1688-89 Revolution had produced a similar result. Using St Cyprian as a

¹⁰ See Robert D. Cornwall, "The Search for the Primitive Church: The Use of Early Church Fathers in the High Church Anglican Tradition, 1680-1745," *Anglican and Episcopal History*, Vol. 59, No. 3 (September 1990), 303-329.

¹¹ McGiffert, *A History of Christian Thought*, 2:24-38.

¹² See Guy Martin Yould, "The origins and transformation of the nonjuror schism, 1670-1715: illustrated by special reference to the career, writings and activities of Dr. George Hickes, 1642-1715." (PhD diss., University of Hull, 1979).

¹³ Cyprian, *Epistle LI. To Antonianus about Cornelius and Novatian*, 24. All references to Cyprian's works follow the translation and numbering of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Fathers to A.D. 325*, editors Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, Vol. 5 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1978).

primary authority, he argued in *The Case in View* (1705) for an eventual end to the schism when all the deprived bishops had died.¹⁴

Cyprian and Dodwell believed salvation outside the Catholic Church was unattainable. Cyprian wrote: "Whoever is separated from the Church and is joined to an adulteress, is separated from the promises of church; nor can he who forsakes the Church of Christ attain to the rewards of Christ ... He can no longer have God for his Father, who has not the Church for his mother."¹⁵ Dodwell wrote in similar fashion, "But there was none in the visible constitution of the Church that represented God and Christ under the notion of a head but the Bishop. And therefore he was taken for the principle of Unity, without union to whom there could be no pretensions to union with God and Christ."¹⁶

Francis Brokesby, Dodwell's biographer and a Nonjuror, summarized Dodwell's belief on the essential nature of the episcopate:

There are some *Members* that are absolutely necessary to the Being of a *Church*; as the head is to the Body of an Animal so is the *Bishop* to the *Church*. This is confirmed by *Holy Scriptures* Reasoning and shew'd to be the Reasoning of S. *Cyprian*, that those are not *in the Church*, who are not (in Communion) with the *Bishop*.¹⁷

¹⁴ Henry Dodwell, *A case in view consider'd: in a discourse, proving that in case our present invalidly deprived fathers shall leave all their sees vacant, either by death or resignation we shall not then be obliged to keep up our separation from those bishops, who are as yet involved in the guilt of the present unhappy schism*. (London, 1705), 20,27.

¹⁵ Cyprian, *On the Unity of the Church*, 6.

¹⁶ Henry Dodwell, *A Defense of the Vindication of the Deprived Bishops* (London, 1695), 19. See Cornwall, *Visible and Apostolic*, 68 and Cornwall, "The Church and Salvation: An Early Eighteenth-Century High Church Anglican Perspective," *Anglican and Episcopal History* (1993), 175-191.

¹⁷ Francis Brokesby, *The works of the learned Mr. Henry Dodwell abridg'd: with an account of his life. By Francis Brokesby, B.D. To which is added, an abstract of Mr. Dodwell's book De cyclis; by Edm. Halley, LL. D. Astron. Reg. Geom. Prof. Savil. & R.S.S.* (London, 1723).

Hickes made precisely the same point in his *Constitution of the Catholick Church*:

That all Christians, Emperors and Kings as well as others, cease to be members of this Spiritual Corporation or Subjects of this Kingdom, by Lawful Excommunication, Apostacy from Christianity, open Heresy, or professing Doctrines destructive to the Catholick Faith: as also by Schism, which in Church Subjects consists in their withdrawing their Subjection and Obedience from their Rightful Bishops.¹⁸

The rightful bishops were the Nonjuring ones, and Hickes's authority for this statement was again Cyprian.

Cyprian's most famous and oft quoted treatise, *On the Unity of the Church*, addressed these themes. In that work he wrote: "This unity we ought firmly to hold and assert, especially those of us that are bishops who preside in the Church, that we may also prove the episcopate to be one and undivided."¹⁹ And again he said, "The episcopate is one, each part of which is held by each one for the whole. The Church also is one, which is spread abroad far and wide into a multitude by an increase of fruitfulness."²⁰ The Church was thus a divine institution, not national, but "spread abroad," it consisted of the federation of interdependent, equal dioceses each bishop charged with keeping the faith and unity of the whole. John Spurr writes, "A patristic fillip was afforded to the Church of England by its reading of St. Cyprian's *De catholicae ecclesiae unitate* of 251. In the hands of the church's scholars, this text provided an authoritative precedent for the universal government of the church as one episcopal office, committed in different parts of the church to particular bishops, each of whom has full and autonomous authority over

¹⁸ Hickes, *Constitution of the Catholick Church*, 69-70.

¹⁹ Cyprian, *On the Unity of the Church*, 5.

²⁰ Cyprian, *On the Unity of the Church*, 5.

his flock.”²¹ This was Cyprian’s central point — “The Bishop is in the Church, and the Church in the Bishop.”²²

Cyprian did believe that St. Peter was first among all the bishops, but in order that, “He [Christ] might set forth unity, He arranged by His authority the origin of that unity, as beginning from one [i.e. Peter].”²³ Cyprian’s view was that the Bishop of Rome was first among equals, and the Church of England assigned the same status to the Archbishop of Canterbury. Further, “Although to all the apostles, after His resurrection, He gives an equal power ... Assuredly the rest of the apostles were also the same as was Peter, endowed with a like partnership both of honour and power; but the beginning proceeds from unity.”²⁴ This position was precisely Dodwell’s ecclesiology as well.²⁵

Hickes’s argument was the same as that of Dodwell. All bishops were equal and the Roman Church was not the Catholic Church, only a part of it, and a corrupt part at that.

Bishops derived their Authority from Jesus Christ, as he is from his Father, and not the Pope. And no man that is acquainted with History, can doubt, that if the Bishops of the Roman Communion might maintain this doctrine safely, they would maintain it freely and openly, and wrest the Keys out of the Pope’s hand. They would, if they durst, let his Holiness know, that they are his *Fellows*, and

²¹John Spurr, “A special kindness to dead bishops” : The Church, History, and Testimony in Seventeenth-Century Protestantism,” *Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol 68, No. 1-2, (March 2005), 313-334, 12.

²² Cyprian, *Epistle LXVIII To Floretius Pupianus, on Calumniators*, 8. See George Stuart Murdoch Walker, *The Churchmanship of St. Cyprian*. No. 9. Lutterworth P., 1968; Wiles, Maurice F. "The Theological Legacy of St. Cyprian." *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 14, no. 02 (1963): 139-149.

²³ Cyprian, *On the Unity of the Church*, 4.

²⁴ Cyprian, *On the Unity of the Church*, 4.

²⁵ Cornwall, "Divine Right Monarchy," 37-66.

Colleagues and co Bishops, as St. Cyprian and his Brethren, called the Roman Bishops of his time.²⁶

Hickes cited Cyprian twelve times in *An Apologetical Vindication*, and at least twenty-three times in *The Constitution of the Catholick Church*.²⁷ *The Constitution of the Catholick Church* quoted Cyprian's Epistle LXXIII to buttress his claim that the usurping bishops who replaced the original deprived Nonjurors were "(a) null Bishops, (b) Usurpers in the Kingdom of God, Breakers of the sacred Order of (c) Co-ordination and Sub-ordination, and of that most holy Bond of Unity, Peace, and Charity by which the Kingdom and City of God doth subsist."²⁸ Cyprian was central in the Nonjurors' apologetical appeals to the early Fathers.²⁹

By 1718, the advanced Usager Thomas Brett saw Cyprian's authority as obviously magisterial. Brett wrote, "St. Cyprian, who was Bishop of Carthage about the year of our Lord 250, is so full upon this Subject that a Man may write a volume out of his works alone, *shewing Bishops to have been appointed by God to be the chief Governors of the Church, to have succeeded the Apostles ...*"³⁰ This position was held generally throughout the Nonjurors' little community.

²⁶ George Hickes, *An apologetical vindication of the Church of England: in answer to her adversaries who reproach her with the English heresies and schisms. With an appendix of papers relating to the schisms of the Church of Rome*. (London, 1706), 151-152.

²⁷ Hickes, *An apologetical vindication of the Church of England*, 94-98, 151-152, 164-173, 200, 210; Hickes, *The Constitution of the Catholick Church*, 30, 67, 71, 88, 96-98.

²⁸ Hickes, *The Constitution of the Catholick Church*, 95-96.

²⁹ Robert D Cornwall, "The Search for the Primitive Church: The Use of Early Church Fathers in the High Church Anglican Tradition, 1680-1745," *Anglican and Episcopal History* (1990), 303-329.

³⁰ Thomas Brett, *The divine right of episcopacy, and the necessity of an episcopal commission for preaching God's word, and for the valid ministration of the Christian sacraments, proved from the Holy Scriptures, and the doctrine and practice of the primitive church. Together With an impartial Account of the false Principles of Papists, Lutherans, and Calvinists, concerning the Identity of Bishops and*

The second aspect of a Cyprianist mentality was the respect given to martyrdom, to those who had suffered for their faith. In Cyprian's time a martyr was not required to die for the Faith; it was sufficient if he had been exiled, tortured, or thrown in prison.³¹ The Nonjurors felt that they too paid a big price for their conscience, although few suffered death. When they beheld the martyrs of Cyprian's age who suffered while in unity with their rightful, true bishops, they easily identified with those heroes a golden age. Norman Sykes pointed to the open and public departure of the Nonjurors from the Established Church, which "gave occasion to a protracted literary controversy, the protagonists of which challenged the validity of the position of the Established Church as a true branch of Christ's Catholic and Apostolic Church, by asserting its schismatic character against the faithful remnant of non-juring congregations who had preserved the integrity of their profession."³² These circumstances seemed to the Nonjurors analogous to those faced by Cyprian.³³ He was himself a martyr and his death was seen widely by early modern Christians as emblematic.³⁴ Spurr remarks, "The Fathers were more than sages; they were exemplars and martyrs. Their lives and death were a testimony to their faith."³⁵ Brad Gregory has demonstrated the link between Cyprian and Protestants and

Presbyters. Also The valid Succession of our English Bishops vindicated, against the Objections of Presbyterians and Romanists. And The Popish Fable of the Nags-Head Consecration of Archbishop Parker fully refuted. By Thomas Brett, L.L.D. (London, 1718), 42.

³¹ McGiffert, *A History of Christian Thought*, 2:28.

³² Norman Sykes, *Church and State in England in the XVIIIth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1934), 285.

³³ See Cornwall, *Visible and Apostolic*, 68.

³⁴ Edelhard Leonhard Hummel, *The Concept of Martyrdom According to St. Cyprian of Carthage*. No. 9. (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1946); Lucy Grig, *Making Martyrs in Late Antiquity* (London: Duckworth, 2004).

³⁵ Spurr, " 'A special kindness to dead bishops,' 8.

Roman Catholics in early modern Europe, who in like manner, encouraged the faithful in the face of martyrdom.³⁶ One of the Henrician martyrs, John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, was styled by his biographer as “a second Cyprian.”³⁷ Likewise, Calvin saw Cyprian’s martyrdom as paradigmatic for Protestant martyrs.³⁸

The Belgian scholar Valérie Rosoux notes the use of memory, and she observes that martyrdoms within a community were remembered for three essential purposes: the pedagogical, the attendant political circumstances, and the legitimation of the current political leader[s].³⁹ In this paradigm the memory of Cyprian’s martyrdom served a lasting purpose that the Nonjurors readily appropriated. If Rosoux’s argument is correctly applied to the Nonjurors’ situation, then this cherished memory served to give a sense of legitimation to the nonjuring community. Another historian, Elizabeth Castelli, has written: “The task of early Christian historians was the production of Christian collective memory, a memory characterized by striking degrees of continuity over temporal and geographical distances.”⁴⁰ Christian historical writing intended to tell a sacred story, creating “pious models for imitation.”⁴¹

The sixteenth-century Reformation brought new dilemmas for those prepared for the Christian imitation of the martyrs. The religious settlement reached at the Peace of

³⁶ Brad Gregory, *Salvation at Stake* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001), 118.

³⁷ Gregory, *Salvation at Stake*, 271.

³⁸ Gregory, *Salvation at Stake*, 157-159.

³⁹ Valerie Rosoux, “The Politics of Martyrdom,” 92-93.

⁴⁰ Elizabeth A. Castelli, *Martyrdom and Memory: Early Christian Culture Making* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2004), 25.

⁴¹ Castelli, *Martyrdom and Memory*, 28.

Augsburg in 1555 made it dangerous to be a Protestant in a Roman Catholic land and the opposite was equally true. Furthermore, flight to a land embracing one's own religion was not always possible. Benjamin Kaplan's research concludes that the "rhetorical thrust" of most post-Reformation literature interposed, "a religious duty to accept martyrdom and die trying [to] change the official religion of their homeland by persuasion and proselytizing."⁴² In practice most church leaders were compassionate in dealing with such circumstances.

Gregory observes Augustine's words, which he notes are largely dependent upon Cyprian's thinking: "Not the punishment, but the cause, makes a martyr."⁴³ Just as one, in Cyprian's view, could not be a true Christian outside the Church, neither could one be a true martyr if not in union with the rightful bishop within the Church.⁴⁴ For Cyprian, salvation was impossible outside the Catholic Church.⁴⁵ The Nonjurors pressed a similar claim vis-à-vis the certainty of salvation, which was questionable outside of their communion.⁴⁶ Cyprian certainly celebrated and encouraged the martyrs. In his *Epistle VII: To the Martyrs and Confessors* he wrote:

I not only beseech but exhort the rest of you, that you all shall follow that martyr [Mappalicus] now most blessed, and the other partners of that engagement, — soldiers and comrades, stedfast [sic] in faith, patient in suffering, victors in tortures, — that those who are united at once by the bond of confession, and the

⁴² Benjamin J. Kaplan, *Divided by Faith: Religious Conflict and the Practice of Toleration in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University, 2007), 157.

⁴³ Gregory, *Salvation at Stake*, 329-330.

⁴⁴ Cyprian, *On the Unity of the Church*, 19.

⁴⁵ Cyprian, *Epistle LXXIII: To Pomey, Against the Epistle of Stephen about the Baptism of Heretics*, 11; *On The Unity of the Church*, 6.

⁴⁶ Henry Dodwell, *Occasional communion fundamentally destructive of the discipline of the primitive catholick church, and contrary to the doctrine of the latest scriptures, concerning church-communion*. (London, 1705), 188.

entertainment of a dungeon, may also be united in the consummation of their virtue and a celestial crown.⁴⁷

The confessors differed from the martyrs only in that they suffered less punishment; both were witnesses to Christ, both confessed their faith openly. The word martyr [μάρτυς] originally simply meant a witness. This delineation of martyrs and confessors presumably suited the Nonjurors quite well, as only a few of them were killed for their confession. Those executed included in 1696 Sir John Friend and Sir William Perkins [or Parkyns] who were tried, convicted and executed in a plot against William III. Jeremy Collier, Shadrach Cook, and William Snatt, all nonjuring clergymen, appeared on the gallows with the condemned and publicly pronounced absolution. This enraged the two archbishops and ten diocesan bishops who thought the Nonjurors were trying to create martyrs. Indeed, Friend's words at the execution made it clear that he was a Nonjuror – "For this I suffer, and for this I die."⁴⁸ Collier subsequently defended his actions with an appeal to the Cyprianic Age.⁴⁹

Hickes was even more direct in referring to the Nonjurors as martyrs and confessors in an age of state persecution.

The Legislative Power may if it pleases, challenge to itself the whole Power of the Keys, which our High Priest in Heaven left to the Apostles and their Successors; and take upon it to Excommunicate, as well as Suspend and Deprive ... In that Case, I believe you would not think Compliance Lawful, especially in the Clergy, whose Duty you would think it rather to be, as Christ's faithful Officers and

⁴⁷ Cyprian, *Epistle VIII: To the Martyrs and Confessors*.

⁴⁸ See Lathbury, *A History of the Nonjurors*, 169-177; Overton, *The Nonjurors*, 124-127, 216-217; Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People*, 99-100. This incident calls out for more research; it is important for the creation of nonjuring martyr narratives and for the sacramental development of absolution in Anglicanism.

⁴⁹ Jeremy Collier, *A Defence of the Absolution Given to Sir William Perkins* (London, 1696).

Servants, to oppose this Sacrilegious Encroachment, tho' it were unto Blood, and suffer as Confessors or Martyrs.⁵⁰

There is little doubt that Hickes saw his life and witness, and that of his community, in much that way. The appeal to Cyprian was in the forefront of his thinking. William Law also appealed to martyr images. In his answer to the Bishop of Bangor, Law offered an interesting critique of Hoadly's criterion of sincerity as definitive for the Christian. Law wrote:

If the favour of God equally follows every degree of sincerity, then it is impossible there should be any difference, either as to merit or happiness, between a sincere martyr and a sincere persecutor; and he that burns the Christian, if he be but earnest, has the same title to reward for it, as he that is burnt for believing in Christ."⁵¹

Illustrations from martyrdom were never far from nonjuring polemic. And the linkage to Cyprian's ecclesiology synergistically strengthened their apologetic.

Ninety years ago Keith Feiling described a shift in emphasis that took place from 1689 to the beginning years of the eighteenth century. He observed, "As years passed on the struggle rose to higher and bleaker grounds of principle ... and the controversy changed from arguing the grounds of political allegiance to analyzing the character of the Church Catholic."⁵² Whatever historians today may criticize in his Tory apologetic, Feiling was absolutely correct in noticing the change in mentality. And, that change was due in large measure to the relentless application of a Cyprianist mentality by the Nonjurors' community.

⁵⁰ Hickes, *Constitution of the Catholick Church*, 147.

⁵¹ Law, *Three Letters to the Bishop of Bangor*, 52-53.

⁵² Keith Feiling, *A History of the Tory Party 1640-1714* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924),303.

George Hickes

George Hickes, writing to Bishop Ken, traced the trajectory along which a Cyprianist mentality finally took the Nonjurors, “In His good time God will raise large and lovely structures of pure and primitive-like communion upon the foundations we shall lay ...making it fuller and more fit for a reformed communion that desires to be primitive and truly catholic in everything.”⁵³ Hickes built an infrastructure for the Nonjurors out of the Cyprianist mentality, by which I mean he consecrated bishops to continue the Apostolic Succession and at the same time deployed Cyprian’s ecclesiology to assert the independence and divine foundation of the [Nonjurors’] Church.

Hickes was a believer in indefeasible divine right, Passive Obedience, and non-resistance, but, beyond those doctrines, he had become convinced by his extensive reading of patristic literature, largely as interpreted by Dodwell, that the English Church, like the Church in primitive times, was not an arm of the state, but established as a divine society by Christ, and was independent of the crown or pope in matters of spiritual jurisdiction.⁵⁴ In short, authority and obedience came to the Church directly from God through the bishops. His posthumous papers, published in 1716 as *The Constitution of the Catholick Church*, presented an uncompromising view of the Nonjurors as the true Church in England. The return of the Shottesbrooke Nonjurors and others to the Established Church forced Hickes’s hand. Goldie says Hickes wrote, “partly in angry

⁵³ George Hickes, *Letter to Thomas Ken, October 24, 1699*. The College Papers, folio 6, 20., cited in Henry Broxap, *The Later Non-jurors*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 124), 6.

⁵⁴ See Guy Martin Yould, "The Origins and Transformation of the Non-Juror Schism, 1670-1715; Illustrated by Special Reference to the Career, Writings, and Activities of Dr. George Hickes, 1642-1715" (unpublished Ph.D. diss. University of Hull, 1979).

retort to Dodwell's apostasy from the Nonjurors."⁵⁵ Dodwell held a more charitable view of the Established Church than did Hickes. The Shottesbrooke Nonjurors believed the same doctrines as Hickes; the interpretation and application of those beliefs were what propelled Hickes to continue the separation.

The anonymous nonjuring publisher of *The Constitution of the Catholick Church* constructed a preface that concluded: "You now see the three great Impediments which hinder us from joining the Revolution Church of England: Schism, Heresy, and Unrighteous Devotions. [We] charge that Communion with being (like the Church of Rome) corrupt in its doctrine, Worship and Ministry."⁵⁶ The publisher conveniently summarized Hickes's arguments:

The Church is independent.... The deprivation of Catholick Bishops by any power is absolutely null and void.... The laity as well as the clergy are bound to adhere to the communion of the Rightful Bishop [i.e. the Nonjuring Bishop]. It is unlawful to communicate with Schismatical Bishops [meaning the present Bishops of the Church of England] till they have repented, acknowledged their Schism, returned to the Church [the Nonjuring Church] and had their Orders confirmed, and Authority from it to act.... Ordinations in the Established Church are invalid spiritually...The Catholick Church is the Kingdom of God which Kingdom had a being in the world independent of the secular powers for above 300 years. Christ is the King of this Kingdom and the Bishops his chief ministers and Vice regents in it.... [Emperors and Kings are simply laymen in the Church and gain nothing more than other men by their Baptism except] a stronger Obligation to defend the Church and its Rights.⁵⁷

The summary is a synopsis of Hickes's ideas, but it leaves much out. This is understandable because the *Constitution of the Catholick Church* is lengthy. The core

⁵⁵ Mark Goldie, "The Origins of the Convocation Controversy," in *Ideology and Conspiracy*, ed. Eveline Cruickshanks (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers Ltd, 1982), 29.

⁵⁶ Hickes, *The Constitution of the Catholick Church*, 16. See chapter four below for the "anonymous publisher."

⁵⁷ Hickes, *The Constitution of the Catholick Church*, 3-5.

alone contains in forty propositions concerning the nature of the Church. Most have already been summarized, but two require more attention. First, Hickes maintained that the Church exists in the bishop, literally it is incorporated, embodied in the bishop; there is no Church apart from the bishop. This is very different from most protestant thought. Dodwell had written extensively on Cyprian's ecclesiology and his work was, in considerable measure, the underpinning of the Nonjurors' argument.⁵⁸ Saint Cyprian said "He who has not the Church for his Mother cannot have God for his Father."⁵⁹ Ignatius of Antioch proclaimed, "For as many as are of God and Jesus Christ, they are with the bishop."⁶⁰ Hickes combined both ideas saying, "...in every Diocese, the Church is in the Rightful Bishop, who is the Principle of Unity in it, and his Flock tho' never so small in Number: And in every Province, the Episcopal College is in the Rightful Primate or President of it, and those Bishops and their flocks which adhere to him, as the Principle of Unity."⁶¹ For Hickes the bishop and his flock was the basic unit of the Church, and the College of Bishops – much like the Ecumenical Councils – was the authority to whom obedience was rightfully due.

⁵⁸ Henry Dodwell, *Dissertationes Cyprianici* (Oxford: 1684); Henry Dodwell, *The Doctrine of the Church of England, Concerning the Independency of the Clergy on the Lay Power, as to those Rights which are Puerely Spiritual, Reconciled with our Oath of Supremacy, and the Lay Deprivations of the Popish Bishops in the Beginning of the Reformation* (London: 1697), VI. Compare, William Law, *Three Letters to the Bishop of Bangor*, 1:7-8, 73; John Findon, "The Non-jurors and the Church of England, 1689-1716" (unpublished D.Phil. Dss. Oxford University, 1978), 174; Cornwall, *Visible and Apostolic*, 174.

⁵⁹ Saint Cyprian of Carthage, *De Unitate*, 6. "He who does not have the Church for his Mother cannot have God for his Father." "Habere non potest Deum patrem qui ecclesiam non habet matrem."

⁶⁰ Saint Ignatius of Antioch, *Epistle to the Philippians 4; Epistle to the Ephesians 4; Epistle to the Magnesians 1*

⁶¹ Hickes, *The Constitution of the Catholick Church*, 72.

Hickes insisted that the state had persecuted the Church by “temporal force,”⁶² and thus its relationship with the Church was forfeit since it had usurped the Church’s authority by depriving the rightful bishops.⁶³ When the state persecuted the Church, Christians had a duty to defend the rights of the Church⁶⁴ and to stay in communion with their rightful bishops.⁶⁵ The authority of the bishop was the same authority the Apostles claimed and exercised.⁶² For Hickes, when the secular authorities usurped the apostolic authority of the Established Church, it was far worse than anything ever done by a pope.⁶⁶ The publication of these papers infuriated Latitudinarians and Whigs alike, and ignited the firestorm known today as the Bangorian Controversy.⁶⁷

Long before the nonjuring schism, many groups held distinctive spiritual ideas vis-à-vis their mission. What distinguished the Nonjurors from others who were cast out? How did they differ from Puritans, Roman Catholics, Quakers, Presbyterians, Congregationalist, Baptists, Nonconformists, and Dissenters generally, or from numerous radical groups that arose in the aftermath of the Civil War? All of these groups were in some degree outside the establishment. All believed they were the true Church, and all of them sought to either reform or reestablish themselves as the rightful Church in Britain. There were clearly many similarities. The Nonjurors employed print culture like the

⁶² Hickes, *The Constitution of the Catholick Church*, 77.

⁶³ Hickes, *The Constitution of the Catholick Church*, 79-80.

⁶⁴ Hickes, *The Constitution of the Catholick Church*, 80.

⁶⁵ Hickes, *The Constitution of the Catholick Church*, 77.

⁶⁶ Hickes, *The Constitution of the Catholick Church*, 118-119.

⁶⁷ See Alison Bryn Schulz, “Freedom and obedience: state and church in late-seventeenth and early-eighteenth century English political pamphlets, with a focus on the life and work of George Hickes” (M.A. Thesis, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1997).

Quakers, small cell groups like the Puritans, a network of bishops like the Roman Catholics; they were constituted as gathered congregations unlike the geographical parishes of the Established Church. They depended upon patrons, as did virtually everyone else. Arguably, they even had "enthusiasm," that most distrusted of traits by Anglicans.⁶⁸ Geoffrey Holmes noted the marked change in religious enthusiasm in the years following 1714, "Passion, idealism, 'enthusiasm' are now frowned on."⁶⁹ Law's teaching, for example, in W. Jardine Grisbooke's opinion, "... has to be seen against its background: he is reacting against the eighteenth century's distastes for 'enthusiasm' and 'fanaticism', and its easy-going Christianity, too often ready to compromise with 'the world' to almost any extent."⁷⁰

John Stoughton, writing in 1874, of the reign of William III, described only two groups, Nonjurors and Quakers, as possessing "religious excitement" or "abundant enthusiasm." He described Hickes "as much a spiritual fanatic as any of the Presbyterian army chaplains, or any of Cromwell's troopers." Kettlewell, likewise, was a man of "devout fervour, which though not healthy is free from worldliness, and which draws its main inspiration from the world to come ... In intensity of religious feelings, he

⁶⁸ C. J. Abbey "Enthusiasm" in Charles John Abbey and John Henry Overton, *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century*, reprint edition (Filquarian Publishing, N.D.), 226-278; Jordan Penney, "'The quiet of mankind': authority, spirit, and enthusiasm in England, 1660-1714." (PhD thesis, University of York, 2010); Michael Heyd, "The reaction to enthusiasm in the seventeenth century: towards an integrative approach." *The Journal of Modern History* (1981): 258-280; Michael Heyd, *Be Sober and Reasonable: The Critique of Enthusiasm in the Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 65-76; Paul Goring, "Anglicanism, Enthusiasm and Quixotism: Preaching and Politeness in mid-eighteenth century literature," *Literature and Theology* 15, no. 4 (2001): 326-341; J. G. A. Pocock, "Enthusiasm: The Antiself of Enlightenment." *The Huntington Library Quarterly* (1997): 7-28.

⁶⁹ Geoffrey Holmes, *Politics, Religion and Society in England 1679-1742* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1986), 182.

⁷⁰ W. Jardine Grisbrooke, "The Nonjurors and William Law," in *The Study of Spirituality*, eds. Cheslyn Jones, Geoffrey Wainwright, and Edward Yarnold, S.J. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), 453-454.

resembled a staunch Methodist of the eighteenth century.”⁷¹ Notwithstanding their passion and commitment, how were the Nonjurors, in their own mind, different?

The answer is threefold and focuses upon authority and obedience. First, the Nonjurors believed that the Church Catholic, including the Church of England, should be governed, as St. Cyprian clearly said, by bishops in apostolic succession, not by popes or presbyters. For the High Church Anglican and Nonjuror the episcopacy was essential; they were episcopalians in Apostolic Succession. This was Henry Dodwell's great contribution to the Nonjurors' cause. Without bishops validly consecrated, the Nonjurors would have ceased to exist. The Nonconformists did not want bishops; their forbears had fought a Civil War over bishops in order to get rid of bishops.⁷² Only the Nonjurors, along with establishment High Churchmen, depended upon valid bishops as a *sine qua non* for their existence.

The Established Church could not, by virtue of refusal to take the necessary oaths, and would not, because of the right of selection vested in the Crown, ordain any nonjuring bishops. Bishop Wagstaff died in 1712, leaving Hickes the last of the English nonjuring bishops. The nonjuring episcopal succession in England was in danger of dying out, and they had to find some way to continue. Several Scottish Episcopalian bishops were willing to consecrate new episcopal candidates for England. Three bishops were required to consecrate a new bishop; this had been the case since the Council of Nicaea in A.D. 325, and the Nonjurors were absolutely obedient to this principle.⁷³

⁷¹ John Stoughton, *Ecclesiastical History of England, The Church of the Revolution* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1874), 398-399.

⁷² On the Anglican and Puritan divide over *jure divino* episcopacy see John F. H. New, *Anglican and Puritan: The Basis of their Opposition 1558-1640* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1964), 54-58.

⁷³ Henry R. Percival, *The Seven Ecumenical Councils of the Undivided Church: Their Canons and*

Second, the later Nonjurors, unlike all other protestant Christians, believed "James III" the rightful king. Their oath given to the Stuart dynasty in the name of God remained sacred. They at first saw the king and church inseparably united, as had James I, Charles I, Archbishop Laud, and those who followed them at the Restoration in 1660. Ultimately they espoused Hickes clearly articulated position that the Church did not depend upon the king, but upon divine institution and obedience to God. They were in a powerful sense, "that long-suffering remnant of the Restoration Church."⁷⁴ Nonjurors combated Erastianism vigorously;⁷⁵ for them both crown and church depended upon the authority of God as part of the divine ordering of society, and the church was not dependent upon the crown.

Third, they saw themselves the true continuing Church of England. In short, they believed Christianity in England, in Britain, depended on them. They had not left the Church, usurpers had tried and failed to seize the Church away from them.

On Ascension Day, 14 May 1713, Hickes, the last living English nonjuring bishop, took action to continue the apostolic succession. He, with two Scottish bishops, James Gadderar and Archibald Campbell, consecrated Jeremy Collier, Samuel Hawes, and Nathaniel Spinckes as new English bishops in order to continue the nonjuring Church. There was a direct link to the earlier Nonjurors; Bishops Lloyd, Turner, and White clandestinely consecrated George Hickes and Thomas Wagstaffe bishops in 1694

Dogmatic Decrees (Grand Rapids: Erdmans Publishing Company, 1979), 11, 557. Canon III of the First Council of Nicaea in 325 A.D. ordered that all the bishops of the province should appoint and presumably ordain the new bishop but at a minimum three bishops were required. The Second Council of Nicaea in 787 in Canon III specifically acted to restate the intention of Nicaea I 325 by ordering that no less than three bishops consecrate a new bishop.

⁷⁴ Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People 1688-1788*, 17.

⁷⁵ Hawkins, *Allegiance in Church and State*, 167.

for precisely the same reasons.⁷⁶ Then, in 1713, Hickes and his colleagues deemed themselves as successors of the Apostles and the only legitimate representatives of the Church of England. The consecration credential of Jeremy Collier, in Hickes's own hand, illustrated their convictions.

In the Name of the Lord. Amen. We George Hickes, Catholic Bishop of the Church of England and Suffragan Bishop of Thetford, Archibald Campbell and James Gadderar Catholic Bishops of the Church in Scotland, according to the assent of the Lord, knowing that all the Catholic Bishops of the English Church except the aforesaid George Hickes have fallen asleep in the Lord, take to ourselves to publish by this missive, that the Reverend Father in Christ George, Suffragan Bishop of Thetford, in the Lord, moreover with attention to the Lords command and aware of the fragility of human memory, as well as for the health of the Church of England, that Holy Catholic and undiminished faithful succession of Bishops in perpetual line, ...do consecrate Jeremy Collier etc.⁷⁷

All three consecrations were witnessed by: Heneage Finch, Earl of Winchelsea, and the Reverend Henry Gandy. Finch became Fifth Earl of Winchelsea in 1712. He refused the oaths, became a Nonjuror, and was never allowed to take his seat in the House of Lords; he did, however, retain the title until his death in 1727.⁷⁸ Henry Gandy was a priest of the Church of England and Dean of Oriel College, Oxford when he refused to take the oath in 1689. Three years after the consecration of Collier, Spinckes, and Hawes, Gandy and Thomas Brett, became bishops at the hands of the same men whose

⁷⁶ Overton, *The Nonjurors*, 29

⁷⁷ Hickes, Campbell and Gadderar, "The Consecration of Jeremy Collier" printed in Broxap, *The Later Nonjurors*, 14. See Overton's *The Nonjurors*, 119. This translation from the original Latin is Overton's.

⁷⁸ His father, the Third Earl of Winchelsea, was also named Heneage Finch. A cousin held the earldom between them. The Third Earl's first cousin was Heneage Finch, First Earl of Nottingham, whose son, also named Heneage, First Earl of Aylesford, was legal counsel with John Somers for the defense of the Seven Bishops in 1688. Somers later, as Lord Chancellor, ended the prosecution of George Hickes. The FitzHerbert-Finch Family, long associated with the earldoms of Nottingham and Winchelsea and prominent in the realm of English law, was a powerful patron to many, including some Nonjurors.

ordinations they had witnessed. The Ascension Day 1713 consecration took place in Hickeys' oratory in Scroop's Court, Holborn, London.

It is also important that they used the Ordinal – "The Form and Manner of Making and Consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons" – from *The Book of Common Prayer* (1662) with its preface that clearly stated the intention to continue this succession that had existed from the time of the Apostles.⁷⁹

It is evident unto all men, diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church – Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. ... And therefore, to the intent that these Orders may be continued, and reverently used and esteemed in the Church, no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, in this Church, or suffered to execute any of the said Functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to the Form hereafter following, or hath had Episcopal Consecration or Ordination.⁸⁰

This was in marked contrast to more Erastian ideas then current among Latitudinarian bishops and Whig parliamentarians. Hickeys and his colleagues believed they were acting to continue the Universal Church in England. Nonjurors had no dioceses, and the three new bishops had neither sees, nor titles, a system probably modeled on Scottish Episcopal practice following the deprivations there in 1691.⁸¹ Or, equally likely, they simply saw themselves returning to a more primitive pre-Constantinian era in which bishops frequently had neither cathedrals nor titles.

⁷⁹ For the force of the 1662 *Act of Uniformity* see Norman Sykes, *Old Priest and New Presbyterian* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1957), 116.

⁸⁰ *The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church according to the Use of the Church of England* (1662; Oxford: Oxford University press, 1969), 633.

⁸¹ J.W.C. Wand, *The High Church Schism* (London: Faith Press, 1951), 43. The Scottish bishops had no dioceses after their deprivation in 1691 but continued to consecrate bishops at large.

Collier was consecrated in George Hickes's private oratory which was in the geographical parish, but not in the church building of, Saint Alban's, Holborn.⁸² All but possibly one of future ordinations also occurred in a private oratory; none were in cathedrals, none in parish churches.⁸³ The Nonjurors' bishops ministered without the institutional accoutrements of the Established Church.

Nathaniel Spinckes published a collection of Hickes's sermons after he died.⁸⁴ One was on the episcopate, and based upon the text Revelation 8:11-12 — the beast with two horns coming upon the earth. The date of this sermon is uncertain. In the sermon Hickes brought together multiple themes that reflected the later High Church view of episcopacy. First, the bishops were the successors of the Apostles and possessed the same authority as the Apostles, whose authority came from Christ. They transferred this authority in an unbroken succession to the bishops in every age and every place.⁸⁵ Second, no one in the ancient Church questioned this fact and not until the fifteenth century was it ever challenged.⁸⁶ Third, the power of Christ given to his Apostles and through them to the bishops was universally attested and taught or "supposed" by the New Testament writers.⁸⁷ Even "...our late blessed sovereign [i.e. Charles I], the martyr

⁸² George Hickes, "The Consecration of Jeremy Collier" in *The Later Nonjurors*, 14. Collier was consecrated in "*Londini in Oratorio R'n Christo Patris pronominal [sp?] George Hickes, quod [writing unclear?] in parochia de S. Andreas Holborn...*"

⁸³ See Broxap, *The Later Nonjurors*, 348-351, where Broxap provides a complete list of all Nonjuring consecrations.

⁸⁴ George Hickes, *Thirteen Sermons on Practical Subjects by the late learned George Hickes, D.D., Dean of Worcester. Published by Nathaniel Spinckes A.M.* (London, 1741).

⁸⁵ Hickes, *Thirteen Sermons on Practical Subjects*, 71,74.

⁸⁶ Hickes, *Thirteen Sermons on Practical Subjects*, 79-80.

⁸⁷ Hickes, *Thirteen Sermons on Practical Subjects*, 79-80.

for the apostolical government said ... 'If the practice of the primitive Church (saith he) and the universal consent of the fathers be not a convincing argument, when the interpretation of Scripture is doubtful, I know nothing'."⁸⁸ Fourth, paraphrasing Saint Augustine of Hippo, Hicke contended, "... episcopal government, that which the universal Church doth hold, and was never instituted by councils but hath always been retained in the Church, we most justly believe to have descended from no authority but the Apostles."⁸⁹ Fifth, the bishop should "remember to expect not honour, but grace; not riches, but poverty; not pleasure, but persecution; serving the Church, and lay down your lives for the good of it."⁹⁰ Finally, bishops could abuse episcopal authority, and popes more than all other bishops had turned apostolic authority to secular ends.⁹¹

Evidence that this sermon predated the crisis of 1689-91, was supported by the failure to mention the usurping bishops of William III's reign. Hicke made the interesting point that the Apostles differed from bishops in that they moved about as missionaries, while the bishops were traditionally situated in dioceses. It is likely he later saw the churchless nonjuring bishops as apostles on a mission.

When Hicke, Campbell and Gadderar consecrated three new bishops in 1713, they feared the Apostolic Succession would die out if they did not act quickly, but, the fundamental reason behind their action was reform of the Church of England, and that reform depended upon them. They looked to the Undivided Church prior to 1054, particularly to the pre-Constantinian Church, for their model, and they sought to restore

⁸⁸ Hicke, *Thirteen Sermons on Practical Subjects.*, 82.

⁸⁹ Hicke, *Thirteen Sermons on Practical Subjects.*, 83.

⁹⁰ Hicke, *Thirteen Sermons on Practical Subjects.*, 85.

⁹¹ Hicke, *Thirteen Sermons on Practical Subjects* , 90.

the Church of England to that primitive purity. They inherited a tradition from the Caroline divines that was well expressed in Thomas Ken's last will, which said "...[he] dies in the Communion of the Church of England, as it stands distinguished from all Popish and Puritan Innovations, and as it adheres to the Doctrine of the Cross."⁹² Overton argued convincingly, the "Doctrine of the Cross does not mean the Doctrine of the Atonement, but the Doctrine of Passive Obedience; in fact, just what Ken's friend Kettlewell meant by it."⁹³ Undoubtedly this ecclesiology underlay Campbell and Collier's motives in approaching the Eastern Orthodox Churches sometime before July 1716 with the goal of ecumenical reunion.⁹⁴

All of those who supported Hicke did so at some personal risk. Most acted not because he was their friend, but because he was one of two nonjuring bishops critically important in carrying on the episcopate the Nonjurors' community.⁹⁵ Clark notes a development from the Caroline divines's earlier position. The Restoration Church "came to be influenced less by Laudians than by a new breed of (what later became known as) High Churchmen, men whose churchmanship was defined by a patristic stress on the Apostolic succession and by the parallel political principle of divine indefeasible right:

⁹² Cited in Lathbury, *A History of the Nonjurors*, 226, and in Overton, *The Nonjurors*, 65.

⁹³ Overton, *The Nonjurors*, 65. See also John Kettlewell, *Christianity a Doctrine of the Cross* in Kettlewell's *Compleat Works*, 2:143-44.

⁹⁴ See Henry Sefton "The Scottish Bishops and Archbishop Arsenius," in *The Orthodox Churches and the West: Papers Read at the Fourteenth Summer Meeting and the Fifteenth Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society*, edited by Derek Baker. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1976).

⁹⁵ For the necessity of episcopacy see Cornwall, *Visible and Apostolic* and Norman Sykes, *Old Priest and New Presbyter*. This view of the episcopate as of the *esse* of the Church, striking for many contemporary scholars, was well established by the time of Cyprian of Carthage or Augustine of Hippo, and the Caroline Divines as well as Restoration Churchmen held an ecclesiology only slightly less developed than the Nonjurors.

Dissenters were thereby both unchurched and identified as politically suspect."⁹⁶ Not only his friends Hickes, but a community who saw him as vital to its enterprise.

At Gloucester Green, after five years on the run, Hickes prematurely wrote his dying man's confession long before his demise. This 1696 *Declaration*, much like John Lake's, was attached to a much later *Last will and Testament*, dated 23 November 1713. A codicil of 18 July 1715 was later added. This latter will reiterated his intention to: "Continue until death in the Faith and Communion of the Church of England as by law established, since the Reformation, as I have also Testified at large in a Declaration interlined and Signed with my own hand."⁹⁷ Both *Declaration* and *Will* were consistent and illustrative of Hickes's concept of obedience. He had, for almost twenty years, lived out his untimely dying declaration of 1696.⁹⁸

After 1710 Hickes stood alone and his actions in 1713 represented a lifelong vision and struggle to rebuild the Church of England along more Catholic and Apostolic lines, as he had begged Thomas Ken to do in 1699: "In His good time God will raise large and lovely structures of pure and primitive-like communion upon the foundations

⁹⁶ Clark, *English Society 1660-1832*, 58,

⁹⁷ George Hickes *The Last Will and Testament of the Reverend Dr. George Hickes* (London: 1716) 11.

⁹⁸ George Hickes, A Declaration made by the Right Reverend Dr. George Hickes, concerning the Faith and Religion in which he lived and intended to die: and referred to in his Will (London: 1743). The sixteen-page Declaration said in part: "I profess and declare the Church of England, as it was governed and administered by true, and lawful, and rightful Bishops before the Revolution, to have been a true and sound Part of the Catholick Church; and I testify my unalterable Adherence to all the Doctrines of it contained in the Thirty-Nine Articles, in Opposition to the corrupt and dangerous Doctrine and Practices of the Roman Church; and this I do to vindicate myself and my suffering Brethren from the Opinion which the common People, and other ignorant and inconsiderate Persons have taken up of us, as Papists, or inclined to Popery, because we have withdrawn ourselves from the publick Assemblies and Worship in the parochial Churches....Accordingly, I am fully persuaded and declare, that the Church of England now consists in the deprived Bishops, so called, and that faithful Remnant which adheres to them, and that the other Archbishops and Bishops, and the great Majority adhering to them are guilty of a great schism to be lamented by all good Christians."

we shall lay ...making it fuller and more fit for a reformed communion that desires to be primitive and truly catholic in everything.”⁹⁹ And on Ascension Day 1713 George Hickee thought he had achieved just that.

"So Conscientious a Regard to Oaths"

Historians know much about oaths in early modern England in general and about the oaths the Nonjurors refused in particular – the Oaths of Allegiance to William and Mary included in the Declaration of Right (1689), the Oath of Association in defense of William III in 1696, the later Abjuration Oath denouncing further Stuart claims to the throne in 1701, and a final act abjuring “James III” at the accession of George I in 1714. With regard to the 1689 oaths, Goldie has counted one hundred and eighty-nine pamphlets written to justify or denounce this oath taking.¹⁰⁰ Gerald Straka argued that the questionable legal standing of William and Mary’s reign was justified largely by “divine right of providence” arguments.¹⁰¹ These providential arguments established that God put William on the throne to save England from popery and absolutism. Tony Claydon and Craig Rose have each more recently underscored the considerable importance devoted to providential thinking in Williamite pamphlets.¹⁰² J. P. Kenyon, on the other

⁹⁹ George Hickee, *Letter to Thomas Ken, October 24, 1699*. The College Papers, folio 6, 20. (Edinburgh: The Scottish Episcopal church Theological College), cited in Broxap, *The Later Non-jurors*, 6.

¹⁰⁰ Mark Goldie, “The Revolution of 1689 and the Structure of Political Argument,” *Bulletin of Research in the Humanities*, LXXXIII (1980), 473-564.

¹⁰¹ Gerald M. Straka, *Anglican Reaction to the Revolution of 1688* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1962).

¹⁰² Tony Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Craig Rose, *England in the 1690s, Revolution, Religion and War* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999).

hand, considered all such arguments devised after the fact, and employed to bolster hardened positions already taken.¹⁰³

Edward Vallance has accented the similarity that faced the clergy in the 1649 oaths due to the Commonwealth and the 1689 oaths to William and Mary. In both of these cases the government abandoned prescriptions of legitimacy and *de jure* arguments, in favor of *de facto* oaths designed to be “as accommodating as possible.”¹⁰⁴ Historians have long noted the form of the 1689 Oath at the accession of William and Mary, which omitted any description of the Prince and Princess of Orange as the “rightful and lawful” monarchs and required instead that: “I, A. B., do sincerely promise and swear to bear true allegiance to their Majesties King William and Queen Mary.”¹⁰⁵ *De facto* situations, however, did not justify *de jure* oaths in a Nonjuror’s mind.¹⁰⁶ Spurr has noted generally throughout the early modern period “oaths could not be set up against the claims of conscience,”¹⁰⁷ and issues of conscience were paramount for Nonjurors. Conversely, Barry Coward describes the solution of High Church Tories who faced the dilemma of accepting the new regime while not denying the legitimacy of the Stuart succession as one of “highly ingenious casuistry.”¹⁰⁸ Conal Condren writes,

¹⁰³ J. P. Kenyon, *Revolution Principles: The Politics of Party 1689-1720* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 25.

¹⁰⁴ Edward Vallance, “Decline of Conscience as a Political Guide: William Higden’s *View of the English Constitution* (1709)” in *Contexts of Conscience in Early Modern Europe, 1500-1700*, eds. Harald E. Braun and Edward Vallance (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 69.

¹⁰⁵ *The High Church Schism*, 9, and Lathbury, *A History of the Nonjurors*, 45.

¹⁰⁶ Harris, *Politics under the Later Stuarts*, 138.

¹⁰⁷ John Spurr, “‘The Strongest Bond of Conscience’: Oaths and the Limits of Tolerance in Early Modern England” in *Contexts of Conscience in Early Modern Europe, 1500-1700*, Braun and Vallance eds., 161.

¹⁰⁸ Barry Coward, *The Stuart Age, England 1603-1714* (London: Longman, 1994), 357.

Easily accused of popery, they [the Nonjurors] sought to occupy the high moral ground by dismissing alternate positions as casuistic expediency ... positioning themselves close to the martyred Charles I, the gist will be apparent: oaths and the hereditary principle were sacrosanct. ... Swearing new oaths violated old, a fast road to perdition.¹⁰⁹

Harris notes an important distinction between Nonjurors, for whom the oaths had an “inviolable nature,” and many Jacobites, who “often showed few scruples about taking oaths.”¹¹⁰ This parallels the Nonjurors eschewing armed force while the Jacobites made efforts to raise armies. In that regard, Vallance argues: “Non-jurors insisted that taking the oath of allegiance to William and Mary bound subscribers to giving full and active obedience to the king’s commands, including giving him military assistance.”¹¹¹ This, of course, they could never do. Jennifer Carter described the situation: “For twelve years after 1689 there was intermittent dispute about the royal title and the oath of allegiance.”¹¹² G. V. Bennet captured the anguish of the future Nonjurors:

“Could Anglican divines disavow their preaching for a generation? Was not James II rightful king still, and was not the Revolution a prime example of rebellion and resistance? If they thus sifted their allegiance, where stood now the religious view of society and social obligation?”¹¹³

Nonjurors were, initially, and by subsequent oaths, faced with affirming “rebellion and resistance” that were antithetical to their doctrine of Passive Obedience, and theories of

¹⁰⁹ Conal Condren, *Argument and Authority in Early Modern England: The Presupposition of Oaths and Offices* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 323.

¹¹⁰ Harris, *Politics under the Later Stuarts*, 212.

¹¹¹ Edward Vallance, “Decline of Conscience as a Political Guide: William Higden’s *View of the English Constitution* (1709)” in Braun and Vallance eds. *Contexts of Conscience in Early Modern Europe, 1500-1700*, 70.

¹¹² Jennifer Carter, “The Revolution and the Constitution” in *Britain after the Glorious Revolution 1689-1714*, ed. Geoffrey Holmes (London: Macmillan, St. Martin’s Press, 1969), 41.

¹¹³ G.V. Bennett, “Conflict in the Church,” in *Britain after the Glorious Revolution 1689-1714*, ed. Holmes, 159.

indefeasible divine right, and non-resistance. Harris expressed their position succinctly, “Those who had greatest scruples [in taking the oaths] were precisely those High Anglican clergy who had led the opposition to James, and especially the bishops.”¹¹⁴ My thesis, similar to Harris, is that Nonjurors viewed their oaths to God as inviolable and their intense scrupulosity distinguished them from jurors. In the end their decision turned on religion and not politics. The two examples presented here illustrate this argument.

William Law (1686-1761) became a fellow of Emmanuel College Cambridge in 1711 and a Nonjuror upon the accession of George I in 1714.¹¹⁵ He attended Cambridge during the same three years that Ambrose Bonwicke studied there at nearby St John’s College. In 1728 he published his most famous book *A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life*. The “holy living” ideal presented therein was not dissimilar to that practiced by his contemporary Bonwicke. They are both illustrative of the second generation Nonjurors who came of age around the same time as the Shottesbrooke Community returned to the Established Church and Hickes consecrated three new bishops to continue the schism.

A Serious Call is about obedience. Law wrote: “The whole nature of virtue consists in conforming to, and the whole nature of vice in declining from, the will of God.”¹¹⁶ All creatures of God, heavenly and terrestrial, were created in an order that was by design to obey him and fulfill his will. This was also true of the “sun and moon” as well as of “angels” all which “conform to his will.” If humans were to be in the divine

¹¹⁴ Harris, *Politics under the Later Stuarts*, 138.

¹¹⁵ See Arthur Keith Walker, *William Law: His Life and Thought* (London: S.P.C.K., 1973); Isabel Rivers, “Law, William (1686–1761),” in *ODNB*.

¹¹⁶ William Law *A Serious Call*, chapter 22.

order of created things they too must make it their life's desire to obey God. "It must be the settled purpose and intention of your heart, to will nothing, design nothing, do nothing, but so far as you have reason to believe that it is the will of God that you should so desire, design, and do."¹¹⁷ The Fall of Man did in Law's mind, had not robbed humanity of agency in acting. In fact, he suggested over and over that the real reason people fail to act as genuine Christians was their failure to intend to follow Christ.¹¹⁸ Intent was as much the key for Law as it was in *The Imitation of Christ*. A practical spirituality focused upon habitual patterns of obedience permeates Law's worldview, and Bonwicke's life offers a good illustration.

Bonwicke's brief life is recorded in his father's book, urged to print by William Bowyer, *A Pattern for Young Students in the University, set forth in the Life of Mr. Ambrose Bonwicke, sometime Scholar of St. John's College in Cambridge*. Fifteen years elapsed from young Bonwicke's death in 1714 until publication in 1729. C. J. Robinson, writing in 1885 said, "It is interesting, not merely as a picture of college life a century and a half ago, but as showing the nature and development of the scrupulous conscience which made both father and son nonjurors."¹¹⁹ The word "Nonjuror" is never mentioned, and only a matter of fact summary of the son's failure to read the royal prayers at Merchant Taylors' School and his subsequent rejection for St. John's College, Oxford is presented. Bonwicke's daily self-examination included, "I resolve to honour and obey the King, and all that are put in Authority, actively or passively: And in the Circumstances I

¹¹⁷ Law, *A Serious Call*, chapter 22.

¹¹⁸ Law, *A Serious Call*, chapter 2.

¹¹⁹ C. J. Robinson, 'Bonwicke, Ambrose (1691–1714)', rev. Christoph v. Ehrenstein, *ODNB*.

am at present, to direct myself according to a good Rule of my Father."¹²⁰ That "good Rule" of his father served all Nonjurors with Passive Obedience and loyalty to the rightful monarch. At the core of all Nonjurors' formation was the concept of obedience.

The sense of his obedience to father and mother, and by extension to all in lawful authority, including tutors and the master, is evident on every page. Bonwicke wanted to attend his father's *alma mater* St. John's, Oxford but was unable to do so because he could not read the prayer for a queen whom he in conscience could not recognize. Like most Nonjurors he paid the price for conscience, however, he later had the good fortune to be chosen for St. John's College Cambridge. At the time of his Oxford rejection, aged nineteen and aware that he would not follow in his father's footsteps, he felt great disappointment. On account of his decision, many of his friends and two of his uncles attacked his beliefs and resolution. Years later, his father remembered that "the heroic Youth stood firm against all their Assaults, resolving to sacrifice every Thing rather than his Conscience."¹²¹ At this time, 22 February 1710, he wrote to his father,

Now tho' I am very well convinced in my own Breast that these Arguments [of his uncles] are very false, yet I cannot so well answer to them, because I do not know whether you would have me open my self so much as I must of Necessity do, if I go to refute these Arguments; therefore I hear all and say little.¹²²

Subsequently his mother wrote him, "I pity you, supposing you have not one Friend at London to encourage you, but that all blame us and you: I hope notwithstanding, you will take Courage and bear up" and she reminded him that he had almost died as an infant, but God delivered him, and now "therefore you have great Reason to hope, if you do your

¹²⁰ Bonwicke, *A pattern for young students in the university*, 129.

¹²¹ Bonwicke, *A pattern for young students in the university*, 13.

¹²² Bonwicke, *A pattern for young students in the university*, 13.

Duty, God will still provide for you some Way or other." She concluded her letter with the assurance that in the "mean Time God may raise us and you up Friends."¹²³

Issues of conscience were expected, and Harris makes the important point, "It was not so much Jacobite principle that led to Nonjurism, but rather a sincerely held belief about the inviolable nature of oaths."¹²⁴ At one point Bonwicke was deeply concerned about keeping his oath made when he was admitted as a scholar of St. John's College. He questioned, "Whether by the words [*faciam ab aliis observari*] which are part of the Oath, I am obliged to tell Lads continually their duty as far as I know it, and also to inform against Transgressors." The words translate, "I shall act so as to be respected by others."¹²⁵ As a Nonjuror and as a Christian he was concerned about how much he should correct other students. Such advice could clearly be to his detriment. Francis Roper, his neighbor in chambers, friend, priest, and one of his tutors, advised him against over scrupulosity, and his father wrote, "It is out of your Province to attempt a Reformation, and would be an affront to your Governors: And the [*faciam ab aliis observari*] can never be meant to oblige you to oppose them. I bless God for his extraordinary Grace to you in giving you *so conscientious a Regard to Oaths*, which I doubt are generally too much disregarded in both Universities; of which the sad Effects are too visible all over the Nation."¹²⁶

¹²³ Bonwicke, *A pattern for young students in the university*, 15.

¹²⁴ Harris, *Politics under the Later Stuarts*, 212.

¹²⁵ I am indebted to Professor Joseph Kicklighter of Auburn University for his translation and insights into this oath's subtleties.

¹²⁶ Bonwicke, *A pattern for young students in the university*, 31-32. The italics are my own.

A full understanding of this situation demands an appreciation of the respect that Nonjurors, including the Bonwicks, showed to rightful authority; proper authority was to be actively obeyed as long as it was not contrary to God's Will. The elder Bonwicke and Roper both judged the Master and Fellows of St. John's, Cambridge in line with the divine ordinance. As a result, they must be obeyed and trusted in their discharge of duty.

On one occasion Bonwicke's brother Philip was to join him at Cambridge, studying at St. John's, and living in his chambers. Another new scholar was also to share the chambers. Their father was worried that Ambrose and Philip might not be able to talk freely if the new student "be not exactly of your Principles."¹²⁷ Ambrose Bonwicke wrote back, "I believe there is but very little Disagreement between us in that point."¹²⁸ Nonjurors, even students, were vigilant in understanding the danger of their position and always conscious of their difference. The possibility of persecution clearly defined them as a unique people. Thus, three nonjuring students ended up safely sharing the same quarters.

At one point, Bonwicke worried about that he should receive Holy Communion in the collegiate church even though he had already received communion in "our own chapel."¹²⁹ In a letter to his father he explained that in answering the question he had searched the ancient Fathers and found no practice of receiving twice. His father assured

¹²⁷ Bonwicke *A pattern for young students in the university*, 47.

¹²⁸ Bonwicke *A pattern for young students in the university.*, 50.

¹²⁹ Derek Beales, "III: The Eighteenth Century," in *St John's College Cambridge: A History*, ed. Peter Lineham (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2011), 169. Beales notes that Bonwicke "...found to his delight that Communion was celebrated in the chapel [of St. John's College, Cambridge] more often than in any other college in either University except Christ Church, Oxford." Presumably, Bonwicke received the Sacrament in both collegiate chapel and nonjuring oratories.

him that his practice was correct; Roper did the same.¹³⁰ This case, and many others, show in Nonjurors the concern for doing the right thing as paramount, whether the subject was oaths or reception of the Sacrament. Hylson-Smith writes, “The Nonjurors did not compartmentalize their beliefs and actions, and for them the root of the matter was a crisis of Christian conscience, grounded in a Christian view of church and society....”¹³¹ We see as well an appeal to the Apostolic Tradition, particularly to the Fathers of the first four centuries. Nonjurors were absolutely concerned with obeying God and their promises to him. They judged the correctness of their obedience by reference to the Scriptures and increasingly to the Tradition of the undivided Church before the split of Eastern and Western Churches in 1054.

For the Nonjurors, being shunned and facing persecution in a world that could not accept them meant learning how to live a holy life in a world they could not fully accept. This was for them little different than the lot of the persecuted Christians before the era of Constantine. The ideal and the practical combined in their world, it had to. Assured they were right, but always a minority, involved some mental accommodation; the Nonjurors mastered that art largely by their notion of Passive Obedience.

The Usages Controversy and Two Notions of Obedience

In 1716, twenty-eight years after the Glorious Revolution, and just three years after Hickes’s consecration of the three new bishops —Collier, Spinckes, and Hawes — that continued the unified nonjuring communion, that same fellowship was split in two by

¹³⁰ Bonwicke, *A pattern for young students in the university*, 87-91.

¹³¹ Hylson-Smith, *High Churchmanship in the Church of England*, 74

a seemingly minor liturgical argument.¹³² Actually, the underlying issues were enormous and reflected the trajectory of the Nonjurors' scholarship and their concepts of obedience, authority, time, and antiquity.¹³³

Richard Hooker (c. 1554-1600) wrote *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, the first five books of this work appeared in his lifetime; book eight was not published until 1648. This book laid down three sources of authority that come from God: Scripture, Tradition and Reason: "The testimony of the Church concerning Scripture [Tradition], and our own persuasion [Reason] which Scripture itself hath confirmed, may be proved a truth infallible."¹³⁴ In some measure, Hooker's formula became an Anglican definition of authority,¹³⁵ but these three sources often required a balancing act.¹³⁶ Peter Lake writes, "We might claim that the 'Anglican moment' of the 1590s enabled Hooker to 'invent

¹³² Guy Martin Yould, "The Origins and Transformation of the Nonjuror Schism, 1670-1715: Illustrated by Special Reference to the Career, Writings and Activities of Dr. George Hickes, 1642-1715." (PhD diss., University of Hull, 1979).

¹³³ James David Smith, *The Eucharistic Doctrine of the Later Nonjurors: A Revisionist View of the Eighteenth-Century Usages Controversy*. (Cambridge: Grove Books, 2000); Leighton, C. D. A. "William Law, Behmenism, and Counter Enlightenment," *Harvard Theological Review* 91 (1998), 301-320.

¹³⁴ Richard Hooker, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, Book III, chapter viii, 14., Bracketed words are my own for clarification. Mary Janet Peterson Johnson, "An 'Anglican Tripod'?: Richard Hooker's Explication of the Roles of Scripture, Reason, and Tradition as Sources of Authority for the Church, Considered in the Light of the Admonition Controversy." (PhD diss., General Theological Seminary, 1986).

¹³⁵ Michael Brydon, *The Evolving Reputation of Richard Hooker: An Examination of Responses, 1600-1714* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

¹³⁶ Lee W. Gibbs, "Richard Hooker's Via Media Doctrine of Scripture and Tradition." *Harvard Theological Review* 95, no. 02 (2002): 227-235; Nigel Atkinson, *Richard Hooker and the Authority of Scripture, Tradition and Reason: Reformed Theologian of the Church of England?* (Carlesle: Paternoster, 1997; William D. Neelands, "Hooker on Scripture, Reason, and Tradition," *Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies* (1997): 75-94; M. E. C. Perrott, "Richard Hooker and the problem of authority in the Elizabethan Church," *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 49, no. 01 (1998), 29-60; Alan Bartlett, *A Passionate Balance: The Anglican Tradition*. (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 2007), 47; Richard Bauckham and Benjamin Drewery, eds., *Scripture, Tradition and Reason: A Study in the Criteria of Christian Doctrine* (Bloomsbury: T. and T. Clark Publishing, 1988).

Anglicanism' in more ways than one; in ways, in fact, that remain with us to this very day."¹³⁷ And, Cornwall writes,

The Church of England had, since the time of Richard Hooker, affirmed the authority of Scripture, tradition, and Reason in matters of religious faith and practice. The attempt to balance these three sources of authority while giving primacy to scripture proved difficult, and the Usages Controversy that divided the Nonjurors movement after 1717 is evidence of that difficulty.¹³⁸

"The Puritans" as New put it, "relied on the Scriptures, and the Scriptures alone, as ... guide for good behavior."¹³⁹ They basically followed a *sola scriptura* model for all church authority as well. The Laudian Churchmen, the Caroline Divines, set the Tradition of the primitive, undivided Church as interpreter of the Scriptures, this was an idea already nascent in Hooker. The Latitudinarians of the early eighteenth century elevated reason to new heights, challenging the High Churchmen of the Restoration, and welcoming a British Enlightenment.¹⁴⁰ The later Nonjuror-Usagers gave Tradition an authority almost equal to Scripture.¹⁴¹ The argument that ensued was over whether, in the Usagers view, the Tradition of the universal, undivided Church, stood beside Scripture as a virtual equal authority. If it did, this represented an enormous development in a High Church direction for Anglican thinking. Hylson-Smith thinks this was the case:

¹³⁷ Peter Lake, "The 'Anglican Moment'? Richard Hooker and the Ideological Watershed of the 1590s," in *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition: Continuity, Change and the Search for Communion*, ed. Stephen Platten (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2003), 121.

¹³⁸ Robert D. Cornwall, "The Later Non-Jurors and the Theological Basis of the Usages Controversy." *Anglican Theological Review* 75, no. 2 (Spring 1993), 166-186.

¹³⁹ John F. H. New, *Anglican and Puritan: The Basis of their Opposition 1558-1640* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1964), 26.

¹⁴⁰ Frederick C. Beiser, "The Sovereignty of Reason: The Defense of Rationality in the Early English Enlightenment." (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014); C.D.A. Leighton, "The Nonjurors and the Counter Enlightenment: Some Illustration," *The Journal of Religious History*, Vol. 22, No. 3, (October 1998), 273.

¹⁴¹ Smith, *The Eucharistic doctrine of the later Nonjurors*.

It was in effect such Nonjurors as Sancroft, Ken, Dodwell, and Nelson, together with a circle of conforming churchmen who were allied to them, despite taking the oath to William III and afterwards to the Hanoverian dynasty, men like Bishop Atterbury, Bishop George Bull, Bishop William Beveridge and Bishop Thomas Wilson, who represented a definite Catholic conception of the Church at the turn of the century. They referred to the authority of the early Church as the highest standard next to the Bible; emphasized the importance of the priestly office; had an institutional conception of the Church; showed a preference for the first Prayer Book of Edward VI with its somewhat richer liturgy compared with that used officially in the English Church; stressed the four usages ... and had a view of the Eucharist which at least approximated closely to the Sacrifice of the Mass.¹⁴²

The two initial leaders of the Usagers and Non-Usagers respectively, were Collier and Spinckes. Overton suggests that the vacuum left by Hickeys' death in 1715 made the controversy more likely as there simply was no one of his stature to unite the Nonjurors.¹⁴³ The unity of the Nonjurors as a separate communion was ruptured over the presenting problem of what they called the "Usages". Uses are to liturgists the particular customaries of rite and ceremony in place in different churches or dioceses. Since the Nonjurors as a whole looked to antiquity, particularly to the Scriptures and Tradition in some balance for authority, thus the insistence by some of their number that four particular practices — included in the 1549 *Book of Common Prayer's* eucharistic liturgy but omitted by the more protestant 1552 revision — should be restored to their practice is of no surprise. The four uses included in King Edward I's 1549 First Prayer Book, and required by the Usagers were:

The Mixed Chalice: water mixed with wine in the chalice.
The Prayers for the Dead, intercessions for the faithful departed.
The *epiclesis*, or invocation of the Holy Spirit over the bread and wine.
The Prayer of Oblation offering the eucharistic sacrifice to God.

¹⁴² Hylson-Smith, *High Churchmanship in the Church of England*, 72-73.

¹⁴³ Overton, *The Nonjurors*, 290.

The so-called Non-Usagers were insistent upon retaining the 1662 Book of Common Prayer without alteration except, of course, the prayers for the rightful monarch.

At exactly the same time as the Bangorian Controversy began, and the Nonjuror William Law wrote *Three Letters to the Bishop of Bangor*, the internal Nonjurors' debate began as well. It was fought out by dueling pamphlets from 1717-1725.¹⁴⁴ This period also witnessed the death of Queen Anne in 1714, the succession of George I in the same year, the death of Hickes in 1715, the Second Abjuration Oath in 1715, the failure of the Great Jacobite Rebellion at Preston in 1715, and the overtures to the Eastern Orthodox Churches begun in 1716. In 1718 the Usagers wrote their own eucharistic liturgy (see appendix 2) based upon ancient sources. The disagreement was never ultimately resolved and finally divided the Nonjurors into three factions not just two — the Unionists, the Ultra-Usagers, and the Ultra Non-Usagers.¹⁴⁵ This division marked their demise as a unified body with the potential of long-range survival.

The historiography of the Usages Controversy began, as in so many other issues regarding the Nonjurors, with Thomas Lathbury and his simple declaration, “The Usages may be regarded as matters of indifference: still I cannot but think, that Collier and Brett, who had subscribed to the Book of Common Prayer, should have yielded their own private views and feelings for the sake of union and peace”¹⁴⁶ The Usages were, however, not matters indifferent as Lathbury thought, but rather the presentation of new developments in the idea of obedience to Tradition.

¹⁴⁴ Overton, *The Nonjurors*, 293f.

¹⁴⁵ Smith, *The Eucharistic doctrine of the later Nonjurors*, 4.

¹⁴⁶ Lathbury, *A History of the Nonjurors*, 363

J. H. Overton wrote convincingly that the controversy was finally about unity rather than liturgy. “In short, it seems to me that, while the Usagers had the best of the argument in detail, Brett and Collier really knowing more about the subject, they put themselves hopelessly in the wrong by insisting upon the necessity of what was not necessary, and what was being introduced at a singularly inopportune time.” Overton’s conclusion was “...from a theological point of view there was nothing to choose between them [Usagers and Non-Usagers]...”,¹⁴⁷ but, in fact, there were major theological differences between them in their understanding of the Tradition as authoritative.

Broxap presented a more nuanced view than his predecessors; for him the underlying issue was authority, “What authority had the five or six bishops to alter the liturgy in any single point? This lack of authority was very much at the ‘back of the minds’; of those who opposed Collier’s innovation.”¹⁴⁸ Broxap saw the Usages controversy vis-à-vis the history of Eucharistic Sacrifice and the doctrine of Real Presence within the Church of England. The Caroline Divines, according to Broxap, restated the earlier Anglican position on these doctrines following the welter of the confusing controversies of the sixteenth century. The Restoration churchmen restated the Caroline Divines’s position, and the Nonjurors were the successors of the best minds of the Restoration Church. There was a distinction, however, “The later Non-Jurors attempted a more elaborate definition of their belief.” He saw in Bishop Deacon’s *Comprehensive View* a telling example of this development in thought. Broxap quoted Deacon: “The Eucharist is both a Sacrament and a Sacrifice. Our Lord instituted the Sacrifice of the Eucharist when he began to offer Himself for the sins of all men *i.e.*

¹⁴⁷ Overton, *The Nonjurors*, 308, 290.

¹⁴⁸ Broxap, *The Later Non-Jurors*, 50.

immediately after eating His last Passover. He did not offer the Sacrifice upon the Cross; it was slain there but was offered at the Institution of the Eucharist.”¹⁴⁹ This was a long way from the sixteenth-century Reformation understanding. Thus, Broxap wrote of what he called “a certain development of doctrine in the Later-Nonjurors...”¹⁵⁰ He viewed Deacon’s position quoted above as representing “the view of the entire body of Non-Jurors.”¹⁵¹ This argument, however, seems tenuous in the context of the bitter debates of the nonjuring community; they were not divided simply by four liturgical practices, but what undergirded those practices.

Cornwall provides both an echo and revision of Broxap’s position. Cornwall writes, “The central issue underlying the Usages Controversy was not a difference in liturgical theology but a disagreement as to the ultimate authority in matters of religious belief and practice.”¹⁵² James David Smith has offered a revisionist, more nuanced account of this controversy, contending that the traditional views, outlined above, simply do not go far enough in explaining the “vast number of tracts and the bitter schism that the Usages Controversy spawned.” In his view differing notions of ecclesiastical authority were only a part of the deeper issues. “At the heart of the Usages Controversy were not only questions about the role of tradition versus the sufficiency of scripture in

¹⁴⁹ Quoted in Broxap, *The Later Non-Jurors*, 319.

¹⁵⁰ Broxap, *The Later Non-Jurors*, 319.

¹⁵¹ Ibid.

¹⁵² Cornwall, “The Later Non-Jurors and the Theological Basis of the Usages Controversy,” 186.

the determination of Christian obligation, but, more importantly, diverging views about the eucharist as a sacrament and as a sacrifice.”¹⁵³

The central issue was precisely the weight of authority given the Tradition vis-à-vis the Scriptures. The constant debates of the Bangorian Controversy without, and the Usages Controversy within, overlapping the ecumenical overtures to the Eastern Orthodox Churches, kept the later Nonjurors constantly sharpening their Faith and Practice — the center of which was the Eucharist closely followed by the notion of Apostolic Succession in the Historic Episcopate. This intense scholarly and apologetical activity divided their fellowship.

In 1718 Collier first, then Spinckes, fired the opening volleys. Jeremy Collier began his pamphlet, *Reasons for restoring some prayers and directions, as they stand in the communion-service of the first English reform'd liturgy, Compiled by the Bishops in the 2d and 3d Years of the Reign of King Edward VI*, with arguments drawn from antiquity, from authors he considered of “unquestionable Authority.”¹⁵⁴ He cited Justin Martyr whom he believed was born before the death of the Apostle John and represented a tradition as old as the Apostles. Also included were Irenaeus of Lyons, Clement of Alexandria, Cyprian of Carthage, the Jewish practice at the Paschal Seder as expounded in Maimonides and the Talmud, the Apostolical Constitutions that he knew were not as old as the Apostles but still regarded authoritative, the Third Council of Carthage, and the

¹⁵³ Smith, *The Eucharistic doctrine of the later Nonjurors*, 5.

¹⁵⁴ Jeremy Collier, *Reasons for restoring some prayers and directions, as they stand in the communion-service of the first English reform'd liturgy, Compiled by the Bishops in the 2d and 3d Years of the Reign of King Edward VI* (London: 1717), 1.

Sixth Ecumenical Council, Constantinople III in 680-81. Collier summarized his initial arguments over ten pages with this paragraph:

Since therefore the Scripture no where declares there was only Wine in the Sacramental cup; since, if 'tis expounded by the *Jewish Paschal* custom, it determines for a Mixture; since the Case stands thus, ought we not to be governed by the Authority of the earliest Ages, by general Practice and Catholick Tradition?¹⁵⁵

The author argued that: Scripture is silent and the universal witness of the primitive Church used the mixed chalice, therefore obedience to authority rests with the “general [i.e. universal] Practice and Catholick Tradition.” The Nonjurors were intensely interested not just in *orthodoxy* but also in *orthopraxy*. In short, they were saying the ancient Church, of the first four centuries particularly, continued the Apostolic practice and should be trusted and obeyed.

Hickes had preferred and used the 1549 Book of Common Prayer; he had employed the four Uses being debated but never imposed them on others; he had been Collier's mentor and consecrated him a bishop.¹⁵⁶ It is not at all surprising that an historian of Collier's stature would admire and emulate his teacher. Collier's method was to establish an historical trail of authorities culminating in the 1549 Prayer Book that in his mind had legal as well as spiritual authority. The 1552 Prayer Book, dramatically more protestant in direction, had removed the four Uses and the 1559 Prayer Book of Elizabeth I had not restored them. The 1662 Prayer Book at the Restoration had followed the practice of the 1559 book.

¹⁵⁵ Collier, *Reasons for restoring some prayers and directions*, 10.

¹⁵⁶ Thomas Brett, *A farther proof of the necessity of tradition, to explain and interpret the Holy Scriptures. In answer to a book, entitl'd, No just grounds for introducing the new Communion Office, &c* (London, 1720), iv.

Some Nonjurors, including Hickes, had already employed a practice, common among Tractarians in the nineteenth century, of moving the Prayer of Oblation from after communion to before, attaching it to the truncated Eucharistic canon. This recreated something akin to the 1549 and earlier forms. They also omitted the phrase “militant here in earth” from the *Prayer for the whole State of Christ’s Church*, thus removing the limitation of not praying for the Church expectant and triumphant.¹⁵⁷

Following Hickes’s death the unifying force that he had exerted among the later Nonjurors was gone, and not surprisingly, the Usagers began to develop the ideas implicit in their community’s earlier scholarship and practice. The result was a hybrid notion of authority that gave far greater weight to Tradition. The Nonjurors people who looked backwards to Christian antiquity for authority, and much like Lake’s *Dying Declaration*, or Hickes’s similar statement, the undivided Catholic Church of the first centuries held unquestioned authority in their world view. So Collier claimed the English reformers led by Thomas Cranmer got it right in the 1549 Prayer Book; the Apostolic, sub-Apostolic, and Patristic practice all confirmed the practices that the Usager Nonjurors were certain were universal, Apostolic, and Catholic.

Nathaniel Spinckes wrote in answer to Collier. Concerning the mixed chalice, “this practice can never be shewn necessary from anything in Scripture, from whence it wou’d be most properly deduc’d, so neither do we hear anything of it for about 150 Years after our Saviour’s Incarnation...,”¹⁵⁸ Spinckes went on to suggest the entire practice was unknown to the Apostles, presumably because unmentioned in the New Testament. The

¹⁵⁷ Smith, *The Eucharistic doctrine of the later Nonjurors*.

¹⁵⁸ Nathaniel Spinckes, *No reason for restoring the prayers and directions of Edward VI's first liturgy. By a Nonjuror*. (London, 1717), 3.

mixed chalice then "...must have a much better plea to be Revived than those which appear to have been not at all known to the Apostles." Following Collier's lead, Spinckes argued from the writings of Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian (whom he suggested noticed diverse liturgical uses), and Cyprian. He expressed his great appreciation for St. Cyprian, who was indeed much relied on by the Nonjurors, but then argued although Cyprian did lay emphasis on the mixed chalice and thought it the Lord's institution, he did so for mystical, symbolic reasons because it denoted, "...not only our Saviour's Blood, but besides an Union of the people with him; the Water signifying the People, and the mixture their inseparable Union with Christ."¹⁵⁹ However, Spinckes still objected to this use because it did not predate the middle of the third century, and probably no longer accurately indicated continuous use or relationship to Apostolic practice. To test his suspicion, Spinckes turned again to the Scriptures and finding no mention of it there concluded, "... how then the truth and certainty of such a Signification should appear, I am yet to learn."¹⁶⁰ In other words, if the Scripture did not require it, there was no authority for it. Thus, the controversy was begun, and Spickes, as much a disciple of Hicke as Collier, had answered his brother bishop.

The principal Usagers were Collier, Thomas Brett, Thomas Wagstaffe, Thomas Deacon, Archibald Campbell, Roger Laurence, John Griffin, and Willoughby Minors. Their counterparts among the Non-Usagers were: Spinckes, William Scott, Samuel Walker, Charles Leslie, Matthias Earbery, William Snatt, Thomas Rogerson, Samuel Downes, and Edward Hart. All of these men wrote to further their respective arguments.

¹⁵⁹ Spinckes, *No reason for restoring the prayers and directions of Edward VI's first liturgy*, 6.

¹⁶⁰ Spinckes, *No reason for restoring the prayers and directions of Edward VI's first liturgy*, 7

Brett, one of the keenest minds among the Nonjurors, pressed the Usager argument to its fullest development. He wrote these words:

The Scripture does testify that the Apostles did deliver Traditions by Word of Mouth, as well as by Epistle or in Writing, and has no where said that those Traditions, which were delivered by Word, were afterwards put into Writing: And has also equally requir'd Obedience to those deliver'd by Word with those deliver'd by Epistle. Therefore I make no scruple to say, that what is prov'd to be Apostolical Tradition, is also prov'd by Scripture, because the Scripture expressly requires our Obedience to such Tradition. And if this be not allowed to be a good Explication, then the VIth Article of the Church of England can not be defended by Scripture, for the Scripture expressly teaches that the Apostolical Tradition is to be observed, but no where teaches that all Apostolical Tradition is written in the New Testament.¹⁶¹

The sixth of the thirty-nine *Articles of Religion* read, “Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.” Brett interpreted the article to mean that the genuine Apostolic Traditions were to be obeyed and that the “Scripture expressly requires our Obedience to such Tradition.” The Non-Usagers, like Spinckes, took the opposite view that matters such as ancient liturgy were not *de fide*, and therefore not required of the faithful. The argument was ultimately on its surface about liturgy; the real issues concerned authority and obedience. In short, for the Usagers like Brett, the Tradition stood alongside the Scripture, and, when in agreement with it, had equal authority. Where the Scripture was silent the presumption followed that the genuine Tradition from the Apostles and their successor bishops was to be equally obeyed. Smith sees the Usagers definition of authentic apostolic tradition as, “only those doctrines which have been

¹⁶¹ Brett, *A farther proof of the necessity of tradition* (London, 1720), 28-29.

believed in all places, at all times, and by all the faithful.”¹⁶² In Brett’s words, “there is nothing truly catholic (as the word sufficiently declares) but what truly and fully comprehends all this.”¹⁶³ He continued, “as we cannot receive any Tradition which is contrary to Scripture, so neither can we receive any interpretation of Scripture which is contrary to truly primitive and universal Tradition.”¹⁶⁴

The cumulative effect of this publication contest produced a kind of dialectic that in turn synthesized a refined argument. This process forced the careful rethinking of arguments on both sides and on occasion also resulted in the overstatement of both sides’s positions. The final positions were still very much Collier’s and Spinckes’s, still firmly held, but arguably more refined. The table below shows how many and frequent were the pamphlets, and how the arguments vis-à-vis obedience to Tradition ultimately divided the Nonjurors.

¹⁶² Smith, *The Eucharistic doctrine of the later Nonjurors*, 10. This is the threefold test laid down in the so-called Vincentian Canon – *quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est* or “what has been believed everywhere, always, and by all.” – from St. Vincent of Lerins (died before 450) in his *Commonitorium* II, 3. This seems to be the thrust of Brett’s argument; I am not sure if he actually used Vincent’s words.

¹⁶³ Brett, *The Necessary use of Tradition*, 43.

¹⁶⁴ Thomas Brett, *Tradition Necessary to Explain and interpret the Holy Scriptures. With a Postscript, In Answer to That Part of a Book Lately Published (call’d No Sufficient Reason for Restoring the Prayers and Directions of King Edward VI’s First Liturgy) Which Seems to Depreciate Tradition. And a Preface, Containing Some Remarks on Mr. Toland’s Nazareus* (London, 1718), 101-102.

Table 5: George Hicckes's published works

| The principal Usagers & Writings | Principal Non-Usagers & Writings |
|---|---|
| Jeremy Collier, <i>Reasons for Restoring some Prayers and Directions</i> , 1718 | Nathaniel Spinckes, <i>No Reason for Restoring</i> , 1718 |
| Jeremy Collier, <i>A Defence of the Reasons</i> , 1718 | William Scott, <i>No Necessity to Alter the Common Prayer</i> , 1718 |
| Archibald Campbell, <i>An Answer to a Printed Letter</i> , 1718 | Charles Leslie, <i>A Letter from Mr. Leslie to a Friend</i> , 1718 |
| Willoughby Minors, <i>The Subtlety of the Serpent</i> , 1718 | Edward Hart, <i>No Reason to alter the Present Liturgy</i> , 1718 |
| Thomas Wagstaffe, <i>The Necessity of an Alteration</i> , 1718 | Nathaniel Spinckes, <i>No sufficient reason, Part I</i> , 1718 |
| Thomas Brett of Kent, <i>The Necessary Use of Tradition</i> , 1718 | Nathaniel Spinckes, <i>No sufficient reason, part II</i> , 1718 |
| Jeremy Collier, <i>Vindication of the Reasons</i> , part I, 1718 | William Snatt, <i>Mr. Collier's Desertion Discussed</i> , 1719 |
| Jeremy Collier, <i>Vindication of the Reasons</i> , Part II, 1719 | Nathaniel Spinckes, <i>No Just Grounds</i> , 1719 |
| Thomas Deacon, <i>The Plaintiff's Charge Disproved</i> , 1719 | William Scott, <i>Vindication of the No Necessity</i> , 1719 |
| Thomas Brett of Kent, <i>A Collection of Principal Liturgies</i> , 1719 | Matthias Earbery, <i>A Dialogue between Timothy a churchman and Thomas an essentialist</i> , 1719 |
| Roger Laurence, <i>Mr. Leslie's Defence</i> , 1719 | Thomas Rogerson, <i>The Controversy about Restoring</i> , 1719 |
| Thomas Brett of Kent, <i>Vindication of the Postscript to Tradition</i> , 1719 | Matthias Earbery, <i>Reflections upon Modern Fanaticism</i> , 1720 |
| Thomas Wagstaffe, <i>Reasonableness and Necessity</i> , 1720 | Samuel Downes, <i>Abridgment of the Controversy</i> , 1720 |
| Jeremy Collier, <i>Further Defence</i> , 1720 | Nathaniel Spinckes, <i>A Reply to the Vindication</i> , 1720 |
| Thomas Wagstaffe, <i>A Defence of the Greek Church against the Roman</i> , 1720 | Samuel Walker, <i>The Doctrine of the Eucharist Stated</i> , 1720 |
| John Griffin, <i>The Common Christian Instructed</i> , 1720 | Samuel Walker, <i>Tradition is No Rule</i> , 1720 |

The debate sharpened the Nonjurors' arguments and displayed their differences. Leighton describes the Nonjurors' positions generally, and the Usagers's position particularly, as Counter Enlightenment: "The Nonjurors derive their status as the purest and most consistent contemporary opponents of the English Enlightenment in a large measure, as it were, accidentally, by virtue of their pre-existing Catholic stances." Leighton is convinced that controversies like the Usages "sharpened" their stance "by the experience of contemporary debate." They "did perceive their own argumentation as a response to it [the English Enlightenment] and were prepared to explore — for them — new means of combating the positions they found most offensive."¹⁶⁵

The argument I present here is that the Usagers among the Nonjurors did develop a hybrid understanding of authority based upon Tradition that pushed the debates of the early eighteenth century far beyond anything imaginable by earlier generations. They may have been "surrogates," as Leighton suggests, for Roman Catholics, occupying in England a position analogous to Counter Enlightenment Catholics on the continent.¹⁶⁶ Or, in my view, their positions were the highly developed result of a persistent Cyprianist mentality inherited from the Caroline and Restoration High Churchmen. The Usagers understanding of obedience to Tradition extended the trajectory of arguments about authority to stress the primitive Tradition in ways not previously seen in Anglicanism.

In the larger picture what was the real enemy targeted by nonjuring notions of obedience? It was in fact modern Arian and Non-Trinitarian views — like John Toland's

¹⁶⁵ C.D.A. Leighton, "The Nonjurors and the Counter Enlightenment: Some Illustration" *The Journal of Religious History*, Vol. 22, No. 3, (October 1998), 273.

¹⁶⁶ C.D.A. Leighton, "Nonjurors and the Counter Enlightenment," 274.

and also many extreme Latitudinarians's — of authority generally.¹⁶⁷ Leighton again argues that the significance of eighteenth-century Arianism "...lay in its foundational assertion of *sola scriptura* interpreted by the individual's reason (with the latter element underlined), together with the destructive doctrinal consequences which that produced." Thus, for Leighton, "Here, certainly we see the central epistemological conflict of the Enlightenment, between reason and revelation, as it extended into a conflict about the institutional location of authoritative knowledge."¹⁶⁸ That is precisely the role the Usagers played, and they exerted influence far out of proportion to their small, diminishing size. Their development of the notion of obedience is critical to understanding early eighteenth-century English history.

Efforts toward reunion and rapprochement by Lord and Lady Winchelsea and others failed.¹⁶⁹ In 1718 the Usagers created their own liturgy based largely upon the *Apostolic Constitutions* (see Appendix).¹⁷⁰ In 1723 The Usagers Collier, Brett and Campbell continued the dialogue with the Eastern Orthodox Churches, while the Non-Usagers refused to continue the ecumenical discussion. By this time, neither body of the Nonjurors was in communion with the other; both bodies consecrated new bishops to continue their respective communions. In 1731 some Usagers led by Brett of Kent and Brett of Sussex signed a settlement agreement with some Non-Usagers led by Gandy,

¹⁶⁷ See Champion, *The Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken*; Justin Champion, *Republican Learning: John Toland and the Crisis of Christian Culture, 1696-1722* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003).

¹⁶⁸ Leighton "Nonjurors and the Counter Enlightenment," 273

¹⁶⁹ Broxap, *The Later Non-Jurors*, 59.

¹⁷⁰ *A communion office, Taken Partly from Primitive Liturgies, And Partly from the first English reformed Common-Prayer-Book: together with Offices for Confirmation, and the Visitation of the Sick.* (London, 1718).

Smith, and Rawlinson, and thereby created a so-called “Unionist “ party.¹⁷¹ Campbell and Griffin refused to sign and formed the extreme Usagers. Blackburn likewise refused to sign and formed the extreme Non-Usagers’ party. The fracture was complete. This tripartite division meant a fragmented witness and disunity for the already small community of Nonjurors.

They had, however, elevated the discussion of obedience to authority to new levels. The contention for the Four Uses was essentially an argument for Tradition as an important source of revelation.¹⁷² If the Usagers prevailed, as Overton and Broxap suggested, then it is fair in one sense to say the development in their understanding of obedience culminated in a hybridized view of obedience, one which elevated Tradition — especially of the Tradition of the first four centuries and the Church pre-Constantine — as normative for High Church Anglicanism in early eighteenth-century Britain. This, after all, was the logical unfolding of the ideas contained in Lake’s *Dying Declaration* and identical to that of Hicke in *The Constitution of the Catholick Church*. The Nonjurors did not invent new doctrines but steadfastly stood for old ones. However, the years of schism and scholarship so honed these old doctrines for a new age that one might suggest a development that looked very different from a century before.

Finally, the bitter Usages Controversy revealed how fast these most conservative of Anglican Christians were moving to challenge the intellectual community, and often provided the intellectual strength to counter the English Enlightenment’s challenges to orthodox Christianity. Goldie writes, “In Nonjuror writings lies a crucial seedbed of the

¹⁷¹ See Overton, *The Nonjurors*, 321.

¹⁷² See Leighton, “The Nonjurors and the Counter Enlightenment,” 276.

Tory leitmotif of the ‘Church in Danger’, for in the 1690s the Nonjurors transmitted to the mainstream of Tory ideology the elevated view of Church authority characteristic of the High Church tradition.”¹⁷³ And beyond the 1690s the Nonjurors developed their understanding of obedience to such a degree that it divided their ranks and proved their demise. Their legacy and scholarship, however, helped create an essential understanding that grounded High Churchmen throughout the long eighteenth century.¹⁷⁴

¹⁷³ Mark Goldie, “The Nonjurors, Episcopacy, and the Origins of the Convocation Controversy,” in *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1759*, ed. Eveline Cruickshanks (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers Ltd., 1982), 15.

¹⁷⁴ See Wand, *The High Church Schism* for the influence of the Nonjurors on the Oxford Movement of the nineteenth century. Also Hylson-Smith, *High Churchmanship in the Church of England*, 71-83, 123-130, and Overton, *The Nonjurors*, 18.

Chapter 4

William Bowyer: Publishers, Printers, and Priests

At the turn of the eighteenth century ... London was abuzz with the new possibilities — and possible dangers — of an unfettered flood of cheap, ephemeral information pouring from the presses. Whereas the Printing Act of 1662 had tried to limit the number of master printers in all of England to twenty-four, by 1705 there were between sixty-five and seventy printing houses in London alone...The flames of ephemeral print were fanned by this period's unparalleled political activity, the so-called rage of party...King William joined in with an unprecedented blitz of printed propaganda to shore up his legacy, although the explosion of print exceeded government influence.

Dror Wahrman in *Mr. Collier's Letter Racks*

In the wee morning hours of January 30, 1713 a fire broke out in the London printing shop belonging to William Bowyer (1663-1737).¹ His residence and the printing presses were co-located so the fire threatened not only his business but also his wife Dorothy,² his children,³ and his elderly print assistant Mr. Charles Cock, aged seventy-six. Bowyer and his wife escaped the fire unhurt, but the flames engulfed his aged assistant. Bowyer never forgot his death, wearing throughout his life a mourning ring to remember him.⁴ The fire completely destroyed Bowyer's print shop, his presses and

Dror Wahrman, *Mr. Collier's Letter Racks: A Tale of Art & Illusion at the Threshold of the Modern Information Age* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 21-22.

¹ Edward Marston, *Sketches of Some Booksellers of the Time of Dr. Samuel Johnson* (London: Oak Knoll, 1902), 111; John Nichols, *Biographical and literary anecdotes* (London: 1782), 2. Bowyer's print shop was at Dogwell-Court in Whitefriars. It had formerly been a pub, The George Tavern.

² Bowyer's wife Dorothy Dawks (1665-1727), widow of Benjamin Allport, was herself the daughter of a prominent London printer Thomas Dawks (1636-1689), and the sister of Ichabod Dawks who had printed Bishop Walton's Polyglott Bible. See Keith Maslen, "Bowyer, William (1663-1737)," *ODNB*; John Nichols, *Biographical and literary anecdotes of William Bowyer* (London, 1782), 1. Nichols says Ichabod Dawes was Dorothy's father.

³ Two of the Bowyers' children had left home at the time of the fire: Mary (or Frances?) had married a printer, the Nonjuror James Bettenham, and William was away at Headley School near Leatherhead, Surrey. See Nichols, *Biographical and Literary Anecdotes*, 9.

⁴ John Nichols, *Biographical and Literary Anecdotes*, 9. The ring was inscribed with this motto: "C.C. [i.e. for Charles Cock] Passé par Feu au Ciel, 30 Jan. 1712 [new date 1713], age 76."

typeface, all his store of books for sale, his warehouse, and his home. The loss was estimated at £5146 18 s., an enormous sum for 1713.⁵ Fires in print shops were a perennial fear; there were so many combustibles – paper, ink, solvents, rags, all contained in wood framed buildings - that once started such fires were difficult to contain.⁶

Fortunately, Bowyer's son William (1699-1777) was away at Headley School. William Bowyer the younger eventually entered his father's business after leaving Cambridge in 1722. Many years later, in 1757, he took on a young twelve-year old apprentice named John Nichols. Upon Bowyers death in 1777, Nichols became proprietor of his master's presses. Nichols, in *Biographical and Literary Anecdotes of William Bowyer, ... and of Many of his Learned Friends* (1782), recorded much of the history of the Bowyers' printing business, including his apprenticeship under and subsequent partnership with the son. He also preserved the elder Bowyer's record of the fire, testimony given under oath to the lord chancellor himself.⁷ Nichols' recorded:

By a memorial presented to lord chancellor Harcourt by Mr. Bowyer, confirmed by oath. It appears that 'the fire broke out between three and four; by accident unknown, in the working-rooms directly over his lodging chambers, and burning with great violence, forced him with his wife and children to save their lives by flight from their beds, with only such a small part of their common wearing apparel as could on the sudden be taken with them, though not sufficient to cover them, leaving behind them a gentleman of their family, who perished in the flames, and was burned to ashes.'⁸

⁵ Nichols, *Biographical and Literary Anecdotes*, 2.

⁶ Mr. Cock's sleeping arrangements were presumably close to the presses, perhaps for better securing them against fire or intruders, which may also explain his greater proximity to the fire's outbreak.

⁷ Stuart Handley, "Harcourt, Simon, first Viscount Harcourt (1661[?]-1727)," *ODNB*. Simon Harcourt, First Viscount Harcourt, was Queen Anne's lord chancellor from April 1713 until the accession of George I in August 1714. He lost the lord chancellorship in September 1714. Harcourt, an ardent Tory, defended Sacheverell before the House of Lords in March 1710, and became lord keeper of the Great Seal in September 1710. He was a friend of Jonathan Swift and Alexander Pope. The case of William Bowyer's fire must have been one of his first heard as lord chancellor.

⁸ Nichols, *Biographical and Literary Anecdotes*, 9

The fire was tragic but not uncommon; there were many losses of life and property due to fires in early modern England. Two facts, however, made the fire noteworthy. First, the date of the fire – King Charles’ Day, 30 January 1713, was the anniversary of the late king’s execution; a red-letter day for High Churchmen and certainly for every English Nonjuror. This raised suspicions. Equally fascinating, the testimony deposition given under oath by Bowyer was received by the lord chancellor of England himself. Nowhere was there proof of arson, nor did Bowyer claim such felony, but surely misgivings must have lingered within Nonjurors’ minds. And, surely testimony at such a high level indicated at least the suspicion of foul play. Bowyer was a leading member of the Nonjurors; the very first work bearing his imprint was an anonymous apologia for King Charles I entitled *Defence of the Vindication of K. Charles the Martyr*, (1699),⁹ written by the nonjuring Bishop of Ipswich, Thomas Wagstaffe.¹⁰ Any work that described Charles I as “the Martyr,” was written from a High Church position, and Nonjurors regarded Charles I as the martyr for episcopacy, which was in their ecclesiology the foundation of the Church as a divine institution.¹¹ The fact that Wagstaffe was prudent enough to omit his authorship and Bowyer courageous enough to include his imprint, says reams about Bowyer’s own audacity. He was openly, unabashedly the leading nonjuring printer of the early eighteenth century and, together

⁹ Nichols, *Biographical and Literary Anecdotes*, 1.

¹⁰ Keith Maslen, “Bowyer, William (1663-1737),” *ODNB*.

¹¹ Robert D. Cornwall, *Visible and Apostolic: The Constitution of the Church in High Church Anglican and Non-Juror Thought* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1993), 82.

with his step son-in-law John Bettenham, enjoyed a special dignity and respect within the nonjuring community.¹²

Nonjurors, fellow printers, and many High Churchmen within the establishment regarded William Bowyer as a man of impeccable integrity. This was demonstrated by the subsequent fund-raising to compensate Bowyer for his loss. Remarkably, by October 1713, only nine months after the fire, Bowyer was back in business at a new location, Temple Lane in Whitefriars. This swift and rare recovery was made possible by a “royal brief with debts forgiven,” numerous charitable donations from friends within the print trade, and from Nonjurors. In fact these mechanisms raised more than £ 2539, approximately half of the £5146 loss incurred.¹³ Bowyer must have had many friends, and some in high places, to receive “royal briefs” and largesse of this magnitude. All of which raises the question, who organized this effort? Its originator was Mr. Timothy Goodwin, a bookseller in Fleet Street, who was quickly aided by Mr. Richard Sare, bookseller in Holborn, and a “liberal contributor” to the subscription. Nichols described Sare as one whose “knowledge of books and of men, the candor and ingenuity of his temper, the obliging manner of his behaviour, and the grateful acknowledgments of any favours and benefits received, effectually recommended him to the friendship of many persons eminent both in station and learning; particularly of Archbishop Wake...”¹⁴ Wake was Bishop of Lincoln in 1713 and three years later Archbishop of Canterbury. Richard Sare, like William Bowyer, had friends in very high places, all the more

¹² Thomas Lathbury, *History of the Nonjurors* (London: William Pickering, 1845), 378. Lathbury names a third prominent Nonjuring printer, “Dalton.”

¹³ Nichols, *Biographical and Literary Anecdotes of William Bowyer*, 2.

¹⁴Ibid., 9.

remarkable since Bowyer was a committed Nonjuror and Sare at least sold many Nonjurors' works.

The Company of Stationers contributed generously as well.¹⁵ This was not surprising inasmuch as Bowyer was one of the most, respected printers of the day. The Master of Saint John's College, Cambridge, Robert Jenkin, and fellows of the college, always sympathetic to the Nonjurors, gave generously too. Ambrose Bonwicke, the nonjuring cleric and headmaster of Headley School in Surrey, contributed by informing Bowyer that his son William's tuition was paid in full. Nichols noted that Bonwicke himself was the patron.¹⁶ The younger Bowyer would go on in 1716 to be a sizar — a student receiving academic scholarship — at Saint John' College Cambridge sponsored by Robert Jenkin.

Nonjuring churchmen and their parishioners contributed in order that the new presses might once again print their publications Lord Chief Justice Parker helped repair the presses by replacing the "Saxon" typeface that had been used in the printing of "Saint Gregory's Homily."¹⁷ Prominent churchmen of the Established Church gave as well; among these were George Stanhope, Dean of Canterbury and the Cathedral Chapter.¹⁸

Thomas Lathbury observed that Nonjurors

... were forced to have recourse to the press as the only means of disseminating their views.... But printers would hardly be forthcoming unless they were more or less in sympathy with their authors' sentiments; for they had to run the risk of being prosecuted, and frequently were prosecuted for printing seditious matter....

¹⁵ John Nichols, *Anecdotes Biographical and Literary of the Late Mr. William Bowyer, printer Complied for private use* (London, 1778), 51.

¹⁶ Nichols, *Biographical and Literary Anecdotes*, 13.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 10.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 7.

By far the most important who performed this essential service was... William Bowyer.¹⁹

Lathbury, Overton, Broxap, and present day historians of the Nonjurors have noted the period roughly contemporary with the fire at Bowyer's printing business as the divide that separated those whom Lathbury called "the Later Nonjurors" from their predecessors.²⁰ I have taken the consecration of Jeremy Collier, Samuel Hawes and Nathaniel Spinckes on 13 May 1713 as the incipient moment for the later movement.

Perhaps the single most controversial writing of the later Nonjurors, at least the one most published and commented on, was Hickeys's posthumous papers entitled *The Constitution of the Catholick Church*. Printed and published in 1716, its authorship alone was revealed. No publisher, printer, or bookseller was given in the title page or front-matter, no doubt to protect those persons from prosecution. The work was highly critical of the establishment both Church and State. Hickeys was a well-known figure in British life, British because of his Scottish connections as well as his prominence as Dean of Worcester from which living he was deprived in 1691.²¹

Printing nonjuring material was regarded as a seditious activity and many printers and clerics were punished. Laurence Howell (c.1664-1720) was a nonjuring priest and Jacobite who wrote a small pamphlet, *The Case of Schism in the Church of England Truly Stated* (1716), probably intended only for circulation within the nonjuring community. He was arrested in 1716 on a charge of treason after the authorities found a

¹⁹ Overton, *The Nonjurors*, 261.

²⁰ Lathbury, *History of the Nonjurors*, 223-224; Overton, *The Nonjurors*, 119f; Broxap, *The Later Nonjurors*, 10f; Cornwall, *Visible and Apostolic*, 87-88.

²¹ Theodor Harmsen, "Hickeys, George (1642-1715)," *ODNB*. Hickeys had accompanied the Duke of Lauderdale to Scotland in 1676 as his chaplain.

thousand copies of the tract in his home. The printer of the tract, Redmayne, was also arrested and tried. He was sentenced to five years in prison and fined £500. On 28 February 1717 Howell likewise was punished severely: a fine of £500 plus three years prison without bail. He was to stand in the pillory, be flogged twice, and finally be stripped of his clerical gown. The Court, consisting of the Lord Mayor and Justices Powys and Dormer, considered this punishment was not only for publishing a seditious tract, but also because George Hickee had ordained him.²² Redmayne and Howell were arrested the same year Hickee's *Constitution of the Catholic Church* was published. Laurence Howell did not survive Newgate Prison; he died there on 19 July 1720.²³

Earlier, Samuel Grascome (1641-1708) another nonjuring priest, wrote *An Appeal to Murther* (1693) critical of the trial and condemnation of the Nonjuror and printer William Anderton executed in 1693. Grascome had ministered to him at his execution.²⁴ Hilckiah Bedford (1663-1724) was yet another nonjuring clergyman imprisoned for publishing. While he had written other books sufficiently seditious to land him in jail, the one for which he was prosecuted was actually penned by the Nonjuror George Harbin. Tried at the Court of King's Bench, Bedford was found guilty of writing, printing and publishing *The Hereditary Right of the Crown of England Asserted* (1713). He was fined 1000 marks and sent to Queen's Bench Prison until May 1718 when he received a royal

²² Robert D. Cornwall, "Howell, Laurence (c.1664-1720), Nonjuring Church of England clergyman," *ODNB*, 2.

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ D. A. Brunton, "Grascome, Samuel (1641-1708)," *ODNB*, 3.

pardon. It seems Bedford preferred to serve the sentence rather than betray his friend or their common cause.²⁵

Charles Henry Timperley, writing in 1839, categorized all the London printers of the early eighteenth century. Under the heading of Nonjurors he named: Bettenham in St. John's Lane, Bowyer in White Fryers [sic], and Dalton also in St. John's Lane.²⁶ Isaac Dalton's printing was limited since he was often in court or in prison. In April 1715 he was fined ten marks and sentenced to three months in prison for printing Bishop Atterbury's *English Advice to the Freeholders of England*.²⁷ In December 1716 he was convicted of printing a pamphlet entitled *The Shift Shifted* supposedly written by George Flint, a Roman Catholic and Jacobite. For this crime he was sentenced to pay twenty marks, stand in the pillory, and serve one year in prison. Also convicted, Flint was imprisoned in The Tower but managed to escape. Dalton's sister, Mary, and Mrs. Flint were not so lucky; both were imprisoned in Newgate.²⁸ It was very hard to maintain a family printing business when perennially imprisoned.²⁹

²⁵ Christoph v. Ehrenstein, "Bedford, Hilckiah (1663-1724)," *ODNB*. It should be noted that he wrote a biography of his close personal friend George Hickes and was buried in the same churchyard near him

²⁶ Charles Henry Timperley, *A Dictionary of Printers and Printing: With the Progress of Literature* (London: H. Johnson, 1839), 632.

²⁷ John Nichols and Samuel Bentley, *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century, Comprising Biographical Memoirs of William Bowyer, Printer, and Many of his Learned Friends* (London: Nichols, 1814), 8:368.

²⁸ Timperley, *A Dictionary of Printers and Printing* (London: 1839), 614; John Doran, *London in the Jacobite Times* (London: R. Bentley & Son, 1877), 1:246.

²⁹ See Jeremy Black, *The English Press, 1621-1861* (Stroud: Sutton, 2001) especially the second chapter, "Politics to 1750," which addresses censorship of Jacobitism, directed at protecting the monarch, and examines the career and prosecutions of opposition journalist Nathaniel Mist, who was sympathetic to Jacobitism. More general treatments are: John Brewer, *The Pleasures of the Imagination: English Culture in the Eighteenth Century* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013), 115; Kathleen Wilson, *The Sense of the People* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 113; David Harrison Stevens, *Party Politics and English Journalism 1702-1742* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1967), 106; James Runcieman Sutherland, *The Restoration Newspaper and its Development* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 183; Keith

Who published Hickeys's *Constitution of the Catholick Church*?

In this environment of prosecution it was not surprising that some Nonjurors' works were published anonymously. Hickeys's *Constitution of the Catholick Church* begs the questions: Who published it? Who printed it? Where was it printed? Who sold it and distributed it? How were these persons related if at all? Were there centers of distribution? These central issues were immediately apparent. The work was published posthumously by an anonymous publisher. The printer was not identified nor was the print shop's address. The date given was 1716, one year after Hickeys's death. The work itself gives no indication that Hickeys ever intended it for publication. Who then did so?

Most likely, the manuscript passed into the hands of someone very close to Hickeys at his death. Assuming that these posthumous papers were worth little in pounds sterling, someone considered them valuable for other reasons, intellectual or political, and *The Constitution of the Catholick Church* certainly included intellectual and political elements. It was not normal for the publisher to omit his name or for the printer not to advertise his shop, and I think it likely those responsible sought to remain anonymous for reasons of self-protection. Scholars have suggested that Jeremy Collier, Nathaniel Spinckes, Thomas Brett, or Hilkiah Bedford, all clergymen close to Hickeys who wished his message to be read, were likely publishers.³⁰ These are logical candidates, but no proof exists. They all knew the *Constitution of the Catholick Church* would create

Maslen, *An Early London Printing House at Work* (New York: The Bibliographical Society of America, 1993), 23, 250-254.

³⁰ Lathbury, *A History of the Nonjurors*, 264. Lathbury said, Hickeys's *Constitution* was published "by some of Hickeys's friends." Overton, *The Nonjurors*, 151. Overton claimed Thomas Brett published it. Theodor Harmsen, "Hickeys, George (1642-1715)." *ODNB*. Harmsen says Spinckes published it.

controversy, but perhaps none imagined it would ignite the firestorm called the Bangorian Controversy.

The controversy named for Benjamin Hoadly (1676-1761), Bishop of Bangor, was on the surface an intellectual debate comprised of hundreds of pamphlets discussing sermons and theological papers. In June 1717 alone, thirty-nine substantial pamphlets were written, and the publication of new tracts continued every month through August 1719.³¹ The last pamphlet appeared in October 1720, four years after the first. All of these were in response to three initial documents: George Hickes's *The Constitution of the Catholick Church* (1716), Benjamin Hoadly's *Preservative against the Nonjurors* (1716) and his sermon *The Nature of the Kingdom, or Church, of Christ* (1717). This intellectual debate involved not only a small faction of nonjuring Churchmen, but also embroiled playwrights and poets, High Anglicans, Church Whigs, Non-Conformists, Dissenters, Latitudinarians, the Ministry, Parliament and the Crown. Why did seemingly obscure theological topics occupy the intellectuals of an entire nation for at least four years? The ideas of Hickes and Hoadly presented a binary opposition in theology, political science, and notions of authority generally, clashing on the heels of a century of constant conflict in all these realms.

The ramifications considered, the identities of who published, printed, and distributed Hickes's posthumous papers is an important historical question. My analysis of Hickes's previously published works shows that of fifteen of his books that identify publisher, printer, or bookseller, six list William Bowyer as the printer; six list Richard

³¹ Andrew Starkie, *The Church of England and the Bangorian Controversy, 1716-1721* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2007), 192.

Sare as the bookseller; five list Bowyer as the printer with Sare as the bookseller.³² The only other book merchant even listed twice is Edmund Curll, a man of dubious integrity known to have pirated others' work, who somehow managed print for sale Hickeys' *Last Will and Testament*. Paul Baines and Pat Rogers have convincingly demonstrated that Curll printed about anything he found profitable.³³ For example, Thomas Tension, Archbishop of Canterbury, died on 14 December 1715, and within one month Curll had pulled together some 120 pages of the archbishop's work and his will and published them as *Memoirs of the Life and Times of the Most Reverend Father in God, Dr. Thomas Tension, Late Archbishop of Canterbury*, without anyone's permission. In the same year he secured Hickeys' *Last Will and Testament* intending another published memoirs scheme. But, when it became apparent that Hickeys' memoirs might be explosive, as they in fact proved to be, Curll backed away; "... no biography ensued – even to his fearless nature, perhaps, it seemed too hot a topic in the present cauldron of politics and religion."³⁴

³² George Hickeys [?], *Pretences of the Prince of Wales* (London, 1705); George Hickeys, *Several Letters between Hickeys and a Popish Priest...* (London, 1706); George Hickeys, *An Apologetical Vindication...* (London, 1707); George Hickeys, *Two treatises: One on the Christian Priesthood, the Other of the Dignity of the Episcopal Order* (London, 1707); George Hickeys, *The Spirit of Enthusiasm* (London, 1709); George Hickeys, *A Second collection of Controversial Letters...* (London, 1710); George Hickeys, *The Spirit of Fanaticism...* (London, 1710); George Hickeys, *Two Treatises: One on the Christian Priesthood, the Other of the Dignity of the Episcopal Order*, Two Vols., 3rd ed. (London, 1711); George Hickeys, *Grammatica Anglo-Saxonica*. (Oxford, 1711); George Hickeys [?], *Some Queries Proposed...* (London, 1712); George Hickeys, *Queries relating to the Birth...* (London, 1714); George Hickeys, *Two Treatises: Treatises: One on the Christian Priesthood, the Other of the Dignity of the Episcopal Order*, 3rd Ed. Enlarged (London, 1715); George Hickeys, *Sermons on Several Subjects*, Vols. 1 & 2, (London: 1715); George Hickeys, *Last Will and Testament* (London, 1716); George Hickeys, *Constitution of the Catholick Church*, (London [?], 1716). George Hickeys, *A Sure Guide to the Holy Sacrament...*(London, 1718); George Hickeys, *A Volume of Posthumous Discourse ... with a preface by Nathaniel Spinckes* (London, 1726); George Hickeys, *Thirteen Sermons on Practical Subjects by the late George Hickeys published by Nathaniel Spinckes*, (London, 1741); George Hickeys, *A Declaration* (London [?], 1743).

³³ Paul Baines and Pat Rogers, *Edmund Curll, Bookseller* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007).

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 76.

If the Sheldonian publication of Hicke's *Grammatica Anglo-Saxonica* (1711), and the two books issued by Edmund Curll are omitted, then one-half of all his works were printed for Richard Sare and William Bowyer printed over one-half as well. Even more interesting is that over forty percent list Bowyer the printer and Sare the seller together. Twelve on this list of nineteen books record no printer at all and may have been printed by Bowyer also, but that cannot be proven.

The terms publisher, printer, and bookseller were often used of the same person. In the tables that follow, Overton's observation, "In the eighteenth century, what we call 'Editor' was often called 'Publisher,' and what we call 'Publisher' was called 'Bookseller.'" ³⁵ is worth remembering. Bowyer and Bettenham, for example, both printed and sold books.

³⁵ Overton, *The Nonjurors*, 151.

Table 5: George Hicke's Published Works

| Hicke's Works | Printer | Publisher | Bookseller |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <i>Pretences of the Prince of Wales</i> (1701) | | | |
| <i>Several Letters between Hicke and a Popish Priest</i> (1705) | William Boyer | | Richard Sare |
| <i>An Apologetical Vindication...</i> (1706) | | | Walter Kettliby |
| <i>Two Treatises: On the Christian Priesthood & Episcopal Order</i> (1707) | William Boyer | | Richard Sare |
| <i>The Spirit of Enthusiasm</i> (1709) | | | Richard Sare |
| <i>A Second Collection of Controversial Letters</i> (1710) | William Bowyer | | Richard Sare |
| <i>The Spirit of Fanaticism</i> (1710) | | | Edmund Curll |
| <i>Two Treatises: On the Christian Priesthood & Episcopal Order, 3rd ed.</i> (1711) | William, Bowyer | | Richard Sare |
| <i>Grammatica Anglo-Saxonica</i> (1711) | Sheldonian Theatre | Sheldonian Theatre | Presumably the Sheldonian Theatre |
| <i>Some Queries Proposed ...</i> (1712) | | | S. Popping |
| <i>Queries relating to the Birth...</i> (1714) | | | |
| <i>Two Treatises: On the Christian Priesthood & Episcopal Order, 3rd edition enlarged.</i> (1715) | William Bowyer | | Richard Sare |
| <i>Sermons on Several Subjects, Volumes 1 & 2.</i> (1715) | | Awnshaw Churchill | W. Taylor |
| <i>Hicke's Last Will & Testament</i> (1716) | | | Edmund Curll |
| <i>The Constitution of the Catholick Church</i> (1716) | | | |
| <i>A Sure Guide to the Holy Sacrament</i> (1718) | | | Charles Ringston |
| <i>A Volume of Posthumous Discourse ... with a Preface by Nathaniel Spinckes</i> (1741) | William Bowyer | Nathaniel Spinckes | |
| <i>Thirteen Sermons on Practical Subjects published by Nathaniel Spinckes</i> (1741) | | | John Hinton |
| <i>A Declaration</i> (1743) | | | |

Also interesting is the number of times Bowyer, and others, printed Nathaniel Spinckes' own books, and the number of times Sare, and other booksellers, sold them. Of fifteen works by Spinckes³⁶ four were printed for Richard Sare and two for his son-in-law, John Bettenham. Two were printed for George Strahan, and one each for: W. Freeman, William Taylor, John Morphew, John Hooke, and T. Bickerton. Only four printers are listed: W.B. once, J. (or F.) N. once, F. (or J.) R. once, and J.P. once. In eleven cases the printer was not indicated. Some booksellers may have been also printers; this was the case apparently with John Bettenham, Bowyer's son-in-law. Conversely, it may be that printers other than those recorded printed these works, or that printers like Bowyer or Bettenham printed more books than those for which they received credit.

³⁶ Nathaniel Spinckes, *Essay towards a Proposal for Catholic Communion Answered by Nathaniel Spinckes*, (London, 1705); Nathaniel Spinckes, *The New Pretenders to Prophecy Re-Examined*, (London, 1710); Nathaniel Spinckes, *The new pretenders to prophecy re-examined: and their pretences shewn to be groundless and false. And Sir R. Bulkeley and A. Whitro convicted of very foul practices, in order to the carrying on their imposture...*(London, 1710); Nathaniel Spinckes, *The Sick Man Visited* 1st ed. (London: Freeman, 1712); Nathaniel Spinckes, *Of Trust in God* (London, 1714); Nathaniel Spinckes, *The Case Truly Stated* (London, 1714); Nathaniel Spinckes, *The Sick Man Visited*, 2 ed. (London, 1717); Nathaniel Spinckes, *The Case Further Stated* (London, 1718); Nathaniel Spinckes, *No Sufficient reason for restoring the prayers of Edward VI's First Liturgy*, Part I (London, 1718); Nathaniel Spinckes, *No Sufficient reason for restoring the prayers of Edward VI's First Liturgy*, Part II (London, 1718); Nathaniel Spinckes, *The Article of Romanish Teransubstantiation Inquired into and Disproved* (London, 1719); Nathaniel Spinckes, *1720 a reply to the vindication of the reasons and defence* (London: printed for T. Bickerton, 1720); Nathaniel Spinckes, *The True Church of England Man's Companion to the Closet* (London [?], 1721); Nathaniel Spinckes, *No Reason for Restoring the Prayers and Directions of Edward VI's First Liturgy* (London, 1717); Nathaniel Spinckes, *No Just Ground for Introducing the New Communion Office* (London, 1719).

Table 6: Nathaniel Spinckes's Published Works

| Spinckes's Works | Printer | Publisher | Bookseller |
|---|--|-----------|-----------------|
| <i>Essay Towards a Proposal for Catholic Communion Answered by Nathaniel Spinckes</i> (1705) | William Bowyer | | Richard Sare |
| <i>The New Pretenders to Prophecy Re-examined</i> (1710) | | | Richard Sare |
| <i>The New Pretenders to Prophecy Re-Examined ... And Sir R. Bulkeley and A. Whitro convicted...</i> (1710) | | | Richard Sare |
| <i>The Sick Man Visited</i> , 1 st ed. (1712) | J. (or F.?) N. | | W. Freeman |
| <i>Of Trust in God</i> (1714) | F. (or J.?) R. | | Richard Sare |
| <i>The Case Truly Stated</i> (1714) | | | George Strahan |
| <i>The Sick Man Visited</i> , 2 nd ed. | J. P. | | William Taylor |
| <i>The Case Further Stated</i> (1718) | | | George Strahan |
| <i>No Sufficient Reason for Restoring... Edward VI's First Liturgy, I.</i> (1718) | | | John Morphew |
| No Sufficient Reason for Restoring ... Edward VI's First Liturgy, II. (1718) | Possibly printed by James Bettenham for himself. | | James Bettenham |
| <i>The Article of Romanish Transubstantiation Inquired Into...</i> (1719) | | | John Hooke |
| <i>A Reply to the Vindication of the Reasons and Defence...</i> (1720) | | | T. Bickerton |
| <i>The True Church of England Man's Companion to the Closet</i> (1721) | | | |
| <i>No Reason for Restoring the Prayers and Directions of Edward VI's First Liturgy</i> (1717) | | | |
| <i>No Just Grounds for Introducing the New Communion Office</i> (1719) | Possibly printed by James Bettenham for himself. | | James Bettenham |

While these tables are informative, more probative evidence tending to prove Spinckes the publisher of *The Constitution of the Catholick Church* exists. The preface to Hicckes's *A Volume of Posthumous Discourse* (1726) and the preface of Hicckes's *Thirteen Sermons* (1741), both by Nathaniel Spinckes, were identical. Furthermore, both printings contained the same text from Hebrews 11:4 — “And now being dead he yet speaketh” — on the cover. William Bowyer printed *A Volume of Posthumous Discourse* and John Hinton printed *Thirteen Sermons*. It is unlikely that different printers, working fifteen years apart, would use the same Biblical text absent some special connection. Spinckes died in 1727, John Hinton must have copied Bowyer and Spinckes's work of 1726. If Hebrews 11:4 was a kind of signature indicating the identity of the publisher, then that person was almost certainly Nathaniel Spinckes. As stricter proof, Hebrews 11:4, appears as the only “signature” on the front page of Hicckes's *Constitution of the Catholick Church*, providing further confirmation that Nathaniel Spinckes was its publisher.

An analysis of *The Constitution of the Catholick Church* reveals a relationship between Hicckes, Spinckes, and a lady named Susannah Hopton, and the papers published therein included correspondence between them. Hicckes had long been a close friend of Hopton; he hid in her home at Kington in 1697, where he spent most of that year while there was a royal warrant for his arrest.³⁷ She also had a friend named Thomas Geers, Sergeant-at-Law for Hereford, whom she tried diligently to convert to her own nonjuring principles. Communication consisted of a three way correspondence between Geers, identified only as Sergeant-at-Law, a country lady, who was Susannah Hopton, and

³⁷ Theodor Harmsen, “Hicckes, George (1642-1715).” *ODNB*. “In 1697 he went to live with the Jacobite antiquary William Brome at Ewithington in Herefordshire, where he stayed for more than a year.”

George Hicke. Hopton had enlisted Hicke's efforts to convert Geers to the nonjuring position.

Hopton was a spiritual writer whose piety, especially later in life, approached that of a nun; she rose at four for matins and continued the round of monastic offices during the day. In 1710 Hicke published Hopton's prior correspondence with a priest in which she renounced Roman Catholicism. Entitled "A Letter Written by a Gentlewoman of Quality to a Romish Priest," it was contained in Hicke's *A Second Collection of Controversial Letters* printed by William Boyer and sold by Richard Sare. She had previously assembled a collection of prayers — *Devotions in the Ancient Way of Offices* — based upon the Roman Catholic priest John Austin's daily office prayer-book of 1668. Hicke also published this book in 1710. Subsequently, Spinckes published Hopton's *A Collection of Meditations in Three Parts* with a review by Hicke. The 1717 edition indicated Daniel Midwinter as the bookseller. Hicke, of course, had died two years earlier on 15 December 1715, and Hopton before him on 12 July 1709. The only one of the three still living, Spinckes presumably took as his responsibility the opportunity to publish material vital to the spirituality of the Anglican Church as the Nonjurors saw it, and Midwinter was a noted seller of Nonjuror writings.³⁸ The actor responsible for carrying on this project, Spinckes seems an even more likely candidate to candidate to have continued publishing Hicke's works after his death.

³⁸ Daniel Midwinter sold: Jeremy Collier's, *An Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain, Chiefly of England: From the First Planting of Christianity, in the Island, With a Brief Account of the Affairs of Religion in Ireland. Collected from the best Ancient Historians, Councils, and Records.* Vol. II. (London, 1714) and John Kettlewell's, *An Help and Exhortation to Worthy Communicating: Or, a Treatise Describing the Meaning, Worthy Reception, Duty and Benefits, of the Holy Sacrament and Answering the Doubts of Conscience, and other Reasons, which most generally detain Men from it. Together with suitable Devotions Added.* 8th ed. (London, 1717).

If Hickee was the author of the *Constitution of the Catholick Church* and Spinckes its publisher, who was the printer? How did publisher and printer relate to each other? In 1705 W.B. — William Bowyer — printed *Several Letters between Hickee and a Popish Priest...* published for Richard Sare at Gray's-Inn-Gate, Holborn, London. In 1707, 1711 and 1715 W.B. printed three editions of *Two Treatises* for Richard Sare. In 1709 Richard Sare published *The Spirit of Enthusiasm* at Gray's-Inn, Holborn, London. In 1710 W.B. printed *A Second collection of Controversial Letters* for Richard Sare. And, in 1726 W. Bowyer printed *A Volume of Posthumous Discourse ... with a preface by Nathaniel Spinckes* at his new post-fire location on Temple Lane in White Friars, London. The initials "W.B." seemed ubiquitous, and the names Hickee, Spinckes and Sare closely entwined.

It is certain that Spinckes would have taken Hickee's posthumous works to someone sympathetic to the cause. William Bowyer's printing shop in Whitefriars, and Richard Sare's bookshop in Holborn stood in close proximity to George Hickee's Oratory, his house-church, where he had consecrated Spinckes, Collier and Hawes. The printers were in the Nonjurors' neighborhood both intellectually and geographically. When we factor in frequency of publication by Spinckes, perennial printing by Bowyer, sales by Sare, the element of trustworthiness invested in Bowyer himself a Nonjuror, and geographical proximity, it becomes highly probable that William Bowyer the elder in 1716 printed, at his new location, *The Constitution of the Catholick Church* for Nathaniel Spinckes who acted as publisher. It is a well-grounded guess that Richard Sare sold it, and various nonjuring oratories in London and beyond all each had their own copy.

Booksellers

It is not possible to say with certainty who distributed and sold Hickeys's *Constitution of the Catholick Church*, although Richard Sare is a likely choice. Clearly its publication was bound to create the likelihood of prosecution and the almost certainty of counterargument which it absolutely did. More demonstrable was the existence of a network of booksellers willing to sell and distribute works by leading Nonjurors. Jeremy Collier's magisterial *An Ecclesiastical History Of Great Britain, Chiefly of England... Collected from the best Ancient Historians, Councils, and Records* (1714) was sold by a group of merchants listed with the addresses of their shops on the title page: Samuel Keble, Richard Sare, John Nicholson, Benjamin Tooke, Daniel Midwinter, George Strahan, and Maurice Atkins.³⁹ By 1714 Collier had been consecrated a bishop in the nonjuring succession, and was a nationally known figure openly critical of the morals of the Stage and the Established Church, Crown, and Parliament. Booksellers offering his work ran a risk. The same was true with the Nonjuror John Kettlewell's *An Help and Exhortation to Worthy Communicating* (1717) which was printed by J. Heptinstall to be sold by: T. Horn, J. Knapton, R. Knaplock, and others.⁴⁰ Some sellers, such as Richard Sare, Daniel Midwinter, and W. Taylor, frequently sold Nonjurors' books. Curiously, the Kettlewell publication lists J. Bowyer as one of its booksellers, probably Jonah Bowyer listed by Charles Henry Timperley in *A Dictionary of Printers and Printing* (1839) as a

³⁹ Jeremy Collier, *An Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain, Chiefly of England: From the First Planting of Christianity, in the Island, With a Brief Account of the Affairs of Religion in Ireland. Collected from the best Ancient Historians, Councils, and Records*. Vol. II. (London, 1714).

⁴⁰ John Kettlewell, *An Help and Exhortation to Worthy Communicating: Or, a Treatise Describing the Meaning, Worthy Reception, Duty and Benefits, of the Holy Sacrament and Answering the Doubts of Conscience, and other Reasons, which most generally detain Men from it. Together with suitable Devotions Added*. 8th ed. (London, 1717). Other booksellers included: J. Wyatt, T. Varnham and J. Osborn, D. Midwinter, R. Robinson, W. Taylor, J. Bowyer, H. Clements, W. Mears, R. Gosling, W. Innys, J. Browne, and W. Churchill.

bookseller active in 1715.⁴¹ Was Jonah Bowyer another child of William Bowyer who in 1717 earned a living selling books?⁴² In any case, a network of booksellers existed to sell Nonjurors' books, and at least some of these merchants were committed Nonjurors themselves, notably James Bettenham, Richard Sare, and probably Daniel Midwinter.

Printing Presses as Pulpits

Robert Darnton has written much about printed communication in early modern Europe and many have used his "communications circuit" model.⁴³ Darnton argues that there was a general pattern in publishing any book that included a "communications circuit" that ran "from the author to the publisher (if the bookseller does not assume that role), the printer, the shipper, the bookseller, and the reader."⁴⁴ Each stage and person(s) in the circuit made a contribution to the communication. Generally the circuit traveled full circle, coming back to the author from the readers who commented on the book. The author being a reader also, often chose to refine or even republish the book. In the case of France, Darnton argues that popular news in Paris often began at the Tree of Cracow, and, when circulated by news mongers – *nouvellistes de bouche* –, forbidden letters made the events of the day quite current. The Tree of Cracow was a meeting place that served

⁴¹ Timperley, *A Dictionary of Printers and Printing* (London, 1839), 613.

⁴² John Nichols, *Biographical and Literary Anecdotes*, 9. Nichols records Bowyer's own testimony: "The fire ... forced him with his wife and children to save their lives by flight." There were clearly two or more children living with Bowyer at the time. We know William was away at Ambrose Bonwicke's school, and Mary (or Frances) had married James Bettenham. Who then was at home? See Keith Maslen, "Bowyer, William (1663-1737)," *ODNB*.

⁴³ See Meike G. Werner, "Book History as the History of Literature," *The Germanic Review* 76, No. 4, (2001), 283-289.

⁴⁴ Robert Darnton, "What is the History of Books?" in Darnton, *The Kiss of Lamourette: Reflections in Cultural History* (New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Co. 1990), 111-135.

to distribute news; there were other locations as well: the Luxembourg Gardens, benches in the Tuileries, cafes, and street corners. If you wanted the news you went to just such a place.⁴⁵

Were there a central communications points corresponding to the Parisian Tree of Cracow in the Nonjurors' network? There were, in fact, several such centers. The fire that destroyed William Bowyer's printing shop offers insight into how they worked. Not only had the fire spread, but so too had news of it. The major efforts at charitable relief for Bowyer also demonstrated a network of mutual support, which closely paralleled the communications circuit already extant. Imagine a communications circuit based upon an informal network of sympathetic oratories, key clergymen, printers, and booksellers. Printed sermons, letters, and books quickly traveled to the oratories, to university colleges, to preparatory schools, and to friends in High Church and Tory circles, and this transit generated more preaching writing, publishing and printing. All of this centered around small congregations meeting in private oratories sometimes under threat of persecution.

The Nonjurors had oratories – Scroop's Court, Trinity Chapel, Dr Rawlinson's Oratory in his chambers at Gray's Inn, to name a few – were places of worship. These were sometimes chapels in private houses, what Americans today might call “house-churches.” Samuel Grascome gave a vivid picture of the Eucharistic assembly at Scroop's Court, Holborn where he ministered probably in 1702. “When all others have their liberty, they [the Nonjurors] alone are not suffered to serve God; but if they do meet

⁴⁵ Robert Darnton, “An Early Information Society: News and Media in Eighteenth-Century Paris” *The American Historical Review* 105, no. 1 (February 2000): 1-35.

together, the Hell-Hounds which are set to hunt them, seize the Persons ... and the Minister [is] committed to Newgate or some filthy Prison for high Misdemeanour.”⁴⁶

Christine Pawley has suggested “institutional sites of print as a middle layer that can bridge the gap between structure and agency and between macro and micro views.”⁴⁷ Pawley argues that in between market models of print culture, such as Robert Darnton’s communications circuit, and resistance models, like Michel de Certeau’s reading as “poaching,” there are intermediate, often informal sites where reading and writing intersect, in churches for example. In such settings, readers might share the writings of others as consumers, but they also have the opportunity to produce new narratives.

I submit these oratories were just such intermediate communications points linked by the clergy for the dissemination of important news. They also distributed and shared important sermons and essays written to prove the truth of the Nonjurors’ position. Since the Nonjurors were deprived of the national pulpits they formerly enjoyed, they needed the culture of print to articulate their ideas. Bowyer’s printing shop furnished such a vital link as an example of Darnton’s “communications circuit.” After the deprivation of the Nonjurors, their own trusted and valued printers became their primary pulpits. They enabled these groups to address the Nation — friends among the Tories, interested High Church readers in the Established Church, and Jacobites who longed for ecclesiastical links.

Another vital part of the network was the association with Saint John’s College, Cambridge that had been quick to respond to Bowyer’s need. Even quicker to help was

⁴⁶ Samuel Grascome, *Two Letters*, 8, cited in D. A. Brunton, “Grascome, Samuel (1641-1708),” *ODNB*.

⁴⁷ Christine Pawley, “Beyond Market Models and Resistance Organizations as a Middle Layer in the History of Reading,” *Library Quarterly* 79, no.1 (Chicago: University of Chicago, 2009), 73-93.

Ambrose Bonwicke's school at Headley, Surrey, which acted a preparatory school for Saint John's. The important story of how Bonwicke initially sheltered the young Bowyer, who was then at Headley School, from news of his father's fire demonstrates the efficacy of this network, as does the subsequent free tuition provided to the lad. The point is that there was a network of Nonjurors linked by a common mission and for the survival of that mission. This network included first nonjuring clerics like Hickes, Spinckes, and Collier. Second, there were the oratories and their patrons. Third, there were invaluable printers like Bowyer who were committed Nonjurors. Fourth, we find booksellers, also part of the communications circuit, distributing the message. The pattern ended with the readers both within and without the nonjuring network. The Nonjurors exerted tremendous influence on the greater community of High Churchman and Tories generally. And, clearly, as the Bangorian Controversy manifestly demonstrated, ardent opponents such as Bishop Hoadley of Bangor and his Whig supporters read them as well. Yes, there was a Nonjuring equivalent of Darnton's Tree of Cracow, and the trunk of that tree was William Bowyer's Printing Shop.

Charles Leslie, *The Rehearsal*, and the Bowyer Connection

Books and pamphlets were not the only means of articulating Nonjurors' ideas. The newspaper was an early modern instrument ripe for use by the nonjuring community, most notably in the hands of Charles Leslie.⁴⁸ Leslie was an Irishman, graduate of Trinity

⁴⁸ See Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 40-43; Dror Wahrman, *Mr. Collier's Letter Racks: A Tale of Art and Illusion at the Threshold of the Modern Information Age* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), especially chapter one.; For the emergence of a Jacobite periodical press see Paul Kléber Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People 1688-1788*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 28-38.

College Dublin, and before his deprivation, chancellor of the cathedral of Connor. Trained as both a lawyer and priest, Leslie lent his considerable intellect to apologetical efforts on behalf of Nonjurors, Jacobites and Tories generally. He was close to George Hickes, Robert Nelson, Francis Cherry, and Henry Dodwell.⁴⁹ Leslie was arguably the most extreme divine right theorist among the Nonjurors.⁵⁰ From 1704 to 1709 during the reign of Queen Anne, he published a biweekly news journal called *The Rehearsal*. This journal offered a direct opposition to Whig arguments appearing in John Tutchin's *Observer* and Daniel Defoe's *Review*. By 1712 London had a number of single sheet newspapers with sales of about 25,000 copies per week, and about 2.5 million newspapers were sold annually in 1713 London. Leslie's *Rehearsal* took its place among a burgeoning print industry that included: the *Post Boy*, *Post-Man*, *Flying-Post*, the *Daily Courant*, the *Evening Post*, the *St. James's Evening Post*, the *Whitehall Evening-Post*, the *London Journal*, the *Daily Post*, the *London Evening-Post*, the *Daily Advertiser*, and the *London Gazette*. The first provincial paper was the *Norwich Post* that appeared in 1701. Thus Nonjurors, while not originators of the newspaper, nevertheless employed it successfully engaging the political debates of the day with their own journal.⁵¹

Thomas Hearne contended that Leslie's effectiveness across a wide-ranging audience was the result of his defense of High Church and Tory causes with an integrity that those who compromised with the 1688 Revolution lacked; Leslie spoke "with

⁴⁹ Dodwell was, like Leslie, a Trinity College, Dublin graduate

⁵⁰ Lucy Mary Hawkins, *Allegiance in Church and State: The Problem of the Nonjurors in the English Revolution* (London: George Routledge & Sons, Ltd., 1928), 131-159.

⁵¹ See Roy Porter *The Creation of the Modern World, The Untold Story of the British Enlightenment* (New York, W.W. Norton & Co., 2000), 76-78.

boldness , & discover'd some thruths which their compliance would not permit them to do."⁵² His positions were so powerfully stated that in March 1709 the government shut down his newspaper, and he was forced to beg a royal pardon. Undeniably, during the nearly six year publication of *The Rehearsal*, Leslie made the Nonjurors' contentions against occasional conformity, for episcopacy as a divine institution, and on behalf of Passive Obedience and indefeasible divine right of the monarchy widely known.

This process was part of what Roy Porter describes as the change from "intensive" to "extensive" reading.⁵³ Traditionally, the reader would own and re-read a library of limited chosen texts; this was intensive reading. Conversely newspapers, journals, lending library volumes, or shared books and journals constituted a great expansion to extensive reading. In the case of less affluent readers this access could be limited, but was certainly increased. Nonjurors, who traditionally fit the "intensive" image, studying privately away in their personal libraries or university carrels, were nevertheless quick to adopt the modern technologies of print culture. Nonjurors constituted an elite academic intelligentsia in possession of substantial libraries; the case of Bishop Thomas Ken, who took over 1000 books with him in his move to Lord Weymouth's Longleat House, is a good illustration.⁵⁴ No doubt Francis Cherry, Henry Dodwell, and Francis Brokesby had a substantial library at Shottesbrooke, while those on

⁵² Thomas Hearne *Remarks* 3.36

⁵³ Roy Porter *The Creation of the Modern World, The Untold Story of the British Enlightenment* (New York, W.W. Norton & Co., 2000), 76-77. Porter attributes the first use of the terms to Rolf Engelsing, *Der Burger als Leser: Leser Geschichte in Deutschland 1500-1800* (J. B. Metzler, 1974).

⁵⁴ Hugh A. L. Rice, *Thomas Ken, Bishop and Non-Juror* (London: S.P.C.K., 1958), 178-182.

the run or in exile like Hickee and Leslie possessed far fewer volumes.⁵⁵ What Leslie's effort with *The Rehearsal* accomplished was to expand readers' — establishment and Nonjurors alike — knowledge of current ideas in a venue that brought nonjuror rhetoric to the attention of many who otherwise would never have heard their arguments. Some were, of course, threatened by this development.

On 18 January 1708 Leslie wrote to a "Friend in the Country, Concerning the threaten'd Prosecution of the Rehearsal, put into the News-Papers." The country friend expressed concern that Leslie was soon to be prosecuted under "Warrants of High Treason" for publishing his newspaper, information was gained from reading "News-Papers" in the country. Leslie responded in this fashion: " Sir, I can tell you no more than the Talk of the Town. It is through all the Coffee-Houses, and makes a great Noise. But I can learn no other Foundation for it but the Industry of his [i.e. Leslies] Opponents, who take pains to spread the report."⁵⁶ Thus, for over a year before the government acted to close the *Rehearsal* the scuttlebutt in the press and coffeehouses proclaimed that action was imminent. In this same letter Leslie recounted his understanding of the *Rehearsal's* place in the news industry:

Sir, my Opinion of these *Papers* upon the whole is this. The *Rehearsal* came in Late The *Observers* and *Reviews* had been in Possession of the Kingdom some Years before he [i.e. Leslie] Began., and what I have Quoted is not the Thousandth part of the Dirt they have thrown upon the *Church*. And tho' his *Paper-War* is all upon the *Defensive*, yet in *Defence* some Blows must be Return'd. And the *Aggressors* must thank themselves.⁵⁷

⁵⁵ Thomas Hearne, *The life of Mr. Thomas Hearne, of St. Edmund's Hall, Oxford; from his own MS. copy, in the Bodleian Library. Also an accurate catalogue of his writings and publications, from his own MS. Copy, which he designed for the Press. To Which Are Added, Several Plates of the Antiquities, &c. mentioned in his Works. Never Before Printed.*(Oxford, 1772), 2-9, 24, 29-30.

⁵⁶ Charles Leslie, *A Letter from a Gentleman in the City to his Friend in the Country, Concerning the threaten'd Prosecution of the Rehearsal, put into the News-Papers.* (London, 1708),1.

⁵⁷ Leslie, *A Letter from a Gentleman in the City to his Friend in the Country* (London, 1708), 4.

Analyzing Leslie's words, the *Rehearsal* was a defensive effort to counter by force — “in *Defence* some Blows must be Return'd” — the older Whig newspapers. It was a clear example of how the Nonjurors were eager to adopt the latest technology to counter their opponents by going on the attack. The *Rehearsal* spared no blows and was effective in presenting a voice that might otherwise have been relegated to the house-church, scholarly paper, or study carrel. Interestingly, Leslie called his newspaper's efforts a “*Paper-War*,” the clear purpose of which was to defend the Church.

The *Rehearsal* was a business enterprise engaging the market, selling news as a commodity. This was very different from Hickes, Dodwell, or Collier's writing scholarly answers to the pressing theological problems of the day. Leslie was addressing in a more popular venue the latest controversies with the same theological foundation already articulated by Hickes and others in more scholarly publications. This was an expansion into the public sphere, one paid for by purchase of the papers.

Benedict Andersen argues that the newspaper was simply a form of the book with a relationship to the market. “The newspaper is merely an ‘extreme form’ of the book, a book sold on a colossal scale, but of ephemeral popularity. Might we say: one-day best sellers?”⁵⁸ In this regard Leslie's work was different from other clerical scholars among the Nonjurors. Leslie and *The Rehearsal* disseminated their writing and did so updated bi-weekly; both Leslie and his colleagues, of course, wrote the same theology. For Andersen, “each book had its own eremitic self-sufficiency.” One can imagine each reader as an “eremite,” a desert hermit, or religious recluse busily digesting news on a far

⁵⁸ Benedict Andersen, *Imagined Communities, Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 2006), 33-34.

grander scale than that available locally. Those who never met a Nonjuror were reading their current opinions in print, up to the moment, addressing the pressing issues. This kept Nonjurors in the public fray, their opinions read by an anonymous vast audience who discussed such matters in the pub and coffeehouse. Thus print culture, and the newspaper in particular, expanded nonjuring influence exponentially.

In 1710 Leslie engaged Gilbert Burnett, Bishop of Salisbury, one of the most vociferous Whig apologists, with a work entitled *The Good Old Cause, or, Lying in Truth*. By this point, Leslie was regarded as dangerous enough for the crown to order his arrest. The accused, however, simply slipped away, failed to appear before the court on 8 August, and subsequently went into hiding at Francis Cherry's estate, Shottesbrooke, Berkshire. The Leslies remained there six months before fleeing to the safety of France, arriving at the Jacobite court in St. Germain-en-Laye on 17 April 1711.

During this interval, and subsequent to the forced closing of the *Rehearsal*, Benjamin Hoadly, later Bishop of Bangor, wrote these words attacking Leslie and supporting the government:

This is the very *Writer* [i.e Charles Leslie] who in his ingenious Papers call'd *Rehearsals*, (in which he here boasts that he sow'd that good seed which is now bring so much Comfort to himself and the rest of his *Non-juring Brethren*) I say, this is the Man who in those *Papers* us'd to banter the *Revolution* from another *Topick*, and be ever representing it as a mere *Abdication*, and to lead all who came into it, still to keep up their abhorrence of *Resistance*; for he well knew that *Resistance* was so plain and evident, that one Word of his could set that Matter right again to his heart's satisfaction. The lucky Opportunity is now come; the plot ripens apace; Whiggism faints under popular clamours; the Pretender is only waiting, one would think, for the first fair wind; the Day begins to break; the *Nation*, the poor man imagines, is now work'd up to the utmost Abhorrence of all resistance to *Hereditary Kings*." ⁵⁹

⁵⁹ Benjamin Hoadly, *The Jacobite's Hopes reviv'd by our late Tumults and Addresses: or, Some Necessary Remarks upon a New Modest Pamphlet of Mr. Lesly's against the Government, intituled, The good old cause: or, lying in truth, &c.* (London, 1710), 3.

Aside from the sardonic wit, not unusual for Hoadly, the bishop's words were testimony to the political force and effectiveness of Leslie's newspaper. *The Rehearsal* was a compelling counter-voice challenging the pro-Whig publications.

Exile at the Jacobite court in France did not stop Leslie's pen.⁶⁰ In 1711, before fleeing to the continent, Leslie wrote *The Finishing Stroke: Being a Vindication of the Patriarchal Scheme of Government*.⁶¹ In 1714 from France he wrote: *A Letter from Mr. Leslie to a Member of Parliament in London*.⁶² I have been unable to find a specific printer's name attached to these works; presumably none wanted to openly risk identification with a foreign court and the outlawed Leslie. Later, during the Usages Controversy, Leslie wrote two tracts from the continent taking the side of the Non-Usagers. The first of these was *A Letter from Mr. Leslie to his friend against alterations or additions to the Liturgy of the Church of England* (1718),⁶³ followed by *A Letter from the Rev. Mr. Charles Leslie Concerning the New Separation to Mr. B_____* (1719).⁶⁴ It is likely that "Mr. B_____" was none other than William Bowyer the printer. Finally, one year before his death, *The Theological Works of the Reverend Mr. Charles Leslie in two volumes* (1721) was published with the clear imprint: "William Bowyer." While it was by

⁶⁰ Charles Leslie, *The Theological Works of the Reverend Mr. Charles Leslie in two volumes* (London, 1721)

⁶¹ Charles Leslie, *The finishing stroke. Being a vindication of the patriarchal scheme of government, in defence of The rehearsals, Best answer, and Best of all. Wherein Mr. Hoadly's Examination of this Scheme in his late Book of the Original and Institution of Civil Government, is fully consider'd. To which are added, remarks on Dr. Higden's late defence, in a dialogue between three H-'s.* (London, 1711).

⁶² Charles Leslie, *A letter from Mr. Lesly to a Member of Parliament in London.* (London, 1714).

⁶³ Charles Leslie, *A letter from Mr. Lesly to his friend; Against Alterations or Additions to the Liturgy of the Church of England.* (London, 1718).

⁶⁴ Charles Leslie, *A letter from the Reverend Mr. Charles Leslie, Concerning the New Separation.* (London, 1719). This is the third edition printed by J. Morphew. The first page reprints the original "Mr. LESLIEs Letter to Mr. B_____. ABOUT *The New Separation.*"

no means certain Bowyer handled the exiled Leslie's printing, it must be considered highly probable. By this time Leslie was in declining health and secured permission from Lord Sunderland to return to his native Ireland — the first time since 1691 — on the stipulation that he finally refrain from political agitation. He died at his family's estate at Glaslough, Ireland on 13 April 1722 and was buried in the parish churchyard.⁶⁵

Who Were the Readers?

The nonjuring community, both lay and clerical members, read what its leaders wrote. Their education levels were comparatively high. William Bowyer the younger was educated at Saint John's, Cambridge and often referred to as the "learned printer." Many Nonjurors were among the intelligentsia of early eighteenth-century England. Goldie observes that "they exerted a profound intellectual influence over Augustan England. Time after time they traversed the boundary between the conformists and themselves and lent massive scholarly and polemical support to Anglican, Tory, and Country Opposition causes.⁶⁶ The Bangorian Controversy called forth their best arguments and voluminous writing. The publishing of Hicke's *Constitution of the Catholick Church* and Bishop Hoadley's response prompted the entire exchange. Many of the finest answers were given by Nonjurors and were read by friends and foes alike. As the debate increased so too did the number of readers who became acquainted with the depth of Nonjuror discourse. William Bradford Gardner in his 1942 essay "George Hicke and the Origins of the

⁶⁵ Robert D. Cornwall, "Leslie, Charles, (1650-1722), nonjuring Church of Ireland clergyman," *ODNB*.

⁶⁶ Mark Goldie, "The Nonjurors, Episcopacy and the Origins of the Convocation Controversy," in *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1759*, ed. Eveline Cruickshanks (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1982), 15-35.

Bangorian Controversy” argued from literary texts to demonstrate that it was Hickeys *Constitution* that began the Bangorian Controversy. He cites the words of Samuel Johnson, “ the attention of the literary world was engrossed by the Bangorian Controversy which filled the press with pamphlets and the coffee houses with disputants.”⁶⁷

Even very late in the eighteenth century the *Constitution of the Catholic Church* circulated. Several large book sales from 1767 to 1780 revealed multiple copies in the collections of prominent persons. This book along with Bishop Hoadley’s *Preservative against the Nonjurors* (1716) and his sermon *The Nature of the Kingdom or Church of Christ* (1717) were found in numerous collections.⁶⁸

William Bowyer and his Networks

These works survived because they were painstakingly printed, under peril of prosecution, by men like William Bowyer. “W.B.” was a tradesman, working with inflammable material, who did an ordinary job in an extraordinary way. He was known for his integrity, professionalism, and commitment as a leading nonjuring Anglican Christian. He printed everything the Nonjurors’ clergymen approved in the face of great danger. He was dependable, trustworthy and highly respected. His books and those of

⁶⁷ W. B. Gardner, “George Hickeys and the Origin of the Bangorian Controversy,” *Studies in Philology*, 39, (1942): 78. Gardner cites: Colley Cibber’s *The Non-juror*, the anonymous *The Theatre-Royal Turn’d into a Mountebank’s Stage*, Alexander Pope’s *The Plot Discovered*, Samuel Johnson’s *The Life of Elijah Fenton*, and Lord Macaulay’s *History of England*,

⁶⁸ *A Catalogue of Many Thousand Volumes of Valuable Books in Many Languages, Arts and Sciences; in which are included the entire library of an eminent Counselor in the Law... which will be sold...on Mouday [sic] December 21, 1767 by William Otridge*, (London, 1767); *A Catalogue of the Libraries of the Right Hon. Lord Teynham et al ... which will be sold by T. Smith and Son, booksellers, in Canterbury* (Canterbury, 1780); *A Catalogue of Several Libraries and Collections of Books, Lately Purchased by Benjamin White ... including those of John Neville, and Dr. Cornwall Tathwell ... the Sale begins in February, 1774* (London, 1774).

other nonjuring printers found a ready market served by a network of booksellers, either Nonjurors themselves or sympathetic to them. On at least two occasions he was a witness to the consecrations of nonjuring bishops, one of whom he had trained as a printer. He had connections that extended to those of very high estate as well as throughout his own trade. In short, Bowyer was part of a network that was vital to the Nonjurors.

There already existed several intertwining networks of publishers, printers, patrons and priests in 1715. The Nonjurors created a mutual assistance survival network not unlike that of the early English Quakers. Kate Peters has demonstrated that the early Quakers developed an efficient communication and mutual support network directed by the clergy but largely operated by laypersons including printers. She has convincingly demonstrated that the Yorkshireman Thomas Aldam and Margaret Fell of Swarthmoor Hall both used their own homes as centers for book distribution and were closely linked to the clerical leaders and the London printers. Aldam wrote to Fell in 1654 articulating the key purpose of this Quaker network: "...to keepe the markets in your County with Bookes" and to "Carrye this the Testimonie of the Truth abroad." ⁶⁹ The Quakers used books to "preserve their message" and to present the truth to others as well, using them much as if they were sermons. ⁷⁰ Of course, in the case of the Nonjurors, the books often were sermons, and the parallels to the network of the later Nonjurors are striking. ⁷¹ Second, the Quakers found a way to communicate their ideas for reformation to the nation at large through print culture. In this they resembled the Huguenots in Barbara

⁶⁹ Cited in Kate Peters, *Print Culture and the Early Quakers* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 51.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 71.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 26-27, 51, 68, and 250.

Diefendorf's studies of sixteenth-century Paris who created a web of mutual support that often cut across social hierarchy and involved printers who shared the faith of their clients.⁷² This too was strikingly parallel to the network of the later Nonjurors. Third, Quakers had agency and voice through this print network even when prohibited. Likewise, the Nonjurors had no pulpit, but they had the press. Had remained hidden in their minute house-churches, their message would have been preached only to themselves; instead, they reached a national audience largely through the agency of printing. Fourth, the print culture of the Quakers and Nonjurors was a marvelous combination of Darnton's circuit of communications.⁷³

Resistance models as articulated by Michel de Certeau also apply to nonjuring print culture. Certeau has constructed a model of readers as "poachers."⁷⁴ The poacher borrows from another's written ideas and they become his own. In the case of Spinckes and Bowyer's use of Hickes's papers this poaching concept involved physically taking the written pages. Spinckes's publication of the *Constitution of the Catholick Church* printed by William Bowyer and likely sold by Richard Sare serves as a perfect example of Certeau's concept of the reader as "poacher." We do not even know if Hickes ever intended his posthumous papers to be published. Spinckes and Bowyer most likely collected and arranged them with the title they chose – *The Constitution of the Catholick Church*. They "poached" them to communicate the Nonjurors' mission so eloquently stated by Hickes, who had originally written locally to meet an immediate pastoral need.

⁷² Barbara B. Diefendorf, *Beneath the Cross: Catholics and Huguenots in Sixteenth-Century Paris* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 130ff.

⁷³ Darnton, "What is the History of Books?", 111-135.

⁷⁴ Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, trans. Stephen Rendall (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 165-176.

Spinckes and Bowyer published them to convert a nation and to meet a national and more catholic concern. Concomitantly, William Bowyer's printing, Richard Sare's selling, and the oratories originating, distributing and refining the nonjuring authors' messages illustrates Darnton's communication circuit in action.

The Link that Proves the Case

John Blackburne (1681-1741) wrote *A Short Account of the Life of the Very Reverend Author* that was appended to the fourth edition (1731) of Nathaniel Spinckes's *The Sick Man Visited*. It is clear from this biography that Blackburne was with Spinckes as he lay dying and that he knew much of his life as a Nonjuror. It is also obvious that he had knowledge of the earliest details of Spinckes's life second-hand. Blackburne was only ten years old at the time of the original 1691 deprivations.

Blackburne became a well known ally of Spinckes in the Usages Controversy, taking the side of retaining the 1662 Prayer Book and the practice of the Restoration Church of England. This placed them into opposition with the party led by Jeremy Collier, which favored a return to the 1549 Prayer Book and several "uses" of the ancient Church. Tragically this controversy split the already small minority of Nonjurors. This alliance explains Blackburne's personal knowledge of Spinckes's life.

Spinckes had known Blackburne for many years, and had consecrated the younger man a bishop in the Nonjuring succession on 6 May 1725. Blackburne continued to exercise an episcopal ministry for the next sixteen years, and was a critical part of the later nonjuring movement. Henry Broxap cites the consecration record:

John Blackburne was consecrated on Ascension Day, May 6th, 1725, by Nathaniel Spinckes, Henry Gandy and Henry Doughty in Dr. Rawlinson's Oratory at his

chambers in Gray's Inn, London, in the presence of John Creyk, R. Rawlinson, Henry Hall, presbyters; Heneage, Earl of Winchilsea, Sir T. L'Estrange, Bart., Thos. Martyn, gent, William Bowyer, Senior, printer.⁷⁵

All the persons present in this little congregation were key leaders. Spinckes, Gandy, Doughty, and the newly consecrated bishop John Blackburne would consecrate Henry Hall a bishop just one month later. John Creyk, who attended, succeeded Samuel Hawes as chaplain to the Earl of Winchilsea, an ardent patron and protector of the Nonjurors. The famous priest and author of *A Serious all to a Devout and Holy Life*, William Law, was present at the second consecration. Most significant was that the last name in both lists, "William Bowyer, Senior, printer." Bowyer was listed in rank order behind an earl, a knight, and a gentleman, but he bore the particularly important title "printer."

Blackburne was the son of Thomas Blackburne of Charleton in Cheshire, and he attended Saint John's College, Cambridge,⁷⁶ a great refuge for Nonjurors. He was admitted to the college on May 29, 1697, six years after Spinckes's deprivation, and held a scholarship. He received the degree B.A. in 1701 and proceeded to M.A. in 1705.

Thomas Lathbury in 1845 recorded the Reverend Richard Bowes's remarks on the death of Blackburne on 17 November 1741. "Soon after the Revolution he [Blackburne] became one of those few truly conscientious who refused the new Oaths. From that time he lived a very exemplary good life, and studied hard: endeavouring to be useful to mankind both as a scholar and divine."⁷⁷

⁷⁵ Broxap, *The Later Nonjurors*, 101.

⁷⁶ Overton, *The Nonjurors*, 314-5. Overton lists Blackburne's college as Trinity, Cambridge.

⁷⁷ Lathbury, *A History of the Nonjurors*, 394.

No record of his ordination to the priesthood or diaconate exists, and his record of refusing to take the Abjuration Oath clearly guaranteed he would not receive a living in the Established Church.⁷⁸ When overeducated and unemployed, the usual place for Nonjurors to seek preferment was under the patronage of other Nonjurors. Samuel Hawes and John Creyk both were chaplains to the Earl of Winchilsea whose largesse toward the Nonjuring cause, and whose contacts with the Stuart dynasty were well established. Not all patrons were lords however. One of the most respected and distinguished nonjuring patrons was a tradesman, William Bowyer, the printer, and it was he who employed John Blackburne. Bowes's record of Blackburne's death in 1741 stated, "To keep himself independent he became corrector of the press to Mr. Bowyer, printer: and was, indeed, one of the most accurate of any who ever took upon him that laborious employ."⁷⁹ Nichols remembered that "Mr. Bowyer's corrector of the press was usually a clergyman" and he mentioned Blackburne specifically.⁸⁰ Henry Broxap recorded: "In the year 1715 Blackburne was acting as press corrector to W. Bowyer, the printer. It is known that he refused the Abjuration Oath, and his permanent home was in Little Britain, London."⁸¹

In 1715 Blackburne was working in Bowyer's print shop correcting typeface and proofreading. One day late in 1715 or early in 1716 – during Blackburne's first year of employment there – Nathaniel Spinckes walked into the print shop with an important

⁷⁸ It is possible that Bowes' record of Blackburne's refusal to take the "new Oaths" refers to the 1701 Abjuration Oath (13 Will. III, c. 6) by which all claims of the Stuart Dynasty and the Pope were renounced. Overton, *The Nonjuror*, 314-315, argued that it was the reiteration of the Abjuration Oath under George I in 1715 that Blackburne refused. In which case it is hard to reconcile Overton's argument with Bowes's remark in 1741 "soon after the Revolution he...refused the new Oaths." It is entirely possible that Blackburne consistently refused both oaths.

⁷⁹ Lathbury, *A History of the Nonjurors*, 394.

⁸⁰ Nichols, *Biographical and Literary Anecdotes*, 12.

⁸¹ Broxap, *The Later Non-Jurors*, 309.

manuscript in hand to be published and printed anonymously. I think three men touched those volatile pages that would ignite that firestorm the Bangorian Controversy. Their names were: Nathaniel Spinckes, William Bowyer, and John Blackburne, and the manuscript was George Hicke's *Constitution of the Catholick Church*.

Chapter 5: Time in the Nonjurors' Worldview

In the new climate of criticism and with the tempo of life accelerating, old ways were challenged, and no longer did hallowed custom or 'God's will' automatically provide answers to life's questions. With material culture burgeoning, 'business' (in both senses of the term) counting and the national pulse quickening, practical calculations meant more. Time — the transient and temporal rather than the eternal — became money, indeed became property: Samuel Pepys was as pleased as Punch to acquire his first timepiece.

Roy Porter

Notions of time changed rapidly following the Revolution of 1688. The English Nonjurors, with the rest of Britain, experienced a society in which ancient agrarian patterns of seedtime and harvest, punctuated by the liturgical rhythms of the Book of Common Prayer, were giving way to clocks in the market place and pocket watches carried by an industrious nation where time was money. Political events were happening at an increased tempo; there were six Parliamentary elections, the trial of Dr. Sacheverill, and the Occasional Conformity dispute all in the first decade of the eighteenth century. The Great Storm of 1703 wrought immense damage and seemed to many a timely portent of judgment. Sir Isaac Newton's new notions of "absolute time" and its correlative support for Latitudinarian Christianity also challenged the intellectual community, including the Church and its nonjuring component.

These circumstances prompted the Nonjurors to engage collectively in a reconsideration of the definition of time. In this chapter we see a hybridization of sacred and clock time employed by the Nonjurors — whereby *chronos* time assumed *kairos* value — in order to present their apologetic agenda. That definition recast ancient

Roy Porter, *The Creation of the Modern World: The Untold Story of the British Enlightenment* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2000), 205.

understandings for a new age, and in considerable measure gave to the nonjuring movement an eternal cast, a perspective of time with the longest possible trajectory for facing an uncertain present and future.

As printing presses replaced pulpits in the previous chapter, here we see Nonjurors acting, largely through print culture, to interpret events such as the Great Storm of 1703 or the Bangorian Controversy as of kairotic import. This was a significant historical revision, that not only complicates narratives of the transition from pre-modern to modern conceptions of time provided by Roy Porter and E. P. Thompson, but also calls into question the secularization narrative provided by Steve Pincus and other scholars. Pincus's statement: "Revolutionary regimes bring with them a new conception of time, a notion that they are beginning a new epoch in the history of the state and its society..."¹ must be examined alongside J.C.D. Clark's persistence of mentalities in an "Anglican-aristocratic ascendancy ... a social order which preserved its hegemony despite repeated internal challenge."² This chapter presents the Nonjurors' adherence to older notions of sacred time set into a new context of more modern clock time, all the while effectively functioning, as Mark Goldie carefully argues, to influence the nation.³ This makes the Nonjurors central to our understanding of time in the eighteenth century generally, and makes their history essential to understanding the larger picture of the conflict between

¹ Steve Pincus, *1688 The First Modern Revolution* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 31.

² J.C.D. Clark, *English Society 1660-1832: Religion, Ideology and Politics during the Ancien Regime* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 25.

³ Mark Goldie, "The Nonjurors, Episcopacy and the Origins of the Convocation Controversy," in *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1759*, ed. Eveline Cruickshanks (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1982) 15-35; see also W. A. Speck, *Reluctant Revolutionaries: Englishmen and the Revolution of 1688* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988).

sacred and secular, kairotic and chronological, perspectives that were rapidly changing in English culture at the outset of the eighteenth century.

Samuel Pepys's Watch

Samuel Pepys (1633-1703) view of time parallels that of many Nonjurors. He is best known for the *Diary* that he began on 1 January 1660 and continued for nine and a half years. Unfortunately, the terminus of the *Diary* preceded the 1688 Revolution, Pepys's forced retirement, and his fellowship with the Nonjurors. The *Diary* is, however, illustrative of Pepys's conception of time.

Pepys's first entry began on Sunday, 1 January 1660 – the first day of a new year, the first day of the month, the first day of the week. While the first of January was not the start of the church year, it was nevertheless an important holy day – the Circumcision of Christ.⁴ Appropriately, Pepys went to church at Exeter House where Peter Gunning, a thoroughly committed Anglican clergyman, preached; the Restoration had of course not yet happened. Pepys' entry for the day was as follows:

Went to Mr. Gunnings church at Exeter-house, where he made a very good sermon upon these words: That in the fullness of time God sent his Son, made of a woman, &c., shewing that by “made under the law” is meant his circumcision, which is solemnized this day.⁵

Thus Pepys began with his, and probably Gunning's understanding, of St. Paul's idea of time (Galatians 4:4) “in the fullness of time” – the Greek of the New Testament is: $\tau\omicron$

⁴ See Matthew Thiessen, *Contesting Conversion: Genealogy, Circumcision, and Identity in Ancient Judaism and Christianity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011); Josef A. Jungmann, S.J., *The Early Liturgy to the Time of Gregory the Great* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Prss, 1959), 267-270.

⁵ Samuel Pepys, *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, eds. Robert Latham and William Mathews. 11 vols. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970-1983), 1 January 1660.

πληρωμα του χρονου. The Authorized Version of the Bible, which Gunning and Pepys undoubtedly used, has: “But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law.” Pepys has omitted the definite article “the” / του in his record. Since the time in question was momentous for them, it was not surprising that Pepys, and probably Gunning, referred to it as *kairos* time instead of *chronos*. The distinction in Greek between *kairos* [καιρός] and *chronos* [χρόνος] is important. The first being the opportune moment, the second, chronological time, a succession of moments.⁶ Gunning and Pepys would have readily understood Paul to mean “in the fullness of time” rather than of “the time.” Both the Christian preacher and parishioner would have automatically understood the reference to be sacred time in a unique occurrence dividing A.D. from B. C. The Incarnation, to which the text refers, was in the forefront of the divine scheme; it was the moment of God’s own choosing. That is what *kairos* would convey. And, as Oscar Cullman convincingly demonstrates, the biblical view of history was linear — from alpha to omega — history had a trajectory that was moving toward a purposeful fulfillment, its End or *telos*. In the prevailing Greek view history was cyclical, repeating itself in endless cycles.⁷ It was the linear trajectory of Christianity that predominated in early modern England and certainly among the Nonjurors.

Paul Langford writes that for most of the eighteenth century it was the older biblical narrative understanding of history that shaped views about the origins and destiny of the world. Pictorial representations of both the deep past and the millennial future

⁶ Oscar Cullman, *Christ and Time: The Primitive Christian Conception of Time and History*, translator Floyd V. Filson, (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964), 37-43.

⁷ Cullman, *Christ and Time*, 51-60.

shared many characteristics: “both presented the history of time, from its beginning to its consummation, as a divinely created stage upon which the drama of human redemption and punishment was played out.”⁸

Stuart Sherman makes much of this paraphrase by Pepys — “in the fullness of time” — perhaps too much. Sherman, however, is certainly on target when he sees Pepys as the first Englishman to record a diurnal, sequential narrative in which *kairos* time is infused into the daily round of events in chronological order. He writes: “Pepys’s diary inscribes a private account of the new time earlier, more assiduously, and more attentively than does any of its extant contemporaries.”⁹

Sherman is reacting to Frank Kermode’s idea of the sound of the pendulum clock — “tick-Tock” — used as a paradigm for the basic emplotment of any narrative, literary or historical. The clock’s “tick” is followed by an empty space before the resolving sound “tock.” So too, in the construction of any narrative, there must be a beginning, a plot, and an ending. The job of the author is to fill in the blank, empty space. This is Kermode’s method of dealing with Walter Benjamin’s paradigms of “simultaneous” and homogeneous empty” time.

Benjamin developed descriptions of time that he called "simultaneous time" and "homogenous, empty time."¹⁰ These, or very similar, concepts have been embraced by numerous scholars including: Benedict Anderson, Michel Foucault, Frank Kermode, and

⁸ Paul Langford, *The Eighteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 73

⁹ Sherman, *Telling Time*, 25.

¹⁰ Walter Benjamin, “Theses on the Philosophy of History,” in Benjamin, *Illuminations* (New York: Schocken Books, 1969), 265

E. P. Thompson.¹¹ The first idea measures salvation history and records saving events; the second notion is time measured by clocks.¹² In this reckoning of "simultaneity-along-time" the narrative of the sacrifice of Isaac in Genesis is a prophecy of the sacrifice of Christ and both sacrifices are remembered as timeless or contemporary events for the preacher and congregation. This peculiar kind of remembering was the norm for the medieval Church.¹³ The second paradigm is "Homogenous Empty Time" in which seconds and minutes are equal and empty of meaning. They are simply quantitative divisions of the hours and days.

The "tick," according to Kermode, calls out for a resolution, the "tock". Any story narrated requires a conclusion, be it happy or sad, comedy or tragedy. Against this theory of emplotment Sherman argues that after Huygens's pendulum there were clocks and watches that had internal springs and no pendulums. They made a very different sound – "tick, tick, tick". They were representations of a new way of hearing and describing time, one that found its way in Pepys' *Diary*. In Sherman's thesis, Pepys emploted kairotic time within a very new chronological narrative counted not just on his personal timepiece but also in his personal daily diary. The point is that Pepys filled

¹¹ Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities* (London: Verso, 1983), 23; Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan (New York: Pantheon Books, 1977); Frank Kermode, *The Sense of an Ending: Studies in the Theory of Fiction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1966) 44-45; and E. P. Thompson "Time, Work-Discipline and Industrial Capitalism," in Thompson, *Customs in Common* (New York: The New Press, 1993).

¹² Benjamin, *Illuminations*, 265.

¹³ Benjamin, *Illuminations*, 265; Anderson *Imagined Communities*, 23. This idea originated in a very ancient Jewish notion of remembrance. In the Passover Seder celebrating the exodus from Egypt, for example, every Jewish participant in every generation is to regard him or herself as having personally come out of Egypt. In the institution of the Christian Eucharist, the same Passover thinking is present: "Do this in remembrance [ἀνάμνησις] of me" means literally for my re-calling, or making present. See, Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (London: Dacre Press, Adam & Charles Black, 1945), 161; and Jean Daniélou, S.J., *The Bible and the Liturgy* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Servant Books, 1979), 136-37.

homogeneous empty time with *kairos* events. What Pepys began on that first day in 1660 — undoubtedly chosen because of its value in *kairos* time — was nevertheless “a rigorously continuous and steady serial narrative — *tick, tick, tick* as no one else in English has quite written it before.”¹⁴ Sherman notes that “Pepys’s diary figures homogeneous time as full rather than empty by a strategy of double containment: a plenum of narrative within each day, and a plenum of narrated days within the calendar.” Or put more simply “each event recounted within the diary occupies a place ‘in the fullness of time’ so constructed and contained.”¹⁵

Like most diarists, Pepys did not always manage to record events daily, but on occasion had to fill in several days at a time. Pepys constructed the entries of course; they were not simply things as they happened, but rather events measured with meanings assigned by Pepys. It is clear from the *Diary* that Pepys practiced punctuality and his own sense of timing for appointments was important to him. Certainly in that sense Pepys benefited from his watch and operated in time that was continuous and “homogeneous.” Did he, however, see life’s largest events recorded in his *Diary* in that way and how did those events relate to clock time?

Pepys did have a very fine watch with which he was utterly fascinated. Here is his entry for 13 May 1665:

To the Change after office, and receiving my Wach from the watch-maker; and a very fine [one] it is – given me by Briggs the Scrivener. Home to dinner; and then I abroad to the Atturney General. ... So home, and late at my office. But Lord to see how much of my old folly and childishness hangs upon me still, that I cannot forbear carrying my watch in my hand in the coach all this afternoon, and seeing

¹⁴ Sherman, *Telling Time*, 33.

¹⁵ Sherman, *Telling Time*, 35.

what a-clock it is 100 times. And am apt to think with myself: how could I be so long without one.¹⁶

There can be little doubt as to his happiness and fascination in possessing a pocket watch.

Nor can there be any doubt he used it. But how did he do so?¹⁷

Pepys rarely names the hour of the day for his routine work and worship. His diary is punctuated by the regular recurrence of the Lord's Day, always indicated with the date. He is routinely up to work in the morning, home for dinner at noon, and returns home in the evening and then, after prayers, to bed with his wife. He describes the most intimate of emotions and affections, his tears and his joys too. One of the most telling instances of time is his recording of the Christian calendar's most sacred day, Good Friday. His entry for 20 March 1668 reads in part as follows:

20th. Up betimes, and to my Office, where we had a meeting extraordinary to consider of several things, among others the sum of money fit to be demanded ready money, to enable us to set out 27 ships ... At it all the morning, and so at noon home to dinner with my clerks, my wife and Deb... I away by coach to White Hall, where we met to wait on the Duke of York, and, soon as prayers were done, it being Good Friday, he come to us, and we did a little business and presented him with our demand of money, and so broke up, and I thence by coach to Kate Joyce's ... to speak with her about the business that I received a letter yesterday ... all the evening ... trying some conclusions upon my viall, in order to the inventing a better theory of musique ... So to supper with my wife, who is in very good humour with her working, and so am I, and so to bed.¹⁸

Thus Pepys placed in an uninterrupted continuous narration, his domestic affairs, the commemoration of the Crucifixion of Christ and his critically important work at the

¹⁶ Pepys, *Diary* 13 May 1665.

¹⁷ Pepys, *Diary* 24 June 1664. Once in 1664, Pepys was given a tour of the Queen's [Catharine of Braganza who was Portuguese and Roman Catholic] bedroom at White Hall. Interestingly, among what must have been fine furniture and fabrics, he said she had only: "...some pretty pious pictures, and books of devotion; and her holy water at her head as she sleeps, with her clock by her bed-side, wherein a lamp burns that tells her the time of the night at any time."

¹⁸ Pepys, *Diary*, 20 March 1668.

Admiralty and Whitehall, with the Duke of York and others, to defend the nation. This is *kairos* commemoration in *chronos* time sequence so typical of Pepys.

King Charles's Day, January 30, was always noted and observed as a "fast" by Pepys, but it was woven into his regular workday at the Admiralty.¹⁹ Days that Pepys considered of great consequence were given generally without clock time: "This day comes the newes that the Emperour hath beat the Turke."²⁰ Pepys noted with great satisfaction and detailed description charitable acts assisting those most grievously treated, but he rarely mentioned exact hours. In the case of an apparent suicide in 1688, of a man who thought he had failed God, Pepys sought to preserve a widow's inheritance intact and without reversion of the estate to the king:

"In the evening with Sir D. Gawden, to Guild Hall, to advise with the Towne-Clerke about the practice of the City and nation in this case: and he thinks that it cannot be found self-murder; but if it be, it will fall, all the estate, to the King. ... I presently took coach to White Hall, and there find Sir W. Coventry; and he carried me to the King, the Duke of York being with him, and there told my story which I had told him: and the King, without more ado, granted that, if it was found, the estate should be to the widow and children. ... This being well done to my and their great joy, I home, and there to my office, and so to supper and to bed."²¹

This was a sacred act – a *kairos* moment – for Pepys, who had no need for clock-time in recording it, even though it involved multiple meetings at the highest level in *chronos* time.

¹⁹ Pepys, *Diary*, 30 January 1668. "Up, it being fast day for the King's death, and so I and Mr. Gibson by water to the Temple, and there all the morning with Auditor Wood, and I did deliver in the whole of my accounts and run them over in three hours with full satisfaction." Pepys, *Diary*, 30 January 1669. "Lay long in bed, it being a fast-day for the murder of the late King; and so up and to church, where Dr. Hicks made a dull sermon; and so home, and there I find W. Batelier and Balty, and they dined with us..."

²⁰ Pepys, *Diary*, 9 August 1664.

²¹ Pepys, *Diary*, 21 January 1668.

On occasion Pepys was specific about the clock's hour. For example, Pepys must not be late to meet his wife on 30 March 1688.²² Almost never do such appointments have a particular religious significance. If a time was extraordinary, Pepys might record the exact hours.²³ Events that were threatening, like the storm of 16 August 1664, were noted with precise time, perhaps for insurance or accounting purposes.²⁴ A great fire on 20 August 1664 is another example of such precision.²⁵ Pepys's most troubling days in the Admiralty were arguably the beginning of August 1668 when he had to defend the Admiralty before Parliament at Westminster, which defense Pepys masterfully accomplished, but not without considerable anxiety. On that occasion Pepys noted the clock time.²⁶

²² Pepys, *Diary*, 30 March 1688. "Up betimes, and so to the office, there to do business till about to [he means two] o'clock, and then out with my wife and Deb. and W. Hewer by coach to Common-garden Coffee-house, where by appointment I was to meet Harris; which I did, and also Mr. Cooper, the great painter, and Mr. Hales.

²³ Pepys, *Diary*, 9 Feb 1665. "So home late at night, after twelve o'clock, and so to bed."

²⁴ Pepys, *Diary*, 16 August 1664. "Wakened about two o'clock this morning with the noise of thunder, which lasted for an houre, with such continued lightnings, not flashes, but flames, that all the sky and ayre was light; and that for a great while, not a minute's space between new flames all the time; such a thing as I never did see, nor could have believed had ever been in nature. And being put into a great sweat with it, could not sleep till all was over. And that accompanied with such a storm of rain as I never heard in my life. I expected to find my house in the morning overflowed with the rain breaking in, and that much hurt must needs have been done in the city with this lightning; but I find not one drop of rain in my house, nor any newes of hurt done."

²⁵ Pepys, *Diary*, 20 August 1664. "I walked to Cheapside, there to see the effect of a fire there this morning, since four o'clock..." and Pepys, *Diary*, 21 August 1664. The next day the fear of fire continued: "21st (Lord's day). Waked about 4 o'clock with my wife, having a looseness, and peoples coming in the yard to the pump to draw water several times, so that fear of this day's fire made me fearful, and called Besse and sent her down to see, and it was Griffin's maid for water to wash her house. So to sleep again, and then lay talking till 9 o'clock."

²⁶ Pepys, *Diary*, 5 August 1668. "So we all up to the lobby; and between eleven and twelve o'clock, were called in, with the mace before us, into the House, where a mighty full House; and we stood at the bar, namely, Brouncker, Sir J. Minnes, Sir T. Harvey, and myself..."

Paul Glennie and Nigel Thrift have observed that Pepys as diarist was more careful with calendar time than clock time.²⁷ He obviously used both, but he used the watch and diary differently. According to Glennie and Thrift, “Pepys’s explicit references to clock time are infrequent;” this is in contrast to his regular references to dates. Pepys had possessed his pocket watch since mid-1665 but his notation of clock times differed little in 1662, 1665, or 1667. The Great Fire of London that destroyed many church clocks in 1667 had little effect on Pepys reference to time by the minute. Far more frequently Pepys recounts time as morning, afternoon, evening, or night and references to noon lack the precision of 12:00 o’clock.²⁸ Their comparison actually shows Pepys’s use of clock time was relatively ordinary, with mentions of half-hours rarer than most others, and quarter hour notations nonexistent. They rate his use of time as a “moral issue” as “weak.”²⁹ Indeed, “beyond a couple references to bells, a night-watchman, and his pocket-watch, Pepys very rarely records how he knew the time ...probably an eloquent comment on the density of clocks and temporal information in London.”³⁰

Pepys was, however, absolutely entranced by watches. Before Christmas in 1665 he recorded his visit:

... to my Lord Brouncker and there spent the evening, by my desire, in seeing his Lordship open to pieces and make up again his Wach, thereby being taught what I never knew before; and it is a thing very well worth my having seen, and am mightily pleased and satisfied with it.³¹

²⁷ Paul Glennie and Nigel Thrift, *Shaping the Day: A History of Timekeeping in England and Wales 1300-1800*. (Oxford University Press, 2009), 198.

²⁸ Glennie and Thrift, *Shaping the Day*, 198.

²⁹ Glennie and Thrift, *Shaping the Day*, 199, see Table 6.3.

³⁰ Glennie and Thrift, *Shaping the Day*, 211.

³¹ Pepys, *Diary*, 22 December 1665.

In other words, his lordship took his watch apart, no doubt oiled it, and reassembled it, all to Pepys's amazement. All of which is to say, Pepys, like many other Englishmen of his day, was utterly captivated with the latest technology. John Styles's research, focused on workingmen at mid-eighteenth century, reveals a similar fascination with watches as items of "display".³² Only men employed in the transportation industry seem to have relied on their watches for accurate time keeping. Watches were a symbol of male importance as much as punctuality. While Pepys was among the elite, his use of the watch was much like that of workingmen.

Pepys's fascination with his new watch and his recording of diurnal events were two different, albeit overlapping, operations. He carefully constructed and recorded the important events — sometimes only important to him — as he lived them. In other words his primary understanding of time was *kairos*; ultimately he embodied in his *Diary*, time with an eternal dimension, and he saw such eternal dimensions in each single day. This was a hybridized time paradigm that suggested the transition from early modern to modern time was a complex process.

Historians know well Pepys's *Diary*, his contributions to the Admiralty, to the Royal Society, and his loyalty to the Stuarts. He had worked very closely with the Duke of York in running the Royal Navy. Indeed, James II was sitting for a portrait for Pepys when the invasion by William of Orange began. He witnessed the king's "Will" at Whitehall on 17 November 1688 and subsequently retired to Windsor with the monarch to assess the situation. Pepys helped the Queen, Mary of Modena, and the Prince of Wales, the infant James Francis Edward Stuart, escape to France. Then the accession of

³² John Styles "Time Piece: Working Men and Watches," *History Today* 58.1 (2008).

William and Mary on February 13 prompted a purge of officeholders and Pepys — almost certainly unable to take the Oath to the new monarchs — resigned on February 20 before he could be deprived. From 5 May to 15 June 1689 the king's messenger detained Pepys under suspicion of treason. Subsequently, from 25 June to 14 July 1690, he was imprisoned as a Jacobite. Pepys was by now in poor health and was released on those grounds. Few thought him a traitor to the nation; but few doubted his loyalty to the Stuarts as well.³³

In his mature years, Pepys, the worldliest of men, would have none but Nonjurors minister to him. He asked his friend, Robert Nelson, to recommend a spiritual director. Nelson chose the most otherworldly of pastors, the nonjuring bishop Nathaniel Spinckes, to be his guide.³⁴ George Hicke was among his close friends and his immediate pastor. Thus, as in other cases, the network of Nonjurors extended its influence far beyond the realm of those technically deprived, although it is certain Pepys avoided that fate by his resignation. And Pepys, like many other conscientious souls, chose to bear quietly his own convictions even at the cost of his own career.

Time in Early Modern England

England emerged from the Middle Ages with bells ringing in church spires and in town clock towers.³⁵ Time was heard, not seen or counted. The ploughman in his field

³³ See C. S. Knighton, "Pepys, Samuel (1633–1703)," *ODNB*.

³⁴ J. H. Overton, *The Nonjurors: Their Lives, Principles, and Writings* (London: Smith, Elder and Co., 1902), 130, 275-76.

³⁵ See David Cressy, *Bonfires and Bells: National Memory and the Protestant Calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England*. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989).

could easily have heard the same hour struck at different times from two parishes within earshot. Uniform time, counted mathematically, regularly, was only then on the horizon. The bells pealed an invitation to sacred events: they called parishioners to matins and evensong; they tolled for the dead; they rang for the great festivals and weddings too.³⁶ As Jo Ellen Barnett so eloquently writes, “The bells, loud as they were, were just a tinkle against the booming pageant of nature’s cycle of death and regeneration.”³⁷

Early modern Britons routinely thought of time in two very different ways. In the first, they counted time as a succession of events. Planting preceded harvest; Lent came before Easter. Time was the relative recording of months or seasons usually synchronous with the seasonal changes or chronological sequences of historical events.³⁸ This calendar-centric time required no clocks or watches; indeed, in this scheme, the sundial was a more fitting timepiece.³⁹ A second way early modern Englishmen thought of time was as events coming and passing, as days and hours come and go.⁴⁰ By 1700 clocks and

³⁶ See Ronald Hutton, *The Stations of the Sun: A History of the Ritual Year in Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996); Ronald Hutton, *The Rise and Fall of Merry England: The Ritual Year, 1400-1700*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

³⁷ Jo Ellen Barnett, *Time’s Pendulum: From Sundials to Atomic Clocks, the Fascinating History of Timekeeping and How Our Discoveries Changed the World* (Orlando: A Harvest Book, Harcourt, Inc., 1998), 41.

³⁸ Leofranc Holford-Strevens, *The History of Time, A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005); Elisheva Carlebach, *Palaces of Time: Jewish Calendar and Culture in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University, 2011).

³⁹ See Keith Thomas *Religion and the Decline of Magic: Studies in Popular Beliefs in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England* (1971; repr., London: Penguin Books, 1991), 395; E. P. Thompson “Time, Work-Discipline and Industrial Capitalism,” in Thompson, *Customs in Common* (New York: The New Press, 1993), 361; E. G. Richards, *Mapping Time: The Calendar and its History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).

⁴⁰ See Gerhard Dohrn van Rossum, *History of the Hour: Clocks and Modern Temporal Orders*, translated by Thomas Dunlap (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1996); Adrian Bardon, *A Brief History of the Philosophy of Time* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 8-12, 24-26, 51-57; Stephen Hawking, *A Brief History of Time* (New York: Bantam Books, 1998), 18, 21-22; Barnett, *Time’s Pendulum*, xii. Before the modern period there were only three main notions of time. The Greek Eleatic School — chiefly the

watches were commonplace.⁴¹ These two ways of thinking about time were in tension, and the two cultures they represented — the ancient agrarian-liturgical realm and the emerging industrious commercial state — produced very different notions of time. However, England, “a land of hamlets and villages” at the start of the eighteenth century, was changing, and countless improvements in telling time propelled England into the forefront of clock production⁴²

David Ogg writes that at the time of James II and William III the world’s “best clocks and watches were made in England” and English clock-making “supremacy was unchallenged.”⁴³ Carlo Cipolla gives 1680 as the date when the English took precedence

philosophers Parmenides (fl. 6th century B.C.) and Zeno of Elea (c. 409 - c.430 B.C.) — held that change and time were illusions. Augustine of Hippo (354-430) picked up this idea in his *Confessions*. In Plato’s *Timaeus* time was real and linked to the revolutions of the planets. Sir Isaac Newton picked up this view in more modern scientific dress in his conception of absolute time - even if all change stopped, time would continue just as gravity does. Aristotle was conceptually between these two positions saying that time was simply a way of describing the relationship of one event to another. Thomas Aquinas in the theological revolution of the thirteenth century adopted this idea and it became a primary understanding of time in the medieval church. It was however, always challenged by the older Augustinian view. The Nonjurors were firmly Augustinian in their conception of time.

⁴¹ David S. Landes, *Revolution in Time: Clocks and the Making of the Modern World* (Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press, 2000), 48; Barnett, *Time’s Pendulum*, 68-73, 78. There were grand mechanical clocks in England as early as the fourteenth century — Norwich Cathedral’s built by Roger Stoke in 1321-1325 and Richer of Wallingford’s astronomical clock at Saint Alban’s built from c.1330-1364 are examples. It is probable that there were small weight-driven clocks that were the forerunners of these grand tower clocks

⁴² J. H. Plumb, *England in the Eighteenth Century (1714-1815)* (Hammondsworth: Penguin Books, 1966), 11; G. J. Whitrow, *Time in History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 110; Barnett, *Time’s Pendulum*, 78-82, 88-91. Until the middle of the seventeenth century almost all clocks possessed only one hand and the dials of public clocks had divisions only of hours and perhaps quarter hours. The origin of the internal spring as an alternative to weights is obscure, but whoever invented the clock spring made a major step forward in creating machines that kept exact mechanical time. The Dutchman Christiaan Huygens (1629-1695) invented the first pendulum clock and that catapulted the clock industry forwards. When William Clement in 1671 built a mechanical clock with another new invention — the escapement — for King’s College, Cambridge, the stage was set for eighteenth-century time keeping.

⁴³ David Ogg, *England in the Reigns of James II and William III* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), 39, 283. This was in part because “in no other industry did the cost of material count for so little, nor the skill of the workman for so much.” England had the skilled artisans to do this precision work. There was a synergistic effect to England’s dominance of the watch-making industry too; clockmakers led the way for other inventors and inventions. The English were so famous for their paramount role in this industry that foreign makers forged English names on their clocks as a marketing technique and clocks exported from England required the maker’s name to be engraved thereupon

over Europeans in clock making.⁴⁴ Many factors assisted the attainment of this premier position.

The Puritans were a major factor; they promoted the abolition of the traditional church year calendar in favor of a six day work week followed by Sunday, which they regarded as the Sabbath. This change in work and worship rhythms was a giant step away from the ancient views of time linked to the church festivals and agrarian seasons. Keith Thomas observes in this a move toward the modern acceptance of homogenous empty time.⁴⁵

After the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685, many Huguenot clock and instrument makers immigrated to England from France. Joel Mokyr attributes much of the advancement and precision in British inventions of the eighteenth century to these *émigrés* who in turn trained other inventors. Mokyr writes “for clocks, pumps, scientific instruments, and chemical compounds, the old world ‘more or less’ would no longer do.”⁴⁶

Other factors in the expanded use of clocks included the rise of a “fiscal-military state,”⁴⁷ rapid changes in the political nation, the “Rage of Party,”⁴⁸ constant political

⁴⁴ Carlo Cipolla. *Clocks and Culture 1300-1700* (1967; repr., New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 2003), 65-69.

⁴⁵ Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic*, 742-744. Thomas writes, “The old church calendar was based on the needs of a people living close to the soil, whereas the Puritan demand for a weekly rhythm in place of a seasonal one emanated from the towns, not the countryside.”

⁴⁶ Joel Mokyr, *The Enlightened Economy: An Economic History of Britain 1700-1850* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 114,135.

⁴⁷ See John Brewer *The Sinews of Power: War, Money and the English State, 1688-1783* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1989).

electioneering with six general elections for Parliament in the first decade of the eighteenth century,⁴⁹ the commercial boom of the 1680s, an emerging merchant class, and the revolution of 1688 all marked a shift in the “process whereby England became recognized not as an *ancien régime* but as a nation of shopkeepers.”⁵⁰ This promoted the use of clocks and watches, for time was money.

Maxine Berg makes the point that many rural families had clocks and their “watches were not necessarily for keeping the time ... time was also about sociability.”⁵¹ Julian Hoppit says that from 1675 to 1725 clock ownership in England increased from 9 to 34 percent. By 1725, 51 percent of London households possessed clocks compared to 29 per cent in the rural areas. Class played a role; from 1675 to 1725 51 percent of the gentry owned clocks while only 4 percent of small farmers and husbandmen did so.⁵²

Porter’s assessment is that England was rapidly becoming a nation concerned with time in the *chronos* sense: “With time growing precious to a commercial people, the English became noted as a nation on the move.” They walked fast, ate fast food, many had watches, and “time discipline was stressed as task orientation yielded to time orientation” and “devout habits of providence” gradually gave way to a new spirit of self-

⁴⁸ See J. H. Plumb, *The Origins of Political Stability: England 1675-1725* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1967), and Linda Colley, *In Defiance of Oligarchy: The Tory Party 1714-1760* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982).

⁴⁹ W. A. Speck, *The Birth of Britain: A New Nation 1700-1710* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994), 1-2.

⁵⁰ W.A. Speck, *Reluctant Revolutionaries: Englishmen and the Revolution of 1688* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 251-52.

⁵¹ Maxine Berg, *Luxury and Pleasure in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 227; John Styles “Time Piece: Working Men and Watches,” *History Today* 58. No. 1 (2008), 44-50.

⁵² Julian Hoppit, *A Land of Liberty? England 1689-1727* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 316; Lorna Weatherill, *Consumer Behaviour and Material Culture in Britain, 1660-1760* (New York: Routledge, 2002), 31.

help and being “provident.”⁵³ For Norbert Elias, this involved the concept of tempo.⁵⁴ This tempo increased movement towards modern chronological reckoning.

Time, in this process, could assume a life of its own. What formerly was in the control of its master could easily, especially with increased tempo, become the master of the man. Mathew Kadane’s “watchful clothier” — Joseph Ryder, who kept a diary from 1733 until 1768 — described this conflict in the 1730s: “... a market Day for the Body, too often makes but small addition to the benefit of the Soul.”⁵⁵

Crediting Puritans like Richard Baxter, E. P. Thompson suggests notions of time-thrift linked to salvation were transmitted through William Law, the Nonjuror, to John Wesley and on to the later Evangelicals.⁵⁶ Thompson writes: “Puritanism, in its marriage of convenience with industrial capitalism, was the agent which converted people to new valuations of time; which taught children even in their infancy to improve each shining hour; and which saturated people’s minds with the equation, time is money.”⁵⁷ Society was moving toward the point when “all time must be consumed.”⁵⁸

⁵³ Porter, *The Creation of the Modern World*, 205-206.

⁵⁴ Norbert Elias, *The Civilizing Process: The History of Manners and State Formation and Civilization*, translated by Edmund Jephcott (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994), 457. “This ‘tempo’ is in fact nothing other than a manifestation of the multitude of intertwining chains of interdependence which run through every single social function people have to perform, and of the competitive pressure permeating this densely populated network and affecting, directly or indirectly, every single set of individuals.”

⁵⁵ Mathew Kadane, *The Watchful Clothier: The Life of an Eighteenth-Century Protestant Capitalist* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013), 101.

⁵⁶ Thompson “Time, Work-Discipline and Industrial Capitalism,” 392.

⁵⁷ Thompson, *Customs in Common*, 393, 398, 400-401. It was actually Benjamin Franklin in *Poor Richard’s Almanac*, January 1751, who coined the phrase “time is money.” See Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (London: Penguin Book, 2002).

⁵⁸ See Hans-Joachim Voth, *Time and Work in England, 1750-1830* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 118. Voth maintains that while workdays of eleven hours remained constant, the number of days worked

Early eighteenth-century Englishmen, according to Jan Golinsky, increasingly measured their lives by hours and minutes; the old agricultural and ecclesiastical calendars were being replaced by a “uniform civic calendar,” and at a widespread level “the Newtonian scale of absolute time became the framework for dating the whole of human history, which was integrated with the timing of such astronomical events as eclipses and the orbits of comets.” Indeed, this idea of time was extended far backwards to explain biblical and secular historical events and forwards to predict the movement of planets in the solar system. It was just one more step to see weather as no longer something particular and extraordinary but a predictable if not controllable part of time. Golinsky writes: “Phenomena of the air ceased to be part of an understanding of time as *kairos* (a discontinuous set of significant sacred events) and became elements in a (continuous, secular) *chronos*. They were noticed not only when they burst upon the scene as apparently preternatural or portentous occurrences, but all the time.”⁵⁹ The weather “was normalized by recording it on a uniform scale of time.” This was part of an optimistic notion of limitless growth of human knowledge and “new view of history” structured by a “homogeneous scale of time.”⁶⁰

“Clock time” in early modern England and Wales is the subject of Glennie and Thrift’s recent research.⁶¹ They maintain that notions of clock time are historically constituted, have no intrinsic meaning, and have taken many different forms over the

increased from 208 days to 306 p.a. from 1750 to 1800. In large measure this was due to desire for increased consumption of goods.

⁵⁹ Jan Golinsky, *British Weather and the Climate of Enlightenment* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2007), 79-80.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

⁶¹ Glennie and Thrift, *Shaping the Day*, 409.

centuries.⁶² “We do not want to invest the passage of time with mystical qualities: for us, time is a resolutely material and mundane set of procedures and practices of aggregation ... we do not believe that the passage of time takes on mysteriously different qualities in different cultures, which is not to say that different cultures may not be collectively minded to believe that.”⁶³ It is my purpose in this chapter to demonstrate that the English Nonjurors did, in fact, impress upon time — including chronological time — “mystical qualities” and that those “mysteriously different qualities,” while also held by other religious people in early modern England, did nevertheless dramatically distinguish the Nonjurors from their more radical opponents.

Temporal versus Spiritual

Jeremy Collier (1650-1726) was chosen and consecrated a bishop by George Hickes, and he became the leader of the later Nonjurors after Hickes’s death in 1715. He remained so until the Usages Controversy divided their numbers. His influence was paramount. He began his monumental history of the English Church with these words:

To enlarge upon the Usefulness of History, would have little Discovery in it: To shew how it opens a communication with the Dead, and revives the ages past for the Benefit of the present: How it marks out the Occasions of Miscarriage, and gives us the Rules for Conduct without the Hazards and Fatigue of Experience: How it acquaints us with the Original of Nations, the Variety of Customs, and the Fate of Empires. To do this, I say, would be to Spend Time on an obvious Topick, and deliver a Truth of which few People are ignorant.

To dismiss this Argument therefore, I shall only observe, That an account of the Rise and Progress of Christianity in any Country must be allow’d a Preference to other Historical Relations. The Dignity of the Subject, the Interests of Eternity, and the Unusual Interpositions of Providence, are such distinguish’d Advantages, that none but Infidels can dispute them. To insist a little upon the last Circumstance, of which we have a remarkable Instance in our own Nation. For

⁶² Glennie and Thrift, *Shaping the Day*, 12-14.

⁶³ *Ibid.*

the Purpose, When Augustine the Monk undertook the Conversion of the Saxons, was any thing Humanly Speaking, more unlikely to Succeed?⁶⁴

The first paragraph's arguments Collier took for granted. In itself, it was a perfect picture of Walter Benjamin's "simultaneous time." However, by adding the second paragraph, Collier heightened his argument to include: "the dignity" of sacred history, "the interests of eternity", and "the unusual interpositions of providence." Here was "messianic time" writ large. Collier went on to elaborate on the "remarkable instance in our own nation," and he begins with Augustine of Canterbury (d. 604) who landed in Kent in the summer of 597. Collier's history is filled with *kairos* moments, such as the example of Augustine with which he began. History and time were uneven, clocked by great events; homogeneous empty time was unimportant. This was sacred history with time measured by: God's revelations, "interpositions of providence" and "the interests of eternity." Time in this paradigm transcended "human speaking," for the hand of God wrote Christian history. Collier's *Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain* suggests an important distinction between accounts of mere "historical relations" and Church History. Thus Collier's notion of time created a hybrid of chronological events measured by sacred clocks.

C.D.A. Leighton sees in Collier's history "a mind habitually directed in a remarkable degree, by a zeal for *ancienneté*'s recreation and vivification of antiquity" showing "a deep conviction about the perennially determinative role of Christian

³⁹ Jeremy Collier, *An ecclesiastical history of Great Britain, chiefly of England: ... to the end of the reign of King Charles the Second. With a brief account of the affairs of religion in Ireland....* (London: 1708-14).

antiquity in ecclesiastical life.”⁶⁵ The French “*ancienneté*” means antiquity, and in Leighton’s use further means the re-creation of it in historical writing, by which it is “vivified” or brought to life in the present moment. This is another way of expressing the biblical idea of remembering — *anamnesis* [ανάμνησις]. This use of history is, of course, both an appeal to authority and a tool for moral and apologetical purposes. To illustrate, Collier’s *A Short View of the Profaneness of the English Stage* included the very revealing subtitle: *Together with the Sense of Antiquity upon this Argument*. The “sense of antiquity” was always important for the Nonjurors.

Leighton writes, “Jacobite political commitment comes quickly to mind as offering some explanation of Non-Jurors’ particular zeal for historical and antiquarian studies; for search for historical precedent often from seemingly *recherché* sources, was at the heart of the period’s constitutional debates.”⁶⁶ However, this was but one obvious reason for their focus on the past, “more determinative of the habits of thought among Non-Juring clergymen, no doubt, was the constant tendency of the British tradition of ecclesiastical learning (shared with the French) to emphasize the importance of historical argumentation, as an auxiliary to and methodology of divinity.”⁶⁷ The Nonjurors “development of the historiographical tradition” constituted the “most important part of their intellectual distinctiveness.” Collier’s sense of time shared with other Nonjurors — Dodwell and Hickeys for example — revealed this intellectual distinctiveness.

⁶⁵ C. D. A. Leighton, “The Non-Jurors and their History,” *The Journal of Religious History* Vol. 29, No. 3, (October 2005), 250.

⁶⁶ Leighton, “The Non-Jurors and their History,” 241.

⁶⁷ Leighton, “The Non-Jurors and their History,” 242.

Contextually the Nonjurors' apologetical efforts of using historical argumentation came at a time when the authority of scripture was particularly under attack by those who placed greater emphasis on individual human reason.⁶⁸ Speaking very generally, the Latitudinarian churchmen, who were increasingly in the ascendancy following the 1688 Revolution, tended to think philosophically in order to overcome the limitations of the ancient past; Nonjurors expressly looked to that past history for sacred truths discernible as "mere facts" that were known by both faith and reason."⁶⁹ Interestingly, both parties employed reason as an epistemological mechanism although Latitudinarians tended to see theories of knowledge empirically – John Locke's epistemology was widespread. Conversely, Nonjurors thought in categories of idealism including Plato and Augustine. This conflict in ideology — epistemology and ideas of authority —provoked what may be described as a conflict between churchmen and anti-clericals set the world of the British Enlightenment and Counter Enlightenment. Leighton describes this "unyielding confrontation" — the characteristic stance of the Nonjurors — "as a means of dealing with a society increasingly permeated by a preference for private over ecclesiastical judgment...."⁷⁰ Collier's appeal to historical facts was in binary opposition to notions of private judgment as authoritative.

The point is that historical time was not simply in the past for Collier. His zeal for antiquity existed because it offered truth for the present. Collier's "history" was never

⁶⁸ See J. A. I. Champion *The Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken: The Church of England and Its Enemies, 1660-1730* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992); Jonathan Sheehan, *The Enlightenment Bible: Translation, Scholarship, Culture* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005).

⁶⁹ Leighton, "The Non-Jurors and their History," 255. Leighton here cites Jeremy Collier's *Ecclesiastical History* 1:lxxix as example of "clean matters of fact."

⁷⁰ Leighton, "The Non-Jurors and their History," 247.

completely past. He saw in history *kairos* moments in “simultaneous, messianic time,” because the hand of God wrote history; Collier used sacred clocks, as did his mentor.

George Hickeys’s *The Constitution of the Catholick Church* published posthumously (see chapter four) arguably presented his most developed understanding of the nature of the Nonjurors’ separation. This work ignited the Bangorian Controversy and enormously expanded the national discussion in which the Nonjurors had a far greater voice than ever possible without it. Generally, the Nonjurors did not write essays about time; their notions of time were imbedded in their apologetical, ecclesiastical, and antiquarian works. Hickeys’s *Constitution* commanded a certain magisterial authority in that regard.

Hickeys rarely used the words: time, clock, calendar, schedule, or even season. Two words, however, were frequently employed in opposition: “Temporal” and “Spiritual.” Since these words occurred often in the context of state and church, a simple equation can be made, for example: “Lords temporal and lords spiritual” in Parliament. Certainly, that use was present. However, the Established Church — the Church of England as established by law — Hickeys placed in the “temporal” category.⁷¹ This makes a simple state and church relationship of these words inadequate.

The original meaning of “temporal” was lasting only for a time. A second meaning occurred in English use by the fourteenth century, as the Oxford English Dictionary puts it:

2. Of or pertaining to time as the sphere of human life; terrestrial as opposed to heavenly; of man’s present life as distinguished from a future existence;

⁷¹ George Hickeys, *The Constitution of the Catholick Church* (London [?], 1716), 148.

concerning or involving merely the material interests of this world; worldly, earthly. (Opp. to *eternal* or *spiritual*.)⁷²

In this meaning, and clearly evident in Hickee's use, temporal meant finite; spiritual meant infinite or eternal. Temporal and spiritual were, in Hickee's usage, words denoting time. The Church in Hickee's construction was spiritual-eternal; the State merely temporal-terrestrial, within human time. Hickee's temporal time was in the *chronos* category; spiritual-time was *kairos* in his understanding. This made his characteristic use of these words far bigger than the mere political; they delineated — much in Augustinian fashion — the earthly city from the City of God.

Hickee, in *The Constitution of the Catholick Church*, contrasted the temporal with the spiritual over twenty-six times. In each of these instances, State and Church were opposed with a sense of time-value implicit. For example, Hickee contrasted “eternal” with “temporal” concerns in matters of conscience. Another use was Christological: “Christ the Archtypal, Eternal *Melchizedech* is the king of the Spiritual Kingdom, Lord of this Spiritual Dominion, and supreme Head of this Spiritual Corporation; and the Bishops as Successors to the Apostles, are under him by Commission deriv'd from him.” The temporal and spiritual societies differed in time value: “...the End of the Ecclesiastical Society is eternal life, but of the Civil Peace and Tranquility of the Commonwealth.” Likewise, the temporal authority exercised “Fear of Temporal Punishment and Death,” but the “Authority of the Ecclesiastical regards their [i.e. subjects'] souls.” Accordingly, “the Spiritual is more Noble than the Temporal Power.” The Church possessed the power

⁷² “temporal, adj.1 and n.1”. *Oxford English Dictionary*, <http://www.oed.com.spot.lib.auburn.edu/view/Entry/198943?rskey=Ohjgrl&result=1> (accessed October 23, 2013).

of excommunication, by which some “are denounced unworthy of the *Church’s Society and Eternal Life*.” Consequently, “the Union of the Church and the State, or of the Spiritual with the Temporal Powers, is broken ... when the State persecutes the Church” as was the case under the apostate Emperor Julian or the Arian Valens or during the reign of Queen Mary I. Therefore, for Hickes, “it is the duty of laity as well as clergy to maintain the Spiritual against the Temporal Power, that is, to maintain the Grand Charter of the Church, which Christ gave at his Ascension.”⁷³

Nowhere is Hickes’s argument more clearly seen than regarding the break in the apostolic succession occasioned by the Williamite bishops usurping the deprived bishops’ sees.

Sir, the Intent of these Cases and the Queries upon them is, to shew you first, that the nullity of the pretended *Seconds* who intruded into the Sees of the deprived *first* Bishops, is not only Temporary, during the lives of the *primi* or first Bishops, as you acknowledge, but perpetual; and that without a real Collation of Right from those who can give it, their Intrusion will affect their Succession to future Ages, as in the case of the Novatians and Donatists, the Succession of whose Bishops was wont to be traced backwards by the Church unto their Original Nullity.⁷⁴

Here Hickes employed an understanding of time regarding the Apostolic Succession — past authority, present actions, and future consequences — clearly a timeline was drawn. The actions in depriving the original nonjuring bishops were not simply “temporary” but rather “perpetual” with consequences that “affect future ages.” The appeal to authority was to the past precedents set in the Novatian and Donatist controversies as well as during the reign of Mary Tudor. Furthermore, the Spiritual authority of the Church was

⁷³ Hickes, *Constitution of the Catholick Church*, 43, 64, 77, 112, 113, 114, 115, 117.

⁷⁴ Hickes, *Constitution of the Catholick Church*, 242.

denied to the usurping bishops because they now possessed only temporal authority. Elsewhere, Hicke wrote, “when bishops and priests are not faithful and rightful their actions are “Irregular, Exorbitant, and out of their Sphere, tho’ for a good end, and void of all Spiritual effect, and can have no other than Temporal Force upon the Suspended and Depriv’d.”⁷⁵ The intruding bishops were now in the “temporal” sphere. Thus the “Spiritual” authority resided only with the rightful bishops in the true Church and could not be given or removed by temporal authority. This because the spiritual authority came from Christ through his apostles and the state’s intrusion broke the perpetual succession. Here we see all dimensions of the Nonjurors idea of time: it looked to past events for authority; it saw history as perpetual linking past and present; it contrasted Spiritual with Temporal — eternal versus temporary; and it had effects in the future. Indeed, for Hicke, salvation depended upon this understanding.

This understanding of history as perpetually linking past and present dovetailed with and neatly complemented Collier’s understanding. Henry Dodwell and Thomas Hearne, as we shall see below, substantially shared this understanding. All these men embraced a living notion of history that conveyed not just wisdom but also real authority to the present. This notion was characteristic of Nonjurors generally.

Circumstances of deprivation, of course, influenced the ways time was experienced and articulated. George Hicke’s years of flight undoubtedly supplied an impetus and urgency to his sense of time.⁷⁶ In like manner, the Dean of Durham, Dennis

⁷⁵ Hicke *Constitution of the Catholick Church*, 148.

⁷⁶ Thomas Lathbury, *A History of the Nonjurors: Their Controversies and Writings, with Remarks on some of the Rubrics in the Book of Common Prayer* (London: William Pickering, 1845), 87; Theodor Harmsen, “Hicke, George (1642-1715),” *ODNB*; Overton, *The Nonjurors*, 97; For the Court of James II at Saint-Germain see Edward Corp, *A Court in Exile: The Stuarts in France, 1689-1718* (Cambridge: Cambridge

Granville's flight into exile in France impacted his own sense of time, imbuing it with a sense of longing and incompleteness.⁷⁷ While at Shottesbrooke, Francis Cherry and Henry Dodwell formed a sanctuary that was half Plato's Academy and half medieval cloister, but set into a working parish of farmers, mechanics, and servants who ran the manor farm. This sanctuary in the beautiful Berkshire countryside presented a far more routine round of hours and days than that presented to Hickes or Granville; time at Shottesbrooke was reckoned as a sacred routine.⁷⁸ The Nonjurors, following deprivation in 1691, generally did one of three things: they fled as fugitives; they went into exile; or they created sanctuaries safe for their newly formed community. For the fugitive time was compressed and urgent; the exile experienced a protracted, often unfulfilled, longing to go home; those who found sanctuary resumed ancient rhythms. Things were simply changing too fast and unexpectedly for the Nonjurors. Eventually, at least among many of the later Nonjurors, a mystical time was close at hand.

University Press 2004), and Eveline Cruickshanks and Edward Corp, eds., *The Stuart Court in Exile and the Jacobites* (London: The Hambelton Press, 1995).

⁷⁷ William Marshall, "Granville, Denis (1637–1703)," *ODNB*; Overton, *The Nonjurors* 163-169. N.B. in most modern printings of this book pages 161-176 are misplaced; they follow page 120; Surtees Society, *Miscellanea* "The Works and Letters of Dennis Granville, DD, Dean of Durham," Vol. 1. (1860); Thomas Babington Macaulay, *The History of England from the Accession of James II*, (Philadelphia: Henry T. Coates & Co., n.d.), 4:446.

⁷⁸ Thomas Hearne, *The life of Mr. Thomas Hearne, of St. Edmund's Hall, Oxford; from his own MS. copy, in the Bodleian Library. Also an accurate catalogue of his writings and publications, from his own MS. Copy, which he designed for the Press. To Which Are Added, Several Plates of the Antiquities, &c. mentioned in his Works. Never Before Printed.* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1772), 2-9, 24, 29-30; Thomas Hearne, *Remarks and Collections* 10:237; Francis Brokesby, *The works of the learned Mr. Henry Dodwell abridg'd: with an account of his life. By Francis Brokesby, B.D. To which is added, an abstract of Mr. Dodwell's book De cyclis; by Edm. Halley, LL. D. Astron. Reg. Geom. Prof. Savil. & R.S.S* (London, 1723), 301-302.

“Pickling the Present in the Past”

Henry Dodwell was the greatest historical theologian among the Nonjurors. He was also one who sought answers to present conflicts by research into the Cyprianist Age. In the debate between Ancients / *ancienneté* and Moderns / *modernité*, he was unquestionably devoted to *ancienneté*. In order to establish as normative for the present the principles of the primitive Church, he employed the most modern critical tools that scholarship of his day offered. In so doing, Dodwell revealed an ability to shape Anglican historiography with a view to an “infallible” and normative past that extended the Scriptural authority into the Patristic period. This provided the Nonjurors and High Churchmen in general an important, if not the most important, apologetical tool against their Latitudinarian and Dissenting opponents. The Nonjurors were decidedly Counter-Enlightenment people; they had absolutely no room for “comprehension” or “occasional conformity” or private philosophical opinion. The Nonjurors’ time bias was for antiquity. We encountered Dodwell’s positions on these notions and on obedience and authority in Chapter Two; here I focus on Dodwell’s *ancienneté* as illustrative of a notion of time embraced not just by him but also by Collier and Hickes and many in the nonjuring community.

Dodwell was a historian, but not as the term is currently employed. Michel de Certeau once said:

Modern Western history essentially begins with differentiation between the present and the past. In this way it is unlike tradition (religious tradition), though it never succeeds in being entirely dissociated from this archeology, maintaining with it a relation of indebtedness and rejection.”⁷⁹

⁷⁹ Michel de Certeau *The Writing of History*, trans. Tom Coley (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 2-3

Dodwell was in this sense the opposite of a “modern” historian; like Collier he sought to revivify the past, seeing in it eternal principles applicable in the present. He embraced the texts of Christian antiquity and from them constructed the architecture of Anglican ecclesiology.

In this regard he had much in common with the antiquarians of the period. Indeed, he was largely responsible for the early tutorship of the greatest antiquarian of the Augustan Age, Thomas Hearne, while they were at Shottesbrooke together. Dodwell was intent upon defending orthodox Christianity by an historical appeal to primitive principles discernible in the patristic period, especially before Constantine. He believed historical facts as discernible in the patristic literature as in pagan classical antiquity – of course, for Dodwell, Christian antiquity was the far more important of the two. In order to recover information from the past, Dodwell employed the best critical scholarship of the seventeenth century. He adamantly opposed the dissenters and later Latitudinarians who used the Scriptures according to their own private interpretations. Against such methods he employed a historical method that attempted to reconstruct the mind of the early church in its own context discoverable through ancient texts.⁸⁰

His focus tended toward the sacramental and ecclesiological, and this lent itself well to the construction of an Anglican ideal model of the Church. To do so required a revivification of the past, applying the past to the present, and creating continuity between the two. This involved a particular understanding of time.

⁸⁰ Henry Dodwell, *Separation of Churches from Episcopal Government ... Proved Schismatical* (London, 1679), xix; Henry Dodwell, *Occasional Communion Fundamentally Destructive of the Discipline of the Primitive Church ...* (London, 1705) pp 12-16. ; See C. D. A. Leighton, "Ancienneté among the Non-Jurors: a study of Henry Dodwell." *History of European Ideas* 31, no. 1 (2005), 5-7.

Leighton describes this idea of time in these words:

This learned discourse was but the expression of a deep and habitual inclination to treat the formative era of Christianity, together with that of the Scriptural narrative, to a far greater degree than pagan antiquity, as *mythical time*, the phenomena of which constituted the enduring experience of humanity, individually and corporately. The re-creation of this antiquity was a divine more than a human task. The manifest commitment of Dodwell and high churchmen like him to it leaves little question about denominating them as champions of *ancienneté*.”⁸¹

What Leighton calls “mythical time” is nothing more than Benjamin’s “simultaneous time” set into the context of the Counter-Enlightenment historiography of the Nonjurors. Dodwell established a living continuity between the apostles and the Cyprianic age. The age of St. Cyprian was very important to him because “the Fathers were the instruments of the communication of that part of the apostolic revelation unrecorded in scripture.” Here was the authority to answer Latitudinarians and Dissenters — *sola scriptura* principles interpreted by individuals were simply not adequate — however, the Patristic Fathers were. Additionally, the key element in this nexus was the historical verifiability of “supernatural phenomena” which gave to the fathers of this age “a *spiritus propheticus*, which bestowed on them a degree of infallibility, *usque ad tempora Constanini*.”⁸² Furthermore, this was an appeal to the Undivided Church, a global perspective, as we shall see below in Chapter Six.

Notions of continuity involve time; the connection of Apostolic and Cyprianic eras involved an idea of “simultaneous time.” The leap across time to Shottesbrooke in Berkshire, or the England of the Nonjurors, required the belief that earlier historical

⁸¹ Leighton, "Ancienneté among the Non-Jurors," 4. Italics are mine.

⁸² Leighton, "Ancienneté among the Non-Jurors," 11.

periods were readily accessible across time by historical or antiquarian research. Further, their message and principles were contemporary in application. Thus, Dodwell gave voice and a model to Nonjurors and High Churchmen in their apologetical defense against the 1688 Revolution and their hetero-orthodox opponents.

Thomas Hearne was an antiquarian and Nonjuror trained by Francis Cherry and Henry Dodwell at Shottesbrooke. Cherry literally took Hearne from the plow and gave him an Oxford University education, with which he became a famous antiquarian, a profession dear to Nonjurors, and assistant keeper of the Bodleian Library.⁸³ In 1695 Cherry took Hearne, then aged seventeen, into his own home to live, where he and Dodwell tutored him in not only "the true Principles of the Church of England but also in Classical-Learning."⁸⁴ Those true principles were the teaching of the Restoration Church of England, and they certainly included passive obedience, the indefeasible divine right of the monarch, and episcopacy as a divine institution. It is likely he was also given devotional manuals like *The Whole Duty of Man* or Robert Nelson's *A Companion for the Festivals and Fasts of the Church of England*; Nelson was often a houseguest at Shottesbrooke.⁸⁵

In later years Hearne remembered "both Mr. Cherry and Mr. Dodwell explained difficult places to him and always illustrated them with curious and useful Observations, such as have been of wonderful Advantage to him since."⁸⁶ Not only reading but transcribing reinforced his education. In those days painstaking transcriptions were an

⁸³ Hearne, *The life of Mr. Thomas Hearne*, 2-9, 24, 29-30. See Theodor Harmsen, *Antiquarianism in the Augustan Age: Thomas Hearne 1678-1735* (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2000), 33-34.

⁸⁴ Hearne, *The Life of Mr. Thomas Hearne*, 3.

⁸⁵ See John Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689*.

⁸⁶ Hearne, *The Life of Mr. Thomas Hearne*, 4.

essential part of scholarship; Hearne copied ancient manuscripts and also contemporary writing such as that of Dodwell. For Hearne, the belief that preservation of antiquities was important began at an early age.

Antiquarians were somewhat like modern day archivists. They created systems for collecting and cataloguing data and objects related to particular subjects and institutions, and they were interested in determining the origins and continuity of these things. Historians in this period, on the other hand, were interested in explaining and interpreting events and presenting them in a chronological narrative so as to show their cause and effect. In both cases an intense interest existed in how antiquity bolstered opinions vis-à-vis church and state. It is probably fair to say that antiquarians were the more conservative of the two. Hearne, according to Harmsen, “like other antiquaries ... was unwilling to accept or even consider the work of political and religious historians and theorists whose ideas threatened the traditional moral order.”⁸⁷

Learning in the Augustan Age, as we have seen above, was divided between “Ancients” and “Moderns.” The former scholars showed great interest in and emulated classical Greece and Rome; the latter sought to develop new research models and make cultural progress. Sir William Temple’s *Essay upon ancient and modern learning* (1692) is an example of the ancients; William Wotton’s *Reflections upon ancient and modern learning* (1694) embraces the moderns’ approach. Antiquarians, however, did not neatly divide along those lines, as many were ancient in their subject matter and modern in methods. Hearne’s respect for the classical writers made him an ancient, but his methods

⁸⁷ Harmsen, *Antiquarianism in the Augustan Age*, 25.

were modern like Wotton's.⁸⁸ Hearne's interests were wide-reaching and included both Roman and English history, geography, topography, heraldry, numismatics, inscriptions, philology, etymology, and local monuments.

Hearne saw his life's work as an antiquarian as all encompassing. For him, "Learning is Antiquities."⁸⁹ His research and preservation was intrinsically linked to his ideological commitments. He divided this labor into three categories: principles and tradition, the study of sources, and public and private service.⁹⁰ In other words, the issues facing England in the early eighteenth century were to be answered by reference to the past. The antiquarian's role, in Hearne's assessment, was to present the ancient truths in order to preserve the ongoing tradition when attacked in the present. Harmsen writes of Hearne's vocation: "Hearne as antiquary was not only a preserver of original documents, he also proved to be a defender of the (orthodox) values which the objects and texts of the past could be seen to represent."⁹¹ Antiquarian and historical work in the early eighteenth century was never far separated from the church and politics.

Hearne is a fitting example of nonjuring antiquarians who sought past authority for their present positions. However, he was not alone in this endeavor. Many Nonjurors could be considered antiquaries: George Hickes wrote the *Anglo-Saxon Thesaurus*; Henry Dodwell engaged the patristic literature; Jeremy Collier wrote ecclesiastical history; Thomas Smith studied Byzantine antiquities; George Harbin wrote of English

⁸⁸ Harmsen, *Antiquarianism in the Augustan Age*, 27.

⁸⁹ Thomas Hearne, *Remarks and Collections of Thomas Hearne (1722-1725)* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1907), VIII: 371, entry for 23 May 1725.

⁹⁰ Thomas Hearne, "Preliminary observations," *Collectanea*, 1715, VI, 51-264. Cited in Harmsen, *Antiquarianism in the Augustan Age*, 166.

⁹¹ Harmsen, *Antiquarianism in the Augustan Age*, 170.

political antiquities; and William Sancroft, the first Nonjuror, collected ancient books.⁹²

All of these scholars, leading Nonjurors, sought to bolster their present position by looking to the past. This was a particular view of time that laid heavy emphasis on the continuity of unchanging truths. It saw history in terms of great events or little antiquities, both pregnant with meaning — with *kairos* occurrences viewed in simultaneous, messianic time.

Nonjurors did not leave this simultaneous time in the past; they brought it forward as present reality. Perhaps the most telling account of this hybridized use of *kairos* time in the chronology of the Nonjurors is the brief story of Ambrose Bonwicke's life recorded in his father's book, urged to print by William Bowyer — *A Pattern for Young Students in the University, set forth in the Life of Mr. Ambrose Bonwicke, sometime Scholar of St. John's College in Cambridge*. Much time had passed from young Bonwicke's death in 1714 until its publication in 1729.

According to the memoir, Bonwicke evidenced a deep concern for time. He was conservative, discreet, composed, organized and deliberate in his actions. He was also a tireless steward of his time: “He was an excellent husband of his Time, rising often at four o’th’Clock, and sometimes earlier...and never, if he was well, going to bed till near ten.”⁹³ Mark Nicholls observes that it was Bonwicke who was given the duty of clock-keeper.⁹⁴ When his tutor gave him no reading schedule, he created his own: “My Tutor

⁹² See Helen Carron, "William Sancroft (1617–93): A Seventeenth-Century Collector and his Library." *The Library* 1, No. 3 (2000), 290-307.

⁹³ Ambrose Bonwicke, *A pattern for young students in the university* (London: 1729), 24,159-160.

⁹⁴ Mark Nicholls, “II: The Seventeenth Century,” in *St John’s College Cambridge: A History*, ed. Peter Lineham (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2011),108.

(says he) did not talk to me about a Method, &c., as I hear is customary; but I have (thinking it convenient) proposed to myself one...”⁹⁵ When others wasted time on tertiary things, he established priorities: “He never was concerned for the Loss of those Sports and Diversions which those of his Years generally set their Hearts so much upon, but his Delight was in Devotion and doing his Duty...”⁹⁶ The same concept of rule was applied to his spiritual life as well: “...he very rarely miss’d the seven o’th’Clock Evening Prayers [in St. John’s collegiate chapel], and was as constant on holy Days at those of eleven in the Morning at a Church in the Neighbourhood.”⁹⁷ He carefully constructed and imposed upon himself a rule of life, just the sort of thing that spiritual directors had long suggested. He created his own and assiduously obeyed it: “ In the Name of God. Amen. Being moved (I hope) by the Spirit of God, and excited by reading Bishop Beveridge’s *Private Thoughts, &c.* after some Days Fasting, Abstinence, Watching and Praying for the particular Assistance and Direction of the Holy Ghost, I formed these Articles of Belief, from the Apostles Creed, Bishop *Beveridge*, Mr. *Nelson*, &c. and the following Resolution grounded thereupon...” (see Figure 4).⁹⁸ His monetary offerings, carefully saved and cheerfully given, demonstrated the same care, for on the evening of his death he had “... consecrated and (as it appeared he had) and set apart what he designed for the Offertory the next day ... and in such Charities, out of his little Stock, he had expended in about three Years and eight Months, the whole Time from his Admission at St. *John’s* to

⁹⁵ Bonwicke, *A pattern for young students in the university*, 24.

⁹⁶ Bonwicke, *A pattern for young students in the university*, 10-11, 20,

⁹⁷ Bonwicke, *A pattern for young students in the university*, 11

⁹⁸ Bonwicke, *A pattern for young students in the university* 108-136.

his Death, above four Pounds.”⁹⁹ This meticulousness resulted in a careful shepherding of his personal schedule. According to his father, he devoted every waking moment to his vocation as a Christian student: “And all this, notwithstanding his constant Attendance on all the Exercise of the House, and his Tutor’s private Lectures.”¹⁰⁰ And Bonwicke would not have separated those two words—Christian and student—for him they were but two descriptions of his calling. He sought to obey Christ, his father, and his tutors: “Within less than a Quarter of a Year after his coming he was chosen Scholar of the House, and the very worthy Master, Doctor [Humphrey] Gower, told him, ‘twas his regular and good behaviour that got him that Preferment, and was the likeliest Means to get him more.”¹⁰¹ Bonwicke’s response to this honor, as in all things, was that he “gave the Glory of it to God alone.”¹⁰²

Here we see a critically important point, how *chronos* time continually became *kairos*. Routines assumed sacred value and ultimately transcended hours and days; yet, all the while Bonwicke meticulously observed both. In this regard, it is remarkable that Bonwicke was the official student clock-keeper at St. John’s. His rising and retiring was to both pray and wind the clock.¹⁰³ This was a hybridization of time that enabled the Nonjurors to function effectively in a changed world. Equally powerful was the connection of time with obedience. Obedience was the primary motive for young

⁹⁹ Bonwicke, *A pattern for young students in the university*, 159.

¹⁰⁰ Bonwicke, *A pattern for young students in the university*, 24-25.

¹⁰¹ Bonwicke, *A pattern for young students in the university*, 25.

¹⁰² Bonwicke, *A pattern for young students in the university*, 27.

¹⁰³ Mark Nicholls, “The Seventeenth Century,” in *St John’s College Cambridge: A History*, ed. Peter Lineham, (Woodbrige: The Boydell Press, 2011), 108.

Ambrose's regimen. Notions of obedience and time came together synergistically in the mindset of Bonwicke and many other Nonjurors.

For Bonwicke time also had a providential quality. He remained always positive. Even when greatly disappointed by failure to gain admittance to his father's *alma mater*, St. John's College, Oxford, because he was a Nonjuror, he saw the providential hand of God in his past. His mother wrote to him, "I pity you, supposing you have not one Friend at London to encourage you, but that all blame us and you: I hope notwithstanding, you will take Courage and bear up" and she continued reminding him that he had almost died as an infant one month old, but God delivered him, and now "therefore you have great Reason to hope, if you do your Duty, God will still provide for you some Way or other." She concluded her letter with the assurance that in the "mean Time God may raise us and you up Friends."¹⁰⁴ There was thus a longer, more optimistic view; one taught him by his mother, that even early in his life involved God's providence. This longer time trajectory with its pattern of rejection and survival was a fundamental characteristic, not just of Bonwicke, but of Nonjurors generally.¹⁰⁵ Rejected at St. John's Oxford, he was subsequently received at St. John's Cambridge, a bastion of Nonjurors. Bonwicke's life was characterized by persistent optimism; if people rejected him, he remained certain God would provide for him. He was confident that God was completely in charge of his time, his life, the Church, and the world. Even at the point of death he persistently pursued his spiritual and academic routine, the same routine that had sustained his life.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁴ Bonwicke, *A pattern for young students in the university*, 14-15.

¹⁰⁵ See Daniel Szechi, *Jacobitism and Tory Politics, 1710-1714* (Edinburg: John Donald Publishers Ltd., 1984), 36-42.

¹⁰⁶ Bonwicke, *A pattern for young students in the university*, 156-159.

Bonwicke's academic studies, as rigorous as his spiritual life, reflect the Nonjurors' looking toward the past for present-day wisdom. This is again an illustration of how sacred stories, *kairos* events, of the past become presently powerful in chronological time. He read Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and learned French because so many good things were written in that language.¹⁰⁷ His reading included: Dionysius's *Peregrinis*, Virgil's *Aeneid*, Aelian's *Varia Historia*, all of Terence, fifty Hebrew Psalms, most of Seneca, Burgersdicius's *Logic*, the *Fasciculus praeceptorum Logicorum*, Bussiere's *Flosculi Historici*, Pindar's *Odes*, Suetonius's *Lives*, Pliny's *Epistles*, *De Oratoribus* by Quintilian [or Tacitus], Roger Ascham's *Epistles*, Plutarch's *Lives*, and Clarendon's *History*.

On Sundays and Holy Days he read Thomas à Kempis's *The Imitation of Christ*, Richard Allestree's *The Whole Duty of Man*, John Kettlewell's *The Measures of Christian Obedience*, Brome *On Fasting*, almost all of Robert Nelson's *Festivals and Fasts*, several chapters in the Greek New Testament, and on one occasion a Latin sermon by Henry Byam. He often translated a Latin text into Greek to improve his ability, and wrote with fluency to his schoolmaster father in Greek and Latin. This was all in his first year.¹⁰⁸

The concept of time as “restoration” is particularly well illustrated by Bonwicke’s favorite adventure story: Archbishop Fénelon's immensely popular *Telemachus*, which he read in self-taught French.¹⁰⁹ The protagonist of the story was the son of Odysseus who searched for his father and assisted him upon his return in reclaiming a kingdom that was

¹⁰⁷ Bonwicke, *A pattern for young students in the university*, 45.

¹⁰⁸ Bonwicke, *A pattern for young students in the university*, 21-23.

¹⁰⁹ Bonwicke, *A pattern for young students in the university*, 45.

his by right. A nonjuring student could find adventure in this story, and with the king's return the ancient fulfillment of an important hope. The book also was important for teaching the proper role and duties of kings, another favorite theme of all Nonjurors.

Happy, said Mentor, is the people, who are govern'd by a wise King: They live in Plenty and Contentment, and love him to whom they owe their Felicity. Thus, said he, O Telemachus, you ought to Reign, and be the Joy of your People. If ever the gods give you the Possession of your Father's Kingdom, love your People as your Children; feel the Pleasure of being beloved by them, and carry your self so, that all the Tranquility and Pleasure they enjoy, may lead them to remember, that they are the rich Presents of a good King: Kings who make it their only business to render themselves formidable to their own Subjects, and to impoverish them in order to make them more submissive, are the Plagues of Mankind... I [Telemachus] answer'd, alas Mentor, 'Tis not now the Question, by what Maxims a King ought to Reign. We shall never see *Ithaca* again." ¹¹⁰.

The return of the rightful king — restoration from exile, an odyssey and a return home — was obviously a primary Nonjuror trope. The peaks and valleys of hope and despair were arguably modified by their faith that God would ultimately set things right. Whether the young student dreamed of such roles, as Telemachus had for himself, is unknown; what is certain is that Ambrose Bonwicke had been shaped by this story long before he ever read it in French.

Bonwicke was bright and his knowledge was of a classical and antiquarian kind. In this regard he was much like Hearne. He had immense ability in classical languages and read ancient authors with ease. He knew four languages beyond his native English, and three were ancient tongues. Rarely did he or any other Nonjuror study science or higher mathematics, much less invent engines to improve commerce or agriculture. Theirs was a conservative study of traditional values.

¹¹⁰ François de Salignac de La Mothe Fénelon, *The Adventures of Telemachus the son of Ulysses. In five parts. Translated from the French. The third edition corrected. To which is added, The adventures of Aristonous* (London, 1701), 31-33.

Arguably, the inherent conservatism in the schools and among the Nonjurors was a reflection of the persistence of mentalities, and of enduring cultural values that most people considered eternal. Jonathan Gathorne-Hardy argued that the classical past was more than "revered," it held the "secret of eternal life, eternal values" and by teaching the essence of classical values over the centuries, early modern English schoolmasters were "pickling the present in the past."¹¹¹ Their motive was to preserve their present culture by "transfusing it with the indestructible safety of an adored past." This aspect of eighteenth-century civilization was far more important, more real to the schoolmasters and their pupils than were the scientific or industrial revolutions, which they indirectly helped bring about. "To them it was a great deal more 'contemporary' to teach classics than, say, science or maths."¹¹² This focus on antiquity and eternity was at the heart of the Nonjurors' mindset.

Mystical Perspectives

Robert Nelson, another Nonjuror, developed the nexus between holy living and the Second Coming of Christ in his widely used *A Companion for the Festivals and Fasts of the Church of England*. Both "the principles of reason and the clear and express testimonies of Scripture" assured him of a general judgment by Christ, and because in this world "good men often suffer" while "bad men as frequently prosper and flourish," it therefore seemed reasonable that there must be a judgment and "distribution or rewards

¹¹¹ Jonathan Gathorne-Hardy, *The Old School Tie: The Phenomenon of the English Public School* (New York: The Viking Press, 1977), 33.

¹¹² Gathorne-Hardy, *The Old School Tie*, 33.

and punishments."¹¹³ This thought, manifested itself in a particular scrupulosity for many High Churchmen. As Nelson described it:

The practice of virtue is attended not only with present quiet and satisfaction, but with the comfortable hope of a future recompense; the commission of any wicked action, though never so secret, sits uneasy upon the mind, and fills it full of horror and amazement: all which would be very unaccountable without the natural apprehension and acknowledgment of future rewards and punishments.¹¹⁴

For the Nonjurors this was an ontological reality that gave them a strong sense of expectation, anticipation, and an eschatological bent.

William Law was a mystic who in many ways represented most clearly the highest ideals and aspirations articulated by the Nonjurors. He did much more than speak about the problems of the age; he actually addressed them with concrete programs for reform. He founded a school for girls, then one for boys, and ultimately directly influenced an entire village. He wrote the very popular *Christian Perfection* in 1726, and his best-known work was *A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life* in 1728.¹¹⁵

¹¹³ Robert Nelson, *A companion for the festivals and fasts of the Church of England: with collects and prayers for each solemnity* (London: printed by W. B. [William Bowyer] for A. and J. Churchill, at the Black-Swan in Pater-Noster-Row, 1704). 23. The Preface is signed: Rob. Nelson, All-Saints 1703, Ormond-Street.

¹¹⁴ Nelson, *A companion for the festivals and fasts of the Church of England*, 23.

¹¹⁵ Isabel Rivers, "William Law and Religious Revival: The Reception of a Serious Call" *Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol. 71, No. 4 (December 2008), 635-36. See J. H. Overton, *William Law, Nonjuror and Mystic: Author of 'A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life' &c. Formerly Fellow of Emmanuel College, Cambridge* (London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1881), 387. The early Methodists were strongly influenced by *A Serious Call*. John Wesley, Charles Wesley, and George Whitfield all read and respected it. John Wesley linked it with Thomas à Kempis' *Imitation of Christ* (c. 1418) and Jeremy Taylor's *Holy Living* (1650) and *Holy Dying* (1651) as the principle works that formed his theology of conversion. Benjamin Ingham's diary of 1733-34 includes both Law's *Christian Perfection* and *A serious Call* in the books studied by the early Oxford Methodists

The mystic generally believes time to be either unreal or simply a human contrivance for counting *chronos* time.¹¹⁶ Mystics are almost always idealists, and for William Law this included, an Augustinian version of Parmendes's position on time. The mystical experience opened the soul to direct — and "direct" was the operative word here — communion with God. Since God was beyond space and time and by definition was ultimate reality, therefore time in chronological computation was less than reality.

J. H. Overton saw in Law's articulation of mysticism an understanding that there existed a spark of the divine within the human being; this affinity with God provided the point of mystical union. Even the institutions of the Church and its Sacramental system, which William Law enthusiastically embraced, were ultimately only helpers along the way to complete union with God. This union for Law was moral, effected by faith and love.¹¹⁷

Law was deeply influenced in his later years by the seventeenth-century Silesian mystic Jakob Böhme (1575-1624); Law spelled his name Jacob Behmen.¹¹⁸ Böhme's writing is at best difficult, and at worst impenetrable. The following paragraph from his *Three Principles of the Divine Essence* will give the reader something of the cast of his thinking.

If we speak of our native country, out of which we are wandering with Adam, and will tell of the Resting-place of the Soul, we need not to cast our minds far off; for far off or near is all one and the same thing with God; the Place of the Holy Trinity is all over ... The Soul, when it departs from the Body, needs not to go far,

¹¹⁶ Shelldrake, *Spirituality and History*, 46.

¹¹⁷ See Overton, *William Law, Nonjuror and Mystic: Author of 'A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life' &c. Formerly Fellow of Emmanuel College, Cambridge* (London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1881), 140-145. Compare Philip Shelldrake, *A Brief History of Spirituality* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2007), 94, *passim*.

¹¹⁸ For the account of Law's introduction to Jakob Böhme, see Overton, *William Law*, 179.

for at that Place where the Body dies, there is Heaven and Hell; and the man Christ dwells everywhere. God and the Devil is there; yet each in his own kingdom. The Paradise is also there; and the Soul needs only to enter through the deep door in the Centre. Is the Soul holy? Then it stands in the Gate of Heaven, and the earthly Body has but kept it out of Heaven; and now when the Body comes to be broken, then the Soul is already in Heaven; it needs no going out or in; Christ has it in his arms...¹¹⁹

Law was orthodox in his adherence to the Scriptures and the Creeds, interpreted by the Undivided Church of the first four centuries and expounded by the Church of England in her *Prayer Book*. The trajectory of his spiritual development following Böhme's mysticism, arguably even more orthodox in its formulation, is evident in these words written in 1740.

For every man, as such, has an open gate to God in his soul; he is always in that Temple where he can worship God in Spirit and in Truth; every Christian, as such, has the *first Fruits* of the Spirit, a *Seed* of Life, which is his *Call* and *Qualification* to be always in a state of inward Prayer, Faith, and holy Intercourse with God. All the Ordinances of the Gospel, the daily *sacramental* Service of the Church, is to keep up, and exercise, and strengthen *this Faith*; to raise us to such an habitual Faith and Dependence upon the light and Holy Spirit of God, that by this seeking and finding God in the *Institutions* of the Church, we may be habituated to seek him and find him; to live in his Light and walk by his Spirit in All the Actions of our ordinary Life.¹²⁰

The goal of the Christian life was for Law this close, personal, immediate union with God the Holy Trinity in everyday life.”

Leighton describes this union with God as *theosis* — the word commonly used in the tradition of Eastern Orthodoxy for the divinization of the human being.¹³² Leighton's analysis is that Law's adoption of Jacob Böhme's mysticism was fundamentally counter-

¹¹⁹ Jacob Behmen “The Three Principles of the Divine Essence,” in *Behmen's Works*, 1:xix. Quoted in Overton *William Law*, 194.

¹²⁰ William Law, *An Appeal to all that doubt or disbelieve the truths of the Gospel, whether they be Deists, Arians, Socinians, or nominal Christians. In which the true Grounds and Reasons of the whole Christian Faith and Life are plainly and fully demonstrated. By William Law, M.A. To which are added, Some animadversions upon Dr. Tripp's reply.* (London, 1740), 312.

enlightenment in its motive. “Behmenism” for Law, “thus offered not the mere observation of correspondences in the external world, which might be disputed, but a perception that, internally, one participated immediately in the divine qualities and processes”, and Law expressed “... the belief that Christians were indeed *divinitatis consortes*.”¹³³¹²¹

This “immediate participation” expressed clearly the transcendence of time in the chronological sense, and it made a claim to epistemological certainty against the empirical arguments of John Locke and British Enlightenment thought. Fundamentally, Law’s mysticism, with its immediacy, certainty, and direct participation of the Christian regenerated soul in the very nature of God, altered the epistemological and ontological understanding of time. In brief, Law’s theology transcended time; time was for him ultimately eternal. God was more the measure of time, and closer too, than was his watch

Likewise, Bonwicke's mystical understanding was a real, permanent, invisible, and eternal world that lay beyond the present transient political realities of Britain. Edward Lake — whose *Officium Eucharisticum* was much used by Bonwicke — said the individual Christian's joy or punishment after this life: “in the places, where they are, may daily be augmented by the hurt or good that may be wrought in this world, by the means left behind them; so 'tis believed by divers, that the glory of St. Paul is increased daily in heaven, and shall be unto the world's end, by reason of them who daily profit by his writings...”¹²² The same reward in reverse was due heretics who were increasingly tortured for the cumulative effects of all they had hurt by their teaching. In this calculus,

¹²¹ Leighton, C. D. A. "William Law, Behmenism, and Counter Enlightenment." *Harvard Theological Review* 91 (1998): 301-320. p 309?

¹²² Lake, *Officium Eucharisticum*, 204-205.

the personal effects of good or bad actions do not cease with death, but are cumulatively magnified to us by those whom our actions on earth have influenced and continue to influence for good or ill. This made self-examination and the increase of virtues in this world eternally important. Bonwicke read these words of Lake every Friday.¹²³

That last evening of his life, 5 May 1714, young Bonwicke prepared alone in his chambers, by self-examination (see Figure 4), to receive the Sacrament the next day, which was Ascension Day. On the eve of that red-letter day, he had attended Evensong in the chapel, met with Sir Newton, and then retired to his room apparently about eight o'clock where he and his Lord prepared to receive each other.¹²⁴ The memoir describes this time and his actions: "...[he] being acted by a nobler principle than the fear of death, prepared himself, in the best Manner it was possible, for death, and the actual Ascent to the blessed *Jesus*, which immediately followed."¹²⁵ Thus, the Ascension of Christ and of Bonwicke were inseparably linked by the author, and the *immediacy* of their union was underscored. The next day a friend noticed his absence at the liturgy, and the "bedmaker" immediately told Francis Roper who discovered Bonwicke's body, still seated in his study chair. In front of him were his two favorite books: Robert Nelson's *A Companion for the Festivals and Fasts of the Church of England* and Edward Lake's *Officium Eucharisticum*. The Book of Common Prayer was beside them. His *Festivals and Fasts* was marked at Easter Eve which meditation was on the preparation for a holy death. His sole study candle had been extinguished. Apparently he had completed his sacramental

¹²³ Bonwicke, *A pattern for young students in the university*, 158.

¹²⁴ Bonwicke, *A pattern for young students in the university*, 149. I am uncertain as to the identity of Sir Newton, but he may have been one of his tutors.

¹²⁵ Bonwicke, *A pattern for young students in the university*, 158-59.

preparation according to the method prescribed in his *Officium Eucharisticum*. His monetary gift, a symbol of his self-offering, was already set aside for the offertory.¹²⁶ Thus was the trajectory of one young Nonjuror's life traced; the tools used in forming it were common to most, if not all, Nonjurors; few achieved it to such a degree in such a short time and with such humility and grace. He died at age twenty-two and was buried in All Saints' churchyard, Cambridge.

Bonwicke died alone like Plotinus's "flight of the alone to the alone" or St. John of the Cross's "ascent of Mount Carmel," preparing by self-examination to receive Holy Communion, knowing he was dying, praying with his books, his sole candle extinguished, on the symbolically significant eve of the Ascension of Christ. A vertical line stretched, much like Jacob's Ladder, straight from his study carrel to heaven can be imagined. This is the classic description of the mystic's direct relationship with God. In 1910, Evelyn Underhill, England's best-known authority on Christian mystical experience, wrote these words:

The mystic assumes—because he tends to assume an orderly basis for things—that there is a relation, an analogy, between this microcosm of man's self and the macrocosm of the world-self. Hence his experience, the geography of the individual quest, appears to him good evidence of the geography of the Invisible. Since he must transcend his natural life in order to attain consciousness of God, he conceives of God as essentially transcendent to the natural world. His description of that geography, however—of his path in a land where there is no time and space, no inner and no outer, up or down—will be conditioned by his temperament, by his powers of observation, by the metaphor which comes most readily to his hand, above all by his theological education. The so-called journey itself is a psychological and spiritual experience: the purging and preparation of the self, its movement to higher levels of consciousness, its unification with that

¹²⁶ Bonwicke, *A pattern for young students in the university*, 149-160.

more spiritual but normally unconscious self which is in touch with the transcendent order, and its gradual or abrupt entrance into union with the Real.¹²⁷

Underhill's analysis is important vis-à-vis the elder Bonwicke's portrayal of his son's death, for that which Underhill calls "his experience, the geography of the individual quest," is used by the father to underscore the spiritual infrastructure of a Nonjuror's piety. It is, in fact, an ideal, a constructed portrait of their worldview. Bonwicke's theology is key to the historian's understanding of his mental universe.

The historian will properly focus neither on the causes of death, as the physician, nor on the mystical heights, as the theologian, but on who constructed the narrative and why they did so.¹²⁸ It was Bonwicke's father with William Bowyer the printer who published the book with the telling title *A Pattern for Young Students in the University*. The biography of this young life, prematurely ended, captured all the ideals of their mental universe. They were expressing the best ideals of the nonjuring community in virtual hagiographical form. Bonwicke's life and death, as reconstructed by his father from the diary, were an expression of obedience, prayer, and sacrifice projected along an earthly trajectory of compressed time that then extended into eternity. These were eternal values that could not be destroyed by time or revolution.

The title itself is so pedagogically revealing; the book was written as an example for university students and it used Bonwicke's life as the model to emulate. If the Nonjurors were about anything, it was education for a Christian life. Here we see their purpose revealed with utter clarity. England would be won back to Anglican Christian

¹²⁷ Evelyn Underhill, *Mysticism: A Study in the Nature and Development of Man's Spiritual Consciousness* (New York: Meridian Books, 1955), 102.

¹²⁸ See Michel de Certeau, *The Mystic Fable: The Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, trans. Michael B. Smith (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992), 1:16.

principles, as they saw them, not by force of arms, but by a new generation taught the truth.

Bonwicke died with the devotional books most admired by Nonjurors opened to the right pages. Bishop Ken, years earlier in his poem about St. Stephen, said of himself,

May I, like him, the influence feel
Of faith, love, patience, courage, zeal;
Forgive my foes, for Heaven prepare –
And die in prayer.¹²⁹

So died young Ambrose in prayer.

Bishops Lake and Hicke had both written important dying declarations that were testimonies of faith solemnly witnessed by the nonjuring community.¹³⁰ Bonwicke died alone — albeit in the midst of the Nonjurors’ stronghold, St. John’s College, Cambridge — and his life was seen as a model for the Nonjurors. Bonwicke must have suffered much from the consumption or tuberculosis that he probably aggravated by excessive fasting and possible attendant malnutrition. Mark Nicholls describes his illness as consumption that caused the “poor young man to cough and spit blood” while winding St. John’s clock.¹³¹ These medical conditions were not highlighted in the narrative. The narrative, however, focused on the obedience to Christ that included the strict marshalling

¹²⁹ Agnes Strickland, *The Lives of the Seven Bishops committed to the Tower in 1688: Enriched and Illustrated with Personal Letters, now first published, from the Bodleian Library* (London: Bell and Daldy, 1866), 319.

¹³⁰ John Lake, *Declaration of the Right Reverend John, Lord Bishop of Chichester upon his Deathbed, August 27, 1689*, in *A Defence of the Profession which the Right Reverend Father in God John, late Lord Bishop of Chichester, made upon his deathbed: concerning passive obedience and the new Oaths. Together with an Account of some Passages of his Lordship’s Life* (London: 1690), 7-8; George Hicke, *The Last Will and Testament of the Reverend Dr. George Hicke* (London: 1716), 11; George Hicke, *A Declaration made by the Right Reverend Dr. George Hicke, concerning the Faith and Religion in which he lived and intended to die: and referred to in his Will* (London: 1743).

¹³¹ Mark Nicholls, “The Seventeenth Century,” in *St John’s College Cambridge: A History*, ed. Peter Lineham (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2011), 109.

of his time and the certainty of faith that transcended *chronos* time. The death scene became a martyrdom or sacrifice and was the *kairos* moment that transcended the mundane affairs of early Hanoverian England. It was given to the greater community, beginning with university students, as a model to emulate. Ambrose's mindset, as narrated by his father, was the icon of Christian discipleship in the Nonjurors' worldview.

Ambrose Bonwicke's obedient witness as a Christian student became a truly inspiring model for others. It is tempting to compare the life of Ambrose to that of the young French Carmelite nun Thérèse of Lisieux (1873-1897) who became so popular in nineteenth-century Roman Catholicism. Both died of tuberculosis at age twenty-two. Both came from relatively humble backgrounds, Thérèse more so than Ambrose. Both observed a daily round of offices — Ambrose, Morning and Evening Prayer in a collegiate chapel, Thérèse, the Breviary in a convent. Both lived, albeit in very different lands, strictly ascetic and devout lives. Both exhibited an immense charity, simplicity, and complete joy even through debilitating illness and premature death. And, both lived lives characterized by obedience above all other virtues.

In a technical sense neither Thérèse of Lisieux nor Ambrose Bonwicke were martyrs, but the mind almost inevitably, intuitively associates their lives as "sacrificial" and their memory with overtones of martyrdom. The answers are complex. Those who observed and sought to preserve constructed all memories of these human deaths. The martyrs did not tell their own story, no matter how dramatic the occasion of the witness might have been. Although Bonwicke's death was private, discreet, and alone inside chambers, it was a remembered story, a historical narrative.

Elizabeth Castelli, building upon Maurice Halbwach's theory of social or collective memory, has written of the early Christian remembrance of the martyrs. She says, "The task of early Christian historians was the production of Christian collective memory, a memory characterized by striking degrees of continuity over temporal and geographical distances."¹³² The question is not whether or not a particular martyrdom happened exactly as told, but rather how the historical event was constructed and remembered. The ancient Christian historians were no different from Herodotus, Diodorus Siculus, or Livy in that they "shared the commemorative, ethical, and ideological interests of the broader cultural context. Christian writing about the past was interested in plotting events along a recognizable teleological trajectory, remembering events in light of a belief of the role of God in history, generating pious models for imitation..."¹³³ The issue is not then separating legends from reality; but rather what was remembered and why?

There are always two sides to martyrdom: the individual who acts as a witness to the faith, and the community that remembers the action. The first has been called "individual intention" and the second aspect "the representation."¹³⁴ Martyrdoms are created by both actions; but there would be no named martyrs if it were not for the community that preserved their memory. Every religious community, certainly the

¹³² Elizabeth A. Castelli, *Martyrdom and Memory: Early Christian Culture Making* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2004), 25.

¹³³ Castelli, *Martyrdom and Memory: Early Christian Culture Making*, 28.

¹³⁴ Valérie Rosoux, "The Politics of Martyrdom" in Rona M. Fields (ed), *Martyrdom: The Psychology, Theology, and Politics of Self-Sacrifice*, (Westport, Connecticut: Praeger Publishers, 2004), 83; see also Fields, "The Psychology and Sociology of Martyrdom," 31-32.

Christian churches, hold as sacred those who died upholding their particular articulation of the faith.

In the Bowyer Ledger there occurs in 1729 this lone accounting entry among so many other print jobs:

1469 (after 28 Oct 29) Bonwicke, Ambrose. A pattern for young students in the university, set forth in the life of Mr. Ambrose Bonwicke [jun.], sometime scholar of St. John's College, in Cambridge. For J. and J. Bonwicke, Stephen Austen, F. Cogan. 1729. 12°. A⁴ B-H¹² I². [O:8°. Rawl. 55]
Ledger P859 Paper recd 18 Oct [29?], dd 250 crown.
NOTES Nichols: preface written by Bowyer.¹³⁵

It is strange and businesslike, seemingly too commercial a commemoration of a martyr. But then he was a different kind of martyr, in a different, more commercial age. It is very interesting that Bonwicke's biography, so very personal, was set out for public view with the authors and publisher openly attested. One can search the Bowyer Ledgers in vain for an entry in 1713 for the printing of Hicke's *The Constitution of the Catholick Church*, which we know to the highest degree of probability that William Bowyer printed; the ledger's record of it simply is not there. That which Valérie Rosoux calls "political circumstances" and "context" had changed by 1729. The Nonjurors were past the early days of uncertainty and prosecution, and even the prejudice and threat left by the Jacobite Rebellion of 1715 were disappearing. They lost a revolution; they would in 1729 witness to the truth.

There was also a sense of "legitimation" within the nonjuring community. A dual process of "convergence and differentiation", argues Rosoux, created identities. This meant that groups recognized commonalities of belief and practice; they also noticed they

¹³⁵ Keith Maslen and John Lancaster (eds.) *The Bowyer Ledgers: The Printing Accounts of William Bowyer Father and Son Reproduced on Microfiche, With a Checklist of Bowyer Printing 1699-1777, A Commentary, Indexes, and Appendixes* (London: The Bibliographical Society, 1991), 116.

were different from "Others".¹³⁶ Memory and identity function dialectically to define a community. The story "reconstructed" by Bonwicke and Bowyer was not false. Rather, the telling of Bonwicke's life story to the community of Nonjurors and to the larger world showed that Nonjurors were loyal, faithful, devout, dependable, hardworking, reasonable Christian subjects. All one had to do was read *A Pattern for Young Students in the University* and the conclusion would be obvious.

After the height of the Nonjuror moment had passed in 1729, at the time of publishing, the elder Bonwicke and the elder Bowyer perhaps sought to preserve the collective memory of their movement in Ambrose Bonwicke's story. But unlike the sixteenth-century martyrologies researched by Brad Gregory, in which particular religious communities were so carefully delineated, Bonwicke's biography contains no mention of Nonjurors.¹³⁷ Maybe a dying movement sought to preserve within the establishment that which was most sacred to Nonjurors. This conjecture comports well with the trajectory lined out by J.C.D. Clark who suggests many of the core values espoused by High Churchmen and Nonjurors, such as Passive Obedience, were actually carried on in slightly modified form to strengthen the establishment right up to 1832.¹³⁸

Bonwicke and most faithful Nonjurors, robustly active in this world, were also focused upon the next; they were intensely scrupulous in their self-examination. Progress in the spiritual life was possible through practice and they often evidenced an optimistic

¹³⁶ Valérie Rosoux, "The Politics of Martyrdom" in Rona M. Fields (ed), *Martyrdom: The Psychology, Theology, and Politics of Self-Sacrifice*, (Westport, Connecticut: Praeger Publishers, 2004), 83, 85-86; Fields, "The Psychology and Sociology of Martyrdom," 31-32 in the same volume.

¹³⁷ Brad Gregory, *Salvation at Stake, Christian Martyrdom in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2001), 346-347.

¹³⁸ J.C.D. Clark, *English Society 1660-1832: Religion, Ideology and Politics during the Ancien Regime* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 14-42.

character. Theirs was a Eucharistic piety centered in sacrifice; a metaphorical martyrdom permeated their position, and they were first created Nonjurors by believing it was absolutely essential to obey one's own conscience. It was the time and place, England post-1688, that situated the Nonjurors' moment. And it was the synergistic effect of adding to the above qualities Passive Obedience, the indefeasible divine right of the monarch, the uninterrupted apostolic succession of the bishops, and the tri-parent infrastructure of God's plan that created the mental universe of Ambrose Bonwicke and gave to it the stark realization of *kairos* time within this chronology.

Providences and the Great Storm of 1703

One powerful illustration of how the Nonjurors applied their understanding of time can be discerned in their interpretation to the nation of the great hurricane that swept across England on 26-27 November 1703. They were not alone in using the storm for apologetical purposes. Daniel Defoe took a survey of the destruction, which included many ships including at least twelve warships of the Royal Navy. As many as 4000 Trees were felled in the New Forrest of Hampshire alone, crops and groves were leveled, tin was ripped from cathedral roofs, notably Ely, and the Eddystone Lighthouse was swept away. Bristol and the Southwest were particularly hard hit. As many as 8000 persons were killed. Not until the hurricane of 1987 would England experience another storm of such magnitude.¹³⁹ Among those killed were Bishop George Kidder and his wife. On the night of 26 November 1703, as they lay in their bed at the Bishop's Palace in

¹³⁹ Daniel Defoe *The Storm* (London, 1704); See Martin Brayne, *The Greatest Storm: Britain's Night of Destruction November 1703* (Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 2002) for a comprehensive treatment of the storm

Wells, the storm broke down the ancient chimneys, and they were tragically crushed beneath the force of their fall. Kidder had replaced the very popular, deprived Thomas Ken as Bishop of Bath and Wells.

Nonjurors considered the sees of the deprived bishops not empty, but rather usurped from their rightful holders. Dodwell urged that any bishop accepting one of the deprived bishop's sees would be in an state of schism from the Church.¹⁴⁰ In fact, as W. A. Speck has observed, few were willing to accept consecration to the deprived bishops' sees: "Painfully aware that filling the vacancies would forever shut the door on an accommodation with the Nonjurors, King William's nominees proved none to eager to accept preferment."¹⁴¹ William Wake turned down Norwich made vacant by Bishop Lloyd's deprivation and also Bath and Wells, Thomas Ken's see. Likewise, William Beveridge, after initially accepting Bath and Wells, subsequently had second thoughts and refused the gift of the see in the face of merciless nonjuring criticism. Kidder accepted the diocese only under great pressure from Archbishop Tillotson at Canterbury, who was himself filling the nonjuring William Sancroft's old bishopric. Kidder's sin was doubled in High Church and Nonjuror eyes by his vote in the House of Lords against the Occasional Conformity Bill. Thus, it was no surprise that many less charitable Tories and Nonjurors saw the hand of God in his death.¹⁴² In the same storm Bishop Ken believed himself miraculously delivered as he stayed with his

¹⁴⁰ Francis Brokesby, *The Life of Mr. Henry Dodwell* (London, 1715), 224-34.

¹⁴¹ Craig Rose, *England in the 1690s: Revolution, Religion and War* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1999), 158.

¹⁴² W. A. Speck, *The Birth of Britain: A New Nation 1700-1710* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1994), 58.

nephew in Poulshot. In a letter to fellow Nonjuror Bishop Lloyd, he related his narrow escape:

Nov. 27th, 1703

My good Lord and dear Brother,

I return you my thanks for both yours. I have no news to return, but that last night there was here the most violent wind that ever I knew; the house shook all night; we all rose, and called the family to prayers, and by the goodness of God we were safe against the storm. It has done a great deal of hurt in the neighbourhood, and all about, which we cannot yet hear of; but I fear it has been terrific at sea, and that we shall hear of many wrecks there. Blessed be God who preserved us. I hope that your Lordship and your family have suffered no harm, and that should be glad to hear that you are well. I beseech God to keep us in his holy fear.

Your Lordship's Most affectionate Friend and Brother,

Tho: B & W¹⁴³

In a subsequent letter to Lloyd, Ken further described just how close a call he had:

I think I omitted to tell you the full [story] of my deliverance in the late storm, for the house being searched the day following, the workmen found that the beam which supported the roof over my head was shaken out to that degree, that it had but half an inch hold, so that it was a wonder it could hold together; for which signal and particular preservation God's holy name be ever praised! I am sure I ought always thankfully to remember it.¹⁴⁴

In an age of providences such “signal and particular preservations” were seen as the intervention of God within historical time. Conversely, the destruction of Bishop Kidder could also be seen as an act of God. Alexandra Walsham sees in this English “providential Protestantism” — or God's judgment portrayed in many tales like the hurricane of 1703 — “evidence of a fruitful and enduring

¹⁴³ “Letter Ken to Lloyd,” 27 November 1703, quoted in Hugh A. L. Rice, *Thomas Ken: Bishop and Non-Juror* (London: S.P.C.K., 1958), 203.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.* 204.

synthesis: novel priorities interweave with inherited formulas, orthodox religious tenets blend with proverbial wisdom and indigenous folklore.” For Walsham there is not so clear a demarcation between ancient and modern in providential thinking, especially “in the context of a national Church comprised largely of involuntary Protestants.”¹⁴⁵ She points out that since Tudor times, and before, “freak storms, torrential rain, and raging gale-force winds were more often thought of as ominous prognostications of the heavier temporal punishments God had in store.”¹⁴⁶

Szechi notes George Lockhart’s apprehension in 1703 on the occasion of a great rain drowning out the roll call in the Scottish parliament. Lockhart took this as an omen or inclination of God’s great displeasure. Such events, says Szechi, were more than a “trifle” to Lockhart who “implicitly believed in portents, apparitions and witchcraft.”¹⁴⁷ Contextually then, the storm could scarcely be seen as anything less than divine intervention into time. Such interventions ill-fitted the Latitudinarian notions of natural order running like a clock.¹⁴⁸

“No writer on the storm,” according to Golinsky, “argued that God was not ultimately responsible for the event.” The real question was whether it was

¹⁴⁵ Alexandra Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 328.

¹⁴⁶ Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England*, 121-122.

¹⁴⁷ Daniel Szechi, *George Lockhart of Carnwath, 1681-1731* (East Linton, Lothian, Scotland: Tuckwell Press, 2002), 198-199.

¹⁴⁸ See Jonathan Israel, *Enlightenment Contested: Philosophy, Modernity, and the Emancipation of Man 1670-1752* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), especially chapter 8: “Newtonianism and Anti-Newtonianism in the Early Enlightenment: Science, Philosophy, and Religion.”

“natural” or not; in other words, was it an “immediate agent of God’s will because it was a departure from the normal cause of nature.”¹⁴⁹ The Nonjurors thought the storm was a departure from normal natural order. There was also another question: Upon whom was the storm’s judgment given? Nonjurors had no doubt it fell upon those who had deprived their bishops and removed the rightful king.¹⁵⁰

Whigs used the storm for political advantage as well. They pointed to the moral evils of English society then under attack by the societies for the reformation of manners. W. A. Speck points out that such societies contended that all the blessings of the 1688 Revolution would be negated without a corresponding moral revolution.¹⁵¹

Daniel Defoe, a dissenter himself, used the storm to press his Williamite agenda. When the storm occurred, he had just been released from four months in prison for writing *The Shortest Way with the Dissenters* (1702), a satirical attack on High Churchmen in which he anonymously pretended to present their position. In short he suggested they follow Louis XIV’s treatment of the Huguenot following the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. The essay was an affront to the Tory party generally and to the new queen, Anne, particularly. Defoe’s position was allied closely to his patron William III. Robert Harley had secured his release in order to use his pen in support of the current regime, and to that end Defoe wrote three works based on the storm: *The Storm*, *The Lay-Man’s Sermon upon*

¹⁴⁹ Golinski, *British Weather*, 45

¹⁵⁰ See Jeremy Collier, *A Dissuasive from the Play-House ... occasioned by the late Calamity from the Tempest* (London, 1703), and Jeremy Collier, *A Representation of the Impiety & Immorality of the English Stage* (London, 1704), 5-6.

¹⁵¹ Speck *The Birth of Britain*, 58.

the Late Storm, and *An Essay on the Late Storm*. All appeared in print in 1704. The first purported to be an objective, data-gathering account of what happened, but Richard Hamblyn, who says the three essays were written more or less concurrently and all contain Defoe's characteristic satirical criticism and his fear of returning to prison, has challenged this view.¹⁵² Paula R. Backsheider has argued that Defoe, desperately in need of capital, began a method he would use throughout his writing career: "He would quote himself either in long identified passages or in phrases, analogies, and well-turned sentences repeated from work to work ... in *The Storm* he began writing for different audiences or in very different modes on the same event."¹⁵³ His motive was survival and it worked. Backsheider contends that in later years Defoe wrote tracts in a growing number of "voices" including: "an Anglican, a Dissenter, a Quaker, a Scot, a leader of the mob, a Whig, a Jacobite, and others."¹⁵⁴ Martin Brayne suggests that Defoe's facts in *The Storm* need to be checked: "it is journalism and its bankrupt author was more concerned with getting his work into print than double checking the facts."¹⁵⁵

The Layman's Sermon is different; it presents a caustic critic of providential views held by Nonjurors:

¹⁵² Richard Hamblyn, "Introduction," in Daniel Defoe, *The Storm*, ed. Richard Hamblyn (London: Penguin Books, 2005),

¹⁵³ Paula R. Backsheider, *Daniel Defoe, His Life* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989), 143.

¹⁵⁴ Backsheider, *Daniel Defoe, His Life*, 143-144.

¹⁵⁵ Martin Brayne, *The Greatest Storm* (Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 2002), 32.

The Jacobites and Non-Jurants shall rise up in Judgment against this Generation, and shall condemn them, for they tell us, this Storm is a Judgment on the whole Nation, for Excluding their Lawful Sovereign, and Abjuring his Posterity: Upon this head they have preached up Repentance, and Humiliation to us; and some of them are willing to reduce all to a very practical Exhortation, and tell us, we ought to look upon it as a Loud Call to Restore the Right Owner (as they call him) to the Possession of his own again; that is, in short, to rebel against a Mild, Gentle, Just and Protestant Queen, and call in the Popish Posterity of an abdicated Tyrant.¹⁵⁶

Defoe, speaking satirically, mocked the Nonjurors, paraphrasing Christ's words:

“The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with the men of this generation, and condemn them: for she came from the utmost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and, behold, a greater than Solomon is here.”¹⁵⁷

Defoe, however, did believe the storm to be “the dreadfulest and most universal Judgment that ever Almighty Power thought fit to bring upon this Part of the World.”¹⁵⁸

Nonjurors seized the opportunity to interpret the storm as a providential judgment on the current Crown and Church. Their construction of the story clearly indicated that they understood time in the older way — as simultaneous, messianic time — and the *kairos* moment where God in judgment enters human crises. By contrast, Defoe satirized their view as simple political expediency:

“These Gentlemen are Men of Uses and Application, and know very well how to

¹⁵⁶ Daniel Defoe, “The Lay-Man’s Sermon upon the Late Storm; Held forth at an Honest Coffee-House-Conventicle,” in Defoe, *The Storm* (1704; London: Penguin Books, 2005), 188.

¹⁵⁷ Matthew 12:42; Luke 11:31-32.

¹⁵⁸ Daniel Defoe, *The Storm*, 2

make an Advantage of God's Judgments, when they serve their turn."¹⁵⁹ Defoe named several Nonjurors in his critique, Collier and Cook, who absolved Sir John Friend and Sir William Parkyns at the gallows in 1696 for their part in the conspiracy to assassinate William III, were singled out.¹⁶⁰ Conversely, Defoe made sure his praise of Queen Anne, and by extension her ministers, was published to protect himself for he knew well the force of fine, pillory, and prison. It is interesting that Defoe set his *Lay-Man's Sermon* in an "honest coffee-house-conventicle" – where such matters were openly discussed and debated in a democratic manner – while High Churchmen preached from pulpits and the Nonjurors Collier and Law turned their printed attacks toward the London stage.

Not surprisingly, the nonjuring bishop Jeremy Collier took the opportunity to write a *Dissuasive from the Play-House ... occasioned by the late Calamity from the Tempest* dated December 10, 1703. Interestingly, Shakespeare's *Tempest* was performed at about the same time as the storm. On December 16 Robert Nelson addressed the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge "whereas acting the *Tempest* upon the next Wednesday after the late dreadful storm, at the new play-house in Little Lincoln's Inn Fields was proper or seasonable?"¹⁶¹ Subsequently, Queen Anne declared a national day of fasting for 19 June 1704, and Collier seized this opportunity to distribute his essay free of charge at the church doors on that day. The *Dissuasive* was a theological reflection on the

¹⁵⁹ Defoe, "The Lay-Man's Sermon upon the Late Storm," 190.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid.

¹⁶¹ Charles Frederick Secretan, *Memoirs of the Life and Times of the Pious Robert Nelson*. (Edinburgh: John Murray, 1860, 107; quoted in George Macaulay Trevelyan, *England Under Queen Anne* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1930), 311.

thunderstorms, and it largely echoed the themes of his 1698 *A Short View* that he was persistently keeping before the nation.

Defoe ridiculed the notions presented by Nonjurors. He would have none of the Nonjurors' apologetic of Kidder's destruction by falling episcopal palace chimneys and Ken's deliverance from the same fate, which distinguished the usurper from the rightful bishop of Bath and Wells. Defoe wrote:

They say this was a High-Church Storm,
Sent out the Nation to Reform;
But th' Emblem left the Moral in the Lurch,
For't blew the Steeple down upon the Church.¹⁶²

Defoe was probably speaking of steeples and churches generally since many church steeples were blown down. He may also have been making a play on the "Protestant Wind" of 5 November 1688 (Guy Fawkes Day) that propelled William III's invasion to Torbay while James II's fleet was left stranded in the Thames. However, for Defoe, this was more literary device than divine providence. Not so for Collier.

Collier pursued his attack in another tract — *A Representation of the Impiety and Immorality of the English Stage with Reason for Putting a Stop thereto* — distributed at church doors sometime in January 1704.¹⁶³ In *A Representation* the late thunderstorm presaged a judgment by God upon England's "profane Diversion," the theater. Not since 1636 had so great a storm

¹⁶² Daniel Defoe, "The Storm. An Essay" in Defoe, *The Storm*, 211.

¹⁶³ The image of this Nonjuror, a bishop at that, standing at the doors of numerous London parish churches, handing out tracts raises the query: How did he do it? Clearly not by himself, there had to be other Nonjurors, their sympathizers, or paid lads helping him distribute the literature. The simplest solution seems most likely; it is likely that nonjuring congregations that could be mobilized swiftly, helped distribute the literature.

struck England and the Civil War followed that calamity a few years later. The storm was a portent of ominous consequences, and Collier's implication was that the theater's impact was akin to the causes of the Civil War. Such political rhetoric was inflammatory and incapable of being missed. Pressing his point, Collier noted that Queen Anne, "has never once given any Countenance to the Play-House by Her Royal Presence, since Her happy Accession to the Throne."¹⁶⁴ Those who have promoted the theater were, in Collier's thinking, the figurative descendants of Cromwellian Roundheads. By contrast, Her Majesty the Queen was the direct descendant of the royal martyr, Charles I. Collier was constructing a binary opposition, impossible to miss, complete with heavenly portents, and one in which it was obvious, for Collier at least, whose side God championed. Obviously, in chronological time reckoning, 1703 was not 1636, nor was Queen Anne's reign the Cromwellian Interregnum, but the Nonjurors, and others, were retelling the storm-story in simultaneous, messianic time.

Some modern historians confirm this assessment. Craig Rose concludes his *England in the 1690s: Revolution, Religion and War* with these words: "In its ideological imperatives and contradictions, its hopes unfulfilled and fears unalloyed, the reign of William III had come to resemble nothing so much as the Cromwellian Protectorate."¹⁶⁵

The Bangorian Controversy and "Homogenous, empty time"

¹⁶⁴ Jeremy Collier, *A Representation of the Impiety & Immorality of the English Stage* (London, 1704), 5-6.

¹⁶⁵ Craig Rose, *England in the 1690s: Revolution, Religion and War* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1999), 268.

Another important illustration of the Nonjurors' practical hybridization of *kairos* with *chronos* time occurred in their response to the Bangorian Controversy where a sermon first preached in *kairos* time, and subsequently printed for wider consumption, was ultimately debated in pamphlets and newspapers. The controversy, named for Benjamin Hoadly (1676-1761), Bishop of Bangor, was on its surface an intellectual debate comprised of hundreds of pamphlets discussing sermons and theological papers.¹⁶⁶ In June of 1717 alone, thirty-nine substantial pamphlets were written and the publication of new tracts continued every month through August 1719.¹⁶⁷ The last pamphlet appeared in October of 1720, four years after the first. All of these were in response to three initial documents: George Hickes *The Constitution of the Catholick Church* (1716), Benjamin Hoadly's *Preservative against the Nonjurors* (1716) and his sermon *The Nature of the Kingdom, or Church, of Christ* (1717). Yet this seemingly intellectual debate involved not just a small faction of nonjuring Churchmen, but also playwrights and poets, High Anglicans, Church Whigs, Non-Conformists, Dissenters, Latitudinarians, the Ministry, Parliament and the Crown. What was there about seemingly obscure theological topics that captivated the intellectual creativity of an entire nation for at least four years? The answer is that the ideas of Hickes and Hoadly presented a binary opposition in theology, political science, and notions of authority generally, and came on the heels of a century of constant conflict in all these realms.

¹⁶⁶ See Andrew Starkie, *The Church of England and the Bangorian Controversy, 1716-1721* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2007).

¹⁶⁷ *All the Advertisements and Letters by the Lord Bishop of Bangor, Dr. Snape, Lord Bishop of Carlisle, Dr Kennet, etc. As they were inserted in the Publick Prints. To which is added A Complete Catalogue of all the Sermons and Pamphlets, for and against the Bishop of Bangor's Sermon in the Order they were publish'd*, 2nd ed. (London, 1717), and Andrew Starkie, *The Church of England and the Bangorian Controversy*, 192.

The Church had matured as it experienced the Civil War, the Restoration, the 1688-89 Revolution, the Convocation Controversy, and the Nonjurors' witness; now new questions had arisen and new answers formulated. Some of those new answers, as we have seen above, were contained in Bishop Hickeys's papers published posthumously as *The Constitution of the Catholick Church* in 1716. He concluded that there were three great impediments that kept the Nonjurors from returning to the Revolution Church of England: "Schism, Heresy, and Unrighteous Devotions." For Hickeys, that church was no better than Rome; both were corrupt in their doctrine, worship, and ministry.¹⁶⁸

One year before Hickeys's *Constitution* was published King George I had named Benjamin Hoadly, an ardent Whig supporter and completely Erastian churchman, to the see of Bangor in the Welsh Church. The next year, 1716, Hoadly repaid the compliment to His Majesty's government by attacking the Nonjurors with an essay entitled *A Preservative against the Principles and Practices of the Nonjurors*.¹⁶⁹ It was essentially a rebuttal of Hickeys's posthumously published papers just off the press. Hoadly followed this with a sermon entitled *The Nature of the Kingdom or Church of Christ*. The sermon, based upon the text John 18:36 "my kingdom is not of this world," and preached before the king, horrified the lower house of Convocation and confirmed the Nonjurors in their belief that if not all Latitudinarians were heretics, certainly Hoadly was. In the sermon Hoadly had argued, "In the Affairs of *Eternal Conscience and Salvation*... He [Jesus] hath left behind him, no visible humane *Authority*; no *Vicegerents* [sic], who can be said

¹⁶⁸ Hickeys, *The Constitution of the Catholick Church*, 16.

¹⁶⁹ 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. By the Right Reverend Father in God Benjamin, Lord Bishop of Bangor. Benjamin, Lord Bishop of Bangor* (London, 1716).

properly to supply his place; no *Interpreters*, upon whom his Subjects are absolutely to depend; no *Judges* over the Consciences or Religion of his People.”¹⁷⁰ Hoadly denied Apostolic Succession, any authority to the Church, proclaimed an invisible Church, and gave as the only test of true religion “sincerity.”

In his sermon Hoadly identified the Church with the Kingdom of Christ, an argument common in Roman Catholic circles but not in Anglican ones. Interestingly though, he took the exact opposite tack from most Roman Catholics with this argument by proclaiming no visible church at all, because the kingdom as taught by Jesus was invisible. Thus, neither the State, nor the Established Church, nor anyone except the individual believer could determine matters of religious faith. The Church, like the kingdom of Christ, depended only on “sincere” belief. Earlier, in the *Preservative*, he had argued in a similar fashion:

Your Title to God’s favour...cannot depend Simply upon your adhering to this Communion; because the very adhering to this Communion, if it were against your Conscience, would entitle you to His Anger: But must depend upon it, considered as a Conduct honestly entered into, by the Dictate of your Conscience. The favour of God...follows *Sincerity*... And consequently, equally follows Every Degree of *Sincerity*.¹⁷¹

There are notable similarities here to John Locke’s *Letter on Toleration*. Of course, if toleration of “sincere” religious faith only was necessary, it was hard to explain the role of the Church of England or its bishops.

¹⁷⁰ Benjamin Hoadly, *The nature of the kingdom, or church, of Christ. A sermon preach'd before the King, at the Royal chapel at St. James's, on Sunday March 31, 1717. By the Right Reverend Father in God Benjamin Lord Bishop of Bangor. Publish'd by His Majesty's Special Command.* (London, 1717).

¹⁷¹ Hoadly, *A Preservative against the Nonjurors*, 55.

Sermons, including Hoadly's, were preached in Benjamin's "simultaneous" or "messianic time." In this reckoning of "simultaneity-along-time" scriptural events were remembered as timeless or contemporary for the preacher and congregation.¹⁷² This was the re-calling kind of remembering [ανάμνησις in New Testament Greek] that made the past events of salvation present.¹⁷³ Time was eternal in this model; as we have seen above was represented by the distinction in Greek between *kairos* [καιρός] and *chronos* [χρόνος].

It is obvious that the Bangorian Controversy's succession of pamphlets in a chronological sequence, was the latter kind of timekeeping, what Benjamin called "homogenous, empty time," time measured by clocks and calendars rather than saving events.¹⁷⁴ The emergence of chronological time was one of the major changes, according to Anderson, that print-capitalism, the invention of the novel, and the newspaper brought to the modern world.¹⁷⁵ This was precisely what was happening in the printing of Hoadly's sermon and the subsequent rebuttals. No longer was theology being *heard* in "simultaneous time" but rather it was *read* in "homogeneous, empty time." Hoadly preached in simultaneous time; but thereafter, literally thousands not present at the royal

¹⁷² Walter Benjamin *Illuminations* (New York: Schocken Books, 1969), 265; Benedict Anderson *Imagined Communities*, 23.

¹⁷³ Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (London: Dacre Press, Adam & Charles Black, 1945), 161; Jean Daniélou, S.J., *The Bible and the Liturgy* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Servant Books, 1979), 136-37; Oscar Cullman, *Christ and Time: The Primitive Christian Conception of Time and History*, translator Floyd V. Filson, (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964), 169; "ανάμνησις" in Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament, Vol. 1 edited by Horst Balz and Gerhard Schneider (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company), 85.

¹⁷⁴ Benjamin, *Illuminations*, 265.

¹⁷⁵ Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 24-25; Dror Wahrman, *Mr. Collier's Letter Racks: A Tale of Art and Illusion at the Threshold of the Modern Information Age* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

chapel to hear the original, debated it in printed editions. Furthermore, his sermon was answered in the newspapers by commercial advertisements. This was eighteenth-century print-capitalism in action and the Nonjurors were adept at it.

George I and his ministers thought they could control the sermon by publishing it. Indeed, they probably thought they could control the Church by promulgating Hoadly's doctrines as well. This control was exactly what the *ancien regime* was losing. For Anderson, the world could only begin to imagine modern nations when three axioms of great antiquity lost their hold on culture. First, a particular "script-language"— like Latin in the Christian West — was no longer seen as an "inseparable part of ontological truth." Second, the notion that monarchs ruled hierarchically through some form of "cosmological (divine) dispensation" no longer held. Third, the idea of time in which "cosmology and history were indistinguishable" departed.¹⁷⁶ All three of these ideas were crumbling, or at least attacked, after the 1688-89 Revolution; the Bangorian Controversy illustrated their decline. In came the idea of time as sequential chronology, and with it pamphlets and newspapers.¹⁷⁷

By putting Hoadly's sermon in print the ministry lost control of it and the debate. While it is possible that Hoadly intended his sermon to create a furor,¹⁷⁸ it is more likely he was just continuing his rather simplistic exegesis and exposition in yet another anti-Tory and anti-Nonjuror homily, one probably designed to impress the king. Far more

¹⁷⁶ Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 36.

¹⁷⁷ See Jonathan Sheehan, *The Enlightenment Bible: Translation, Scholarship, Culture* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007).

¹⁷⁸ See George Every, S.S.M., *The High Church Party 1688-1718* (London: S.P.C.K., 1956), 161. Every contends that Hoadly's Preservative was motivated primarily as an attack on Nonjuror theology and "therefore no one who held these views, however innocent of Jacobitism, could be trusted by the present government."

probable is the thought that Nathaniel Spinckes and William Bowyer, acting anonymously, published the *Constitution of the Catholick Church* knowing exactly what they were doing, gaining a national audience.

The debate was out of control almost as soon as it began. No one could control the trajectory of discourse. Hoadly's sermon was being modified even before it was printed. What had once been private property was now in the public domain. Each critic and every defender, added to the discourse, so that the original words or intent of Hicke or Hoadly were no longer the issue. The Bangorian contributors constructed the story and it was moving more rapidly than it could ever have done before.¹⁷⁹

The reaction of the Church's lower house of Convocation to Hoadly's sermon was swift and certain. A committee was appointed and met on 3 and 10 May 1717 to consider the sermon. Hoadly's theology was contrary to any High Church Anglican understanding, even offended most Church Whigs, and it was judged worthy of censure, Hoadly of impeachment. The "Representation" from the clergy in the lower house was adopted on May 10 and sent on to the Archbishop of Canterbury and bishops of the Province of Canterbury for their concurrence.¹⁸⁰

¹⁷⁹ See Wahrman, *Mr. Collier's Letter Racks*, 19-22.

¹⁸⁰ *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. Read in the Lower House, May 10, 1717. And Voted, Nemine Contradicente, to be Receiv'd and Entred upon the Books of the said House. Published from the original report*, 2nd ed. (London, 1717), 1. The clergy of the lower house were the priests—parochial, collegial, archdeacons, deans, prebendaries and canons of cathedrals—chosen to represent their dioceses within the southern Province of Canterbury. The text in full follows:

“That the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Bangor, hath given great and grievous Offence, by certain Doctrines and Positions by him lately published partly in a Sermon, Intituled *The Nature of the Kingdom or Church of Christ*: And partly in a Book, Intituled, *A Preservative against the Principles and Practices of the Non-jurors both in Church and State*.

The Tendency of the Doctrines and Positions contain'd in the said Sermon and Book, is conceived to be,

Remarkably, this was only the fifth document printed and published in the controversy.¹⁸¹ This indicated how swiftly news of the sermon traveled, and how seriously the Church saw it. The lower house adopted the resolution *nemine contradicente*—with no one opposed—and then resolved to send the matter swiftly to the upper house of Convocation, a body composed of the bishops who were mostly Whigs supportive of the government.

Before the bishops could debate the matter the crown moved swiftly to prorogue Convocation in order to preserve the government from clerical criticism and save Hoadly from synodical censure. The last thing the government of George I needed was more High Church and Tory criticism similar to that experienced in the riots of 1710 following Henry Sacheverell's sermon *In Peril Among False Brethren* preached on the fifth of November 1709.¹⁸² The government in 1717 could not allow another cry of the "Church in Danger" to challenge its legitimacy.¹⁸³ To make matters worse for the government, Hoadly's sermon had been published with the imprimatur: "By His Majesty's Special Command." So the king immediately prorogued convocation before the bishops could act; things however did not quiet down.

(1) First, To subvert all Government and Discipline in the Church of Christ, and to reduce His Kingdom to a State of Anarchy and Confusion.

(2) Secondly, To impugn and impeach the regal Supremacy in Cause Ecclesiastical, and the Authority of the Legislature, to inforce Obedience in Matters of Religion, by Civil Sanctions"

¹⁸¹ *All the Advertisements and Letters by the Lord Bishop of Bangor, Dr. Snape, Lord Bishop of Carlisle, Dr Kennet, etc. As they were inserted in the Publick Prints. To which is added A Complete Catalogue of all the Sermons and Pamphlets, for and against the Bishop of Bangor's Sermon in the Order they were publish'd*, 2nd ed. (London, 1717), 41.

¹⁸² See G. Holmes, "The Sacheverell riots," *Past and Present*, LXXII (1976), 55-85.

¹⁸³ See Julian Hoppitt, *A Land of Liberty? England 1689-1727* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 232-236.

Pamphlets started appearing; every month there were more of them. By 19 July 1717 there were sixty-six small books or pamphlets in print; the newspapers contained at least twenty paid advertisements usually in letterform, some of which ran to several pages.¹⁸⁴ The first of these was by Andrew Snape the Tory master of Eton College; his *A Letter to the Bishop of Bangor* appeared on 6 May 1717, three days after the first meeting of Convocation on May 3 and four days before the lower house adopted the committee's report censuring Hoadly. Hoadly's sermon had been preached on March 31. This was lightning-quick response; within one month the church's authorities as well as the first prominent opponent of the sermon had written and published their censures. It is important to note that Snape did not hear Hoadly's sermon; he first heard of it and subsequently read the published printing of it. He referred in his first *Letter* to page numbers in Hoadly's printed text.¹⁸⁵ The sermon had already gone through several revisions in its transmission to Snape.¹⁸⁶ Hoadly responded to Snape first on 17 May 1717. Snape's *A Second Letter to the Lord Bishop of Bangor in Vindication of the Former* was written on 24 June 1717. That very day a second reply from Hoadly arrived in Snape's study at Eton before the bishop could have seen Snape's reply, and after Snape wrote his second letter, presumably just before Hoadly's second letter arrived.¹⁸⁷ Then, Snapes' second letter was published on June 28. Things were moving very fast; by a

¹⁸⁴ *All the Advertisements and Letters by the Lord Bishop of Bangor*, 1-40, 46.

¹⁸⁵ Andrew Snape, *A Letter to the Bishop of Bangor Occasion'd by his Lordship's Sermon preach'd before the King at St. James's, March 31st, 1717* (London, 1717).

¹⁸⁶ See Robert Darnton, "What is the History of Books?," in Darnton, *The Kiss of Lamourette: Reflections in Cultural History* (New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Co. 1990), 111-135; Robert Darnton, "An Early Information Society: News and Media in Eighteenth-Century Paris" *The American Historical Review* 105, no. 1 (Feb. 2000), 1-35.

¹⁸⁷ Andrew Snape, *A Second Letter to the Lord Bishop of Bangor, In Vindication of the Former* (London, 1717), 67.

contemporary account his second letter was the forty-sixth document published in the debate.¹⁸⁸

At this time, on 13 June 1717, the Nonjuror William Law's first of three letters appeared in print — *The Bishop of Bangor's Sermon and Defense of it, answered*.¹⁸⁹ Law was in London on this date, perhaps serving as deacon in one of the Nonjurors' congregations. In his first letter he related how Hoadly had trivialized the Anglican notions of ecclesiology and authority; a transgression all the more remarkable since Hoadly was a bishop. Law replied to him:

If *Regularity* of Ordination, and *Uninterrupted Succession* be mere Trifles, and nothing; then all the Difference betwixt us and other Teachers, must be nothing: For they can differ from us in no other respects. So that, my Lord, if Episcopal Ordination, derived from Christ, hath been contended for by the Church of *England*, your Lordship hath in this Point deserted her.¹⁹⁰

Law believed ordination or consecration of a bishop by bishops in the "Uninterrupted Succession" from Christ—through the laying on of hands by his apostles, and thus down through the centuries from bishop to bishop—was essential for validity of the sacraments. Hoadly's "mere Trifles" were to Law the *sine qua non* of the Church's very existence. Law contended: "If there be no Uninterrupted Succession, then there are no Authoriz'd Ministers from Christ; if no such Ministers, then no Christian Sacraments, then no Christian Covenant, whereof the Sacraments are the Stated and Visible Seals."¹⁹¹ Perhaps the most quoted words were and remain: "You have left us neither priests, nor

¹⁸⁸ *All the Advertisements and Letters by the Lord Bishop of Bangor*, 41.

¹⁸⁹ *All the Advertisements and Letters by the Lord Bishop of Bangor*, 43-44.

¹⁹⁰ William Law, *Three letters to the Bishop of Bangor*, 9th ed. (1717; London, 1753). 13

¹⁹¹ William Law, *Three letters to the Bishop of Bangor*, 15.

sacraments, nor Church; and what has your Lordship given us in the room of these advantages? Why, only sincerity.”¹⁹²

Law subsequently wrote and published a *Second and Third Letter to the Bishop of Bangor*. Hoadly wrote in 1718, a much too late, *Response to Convocation*.¹⁹³ There is no point for our purposes here in tracing the protracted arguments. The point is that the Nonjurors, who were deprived of pulpits, now represented by Law, were now read in the press in up to date time. I find no evidence that Nonjurors wrote to the newspapers; they preferred ephemeral, cheaply printed pamphlets. However, they certainly took advantage of the attention given the crisis by the newspaper. They had mastered a new technology and placed ancient arguments into modern context. They were writing sacred story in *chronos* time by using print culture.

The journalists put the advertisements together in a certain way on pages they chose. This is the primary literary convention that makes newspapers fiction for Anderson. The events were constructed as an "imagined linkage" by "calendrical coincidence" and the "market."¹⁹⁴ Non-connected events occurring in different places but on the same day appeared in the paper as the editor chose to arrange them. The paper published in order to sell papers. These newspapers were but an "extreme form" of the book sold on a "colossal scale, but of ephemeral popularity." They were in Anderson's words: "one-day best-sellers."¹⁹⁵ Their fleeting nature meant fresh news had to be

¹⁹² William Law, *Three letters to the Bishop of Bangor*, 161.

¹⁹³ Benjamin Hoadly, *An answer to the representation drawn up by the Committee of the Lower-House of Convocation concerning several dangerous positions and doctrines contain'd in the Bishop of Bangor's Preservative and Sermon. By Benjamin, Lord Bishop of Bangor*. (London, 1718).

¹⁹⁴ Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 33.

¹⁹⁵ Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 35.

generated lest the papers become boring, repetitive. The Bangorian Controversy furnished a new construction of the theological-political-ecclesiological story virtually daily using “homogenous, empty time” and the interest generated, of course, sold pamphlets and papers. All the while, using a hybridization of *kairos* and *chronos* time, the Nonjurors used the controversy and their access to print culture to great advantage, to promote their own apologetical agenda. They thus reached a national audience that the nation thought had been denied them.

Epilogue: A Watch kept

On the evening of 4 June 1703 a remarkable rite took place at St. Olave, Crutched-Friars' Church, Hart Street, London. Evening funerals were popular in the Church of England in those days; they were symbolic of the end of life, awaiting the rising sun, a symbol of the resurrection of the Son of God. The church was crowded because of the great congregation and, St. Olave's Church was small, but extraordinarily beautiful, one of the few medieval churches to survive the Great Fire of 1666. The deceased was a commoner, but none present underestimated his greatness or his importance to the nation. Some suggested that he had saved the Royal Navy. No doubt he had his hand in running it efficiently since that day in 1660, when he accompanied the restored King Charles II and the duke of York onboard the *Naseby* as she sailed triumphantly home to England. For his loyalty to the old regime he was thrust out in 1688-89. That scarcely stopped the powerful and elite of the nation, and the many who had benefited from his largesse, from attending the funeral. The second Earl of Sandwich and his brother the Dean of Durham were there. So too were the president and many fellows of the Royal Society. The Dean of Christ Church, Oxford, Henry Aldrich, was

there. The Master of Trinity House, London — the venerable institution that regulated piloting and served as a charity for sailors — was there as well. The Board of the Admiralty was present in nearly full force. The deceased's doctors, his banker, his bookbinder, his lawyer, and many friends were there too. The ecclesiastical hierarchy was represented well; the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London were both in attendance, only not officiating. The clergyman officiating had ministered to the man during his dying days; twice he pronounced absolution; twice he gave him Holy Communion. In another century, at a later time, the deceased man would be remembered as the greatest diarist in the English language. This day, however, he was simply remembered as a powerful civil servant and faithful Christian. His name was, obvious by now, Samuel Pepys; the clergyman was his dear friend, George Hicke. The establishment, both spiritual and temporal, stood witness to the interment of the former Clerk of the Acts and Secretary of the Admiralty as his body was laid to rest "under the Communion Table" of a parish of the Church of England, by a nonjuring, once outlawed, bishop.¹⁹⁶ The interment was a powerful symbol of the Nonjurors' effective use of time and relationships, an effort that reached to the leadership of England. It is also a clear indication that their Restoration Anglicanism values were never completely lost to the Church of England. While the establishment watched in respect and reverence, Pepys had kept his watch — both his pocket watch employed in the day-to-day world of his work,

¹⁹⁶ Henry B. Wheatley ed., *The Diary of Samuel Pepys M.A. F.R.S. Clerk of the Acts and Secretary to the Admiralty* (London: George Bell & Sons, 1904), lii.; Richard Ollard, *Pepys* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1974), 111, 286, 341. Ollard judges Pepys to be not a Nonjuror, he was far too practical politically, but rather one who in later life came deeply under the influence of brilliant High Church theologians especially George Hicke and Nathaniel Spinckes. Pepys was also friend of another prominent Nonjuror, Bishop Thomas Ken (1637-1711). In 1683, they had traveled together by ship to assist Lord Dartmouth in the evacuation of the colony of Tangier. See Richard Ollard, *Samuel Pepys and his Circle* (London: National Portrait Gallery, 2000), 53.

and his watch on the nation and conscience evidenced in his *Diary* — and his nonjuring perspective on time was eternal.

Chapter 6

“The Orthodox and Catholic Remnant of the British Churches”

Though eighteenth-century Anglicans did not recognize any form of patriarchal authority over the Church of England, the Non-Jurors, advocated a plan of union that would have placed the churches under the patriarchal authority of Jerusalem, which the Non-Jurors considered the “mother see.” ... The Non-Juror defense against charges of sectarianism [made against them] was rooted in their belief that they were the sole heirs of apostolic succession in England.

Robert Cornwall in *Visible and Apostolic*

Sometime before July 1716, somewhere in London, Bishop Archibald Campbell, a Scottish Episcopalian and Nonjuror, met Arsenius, Archbishop of Thebais, who was under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Alexandria.¹ The choice of a bishop for the see of Alexandria had been passionately contested, money spent to buy the position, and, as a result the see left impoverished. Judith Pinnington’s assessment of this “begging” mission by Arsenius [or Arsenios] is that it redounded “as usual, not for the benefit of the Orthodox faithful but to pay off a huge debt, incurred on this occasion by Samuel (Patriarch since 1710) to buy off the Turkish intrusion of Cosmo of Sinai in his place.”²

The title “The Orthodox and Catholic Remnant of the British Churches” was the description given themselves by the nonjuring bishops in their initial proposal for reunion with the Eastern Orthodox, from London, dated 18 August 1716.

Robert D.Cornwall, *Visible and Apostolic: The Constitution of the Church in High Church Anglican and Non-Juror Thought* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1993), 78, 109.

¹The primary documents for this story are contained in the “Jolly Kist”- named for Bishop Alexander Jolly (1756-1838) who collected and collated the originals and copies - and are in the possession of the Scottish Episcopal Church’s Theological College in Edinburgh. In 1868 these were translated into English in order by George Williams, *The Orthodox Church of the East in the Eighteenth Century, being the Correspondence between the Eastern Patriarchs and the Nonjuring Bishops with an Introduction on Various Projects of Reunion between the Eastern Church and the Anglican Communion* (London: Rivington’s, 1868). Subsequently they were catalogued in order by John Dowden, “Note on the Original Documents containing, or relating to, the Proposals of the Nonjuring Bishops for a ‘Concordat’ with the Orthodox Church of the East, 1716-1725” *Journal of Theological Studies* vol. 1, no. 4 (1900).

²Judith Pinnington, *Anglicans and Orthodox: Unity and Subversion 1559-1725* (Leominster: Gracewing, 2003), 158.

Most of the Christians in Egypt were Coptic; the Orthodox in communion with the see of Alexandria were a minority. The Orthodox clergy of Grand Cairo, Alexandria, and Damietta duly elected the new Patriarch Samuel in 1710. He in turn sent Arsenius to solicit funds from the English monarch and church. Arsenius wrote an impassioned appeal to Queen Anne,³ and bounty was generous. Later on George I was less so. At all times the Nonjurors were too impoverished to assist even if inclined to do so. Subsequently, Bishop Campbell and Archbishop Arsenius began a protracted ecumenical dialogue that eventually included the English Nonjurors, Scottish Episcopalians, and the Alexandrian, Russian, and Greek Orthodox Churches.

The story, as related by Thomas Brett in 1728, began in July of 1716 with Campbell taking his ecumenical idea formulated with Arsenius, with whom he already had some discourse upon that subject, to his colleagues: Collier, Spinckes, Lawrence, Brett, and presumably Gandy since they met at his house.⁴ Lawrence declined participation because he considered the Orthodox “more bigoted than the Romanists” and Brett followed his lead.⁵ Spinckes translated the Nonjurors’ proposal into Greek and signed it together with Campbell, Collier. This missive was taken to Moscow with the letter to the Czar, printed in part here, by Arsenius.⁶

³ Arsenius, *Lachrymæ & Suspiria Ecclesiae Graecae: Or, The Distressed State of the Greek Church, Humbly Represented in a Letter to the Late Majesty Queen Anne, from the Patriarch of Alexandria; by the hands of Arsenius Archbishop of Thebais, Now residing in London* (London: 1714).

⁴ See “Letter of Thomas Brett to George Smith,” 30 April 1730, in Henry Broxap, *The Later Non-Jurors* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1924), 31.

⁵ Williams, *The Orthodox Church of the East in the Eighteenth Century*, 3.

⁶ See Pinnington, *Anglicans and Orthodox*, 173. Pinnington thinks Nicholas Spinckes did not sign this first *Proposal for a Concordat*, but that James Gaderrar did. She cites W. Walker, *The Life of the Right Reverend Alexander Jolly and the Right Reverend George Gleig* (Edinburgh: 1806), 270. My reading of the “Letter of Thomas Brett to George Smith,” 30 April 1730 convinces me that Spinckes did sign the original

A Letter to the Csar of Moscovy ... Sir, - The archmandrite, who attended the Archbishop of Thebais at London, acquaints us, that your Majesty is pleased to encourage the proposal of union between the Greek and Britannic Churches, and that your Majesty has graciously offered to send the Articles to the four Eastern Patriarchs... And since God hath put it into the heart of so great a Prince, to assist in closing the breach of the Catholic Church, and restoring the harmony designed by the Christian institution, we hope the undertaking will prosper in your Majesty's hand... Some late practices with respect to Church and State have reduced our Communion to a few; but your Majesty knows truth and right do not depend on numbers.

A. Campbell, J. Collier, N. Spinckes to Peter the Great, 8 Oct.1717 ⁷

Peter the Great endorsed the proposal and, presumably after sharing it with the Holy Synod of Moscow, sent it on 16 August 1721 to Samuel the Patriarch of Alexandria. From Alexandria it was duly communicated to the other three Eastern Patriarchs: Constantinople, Antioch, and Jerusalem⁸ The Eastern Patriarchs — Jeremias of Constantinople, Samuel of Alexandria, and Chrysanthus of Jerusalem, joined by a synod of the clergy of Constantinople — met in Constantinople on 12 April 1718 and drew up a response, which ran to fifty-two pages in George Williams's translation.⁹ Attached to this letter was another document — *A Synodical Answer to the Question, What are the Sentiments of the Oriental Church of the Grecian orthodox; sent to the Lovers of the Greek Church in Britain in the year of our Lord 1672* – which had been

1716 *Proposal for a Concordat*, but not the Nonjurors's subsequent *Reply to the Answers of the Orthodox of the East* on 29 May 1722. Gadderar may have signed the *Proposal* but certainly signed the *Reply*. The reason Spinckes refused later was that he was a Non-Usager and that controversy had divided the Nonjurors. See Henry Broxap, *The Later Non-Jurors*, 31. An earlier, less complete memoir by Brett dated 30 March 1728 is printed in Williams, *The Orthodox Church of the East in the Eighteenth Century*, 3-4.

⁷ Archibald Campbell et al "A Letter to the Czar of Moscovy " 8 October 1717 quoted in Thomas Lathbury, *A History of the Nonjurors: Their Controversies and Writings, With Remarks on Some of the Rubrics in the Book of Common Prayer* (London: William Pickering, 1845), 318-319.

⁸ "Letter of the Archbishop of Thebais to the Nonjurors," from Petersburg, 1721, August 16th, in Williams, *The Orthodox Church of the East in the Eighteenth Century*, 12-14.

⁹ Williams, *The Orthodox Church of the East in the Eighteenth Century*, 15-67.

written by Chrysanthus, the present Patriarch of Jerusalem in 1718. This latter document was an exposition of faith from the Synod of Bethlehem, 1672.¹⁰ The Orthodox thought these documents framed their terms for ecumenical reunion.

Consider the two sides of this communication. Campbell, Collier, and Spinckes, bishops without dioceses, meeting in house-churches, with a small number of adherents, boldly write to the four greatest bishops of the Eastern Orthodox Church whose jurisdiction covered one-half of Christendom. And, furthermore, they gained the Czar's endorsement, and he forwarded their proposal. Truly an astonishing imbalance of importance existed between the parties, yet the matter was taken up seriously by the Patriarchs.

It took five and one half years for the Patriarchs's letter to reach London. The response was not one the Nonjurors hoped for, and they must have been disappointed.¹¹ The Patriarchs and Nonjurors understood each other very differently. Still, the Nonjurors wrote back on 29 May 1722. By this time, however, the Usages Controversy had divided the Nonjurors¹² and the effect was to remove Spinckes and other Non-Usagers from the Orthodox dialogue because they opposed change to the Prayer Book liturgy, an integral part of the Proposal.¹³ Only, the Usagers continued the dialogue with Orthodoxy. Brett now returned to the ecumenical overture with two bishops new to it, James Gadderar, a

¹⁰ Williams, *The Orthodox Church of the East in the Eighteenth Century* 67-76; J.H. Overton, *The Nonjurors: Their Lives, Principles and Writings*, (London: Smith and Elder, 1902), 464.

¹¹ H.W. Langford, *The Non-Jurors and the Eastern Orthodox*, 7.

¹² See James David Smith, *The Eucharistic Doctrine of the Later Nonjurors: A Revisionist View of the Eighteenth-Century Usages Controversy* (Cambridge: Grove Books Limited, 2000), 3.

¹³ "Letter of Thomas Brett to George Smith," 30 April 1730, in Broxap, *The Later Non-Jurors*, 32.

Scotsman, and John Griffin.¹⁴ Despite the discouraging content of the Patriarchs' letter, the Nonjurors responded in a remarkably positive fashion, assuming that the Patriarchs were operating on a paradigm of Tradition and authority much like their own. The Nonjurors replied in 1722:

For since the determining rule is equally received by the Oriental Churches and the Catholic Remainder in Britain; since the inspired Writings of the Old and New Testament, as interpreted by the primitive Fathers, are the common standard of Faith and Worship to both; we do not despair, but that by the blessing of God, when the case shall be farther examined by the Catholic Oriental Church, such allowances and concessions may be made, as may dispose both parties to unite in Communion with each other."¹⁵

The Orthodox were not operating on that understanding and were in no way disposed to make "allowances and concessions." Their "determining rule" for authority, which closely resembled as we have always done, was obviously misunderstood by the Nonjurors; there was no "common standard of Faith and Worship to both." I do not propose to discuss the protracted theological arguments here, only to demonstrate the way in which the Nonjurors thought when face to face with a global entity as foreign and immense as the Eastern Orthodox Church.

Other lesser letters were exchanged, but the endeavor came to an end with the death of Peter the Great and Archbishop William Wake's discovery of the Nonjurors' secret initiative.¹⁶ The entire dialogue had been conducted, from the British side, in secret. It took Wake eight years to learn of it, and then only from Thomas Payne, the

¹⁴ Thomas Brett, "Letter of 30 March 1728," in Williams, *The Orthodox Church of the East in the Eighteenth Century*, 3-4.

¹⁵ "Reply to the Answers of the Orthodox of the East," in Williams, *The Orthodox Church of the East in the Eighteenth Century*, 84

¹⁶ Pinnington, *Anglicans and Orthodox*, 190; Overton, *The Nonjurors: Their Lives, Principles, and Writings*, 464-465.

Anglican chaplain to the British Ambassador in Constantinople.¹⁷ Wake wrote forcefully, in September 1725, to Chrysanthus, Patriarch of Jerusalem:

...Certain schismatic Priests of our Church have written to you under the fictitious titles of Archbishop and Bishops of the Anglican Church, and have sought your Communion with them; who, having neither place nor Church in these realms, have bent their efforts to deceive you who are ignorant of their schism. ... [They] have enticed many of the people to their party; have established congregations apart from the Church; and have at length reached such a pitch of madness as, on the demise of the first promoters of the schism, to consecrate to themselves new Bishops to succeed them. These are the men who have presumed to write to you. These are they who have endeavoured to withdraw you from the Communion of our Church.... Of these men I pray and beseech your Reverence to beware.¹⁸

The Archbishop had a definite fear of these Nonjurors who had systematically attacked the leadership of the Church of England. His concern was to defend the Church he served. He also astutely identified the core of their faith and practice, which was to consecrate new bishops to continue the schism thereby indicating the continued illegitimacy of the Established Church. That was precisely the point. What did Campbell and Gadderar, Collier and Spinckes have in common? All were part of Hicke's consecrations of new bishops on Ascension Day 1713. All were Hicke's colleagues. All shared Hicke's vision. Campbell and Gadderar were co-consecrators in ordaining Collier and Spinckes. Wake put his finger on the Nonjurors' defining moment; and as Wake said to Chysanthus, these are the same men writing to you. They were indeed.

A Place in the Universal Church?

The Nonjurors had developed a passion for the Church of the first four centuries. Steven Runciman in commenting on Thomas Ken's declaration in his Will of 1711 — "I

¹⁷ Williams, *The Orthodox Church of the East in the Eighteenth Century*, xxxix.

¹⁸ Williams, *The Orthodox Church of the East in the Eighteenth Century*, lvii–lviii;

die in the holy and apostolic faith professed by the whole Church before the division of East and West.”¹⁹ — concluded: “To his [Ken’s] followers it was therefore almost a sacred duty to try to achieve union with the Orthodox.”²⁰ King James I had a vision of reunion with the Eastern Orthodox Churches and that was probably never forgotten even through the vicissitudes of the Cromwellian era.²¹ The Nonjurors, driven by the ideal of the undivided Catholic Church of the first centuries, naively identified the eighteenth-century Orthodox Churches of the East with that primitive and pure Christianity. They coupled this idea with their great scholarship of the patristic literature and assumed the Orthodox did as well. Unlike England, “Orthodox history is marked outwardly by a series of sudden breaks ... Yet these events, while they have transformed the external appearance of the Orthodox world, have never broken the inward continuity of the Orthodox Church.”²² That could not be said for English religious history.

Pinnington says the Nonjurors, “...boldly tackled the question of the Seven Ecumenical Councils in a way that only the ‘purist’ mentality which we have already seen the Nonjurors to possess could have contemplated.”²³ This “purist” mentality requires explanation. In Pinnington’s view, the Nonjurors were heirs to two

¹⁹ “Will of Bishop Ken,” in E. H. Plumtre, *The Life of Thomas Ken, D.D.: Bishop of Bath and Wells* (London: Wm. Isbister Limited, 1890), 2:209.

²⁰ Steven Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity: A Study of the Patriarchate of Constantinople from the Eve of the Turkish Conquest to the Greek War of Independence* (1968; repr. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 310.

²¹ W. B. Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

²² Timothy [Bishop Kallistos] Ware, *The Orthodox Church: A Clear and Detailed Introduction to the Orthodox Church written for the Non-Orthodox as well as for Orthodox Christians who wish to know more about their own Tradition* (1963; repr. London: Penguin Books, 1997), 195.

²³ Pinnington, *Anglicans and Orthodox*, 174.

“boulversements” - the French word means a confused reversal of things - in one century. The Civil War and Commonwealth that almost destroyed classical Anglicanism, and the 1688-89 Revolution that left “its [classical Anglicanism’s] surviving champions” in a deprived state. Thus, Nonjurors were “ inclined to take an abstract purist line concerning the ‘Christian State’ which has no parallel in Western Catholic tradition or indeed in Orthodoxy which, in its [the Orthodox Churches’s] Babylonian captivity, still hankered after the Byzantine commonwealth.”²⁴ Pinnington’s notion of a “purist” mentality is akin to my articulation of a Cyprianist Mentality. Paul Monod says something similar when he describes “the Nonjuring search for religious purity....”²⁵ Not dissimilar is Mark Goldie’s statement, “They stood beyond the pale of the Revolution and cherished a self-image of martyrdom to a purer Anglicanism, now perverted by an Erastian stare.”²⁶

This psychology of the Nonjurors is key to understanding why they approached the Eastern Orthodox Patriarchs.²⁷ Monod, in describing the Nonjuror Thomas Deacon’s efforts in Manchester, writes: “Like those Nonjurors who sought a union with the Greek or Russian Orthodox Churches, he was immensely ambitious, and aimed at finding a ‘primitive’ form of worship that would have universal appeal.”²⁸ These primitive and religious purity qualities, extended far beyond the liturgical; the Nonjurors were bold and

²⁴ Pinnington, *Anglicans and Orthodox*, 159.

²⁵ Paul Kléber Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People, 1688-1788* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 140-141.

²⁶ Goldie, Mark. "The Nonjurors, Episcopacy, and the Origins of the Convocation controversy," in *Ideology and conspiracy: aspects of Jacobitism 1689-1759*, ed. Eveline Cruickshanks (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1982), 15.

²⁷ Pinnington, *Anglicans and Orthodox*, 159.

²⁸ Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People, 1688-1788*, 141.

audacious in their attempt to recreate in Britain what they believed to be the pure, primitive Church of the first four centuries.²⁹

This point, according to C.D.A. Leighton, was accented by the Nonjurors' conviction that the early Church possessed the living and active power of the Holy Spirit to a far greater degree than did the Church of their time.³⁰ Leighton quotes the following passage from Thomas Brett. Brett was quite clear that he based his case for the authority of the primitive Church on the *charismata* of the Holy Spirit:

I fix upon this period, not only because all the Learned allow it to have been the purest and most uncorrupt Age of the Church, but also because the Charismata, or miraculous Gifts and Graces of the Holy Spirit were so long undoubtedly continued in the Church.³¹

This special possession of the Holy Spirit is also an essential point in Pinnington's argument about Dodwell's doctrine; she writes: "Dodwell identified his *theologoumenon* with a very tangible idea of the Church which made his opponents uncomfortable, a Church in strict apostolic succession of faith wherein baptism, as access to this *pneuma* [Greek for the Spirit], was administered 'in Communion with the true Bishop'."³² She sees this mentality overlapping both the Nonjurors episcopal ecclesiology and their worship, which became more exotic with the Usages Controversy, incidentally happening concurrently with the ecumenical overtures to the Eastern Orthodox. Pinnington says, "We see then that the preferred norm of worship among the Nonjurors was 'charismatic'

²⁹ Robert D. Cornwall, "The Search for the Primitive Church: The Use of Early Church Fathers in the High Church Anglican Tradition, 1680-1745," *Anglican and Episcopal History* (1990), 303-329.

³⁰ C.D.A. Leighton, "William Law, Behmenism, and counter enlightenment," *Harvard Theological Review* 91. No. 3 (July 1998), 301.

³¹ Thomas Brett, *Tradition Necessary to Explain and Interpret the Holy Scriptures* (London: 1718), 58.

³² Pinnington, *Anglicans and Orthodox*, 168.

in a decidedly patristic sense. They were aware that the modern age was lacking in spontaneous gifts of the Spirit and that liturgy had therefore hedged itself with objective norms.”³³ The word “charismatic” here means endowed with the gifts of the Holy Spirit or *pneuma*. In this regard the Nonjurors were very close to the Orthodox. One important twentieth-century Orthodox theologian, Vladimir Lossky, describing the nature of the Tradition wrote:

Tradition, in fact, has a pneumatological character: it is the life of the Church in the Holy Spirit. Truth can have no external criterion for it is manifest of itself and made inwardly plain; it is given in greater or lesser degree to all members of the Church; for all are called to know, to preserve and to defend the truths of the faith.
³⁴

Lossky saw this Tradition as directed by the Holy Spirit; it was the guiding force for truth in the Church through the centuries. Lossky further contended:

Now tradition is not merely the aggregate of dogmas, of sacred institutions, and of rites which the Church preserves. It is, above all, that which expresses in its outward determinations a living tradition, the unceasing revelation of the Holy Spirit in the Church.³⁵

Lossky wrote for the twentieth century, but would have thought this true for Orthodoxy of the eighteenth as well. The Nonjurors were very close to this thinking both in their scholarship — Dodwell is a case in point — and in their spirituality — the mysticism of William Law is an example.³⁶ This thinking, combined with an antiquarian bent and their

³³ Pinnington, *Anglicans and Orthodox*, 169.

³⁴ Vladimir Lossky, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church* (1957; repr. Cambridge: James Clark and Co. Ltd., 1973), 188.

³⁵ Lossky, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*, 236.

³⁶ See John Henry Overton, *William Law, Nonjuror and Mystic: Author of 'A serious call to a Devout and Holy Life' &c. Formerly Fellow of Emmanuel College, Cambridge. A Sketch of His Life, Character, and Opinions* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1881), Chapters 10-12.

episcopal ecclesiology, convinced them that the Eastern Orthodox Churches were their closest allies in faith and practice.³⁷

There was considerable truth in this thesis. However, the Nonjurors knew very little about practical church life in Greece, Egypt, Jerusalem, or Russia. Furthermore, the Nonjurors knew the churches of the East only from the ancient texts they read. In fact, as Steven Runciman wrote, “Few Englishmen penetrated into Greek lands, apart from pilgrims to Palestine, passing through Cyprus.”³⁸ Almost none ever witnessed the Liturgy of Saint James that they so admired ; they knew it only from texts, not from worship.³⁹ One notable exception was Thomas Smith, the Church of England chaplain for the Levant Company at Constantinople from 1668-1670; Smith was an authority on Greek Orthodoxy and wrote *An Account of the Greek Church* published in 1680.⁴⁰ He later became a Nonjuror. Another important exception was Robert Frampton, one of the original deprived bishops, who had been chaplain to the Levant Company at Aleppo from 1655-1667. Frampton was one of a number of Laudian exiles, some of whom became chaplains in the exotic lands of the Middle East.⁴¹ Frampton not only learned Arabic and

³⁷ On their antiquarian bent see : Theodor Harmsen, *Antiquarianism in the Augustan Age: Thomas Hearne 1678-1735* (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2000); Richard L. Harris editor, *A Chorus of Grammars: The Correspondence of George Hickes and his Collaborators on the Thesaurus linguarum septentrionalium* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1992).

³⁸ Steven Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity: A Study of the Patriarchate of Constantinople from the Eve of the Turkish Conquest to the Greek War of Independence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968, reprinted 1997), 292-293, 290.

³⁹ Pinnington, *Anglican and Orthodox*, 178.

⁴⁰ Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity*, 292-293, 307.

⁴¹ Stephen Neil, *Anglicanism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 204-206. Edward Pococke (1604-91), the great orientalist, was chaplain at Aleppo and friend of Cyril Lucar, Patriarch of Constantinople. Isaac Basire (1606-76) whose intent was to communicate Anglicanism to the Eastern Orthodox with the hopes of intercommunion. John Covell (1635-1722) was chaplain at Constantinople during the years 1671 to 1676; his book *Some Account of the present Greek Church, with Reflections on*

lived on good terms among Muslims but also knew much about Eastern Orthodoxy.⁴² Deprived in 1690, he retired to the parish of Standish in the Vale of Gloucester where he catechized the young.⁴³ Interestingly, Queen Anne sought to translate him to the see of Hereford upon her accession.⁴⁴ Frampton died in 1708 and it is doubtful his experience in the East influenced the Nonjurors later plan. Still, there was generally a dearth of knowledge among Anglicans about Orthodoxy. Concerning the liturgy, for example, Pinnington writes, “The Nonjurors, with their purely textual knowledge of Orthodox liturgy could not evaluate. ...Generations of *sotto voce* recitation of key parts of the *anaphora* at considerable speed [that] had created a pseudo-theatrical mystique which partially concealed the meaning of the text from the Orthodox themselves and confused an outsider for whom the whole text presented itself on the same level.”⁴⁵ Thus, the Nonjurors, operating almost exclusively on historical-textual research, did not grasp much of contemporary Orthodox practice. There was a down side to this scholarly approach. Pinnington thinks, “There was ... in Dodwell, as in Collier, Brett and Deacon, an implication that in the seclusion of their study and oratory they knew better the implications of the Greek Tradition than the Greeks knew themselves. This was probably noticed and resented in subsequent negotiations.”⁴⁶

their present Doctrine and Discipline, particularly on the Eucharist was delayed in publication until 1722 and probably had little influence on the later Nonjurors.

⁴² Neil, *Anglicanism*, 205-206.

⁴³ *The Life of Robert Frampton, Bishop of Gloucester: Deprived as a Non-Juror 1689*, ed. T. Simpson Evans (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1876), 208, 231.

⁴⁴ Neil, *Anglicanism*, 206.

⁴⁵ Pinnington, *Anglicans and Orthodox*, 178.

⁴⁶ Pinnington, *Anglicans and Orthodox*, 166.

The Nonjurors had a romantic idea of Orthodoxy, one coupled with a passionate desire for a place in the universal Church and a genuine openness to new possibilities. However, their position must be qualified by Pinnington's convincing critique of the Nonjurors as "totally enclosed ...in their scholarly study." Dodwell, for example incorrectly assumed: [If a doctrine was] "True and Catholic for the first Four Centuries, it is so still ..."⁴⁷ This was a conservative position, nevertheless, the Nonjurors were remarkably more open to new possibilities than the Orthodox. Perhaps, they also felt they had broken free of state constraints and had nothing to lose and everything to gain. Conversely, the Orthodox in Greece, Egypt, and Palestine, felt very constrained and had lived since 1453 under the heavy-hand of Islamic rule.⁴⁸

The Nonjurors' ecclesiology had become far more Catholic but no less anti-Roman, and they were engaged in a protracted schism with the Church of England. This left them with one ecumenical overture that made sense theologically, one toward the Eastern Orthodox. The Nonjurors had come to see themselves as the Orthodox British Church, a kind of Western Orthodoxy. In fact, the name they assigned to themselves as they wrote the Patriarchs was: "The Orthodox and Catholic remnant of the British Churches."⁴⁹ Interestingly, they also called themselves: "The suffering Catholick Bishops

⁴⁷ Henry Dodwell, *Immortality Preternatural to Human Souls, The Gift of Jesus Christ, Collated by the Holy Spirit in Baptism ... by a Presbyter of the Church of England* (London, 1708), 2. Interestingly, Dodwell was not a "presbyter" but a layman., albeit, arguably, the Nonjurors' most brilliant theologian.

⁴⁸ See Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity*, 165-207.

⁴⁹ "Letter of Thomas Brett to George Smith," 30 April 1730, in Broxap, *The Later Non-Jurors*, 30, and in Williams, *The Orthodox Church of the East in the Eighteenth Century*, 4.

of the old constitution in Great Britain.”⁵⁰ This title reflected their prevailing mentality of martyrdom, which we have traced before. Some of the later Nonjurors under Thomas Deacon at Manchester called themselves “The Orthodox British Church.”⁵¹ They clearly felt an affinity to the Eastern Church. With regard to the office of patriarch, Robert Cornwall adds an interesting observation on High Church and Nonjuror ecclesiology that the Nonjurors’ scheme would have placed them under the Patriarch of Jerusalem, which they “considered the ‘mother see’.”⁵²

This notion reversed the patriarchal order which through centuries of Orthodox history had placed Constantinople first, and was unimaginable to the Four Eastern Patriarchs.⁵³ For Nonjurors, Christianity began in Jerusalem, thus it should be primary; the Orthodox understood the seat of power and ecclesiastical authority was Constantinople, the “Ecumenical Patriarchate.” Nonjurors were reading about the East; Orthodox had lived in it. They were in different places.

Had the Nonjurors managed an ecumenical reunion with the Eastern Orthodox the ramifications would have been immense. It would have given them the legitimacy they so desperately needed and vindicated their long held anti-papal position, their Cyprianist mentality and ecclesiology, their conviction that there could be only one Church, and their contention that they were that true catholic and national Church of Britain. Thus, Cornwall writes, “The Non-Juror defense against charges of sectarianism [made against

⁵⁰ Williams, *The Orthodox Church of the East in the Eighteenth Century*, 6.

⁵¹ See Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People*, 141; Pinnington, *Anglicans and Orthodox*, 162.

⁵² Cornwall, *Visible and Apostolic*, 109.

⁵³ “The Patriarchs’ Answer to the Proposals,” in Williams, *The Orthodox Church of the East in the Eighteenth Century*, 26.

them] was rooted in their belief that they were the sole heirs of apostolic succession in England.”⁵⁴ In short, they and they alone could unite with the Orthodox, and such reunion would give them a recognized place in the Universal Church. They were “In search of a Home.”⁵⁵

Very different places

What went wrong with such a bold ecumenical scheme? Pinnington’s argument, which I follow here, is compelling:

Altogether, the Nonjurors had failed to allow for the immoveability of a prescriptive system of centuries’ duration. They themselves had narrowly escaped the threat of extinction and renewed themselves by a re-examination of the Church of the Fathers. They believed therefore that all things were possible. But all things were *not* possible with the Greeks. In fact very little was possible which was not already in place.”⁵⁶

“Looking back ... on the correspondence with the Non-Jurors” writes Timothy Ware, “one is struck by the limitations of Greek theology in this period: one does not find the Orthodox tradition in its fullness.”⁵⁷ Part of that limitation Pinnington describes as “immoveability” and that in a “prescriptive,” largely static system. Ware describes two very different places inhabited by the Orthodox of the East and Nonjurors in the West. He writes: “The Reformation controversies raised problems which neither the Ecumenical Councils nor the Church of the later Byzantine Empire were called to face: in the seventeenth century the Orthodox were forced to think more carefully about the

⁵⁴ Cornwall, *Visible and Apostolic*, 78.

⁵⁵ Pinnington, *Anglicans and Orthodox*, 156. The phrase is actually Pinnington’s title for chapter five.

⁵⁶ Pinnington, *Anglicans and Orthodox*, 176.

⁵⁷ Ware, *The Orthodox Church*, 99.

sacraments, and about the nature and authority of the Church.”⁵⁸ The Nonjurors, by challenging the Patriarchs’ understanding, were ultimately instrumental in promoting that deeper thinking in the Eastern Churches. However, neither Nonjurors nor Orthodox were able to perceive each other outside of their own worldview. In dealing with the issues surrounding the Eucharist — the doctrine of transubstantiation was the most perplexing — Pinnington concludes: “Anglicans like [Edward] Stephens, Hickes and Collier, who steeped themselves in the textual tradition were more faithful to historic Orthodoxy than the patriarchs whose favour they sought.”⁵⁹

H. W. Langford thought that the entire reunion scheme fell apart because it was not about reunion at all from the Orthodox side, rather, “something quite different, namely submission to the Orthodox, and this the Non-Jurors refused.”⁶⁰ The Nonjurors were not prepared to submit to any scheme they considered wrong; they had already suffered against forces far nearer home. Again Langford wrote, “The Non-Jurors had hoped for reunion negotiations. The replies they received, however courteously phrased, demanded only one thing — not reunion, not intercommunion, but unconditional surrender.”⁶¹

The Tradition was tremendously important to both Orthodox and Nonjurors. The Eastern Patriarchs wrote to the Nonjurors in 1718: “We preserve the Doctrine of the Lord uncorrupted, and firmly adhere to the Faith He delivered to us, and keep it from blemish

⁵⁸ Ware, *The Orthodox Church*, 99 .

⁵⁹ Pinnington, *Anglicans and Orthodox*, 178.

⁶⁰ H. W. Langford, “The Non-Jurors and the Eastern Orthodox: A paper read to the Fellowship of St Alban and St Sergius Conference at Durham,” 26 June 1965, transcribed by Ian B. Pitt, 2001. (Project Canterbury online),1.

⁶¹ Langford, “The Non-Jurors and the Eastern Orthodox,” 12.

and diminution, as a Royal treasure, and a monument of great price, neither adding any thing, nor taking any thing from it.”⁶² The Tradition was fixed and had never changed in the Orthodox mind; the Nonjurors had seen too much change, and their efforts were to restore a corrupted church to its proper faith and practice. Ware writes, “The idea of a living continuity is summed up for the Orthodox in the one word *Tradition*.”⁶³ The Orthodox employed a different paradigm than the Nonjurors. The Nonjurors were, for all their antiquarian interests and Catholic ecclesiology, very much wedded to the idea of Scripture, Tradition and Reason as found in Anglicanism since Richard Hooker. They developed Tradition as authority, especially the Usagers during the controversy that bore their name. Scripture remained primary authority for the Nonjurors even if Tradition stood equally alongside it. The Orthodox operated on a completely different paradigm. Since the Tradition existed in oral form before the New Testament, Scripture was included within it. The Ecumenical Councils were inspired by the Holy Spirit just as the Gospels. Ware defines Tradition in Orthodox practice, and cites the above 1718 Letter to the Nonjurors as his example:

To an Orthodox Christian, Tradition means ... something more concrete and specific ... it means the books of the Bible; it means the Creed; it means the decrees of the Ecumenical Councils, the Service Books, the Holy Icons – in fact the whole system of doctrine, Church government, worship, spirituality and art which Orthodoxy has articulated over the ages.⁶⁴

No such paradigm presented itself as a possibility to the Nonjurors. Both parties started from different places and argued from different models. Any change of the magnitude

⁶² “The Patriarchs’ Answer to the Proposals,” in Williams, *The Orthodox Church of the East in the Eighteenth Century*, 17.

⁶³ Ware, *The Orthodox Church*, 196.

⁶⁴ Ware, *The Orthodox Church*, 196.

necessary for ecumenical negotiations was probably impossible for both the Orthodox and the Nonjurors in 1716 – 1718.

These difficulties were exacerbated by an interpretative breakdown. Bishop Spinckes, an accomplished scholar of New Testament *koine* and patristic Greek, had accurately translated the Nonjurors' English messages, and most Nonjurors were able to read with considerable comprehension the documents sent and received. The problem was what the Latin American historian James Lockhart called: "Double Mistaken Identity."

At the heart of cultural interaction was a process I call Double Mistaken Identity, in which each side of the cultural exchange presumes that a given form or concept is functioning in the way familiar within its own tradition and is unaware of or unimpressed by the other side's interpretation.... After an interval, awareness sometimes began to grow ... of the inaptness of the original identification, and the mistake in identity was rectified, though too late to change the direction things had taken.⁶⁵

That describes precisely the dynamic at work in this ecumenical encounter. This mistake was operative in several points the Nonjurors articulated. Three notable examples are the erroneous order of primacy among the Patriarchs, the different ideas of Tradition, and the particular Orthodox understanding of "transubstantiation." The subtlety and confusion of the theological debates are beyond the scope of this chapter; the point is that language functioned as a double mistaken identity.⁶⁶ Had both parties understood the deeper

⁶⁵ James Lockhart, "Double Mistaken Identity: Some Nahua Concepts in Postconquest Guise," in *Of Things of the Indies: Essays Old and New in Early Latin American History* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999), 99.

⁶⁶ For a thorough treatment of the theological issues see: Pinnington, *Anglicans and Orthodox*, 156-197; Langford, "The Non-Jurors and the Eastern Orthodox"; Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity*, 289-319.

meaning of the forms and concepts that the other used, they would have realized they were closer than imagined.⁶⁷

Another reason for the failure of the ecumenical talks was the mistaken notion by the Orthodox that the Nonjurors were Lutheran and Calvinist in their orientation. This absurd misunderstanding reflected their fear that such ideas, which had come to the Patriarchate of Constantinople via Cyril Lucaris, a Calvinist or very close to it, who was patriarch from 1620 to 1638, might once again take hold in their churches.⁶⁸ In the Patriarchs' reply to the Nonjurors they spared no feelings: "Being born and bred in the principles of the Luthero-Calvinists and possessed with their prejudices, they [the Nonjurors] tenaciously adhere to them like ivy to a tree, and are hardly drawn off."⁶⁹ Of course, the Nonjurors were distinct from both Lutheranism and Calvinism; they did not wish, however, to repudiate the English Reformation. Their concerns were over the authority of ancient Ecumenical Councils, which were not equal in weight to Scripture, veneration of the Virgin Mary, invocation of the saints, any explanation of how the bread and wine became the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist, and Icons as leading the ignorant toward superstition.⁷⁰ In these concerns the Nonjurors showed their very

⁶⁷ Pinnington, *Anglicans and Orthodox*, 186-190.

⁶⁸ On Cyril Lucaris see: Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity*, chapter 6 "The Calvinist Patriarch," and Langford, "The Non-Jurors and the Eastern Orthodox," 7.

⁶⁹ "The Patriarchs' Answers to the Proposals," in Williams, *The Orthodox Church of the East in the Eighteenth Century*, 48.

⁷⁰ See "The Patriarchs' Answers to the Proposals" in Williams, *The Orthodox Church of the East in the Eighteenth Century*, 9-10.

“protestant” inheritance. To the Orthodox they seemed prejudiced or fearful where no fear was warranted.⁷¹

Pinnington’s contention that in 1717 “Union could easily have been a *fait accomplis* on the Russian side with the Nonjurors pressurized to greater conformity after the event, with the easy concurrence of the Greeks” is revealing.⁷² Conversely, she sees in the Nonjurors’ project and liturgy something “too close to the reformation and too suggestive of ‘Jesuit’ blandishments to give the Greeks of that time any degree of reassurance.”⁷³

This divide was immense, bigger than the Nonjurors proposal. It was really indicative of a longstanding separation, growing greater since “The Great Schism” between Rome and the four Eastern Patriarchs in 1054. That division had greatly reduced dialogue between the East and West; it was as much a division of two cultures as of two churches.⁷⁴

The Eighteenth-Century Ecumenical Context

The Nonjurors’ ecumenical overtures to the Eastern Orthodox Churches were not, at least in any modern sense, ecumenical. Their rejection of Roman Catholics as papists, of Presbyterians, Non-Conformists, dissenters, sectarians and other Protestants as schismatics and heretics, guaranteed a lonely position within a rapidly changing English

⁷¹ See “The Patriarchs’ Answers to the Proposals” in Williams, *The Orthodox Church of the East in the Eighteenth Century*, 51.

⁷² Pinnington, *Anglicans and Orthodox*, 189.

⁷³ *Ibid.*

⁷⁴ See Nicolas Zernov, *Eastern Christendom: A Study of the Origin and Development of the Eastern Orthodox Church* (New York: Putnam, 1961), especially Chapter V.

religious scene. The key to understanding the Nonjurors' efforts is found in Monod's telling description of them as "that long-suffering remnant of the Restoration Church," — a church with a distinctly unfavorable record on ecumenism.⁷⁵

J.C.D. Clark writes of the Restoration settlement, which importantly "...came to be influenced less by Laudians than by a new breed of (what later became known as) High Churchmen, men whose churchmanship was defined by a patristic stress on the Apostolic succession and by the parallel political principle of divine indefeasible hereditary right: Dissenters were thereby both unchurched and identified as politically suspect."⁷⁶ The Nonjurors were these High Churchmen after the 1688-89 Revolution. Remembering the dialogue at the first meeting to discuss Campbell and Arsenius's plan, Thomas Brett recalled, "I was then a perfect stranger to the doctrines and worship of that Church, but as I wished most heartily for a general union of all Christians in one Communion, I was ready to have joined Mr. Campbell on this occasion."⁷⁷ It was, of course, far easier to embrace the reunion of all Christians in "one Communion" in the abstract and theoretical. In the same letter, Brett remembered, "But Mr. Lawrence being in the room [at Bishop Gandy's house], drew me aside, and told me, that the Greeks were more corrupt and more bigoted than the Romanists, and therefore vehemently pressed me not to be concerned in this affair."⁷⁸ Subsequently, Brett withdrew, but later rejoined the effort. That Brett desired the reunion of all Christians was undoubtedly true, but he meant in one church, and in England the Nonjurors were that church. It was simply impossible for High

⁷⁵ Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People, 1688-1788*, 17.

⁷⁶ Clark, *English Society 1660-1832*, 58.

⁷⁷ Williams, *The Orthodox Church of the East in the Eighteenth Century*, 3.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

Church Anglicans in general, and the English Nonjurors in particular, to conceive of more than one church in one land. From the Nonjurors' perspective, the Nonconformists as well as the Established Church of England were illegitimate.

The Roman Catholics were under the domination of the papacy and heretical; virtually all historians writing of the Nonjurors note their complete disdain for those whom they called "papists" and "Romanists." Overton's assessment was, "There were no more uncompromising opponents of Romanism than the Nonjurors."⁷⁹ The logical move for them was intercommunion with and mutual recognition from the Orthodox Churches of the East. Runciman traced a similar affinity from the Orthodox side vis-à-vis Anglicanism.⁸⁰ It is doubtful how much the Eastern Churches, with the possible exception of the Russian, saw that affinity.⁸¹

The Anglican dilemma since the English Reformation was how to bring together diverse groups within the one Church of England. This effort arguably began with the Synod of Whitby in 664, long before the sixteenth-century reforms.⁸² But it was the reforms of Edward VI's reign and the counter-reforms under Mary that prompted the Elizabethan Settlement with its Act of Uniformity in 1559, which introduced for centuries to come the dynamic of uniformity and comprehension.⁸³ The Elizabethan Settlement was an odd ecumenical idea and perhaps settled very little; but it did give

⁷⁹ Overton, *The Nonjurors*, 12.

⁸⁰ See Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity*, 289.

⁸¹ See Pinnington, *Anglicans and Orthodox*, 179-189.

⁸² For the Synod of Whitby see Margaret Deanesly, *The Pre-Conquest Church in England* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1963), 83-91.

⁸³ Nicholas Tyacke ed. *England's Long Reformation: 1500-1800* (London: Routledge, 2011); J. R. H. Moorman, *A History of the Church of England* (London: A & C Black, 1986), 199-203; Stephen Neil, *Anglicanism*, 99-106.

peace a chance.⁸⁴ Conversely, Diarmaid MacCulloch sees it as a “revolution,” one “breaking with the past,” and with “no significant concessions to Catholic opinion.”⁸⁵

The problem for the Elizabethan reformers was in part what the Roman Catholic historian Eamon Duffy calls the “attraction of continuity,” for “The early Elizabethan church was that anomalous thing, a Protestant church largely made up of a population as yet unconvinced of the worth of the Reformation, and mainly staffed by former Catholic priests, relatively few of whom had embraced a full-blooded Protestantism.”⁸⁶

Christopher Haigh observes that churchmen in the late sixteenth century Church of England were “de-Catholicised but unProtestantised. What they were not is a good deal clearer than what they were.”⁸⁷ The Puritan ascendancy, the Civil War and Interregnum, and the Restoration Act of Uniformity 1662 all made uniformity more difficult.⁸⁸ As Anne Whiteman wrote, “It was indeed no new thing that difference should exist among Protestants in England; what was new in 1662, and what needs explanation if the genesis of Church and Dissent is to be traced, is that a dichotomy then became permanent and officially recognized.”⁸⁹ With the High Church ascendancy, as described by Clark, the

⁸⁴ See Owen Chadwick, *The Reformation* (1972; repr. Hammondsworth: Penguin Books, 1982), 129-132.

⁸⁵ Diarmaid MacCulloch, “The Church of England 1533-1603,” in *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition: Continuity, Change and the Search for Communion*, ed. Stephen Platten (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2003), 27-28.

⁸⁶ Eamon Duffy, “The Shock of Change: Continuity and Discontinuity in the Elizabethan Church of England,” in *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition: Continuity, Change and the Search for Communion*, ed. Stephen Platten (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2003), 44.

⁸⁷ Christopher Haigh, *English Reformations. Religion, politics, and society under the Tudors* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 310.

⁸⁸ Mark Goldie, “The theory of religious intolerance in Restoration England,” in *From Persecution to Toleration: The Glorious Revolution and Religion in England*, eds. Ole Peter Grell, Jonathan I. Israel, Nicholas Tyacke (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 331-68.

⁸⁹ See Anne Whiteman “The Restoration of the Church of England,” in eds. Geoffrey F. Nuttall and Owen Chadwick, *From Uniformity to Unity 1662-1962* (London: SPCK, 1962).

problem of including many different religious groups within one church was exacerbated. This practice of Comprehension sought to preserve the legal fiction, if not the theological reality, of *one* Church of England.⁹⁰ Whiteman's understanding was that, "The birth of Dissent must also be regarded as the direct consequence of the 'Puritan Revolution', a revolution which failed and, bringing in its wake political bitterness and a new rigidity in theological thinking and ecclesiastical policy, made it very difficult, if not impossible, to re-establish a comprehensive Church of England when the King came back in 1660."⁹¹ The Restoration Church, as John Spurr has convincingly demonstrated, took on a developed consciousness of being Anglican.⁹² Later, Archbishop Sancroft had a scheme to comprehend at least the moderate Presbyterians within the state church.⁹³ To what extent this was to strengthen the Anglican hegemony more than to include non-Anglicans is much debated; "Thus even Sancroft, Turner and the future non-jurors" in Gibson's view, "sought a reformed monarchy, and were probably prepared to make peace with the Dissenters as the price for it."⁹⁴

⁹⁰ See W.A. Speck, *Reluctant Revolutionaries*, 177-179; Benjamin J Kaplan *Divided by Faith: Religious Conflict and the Practice of Toleration in Early Modern Europe: Religious Conflict and the Practice of Toleration in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press, 2007), 138.

⁹¹ Whiteman, "The Restoration of the Church of England," 22; I. M. Green, *The Re-Establishment of the Church of England 1660-1663* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977).

⁹² John Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991), especially Chapter 8: "The Church of England and Restoration Anglicanism"; Clark, *English Society 1660-1832*, 52-66.

⁹³ See William Gibson, *James II and The Trial of the Seven Bishops* (Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 150-152.

⁹⁴ Gibson, *James II and The Trial of the Seven Bishops*, 202.

The conflicts of the seventeenth century had honed Nonjurors perspectives too. The Civil War and Interregnum had shown them that Puritans and Presbyterians would attack both the king and the bishops.⁹⁵ Thus, Roger Thomas concluded,

The Alternative confronting the Church of England at the Restoration was not comprehension or indulgence but coercion or toleration. Only if toleration had been chosen would the further question have arisen whether that toleration should be exercised within the Church (comprehension), making it more truly catholic, or outside the Church (indulgence) – always a second best, if you intend the Church to be, like the State, an inclusive body.⁹⁶

Of course the Anglican Cavalier Parliament and the Clarendon Code took the “coercion” course and that legacy became the High Church Tory agenda.⁹⁷ And for the original future nonjuring bishops, their efforts of Passive Obedience to James II and against his policies of toleration, culminating in the Trial of the Seven Bishops, marked both a victory and warning.⁹⁸ The Glorious Revolution and Toleration Act of 1689 — an *Act for exempting Their Majesties Protestant Subjects, dissenting from the Church of England, from the Penalties of certain Laws* [27 May 1689] — brought matters concerning toleration and comprehension to a crisis.⁹⁹ The 1688-89 Revolution, in Clark’s view, “...

⁹⁵ Whiteman “The Restoration of the Church of England,” 87.

⁹⁶ Roger Thomas, “Comprehension and Indulgence,” in *From Uniformity to Unity 1662-1962*, eds. Geoffrey F. Nuttall and Owen Chadwick (London: SPCK, 1962), 191.

⁹⁷ See John Spurr, *The Post-Reformation: Religion, Politics and Society in Britain 1603-1714* (Harlow, England: Pearson Longman, 2006), 144-158; for a Marxist treatment, see Christopher Hill, *The Century of Revolution: 1603-1714*, 209-211; Whiteman, “The Restoration of the Church of England,” 19-88, is a balanced treatment of the ecumenical problems faced in 1662.

⁹⁸ See John Miller “James II and Toleration,” in *By Force or By Default? The Revolution of 1688-89*, ed. Eveline Cruickshanks (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers Ltd., 1989), 2-27; Scott Sowerby, *Making Toleration: The Repealers and the Glorious Revolution* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2013); Gibson, *The Trial of the Seven Bishops*, 194-197; Gerald Straka, *The Revolution of 1688*, 67.

⁹⁹ See John Spurr, “The Church of England, comprehension and the Toleration Act of 1689,” *English Historical Review* (1989), 927-946; George Every, *The High Church Party, 1688-1718* (London: S.P.C.K., 1956), especially Chapter 2: “Conflict over Comprehension in 1688-9.”

confirmed the denominational pattern established in the 1660s: no longer did significant bodies of Dissenters expect to return to the Church under the banner of comprehension, or to reform the Church along their own lines.”¹⁰⁰ Nicholas Tyacke sees the deep divisions among Protestants in the seventeenth century as temporarily destructive of the Elizabethan Settlement “with the Puritans and their Dissenter successors claiming to be the true heirs of the Reformation — a conflict of interpretation which the 1689 Toleration Act only served to institutionalize.”¹⁰¹ Jeremy Gregory takes a somewhat different view of “England’s Long Reformation” traced from 1500-1800. He writes:

I would point to the parallel debates of historiography over the distinctions between “Puritans” and “Anglicans” in the late sixteenth century, between “Calvinists” and “Arminians” in the early seventeenth century, between Anglicans and “Dissenters” in the late seventeenth century, between Methodists and Anglicans in the eighteenth century, and between Evangelicals and High Churchmen in the early nineteenth century, all of which increasingly are seen by historians to have had common pastoral aims, and where the polarities were less sharp than used to be believed.¹⁰²

Nevertheless, lines were sharply drawn over the practice called Occasional Conformity by which Nonconformists and Dissenters would go to their Anglican parish and receive communion occasionally, only to qualify as a member of the Church of England for voting and office holding purposes.¹⁰³ The Occasional Conformity debates of

¹⁰⁰ Clark, *English Society 1660-1832*, 81; Harris, *Politics under the Later Stuarts*, 178; Speck, *Reluctant Revolutionaries*, especially chapter 8.

¹⁰¹ Nicholas Tyacke, “Introduction: re-thinking the ‘English Reformation’,” in *England’s Long Reformation 1500-1800*, ed. Nicholas Tyacke (London: Routledge, 1998), 1-2.

¹⁰² Jeremy Gregory, “The Making of a Protestant nation: “success” and “failure,” in *England’s Long Reformation*,” in *England’s Long Reformation 1500-1800*, ed. Nicholas Tyacke (London: Routledge, 1998), 320-321.

¹⁰³ G. V. Bennett, “Conflict in the Church,” in *Britain after the Glorious Revolution 1689-1714*, ed. Geoffrey Holmes (London: Macmillan St Martin’s Press, 1969), 167-168; Cornwall, *Visible and Apostolic*, 35-37; Kaplan, *Divided by Faith*, 140-142.

the early eighteenth century resulted in a High Church “victory” of sorts with *The Occasional Conformity Act* passed in 1711.¹⁰⁴ The measure proved more divisive than useful and was repealed under George I in 1714.¹⁰⁵ Nonjurors habitually condemned the practice of Occasional Conformity, which they considered sacrilegious.¹⁰⁶ The Occasional Conformity dispute convinced them that the “Church in Danger” trope was real, and that Nonconformists sought to use the Church of England only for political ends.¹⁰⁷ Furthermore, moves toward Toleration were largely undermining the Church of England, at least from the High Church Tory position which the Nonjurors inherited.¹⁰⁸

The entire episode with James II and Roman Catholicism insured that the Nonjurors’ anti-papal stance was chiseled in stone. The prejudice against Roman Catholics expressed by Nonjurors and other Englishmen was a special one,¹⁰⁹ and the anti-papist tropes were virtually unending in Britain.¹¹⁰ However, not only this perennial conflict was worrisome. A new enemy had joined the attack on traditional Christian

¹⁰⁴ Every, *The High Church Party, 1688-1718*, especially Chapter 6: “Occasional Conformity.”

¹⁰⁵ For the repeal of the Occasional Conformity Act see Linda Colley, *In Defiance of Oligarchy: The Tory Party 1714-60* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 192-194.

¹⁰⁶ Cornwall, *Visible and Apostolic*, 117.

¹⁰⁷ See William Gibson, *The Church of England 1688-1832: Unity and Accord* (London: Routledge, 2001), 75-85; Harris, *Politics under the Later Stuarts*, 152-154.

¹⁰⁸ Mark Goldie, “John Locke, Jonas Proast, and religious toleration 1688-1692,” in *The Church of England c.1689-c.1833: From Toleration to Tractarianism*, eds. John Walsh, Colin Haydon, and Stephen Taylor (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 143-171; Harris, *Politics under the Later Stuarts*, 68-69, 128-129, 139, 152, 179-180.

¹⁰⁹ Spurr, *The Post-Reformation 1603-1714*, 10-12; Speck, *Reluctant Revolutionaries*, 167-172; Bernard and Margaret Pawley, *Rome and Canterbury through Four Centuries: A study of the relations between the Church of Rome and the Anglican Churches 1530-1973* (New York: The Seabury Press, 1975), 42-64.

¹¹⁰ For the fear of popery, pro-Protestant sentiments, and pope-burning processions see: Harris, *Politics under the Later Stuarts*, 12-13, 60, 64; Linda Colley, *Britons, Forging the Nation 1707-1837* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 19-30.

belief: the Deists. John Locke published his *The Reasonableness of Christianity* in 1695, and John Toland's *Christianity not Mysterious* appeared in 1696.¹¹¹ Concurrently, Latitudinarians with sympathies toward the new thinkers were appointed to the episcopal bench. Two Archbishops of Canterbury — Tillotson and Tenison — were friendly with Deists. In this context, Goldie writes, "...to High Churchmen the distinction between Latitudinarians and heretics was a fine one."¹¹² High Churchmen to a great extent, and Nonjurors to an even greater extent, felt themselves attacked from all fronts. "The Nonjuror Charles Leslie believed William III to be elevating Presbyterians, fanatics and atheists, and although he genuinely feared the return to Romanist repression if the Restoration of James II occurred, he thought that preferable to England's impending collapse into complete irreligion."¹¹³ The Nonjurors, and their Scottish Episcopalian counterparts, had no one with whom they could unite in Britain. Ecumenism in this context had to search far afield, and for the Nonjurors that meant the Eastern Orthodox. Their imagined world was far from the Orthodox reality under Turkish dominion; nevertheless, their imagination made possible a suitable, in Nonjurors' eyes, ecumenical partner.

A precocious, unfulfilled Vision

The ecumenical efforts begun by Alexander Campbell and Arsenius of Thebais were precocious but unfulfilled. Yet they left a vision appreciated in succeeding

¹¹¹ See J.A.I. Champion, *The Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken: The Church of England and its enemies 1660-1730* (1992; repr. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), and Justin Champion, *Republican Learning: John Toland and the Crisis of Christian Culture, 1696-1722* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003).

¹¹² Goldie, "The Origins of the Convocation Controversy," 16.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*

centuries, a hope ahead of its time. Nicolas Zernov wrote, with the advantage of hindsight not given the Nonjurors or Orthodox, “In the eighteenth century neither side was willing to listen to criticism and suggestions yet this exchange of letters began discussions which became more fruitful in the course of the next two centuries.”¹¹⁴ Langford wrote, “Much of what the Non-Jurors stood for theologically is now an Anglican commonplace.”¹¹⁵

Perhaps of the greatest importance from an Eastern perspective was that the Nonjurors’ overtures acted as a catalyst to clarify their own confession. The Nonjurors compelled the Eastern Orthodox Patriarchs to articulate their faith vis-à-vis Western understandings. Ware says that since the last Ecumenical Council of the undivided Church in 787, there have been only thirteen chief Orthodox doctrinal statements; these are sometimes called: “The Symbolical Books.” The eleventh of these is “The Answers of the Orthodox Patriarchs to the Nonjurors (1718, 1723).”¹¹⁶ How remarkable this was; The Eastern Orthodox Churches would have considered the whole Church of England very small by comparison with their numbers and geographical expanse. Yet their leaders corresponded with a handful of Nonjuror bishops with little financial backing, meeting in house churches, diminished by the Usagers separation, and, by 1716, possessing more hope than adherents.

Also remarkable, considering their reduced numbers and straitened circumstances, were that the Nonjurors had the courage and vision to reach out to Orthodoxy. They certainly did not lack for imagination and openness to possibilities. In that sense the most

¹¹⁴ Zernov, *Eastern Christendom*, 159.

¹¹⁵ Langford, *The Non-Jurors and the Eastern Orthodox*, 12.

¹¹⁶ Ware, *The Orthodox Church*, 203.

conservative of all English clerics were very modern. The simplest explanation for this extraordinary outreach was that union with Eastern Orthodoxy — or more accurately, as they saw it, with the pure and primitive Church of the first four centuries — was integral to the Nonjurors' mentality. It was enshrined in the dying declarations of Ken, Lake, and Hicke, and logically unfolded from the scholarship of Dodwell, Collier, and Brett. It was always in their minds, and Arsenius's visit and Campbell's bold initiative gave them occasion to act upon an idea long embraced.

Conclusion

In a generation of great learning the most profound scholars were among the Non-Jurors, and a High-Church revival was assisted by the labours of antiquaries and liturgists, who traced from the primitive Christian model their notion of ideal relations between Church and State.

Keith Feiling in *A History of the Tory Party 1640-1714*

The argument presented in these pages has been that five different paradigms shaped the English Nonjurors' worldview: a radical obedience, a Cyprianist mentality, use of printing presses to replace lost pulpits, a hybridized view of time, and a global ecumenical perspective that linked them to the Orthodox East. These five operated synergistically to create an effective tool for the Nonjurors' survival and success in their mission. The Nonjurors' influence, out of all proportion to their size, was due in large measure to this mentality. Their unique circumstances prompted creative thinking, and they were superb in that endeavor.

The Nonjurors found themselves thrust out following the Revolution of 1688-89. Just months before, the Seven Bishops had seen victory in the face of the entire nation following their imprisonment, trial and acquittal. Remarkably, later, five of the Seven became the first Nonjurors. The remembrance of that triumph probably gave hope to their future little community. Their notion of Passive Obedience combined with the indefeasible divine right of the monarch placed them in a position where they refused to take the oaths, a position that was simultaneously admired by many but followed by few.

They numbered peers of the realm and the Archbishop of Canterbury among their fellowship. Their community was strikingly well educated, numbering over four hundred priests, many of who were fellows of Oxford or Cambridge colleges. There were others

Keith Feiling, *A History of the Tory Party 1640-1714* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924), 303.

with no oath to non-jure, who nevertheless embraced their cause for conscience's sake. Women too, were an important part of a movement perhaps incorrectly described as clerical.

Their notion of radical obedience to God was coupled with a spirit of martyrdom in the face of what they saw as an illegitimate state and an illegitimate church. As year succeeded year, the articulation of their position, in a society where politics and faith were inseparable, became increasingly far more religious than political. They were truly pioneering in the anti-Erastian efforts exerted for the independence of the Church. Their extensive scholarship, particularly in the patristic literature, honed to razor sharpness what I have called a Cyprianist mentality. St. Cyprian of Carthage, for the Nonjurors, described the polity and ecclesial structure of their own church; he also presented a model of martyrdom, which they saw themselves fulfilling. This ecclesiological thinking saw bishops in direct apostolic succession from the Apostles as the foundation of faith and practice and the guarantors of sacramental validity and ecclesial authority. This also explains why it was so important for Hickes to consecrate three new bishops on Ascension Day in 1713. With this thinking came a parallel paradigm; just as the Holy Spirit had endowed the Cyprianist Age with special charisms, the Nonjurors too, in an increasingly hostile environment, were possessors of that very Spirit. Thus in their view there were no other orthodox churches in England. Joining with Scottish nonjuring Episcopalians they formed an orthodox church that they began to see as Western Orthodoxy.

They lived within sight of the great churches they had once served. Reduced to poverty, in straitened circumstances, they worshipped in house churches. This merely

reinforced the mentality of long-suffering and martyrdom. Had not the church of the first generations done the same? They increasingly saw themselves like the Church of the first four centuries. This understanding was coupled to a purist notion in faith and practice in pursuit of the pure Primitive Church they sought to emulate. Scrupulosity in the arena of piety and moral theology imparted to their world-view a very serious quality so evident in the piety of Bonwicke and Law. And, if obedience to God characterized their mentality, interpretation was necessary for this obedience to be practiced. The later Nonjurors — following Hicke's decision to consecrate three new bishops in 1713 — increasingly laid greater weight on the place of Tradition for the authority. The balance of Scripture, Tradition, and Reason followed by Anglicans in differing proportions since Richard Hooker's time, was pushed by the Usagers to give the greatest weight to Tradition ever seen within the Church of England. And, Tradition, in their view, meant that pure Cyprianist Age. The Usages Controversy divided their already small community over the notion of authority to Tradition; but it also pushed the Usagers into the creation of a new liturgy in 1718, one they imagined represented the ancient British Use, and forged their resolve to reunite with the Eastern Orthodox Patriarchs.

The Nonjurors proved remarkably adept at adapting to their new situation. Deprived of their pulpits they employed printing presses. Print culture, a very eighteenth-century industry, proved powerful in their hands under William Bowyer's lead and during the Bangorian Controversy. Their literature was an inspiration to High Church Tories who were willing to accept nonjuring inspiration but unwilling to leave everything and follow them into deprivation. Many admired the Nonjurors because of their integrity; their sacrifice imbued their small numbers with authenticity in an age where

that quality was in short supply; and their ideas gave to the various “Church in Danger” controversies, like Occasional Conformity, an intellectual underpinning.

Remarkably, they began to see themselves as living in sacred time, not just in sacred times, but also in a *kairotic* arena in which their ideas truly mattered in the contemporary chronology. This gave them a boldness exhibited in their scholarship, their apologetical efforts, the Bangorian Controversy, their spiritual writing, liturgical creativity, and the ecumenical overtures to the Eastern Orthodox. Time and time again, they demonstrated a willingness not to hide but to engage the society in ways that mattered. Their often brilliant scholars enriched the life of the academic world. Places such as St John’s College, Cambridge, the college of Ambrose Bonwicke, became Nonjuror strongholds and served to train the next generation. All the while, they were deprived from taking the degrees they earned or holding the positions for which they otherwise would have been most qualified.

Throughout all of this they developed a clear mentality that shaped their motives and actions. Those five ideas operated synergistically to create the Nonjurors’ world; it was this synergy, combined with the integrity of their position that gave them influence well beyond their size for at least three decades. If Nonjurors had one foot in the seventeenth century and the other in the eighteenth, they increasingly saw things in the longest possible trajectory. Concepts like “short-term” or “expediency” were missing from their minds. Ultimately, some of them approached the solutions to their quest in virtually mystical terms. In many ways these most conservative of Anglican Christians were centuries ahead of their time.

Looking back at John Lake's Dying Declaration — or Ken's or Hicke's — we see their mentality clearly. Hicke had written, in his dying declaration, these words:

I profess and declare the Church of England, as it was governed and administered by true, and lawful, and rightful Bishops before the *Revolution*, to have been a true and sound Part of the Catholick Church; and I testify my unalterable Adherence to all the Doctrines of it contained in the Thirty-Nine Articles, in Opposition to the corrupt and dangerous Doctrine and Practices of the Roman Church ... Accordingly, I am fully persuaded and declare, that the Church of *England* now consists in the deprived Bishops, so called, and that faithful Remnant which adheres to them, and that the other Archbishops and Bishops, and the great Majority adhering to them are guilty of a great schism to be lamented by all good Christians.¹

George Hicke's escape in the night at Shottesbrooke showed the force of their sacrifice and struggle to promote those ideas. Henry Dodwell's magisterial scholarship in the patristic literature was an apologetical underpinning for many High Churchmen as well as Nonjurors. Charles Leslie's pen and *Rehearsal* showed just what journalism could do to promote their worldview. Jeremy Collier's historical writing and critique of the London theater showed how no popular arena was left unaware of the Nonjurors' scrutiny. William Bowyer's apologetical printing presses handled inflammatory material with prudence and professionalism. William Law's *Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life*, put into practice at King's Cliffe, was a Nonjuring call to England to reform. Ambrose Bonwicke's pursuit of perfection and ascent to glory in his Cambridge study chamber was a transparent model of what many Nonjurors believed their ideal. Whether in word or deed, scheme or study, in public criticism or private devotion, they saw themselves creating a more pure church and offering more perfect praise to God. Through obedience, Cyprianist thinking, a hybridized notion of sacred time, using printing presses

¹ George Hicke, *A Declaration made by the Right Reverend Dr. George Hicke, concerning the Faith and Religion in which he lived and intended to die: and referred to in his Will* (London: 1743)

as pulpits, or global schemes of Eastern ecumenism, they saw themselves creating an infrastructure much like Hicckes's words to Ken in 1699: "In His good time God will raise large and lovely structures of pure and primitive-like communion upon the foundations we shall lay ...making it fuller and more fit for a reformed communion that desires to be primitive and truly catholic in everything."²

Praise God, from whom all blessings flow,
Praise Him, all Creatures here below,
Praise Him above, y^e Angelick [*ye Heavenly*] Host,
Praise Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.³
Thomas Ken

²George Hicckes, "Letter to Thomas Ken, October 24, 1699" in The College Papers, folio 6, 20. (Edinburgh: The Scottish Episcopal church Theological College), cited in Henry Broxap, *The Later Non-jurors*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1924), 6.

³Thomas Ken, "A Morning Hymn" in E. H. Plumptre, *The Life of Thomas Ken, D.D. Bishop of Bath and Wells* (London: Wm. Isbister Limited, 1890), 210-215. Ken wrote three hymns – for Morning, Evening, and Midnight – all concluded with this familiar doxology.

Figure 2:
Ambrose Bonwicke's Self-Examination before Receiving Holy Communion

The best Preparation for the Holy Sacrament, is to endeavour to live constantly according to the Precepts of the Gospel, which will fit a Man to receive at any Time.

Having endeavoured to lay a firm foundation of Faith, by God's Grace, I proceed now, relying upon the same Grace, to form such resolutions as may make my Practice suitable thereto, and conformable to God's holy Will. In the first Place I solemnly renew my baptismal Vow, (begging Pardon humbly for any rash ones that I have since made) my Part of which, *viz* all that is to be performed by me, I find summed up by the Apostle⁴ in these Words: *That denying Ungodliness and worldly Lusts, we live godly, righteously and soberly in this present world;* which is excellently paraphrased in our Church Catechism, summing up all the End of the Ten Commandments, the Whole of Duty to God, our Neighbour and our selves.

I. I resolve therefore, as 'tis my Duty, to believe in God; i.e. to believe in the Holy Scriptures which are his Word, taking all the Laws therein recited for his Laws, and the Promises of Pardon and Happiness to the Penitent, and the Threatenings of Death to the Impenitent, for his Promises and Threatenings; and to make this effectual, I'll endeavour to walk by Faith, not by Sight, that so I may not be deceived by the false Baits of Sin, nor prefer momentary to eternal Pleasures. This will encourage me in Self-Denial, and comfort me under all Calamities.

II. I resolve to fear God, and to love him with all my Heart, with all my Mind, with all my Soul, and with all my Strength: I'll endeavour therefore not to do any Thing that may offend him, and for his Sake will do all that he bids me. I'll endeavour always to be looking upon God, as always looking upon me, which shall make me not dare to do any ill Action in his Sight, that I would not do before Men. And since God sees my inward Thoughts, I'll endeavour as much to watch over the Motions of my Heart as my outward Actions, that they may not be wicked nor vain, proud, lustful, etc. or hindring my Studies. To which End 'twill be useful to keep my Mind fixed on good or innocent Objects, and to examine all Thoughts of Moment as they come into my Mind, that by letting an unexamined Thought harbour in my Breast, I be not drawn into Sin: Not as if I could examine every one, but such only as have the Face of Sin. I'm resolved to love God as the greatest of Goods, and hate Sin as the worst of Evils, which Love I must shew, by endeavouring always to please him in avoiding that; and in all my Expressions of Love to my Fellow Creatures, so to love the Person, as yet to hate his Sins; and so to hate his Sins, as to love the Person. I'll endeavour habitually to desire spiritual Mercies more than Temporal, and these only in Reference to them; and therefore to subject my Affections to my Reason, and this to the Word of God.

⁴ Titus ii.12.

III. I resolve to worship God, to give him Thanks, to put my whole Trust in him: *i.e.* In his Providence for outward Supplies as I need 'em, In his Mercy for Pardon of Sins when I repent of them, and in his Spirit for Grace and inward Aid when I endeavour together with him. And thus trusting in God, I'll endeavour to arm my self with that Spiritual Courage and Magnanimity, as to press thro' all Duties and Difficulties whatsoever, for the Advancement of God's Glory and my own Happiness. I'll endeavour to conquer those childish Fears I've formerly been troubled with; the surest Remedy against which is always to keep a good Conscience. I will call on God devoutly in my religious Address to him. I'll be devout at Publick Prayers, and at home I must take Care to strike as great an Awe of the Divine Presence into my Mind, as if I were at Church. To prevent Indevotion, I'll take Care to meditate before Hand seriously, and fix in my Mind and Awe of the tremendous Majesty I am going to Address, take fitting Opportunities when I am best inclined to, and prepared for Prayer. To which end 'twill be useful as often as I can to say my Evening Prayers before nine, my Noon, especially at home, before six o'th'Clock. I must reject all wandering Thoughts, and to prevent their intruding, 'twill be useful to keep my Eyes fixed on my Book in Chapel, or shut or covered, or so fixed upwards, or some Way, that they bring not in Matter for wandring Thoughts. I'll endeavour to behave my self decently in Chapel, bridling my Tongue from loose Talk and jesting, and not speaking without Necessity during divine Service; and not minding what others do to my own Hindrance, by unnecessary bowing, etc in Prayer Time: And be as devout as I can at singing of Psalms, Anthems, etc. I'll take Care to allow my self a fit Time for sacramental Preparation, and to facilitate it, be careful over my nightly Examinations; and besides, unless lawfully or unavoidably hindered, allow half a Day for such Preparation.

IV. I resolve *to honour his holy Name and his Word*: And therefore to make his holy Word the Rule of all my Actions, as that which contains fully all my Duty. And I will endeavour so seriously to hear and read it, as that I may constantly be conformed by it in well-doing, and also perfected in my Knowledge of what I am to believe, and particularly practice in order to my eternal Salvation. To this End also I must be attentive to Sermons, which for my Improvement 'twill be useful to write down on Holy-Days as my Circumstances will permit, not scrupling sometimes to omit it for a greater Good, or other lawful Hindrance.

V. I resolve *to serve God truly, all the Days of my Life*. I will therefore endeavour to do every Thing in Obedience to the Will of God with a right Intention of Mind; especially my Acts of Charity: And make his Glory the Aim of all my Designs ultimately, tho' I'm not obliged particularly and immediately to design in every single Action. To make these Endeavours the more effectual, I set my self these Rules, and must take Care not to venture on any Action of Moment, where I can deliberate, 'till I know 'tis lawful, lest by doubting I make all my Actions sinful; and as for sudden Acts, 'tis the safest Way not to venture on what I have condemned already, till I am convinced fully of my Mistake. The best Way to serve God is to make Christ my Pattern, where I doubt, asking my self, what he would do; always judging, that what he had commanded in Scripture he would do, or what is not expressly or implicitly forbidden there. In all my Behaviour I'll endeavour to be considerate, and never do any Thing that in my Conscience I am persuaded is unlawful, nor obstinately oppose the Motions of God's Holy Spirit exciting me to do my

Duty, nor wholly disregard the inward Whisperings of my Conscience, but incline to them as far as they are necessary, and my Affairs will permit; but take Care too not to be led into unnecessary Scruples and Superstition thereby. I must not indulge my own Corrupt Inclinations contrary to Scripture and reason, nor break rashly a well weighed Resolution; and take Care not to be imposed on by specious Suggestions and false Reasoning. 'Twill be proper for me to follow my Father's Advice and good Examples, especially in relation to Swearers, and using Gaming or vain Recreations on Fast-Days; and in all real momentous Doubts to incline to the safest Side.

VI. I resolve, as 'tis my Duty, *to love my Neighbour as my self, and to do unto all Men as I would they should do unto me.* To love and honour, and when Need is, to succour my Father and Mother. I'll endeavour to practice the great Duty of Charity in all its Branches, being the true Love of God and our Neighbour, and to do good to all in the best Way that I can with Prudence and Discretion.

VII. I resolve *to honour and obey the King, and all that are put in Authority,* actively or passively: And in the Circumstances I am at present, to direct my self according to a good Rule of my Father's.

VIII. I resolve *to submit my self to all my spiritual Pastors, and all my Governours, and to shew Reverence to all my Betters:* I'll endeavour therefore to carry my self with due Respect to my Superiors, with Condescension to my Inferiors, and civilly to all, guarding my self against proud, surly, insolent Behaviour even to the meanest; and giving my Betters all the Respect they justly require, and their Titles in Opposition to the mad Notions of Quakers, etc. To this Purpose I ought often to consider that the meanest of my Fellow -Creatures in some Measure excel me, and therefore be willing to undergo little Injuries, Deficiencies in their service, and small Affronts.

IX. I resolve *to bear no Malice nor Hatred in my Heart, to hurt no body by Word or Deed, but to be true and just in all my Dealing.* To this Purpose I'll particularly guard against Anger and hasty Speeches; and that I may not Sin by Anger, take Care it be placed on a due Object, and do not exceed its proper Bounds. I must not be *hasty in my Spirit,*⁵ but *defer my Anger* according to *Discretion.*⁶ I'll take Care never to speak Evil of any, unless Justice or Charity or some good Reason oblige me to it, so as to do him no Harm, and to keep from the greater Fault. I'll not indulge my self in idle Tales, and Censurings of others, lest I wound my Neighbour's Credit, and his Charity to whom I speak: And to take away all Occasion of this, not hear with Pleasure Evil of others, and when I do , conceal it, unless good Reason call it forth. To avoid Anger, it will be useful to be prepared to bear little Affronts, and not to resolve in my Mind Aggravations of Injuries, and avoid Peevishness about Meats, etc.

⁵ Ecclesiastes vii.9.

⁶ Proverbs xix.11.

X. I resolve *to keep my Hands from picking and stealing, and my Tongue from evil speaking, lying and slandering.* To govern my Tongue I will endeavour always to set a Watch before my Mouth, avoid much speaking, consider as well as I can what I speak, and take Care that *no corrupt communication proceed out of my mouth,*⁷ but what is beneficial, or at least harmless. I'll avoid all vain Swearing, and endeavour to reprove it in others as I can, and some Way or other shew my Dislike to such Company, endeavouring to be very uneasy at hearing God's Holy Name profaned, not rashly venturing amongst common Swearers, and if no other Method will do, leaving such Company as soon as I can. I'll take Care too to avoid all Lying, making my Intentions conditionally, and not indulging jesting Lyes. I'll avoid carefully rash Execrations and swearing in Thought, and not help out Discourse with scandalous Stories, but as prudently as I can discountenance such Talk, and vindicate my Neighbour's injured Credit as well as I can. And that I may not be censorious or uncharitable, and have unjust Suspicions and mean Opinions of others without reason, I'll take Care not to be proud and self-conceited my self, but meek and humble, often calling to Mind my great and crying Sins.

XI. I resolve *to keep my Body in Temperance, Soberness and Chastity, and not to covet other Mens Goods.* I'll endeavour to avoid all Manner of Uncleaness, and all filthy Company, never by smiling, etc. countenancing any obscene Jests; but beating down all impure Thoughts, and irregular Fancies, at their first Beginning, not consenting to the least Approach towards Uncleaness, which my Conscience shall check me for. I'll endeavour upon the first true Sense of having drunk enough to leave off, and tho', perhaps, I could bear more, yet deny my self, lest I be ensnared unawares by little Springs and Dissimulations. I must take Care that Hunger or Carelessness do not make me omit saying Grace devoutly to my Meals; and endeavour by my Example, and other prudent Means, to bring others to this good Practice.

XII. I resolve *to be diligent in my own Calling, and to do my Duty in that Stare of Life, to which it hath, or shall, please God to call me.* To this End I'll take Care to do all my Actions with Prudence and Discretion, endeavouring to bestow my Charity with a due Proportion to what God has given, or rather lent me to be accounted for. I'll be wary in the Choice of my Company and Friends, and faithful and constant to those I shall enter into a State of Friendship with, as I desire my Friend should be to me. I'll endeavour by a double Diligence in my Studies, especially, if possible, to redeem my past Time, employing all the Gifts and Endowments both of Body and Soul to the Glory and Service of my great Creator, improving the Talents he hath given me, to his Honour, and my Neighbour's Benefit; endeavouring to improve good Thoughts into holy Actions, and to take Afflictions as Tokens of his Mercy to me, and to amend under them. I'll take Care that my Recreations be innocent, and take not up too much of my Time, suiting them to the particular Circumstances I may be in; and not be overscrupulous about them, nor childish in my Behaviour, chiefly regarding my Health and Reputation, and watching that I be not drawn to Covetousness, Anger, cheating or tamely hearing Swearing in them, so as to seem to comply with it; and therefore 'twill be best to avoid much Play, or, with others, than known Acquaintance. To avoid Idleness I must take Care not to loiter away

⁷ Ephesians iv.29.

my precious Time, especially such as is designed for Devotion, and not let my Friends rashly persuade me to misspend my Time, and must find Employment for broken Hours.

Thus have I endeavoured to fence my self against Sin, by these Rules ... and those which I think most to my present Circumstances, which yet I fear will be most difficult, I have marked with red Lines [the Original was so marked] and purpose to be most careful in observing them.

There follows in the text this prayer:

And now, O my God, I am not able of my self to do any Thing that is good; 'tis thy self, my God and my Guide, that I solely and wholly depend upon. O for thine own Sake, for thy Son's Sake, and for thy Promise Sake, do thou both make me to know what thou wouldst have me to do, and then help me to do it. Teach me first what to resolve upon, and then enable me to perform my Resolutions. Keep me, if it seem good to thee, from Scrupulousness and Superstition, Carelessness and Profaneness; that I may cheerfully walk with thee in the Ways of Holiness here, and rest with thee in the Joys of Happiness hereafter, thro' *Jesus Christ* our Lord. *Amen*

Figure 3: The Nonjurors Liturgy of 1718¹

The Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion

Introductory Rubrics
Introits for Sunday and Holy Days
Salutation and Lesser Litany
Lord's Prayer (priest alone)
Collect for Purity
Summary of the Law
Collect for the King
Collect of the Day
Epistle
Gospel
Nicene Creed
Notices
Sermon or Homily
Exhortations (3)
Offertory (Alms, Bread, Wine) with Sentences
Offertory Collect

The shall the Priest turn to the People and say,

 The Lord be with you.
Answer. And with thy Spirit.
Priest. Lift up your hearts.
Answer. We lift them up unto the Lord.
Priest. Let us give thanks unto our Lord God.
Answer. It is meet and right so to do.

Then shall the Priest turn to the Altar, and say,

It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty, that we should at all times, and in all places, give thanks unto thee, O Lord, holy Father, * almighty everlasting God.

Here shall follow the proper preface according to the time, if there be any specially appointed: or else immediately shall follow,

Therefore with angels and archangels, and with all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify thy glorious Name, evermore praising thee, and saying,

Here the People shall join the Priest, and say,

¹ R.C.D. Jasper and G.J. Cumming, *Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1990), 292-297.

* *These words (holy Father) must be omitted on Trinity Sunday.*

Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Hosts: heaven and earth are full of thy glory: Hosanna in the highest: Blessed is he that cometh in the Name of the Lord: Glory be to thee, O Lord most high. Amen.

[I have omitted the proper prefaces for Christmas, Easter, Ascension, Whitsunday, and Trinity Sunday here; they were originally printed *in situ*]

Immediately after, the Priest shall say,

Holiness is thy nature, and thy gift, O Eternal King: Holy is thine only begotten Son our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom thou hast made the worlds; Holy is thine Ever-blessed Spirit, who searchest all things, even the depths of thine infinite perfection. Holy art thou, almighty and merciful God; thou createdst Man in thine own image, broughtest him into Paradise, and didst place him in a state of dignity and pleasure: And when he had lost his happiness by transgressing thy command, thou of thy goodness didst not abandon and despise him. Thy Providence was still continued, thy law was given to revive the sense of his duty, thy Prophets were commissioned to reclaim and instruct him. And when the fullness of time was come, thou didst send thine only begotten Son to satisfy thy Justice, to strengthen our Nature, and renew thine Image within us: For these glorious ends thine Eternal Word came down from heaven, was incarnate by the holy Ghost, born of the Blessed Virgin, conversed with mankind, and directed his life and miracles to our salvation: And when his hour was come to offer the Propitiatory Sacrifice upon the Cross; when he who had no sin himself, mercifully undertook to suffer death for our sins, in the same night that he was betrayed (a) took bread; and when he had given thanks, (b) he brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take eat, (c) THIS IS MY BODY, which is given for you, Do this in remembrance of me.

Here the People shall answer. Amen

Then shall the Priest say,

Likewise after Supper, (d) he took the Cup; and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this, for (e) THIS IS MY BLOOD of the New Testament, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins; Do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me.

Here the People shall answer, Amen.

Then shall the Priest say,

^a *Here the Priest is to take the Paten into his hands:*

^b *And here to break the Bread;*

^c *And here he is to lay his hands upon all the Bread.*

^d *Here he is to take the Cup into his hands:*

^e *And here to lay his hand upon every vessel (be it Chalice or Flagon) in which there is any Wine and Water to be consecrated.*

Wherefore, having in remembrance his Passion, Death, and Resurrection from the dead; his Ascension into heaven, and second coming with glory and great power to judge the quick and the dead, and to render to every man according to his works; we Offer to Thee, our King and our God, according to his holy Institution, this Bread and this Cup; giving thanks to thee through him, that thou hast vouchsafed us the honour to stand before thee, and to Sacrifice unto thee. And we beseech thee to look favourably on these thy gifts, which we are here set before thee, O thou self-sufficient God: And do thou accept them to the honour of thy Christ; and send down thine Holy Spirit, the witness of the Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, upon this Sacrifice, that he may make this ^(^f) Bread the Body of thy Christ, and ^(^g) this Cup the Blood of thy Christ; that they who are partakers thereof, may be confirmed in godliness, may obtain remission of their sins, may be delivered from the Devil and his snares, may be replenished with the Holy Ghost, may be made worthy of thy Christ, and may obtain everlasting life, Thou, O Lord Almighty, being reconciled unto thee through the merits and mediation of thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ; who, with thee and the Holy Ghost, liveth and reigneth ever one God, world without end. Amen.

Almighty and everliving God, who by thy holy Apostle hast taught us to make prayers and supplications, to give thanks for all men; we humbly beseech thee most mercifully to accept these our oblations, and to receive these our prayers, which we offer unto thy Divine Majesty, beseeching thee to inspire continually the Universal Church with the Spirit of truth, unity, and concord; and grant that all they that do confess thy holy Name, may agree in the truth of thy holy Word, and live immunity and godly love. Give grace, O heavenly Father, to all Bishops and Curates, that they may both by their life and doctrine set forth thy true and lively Word, and rightly and duly administer thy Holy Sacraments. We beseech thee also to save and defend all Christian kings, princes, and governours; and especially thy servant our King, that under him we may be godly and quietly governed: and grant unto his whole Council and to all that are put in authority under him, that they may truly and indifferently minister justice, to the punishment of wickedness and vice, and to the maintenance of thy true religion and virtue. And to all thy people give thy heavenly grace, that with meek heart and due reverence they may hear and receive thy holy Word, truly serving thee in holiness and righteousness all the days of their life. And we commend especially unto thy merciful goodness this congregation, which is here assembled in thy Name to celebrate the commemoration of the most glorious death of thy Son. And we most humbly beseech thee of thy goodness, O Lord, to comfort and succour all them, who in this transitory life are in trouble, sorrow, need, sickness, or any other adversity; (*especially those for whom are prayers are desired.**) And here we do give unto thee most high praise and hearty thanks, for the wonderful grace and virtue declared in all thy Saints, from the beginning of the world; and particularly in the glorious and ever-blessed Virgin Mary, mother of thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord and God; and in the holy Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, and Confessors; whose examples, O Lord, and stedfastness in thy faith and keeping thy holy commandments, grant us to follow. We commend unto thy mercy, O Lord, all thy Servants, who are departed from us with the sign of faith, and now do rest in the sleep of peace: Grant unto them, we beseech thee, thy mercy and everlasting peace; and at the day of the general resurrection, we and all they who are of the mystical Body of thy Son, may altogether be set

^f Here the Priest is to lay his hands upon the Bread.

^g And here upon every vessel (be it Chalice or Flagon) in which there is any Wine and Water.

on his right hand, and hear that his most joyful voice: Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the Kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. Grant this, O Father, for Jesus Christ's sake, our only Mediator and Advocate. Amen.

** This is to be said when any desire the Prayers of the Congregation.*

The shall the Priest say the Lord's Prayer, the People repeating after him every Petition: Our Father, which ... for ever and ever. Amen

Then shall the Priest turn to the People and say:

The Peace of the Lord be always with you.

Answer. And with thy spirit.

Priest. Christ, our Paschal Lamb, is offered up for us, once for all, when he bare our sins in his body upon the Cross, for he is the very Lamb of God, that taketh away the sins of the world: Wherefore let us keep a joyful and holy feast unto the Lord.

Then the Priest shall say to all those that come to receive the Holy Communion:

INVITATION: "Ye that do truly..."

CONFESSION: "Almighty God, Father of our Lord ..."

ABSOLUTION: "Almighty God, our heavenly Father ..."

COMFORTABLE WORDS

PRAYER OF HUMBLE ACCESS: "We do not presume ..."

Then shall the Bishop if he be present, or else the Priest that officiateth, kneel down and receive the Communion in both kinds himself, and then proceed to deliver the same to other Bishops, Priests, and Deacons in like manner, if any be present; and after that to the People also in order into their hands, all meekly kneeling. And when he delivereth the Sacrament of the Body of Christ to any one, he shallk say:

The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy Body and Soul unto everlasting life.

And the Priest or Deacon that delivereth the Sacrament of the Blood of Christ to any one, shall say:

The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy Body and Soul unto everlasting life.

Here the Person receiving shall say: Amen.

COMMUNION

PRAYER OF THANKSGIVING

GLORIA IN EXCELSIS

BLESSING

FINAL COLLECTS AND RUBRICS

Bibliography

Primary Sources

[A.B.] *The mystery of phanaticism: or the artifices of dissenters to support their schism. Together with the evil and danger of them. Set forth in fourteen letters to a friend. Wherein is made appear, That nothing but the Subtilty and Cunning of their Teachers, doth hinder the People from conformity. By a divine of the Church of England. This work was perus'd in Manuscript and greatly approv'd by Archbishop Sancroft, Bishop Kenn, Mr. Kettlewell, Dr. Aldrich, Dean of Christ-Church Oxon, Dr. Jane, &c. to whom the author was well-known and admir'd for his Learning and firm Adherence to the Principles of real Christianity.* 1698 London, 1742.

All the Advertisements and Letters by the Lord Bishop of Bangor, Dr. Snape, Lord Bishop of Carlisle, Dr Kennett, etc. As they were inserted in the Publick Prints, 4; and A Collection of Papers Scatter's lately about the Town in the Daily-Courant, St. James's-Post, &c. with Some Remarks upon them. In a Letter from the Bishop of Carlisle to the Bishop of Bangor. London, 1717.

All the Advertisements and Letters by the Lord Bishop of Bangor, Dr. Snape, Lord Bishop of Carlisle, Dr Kennett, etc. As they were inserted in the Publick Prints. To which is added A Complete Catalogue of all the Sermons and Pamphlets, for and against the Bishop of Bangor's Sermon in the Order they were publish'd, 2nd ed. London, 1717.

Allestree, Richard. *The Gentleman's calling. Written by the author of The whole duty of man.* London, 1705.

———. *The Ladies calling in two parts. By the author of The whole duty of man* Oxford, 1720.

———. *The Whole Duty of Man, laid down in a plain and familiar way for the use of all.* London, 1703.

[Amhurst, Nicholas?] *A congratulatory epistle from His Holiness the Pope, to the Reverend Dr. Snape. Faithfully translated from the Latin original into English verse.* London, 1718.

Astell, Mary, and John Norris. *Letters concerning the love of God.* 1695 London; Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate Publishing, 2005.

Astell, Mary. *A fair way with the dissenters and their patrons. Not Writ by Mr. L-----y, or any other Furious Jacobite, whether Clergyman or Layman; but by a very Moderate Person and Dutiful Subject to the Queen.* London, 1704.

———. *A Serious Proposal*. London: 1694.

———. *Some reflections Upon Marriage*. London, 1703. Second edition; First published in 1700 as “Some reflections upon marriage occasioned by the Duke and Dutchess of Mazarine’s case”

Baker, Thomas. “A Bookplate” in St. John’s College, Cambridge archives: http://www.joh.cam.ac.uk/library/special_collections/early_books/pix/provenance/baker/baker.htm, [accessed 7 August 2012].

Ballard, George. *Memoirs of several ladies of Great Britain, who have been celebrated for their writings or skill in the learned languages arts and sciences*. Oxford, 1752.

Barrington, John Shutte. *The layman’s letter to the Bishop of Bangor: or, an examination of His Lordship’s preservative against the nonjurors; Of the Vindication of the Realm and Church of England; Of the Nonjurors Separation from Publick Assemblies, examin’d, by Dr. Bennet; and of all other late discourses, occasion’d by the Charge of Perjury, Rebellion and Schism, imputed to the Body of the People*. London, 1716.

———. *The layman’s second letter to the Bishop of Bangor: or, an examination of His Lordship’s sermon before the King. And of Dr. Snape’s letter to his Lordship*. London, 1717.

———. *A dissuasive from Jacobitism: shewing in general what the nation is to expect from a Popish King; and in particular, from the Pretender*. London, 1713.

[Bedford, Hilckiah?] *A vindication of the late Archbishop Sancroft, and of his brethren the rest of the depriv’d bishops, from the reflections of Mr. Marshal in his Defence of our constitution in church and state: Particularly with regard to their Refusing to publish an Abhorrence of the Prince of Orange’s Invasion; their Meeting at Guild-Hall, and their Endeavours for a Regency. In a letter to a friend*. London, 1717.

Bennet, Thomas. “Preface.” In *The Nonjurors Separation from the Public Assemblies of the Church of England examin’d, and prov’d to be scismatical, upon their own principles*. London, 1716.

Biographium fæmineum. The female worthies: or, memoirs of the most illustrious ladies, of all ages and nations, ... Collected from history, and the most approved biographers, ... In two volumes. London, 1766.

Birch, Thomas. *The Life of the most reverend Dr. John Tillotson, lord archbishop of*

Canterbury, compiled chiefly from his original papers and letters, 2nd edition.
n.p.,1753

Blackbourne, John. *The Life of the R. Reverend Mr. Nathaniel Spinckes, By the Reverend John Blackbourne*. n.p.

Bonwicke, Ambrose, "An undated letter to his wife." In Sylvanus Urban (ed) *The Gentleman's Magazine and Historical Chronicle* Vol XLVIII. London, 1778.

Bonwicke, Ambrose. *A pattern for young students in the university, set forth in the life of Mr. Ambrose Bonwicke, sometime scholar of St. John's College in Cambridge* Londo,1729.

The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church according to the Use of the Church of England. 1662. Standard edition.

The Bowyer Ledgers: The Printing Accounts of William Bowyer Father and Son Reproduced on Microfiche, With a Checklist of Bowyer Printing 1699-1777, A Commentary, Indexes, and Appendixes, edited by Keith Maslen and John Lancaster. London: The Bibliographical Society, 1991.

Brett, Thomas. *An Account of Church Government and Governors*. 2nd ed. London, 1710.

———. *Dr. Bennet's concessions to the non-jurors prov'd to be destructive of the cause, which he endeavours to defend; as they make the nonjurors to be the Catholicks, and his own communion to be schismatical. In a letter to a friend*. London, 1717.

———. *Dr. Brett's Vindication of Himself from the Calumnies Thrown upon Him in Some Late Newspapers, wherin He is falsely Charged with Turning Papist*. London, 1715.

———. *The Divine Right of Episcopacy, and the Necessity of an Episcopal Commission for Preaching God's Word, and for the Valid Ministration of the Christian Sacraments, Proved from the Scriptures and the Doctrine and Practice of the Primitive Church*. London, 1718.

———. *Farther Proof of the Necessity of Tradition, to Explain and Interpret the Holy Scriptures*. London, 1720.

———. *Tradition Necessary to Explain and interpret the Holy Scriptures. With a Postscript, In Answer to that Part of a Book Lately Published (call'd, No Sufficient Reason for Restoring the Prayers and Directions of King Edward the Sixth's First Liturgy) Which seems to Depreciate Tradition. And a Prface , containing Some Remark's on Mr Toland's Nazarenus*. London, 1718.

Brokesby, Francis. *An history of the government of the primitive church, for the Three First Centuries, and the Beginning of the Fourth. Shewing That the Church in those first Ages, as it has been ever since, was governed by Bishops, or Officers superior to Presbyters. Wherein also the Suggestions of David Blondel to the contrary are considered.* London, 1712.

———. *The divine right of church-government by bishops, its universal reception, even in the first ages of the church, asserted and proved. D. Blondel's and others arguments against it considered. The challenge renewed, To shew any Church, till lately, that hath not been Governed by Episcopal Government. And a Perswasive to Dissenters to return to the Communion of the Church of England. Being a Preliminary Discourse to an History of the Government of the Church, for the Three First Centuries and the beginning of the Fourth.* London, 1714.

———. *The works of the learned Mr. Henry Dodwell abridg'd: with an account of his life. By Francis Brokesby, B.D. To which is added, an abstract of Mr. Dodwell's book De cyclis; by Edm. Halley, LL. D. Astron. Reg. Geom. Prof. Savil. & R.S.S.* London, 1723.

Bullock, Christopher. *The Per-Juror.* London, 1717.

Burnet, Gilbert. *The abridgment of The history of the reformation of the Church of England. By Gilbert Burnet, D. D. Late Lord Bishop of Sarum.* London, 1718.

———. *An answer to Mr. Law's letter to the Lord Bishop of Bangor, in a letter to Mr. Law.* Londo, 1717.

———. *The Bishop of Salisbury's new preface to his pastoral care, consider'd, with respect to the following heads, viz. I. The qualifications of the clergy. II The distinction of high and low church. III. The present posture of affairs.* 3rd ed. London, 1713.

———. *A collection of several tracts and discourses written in the years 1677, to 1704.* 3 vols. London, 1704.

———. *A Discourse of the Pastoral Care.* London, 1713.

———. *The present state of Jacobitism in England. A Second part. In answer to the first.* London, 1702.

———. *Reflections on ... 'Some Discourses.'* London, 1696.

———. *A sermon preached at the funeral of the Most Reverend Father in God, John Tillotson, by divine providence, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate and Metropolitan of all England. Who died at Lambeth the 22d day of November,*

in the 65th Year of his Age: and was buried at St. Lawrence Jewry, in London, on the 30th of that month, anno Dom. 1694. By the Right Reverend Father in God. Gilbert Lor Bishop of Sarum. London, 1709.

A Catalogue of Several Libraries and Collections of Books, Lately Purchased by Benjamin White ... including those of John Neville, and Dr. Cornwall Tathwell ... the Sale begins in February, 1774. London, 1774.

Chishull, Edmund. *The excellency of a proper, charitable relief. A sermon preach'd before the Sons of the Clergy, at their anniversary-meeting in the Cathedral church of St. Paul. December the 2d, 1714. By Edmund Chishull, B.D. Chaplain in Ordinary to His Majesty. With an Appendix, containing an Account of this Charitable Institution, and the Particulars of Dr. Turner's Will. London, 1714.*

Cibber, Colley. *The non-Juror. A comedy. As it is acted at the Theatre-Royal, by His Majesty's servants. Written by Mr. Cibber. London, 1718.*

[Collier, Jeremy?]. *A Brief Essay concerning the Independence of Church Power. London, 1692.*

Collier, Jeremy. *A Defence of the Reasons, Some Prayers and Directions of King Edward the Sixth's First Liturgy: Being a Reply to a Book, Entitled, No reason for Restoring Them. London, 1718.*

———. *The Desertion Discussed in a Letter to a Country Gentleman. London, 1689.*

———. *An Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain, Chiefly of England: From the First Planting of Christianity, in the Island, With a Brief Account of the Affairs of Religion in Ireland. Collected from the best Ancient Historians, Councils, and Records. 2 vols. London, 1714.*

———. *An Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain Chiefly of England from the First Planting of Christianity, to the End of the Reign of Charles the Second. New Edition. 9 vols. 1714; London, 1845.*

———. *Mr. Collier's Dissuasive from the Play-House. London, 1703.*

———. *A Representation of the Impiety and Immorality of the English Stage in The English Stage: Attack and Defense 1577-1730, edited by Arthur Freeman. Boston: Boston University Press, 1973.*

———. *A Short View of the Immorality, and Profaneness of the English Stage together with the Sense of Antiquity upon this Argument. London, 1698.*

———. *A short view of the profaneness and immorality of the English stage,*

&c. *With the several defences of the same. In answer to Mr. Congreve, Dr. Drake, &c. By Jeremy Collier, A.M.* London, 1730.

——— *A Short View of the Immorality and Prophaneness of the English Stage by Jeremy Collier, A Critical Edition.* 1698; New York: Garland Publishing, 1987.

———. *Some Thoughts Concerning the Stage in a Letter to a Lady.* London, 1704.

———. “Upon Pride” in *Essays Upon Several Subjects.* London, 1698.

———. “Of Whoredom.” In *Essays Upon Several Moral Subjects.* London, 1707.

Collins, [?]. *Howell and Hoadly; Or The Church of England Crucify'd Between TWO _____ Being An Account of the fatal Effects of Religious Differences in all Ages; With Some Thoughts of what may be the Consequences to the Church of England, from the present Dispute.* Dublin, 1717.

Convocation of Canterbury. *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. Read in the Lower House, May 10, 1717. And Voted, Nemine Contradicente, to be Receiv'd and Entred upon the Books of the said House. Published from the original report, 2nd ed.* London, 1717.

De la Pryme, Abraham. *The Diary of Abraham de la Pryme, The Yorkshire Antiquary.* Durham: Andres and Company, 1869.

Defoe, Daniel. *A Short View of the Present State of the Protestant Religion in Britain: As it is Now Profest in the Episcopal Church in England, the Presbyterian Church in Scotland, and the Dissenters in Both. as it is Now Profest in the Episcopal Church in England, the Presbyterian Church in Scotland, and the Dissenters in Both.* n.p., 1707.

Dodwell, Henry *A case in view consider'd: in a discourse, proving that in case our present invalidly deprived fathers shall leave all their sees vacant, either by death or resignation we shall not then be obliged to keep up our separation from those bishops, who are as yet involved in the guilt of the present unhappy schism.* By Henry Dodwell, M.A. London, 1705.

Dodwell, Henry. *The case in view, now in fact, proving, that the Continuance of a separate communion, without substitutes in any of the late invalidly-deprived sees, since the death of William late Lord Bishop of Norwich, is schismatical.* London, 1711.

Dodwell, Henry. *Dissertationes Cyprianicae*. Oxford, 1684.

———. *The Doctrine of the Church of England, Concerning the Independency of the Clergy on the Lay Power, as to those Rights which are Purely Spiritual, Reconciled with our Oath of Supremacy, and the Lay Deprivation of the Popish Bishops in the Beginning of the Reformation*. London, 1697.

———. *A further prospect of The case in view, in answer to some New Objections Not There Considered*. London, 1707.

———. *A Vindication of the Deprived Bishops*. London, 1695.

Fénelon, François de Salignac de La Mothe-. *The Adventures of Telemachus the son of Ulysses. In five parts. Translated from the French. The third edition corrected. To which is added, The adventures of Aristonous*. London, 1701.

———. *Instructions for the education of a daughter, by the author of Telemachus. To which is added, a small tract of instructions for the Conduct of Young Ladies of the Highest Rank. With Suitable Devotions Annexed. Done into English, and revised by Dr. George Hickes*. London, 1707.

Finch, Anne. *Miscellany poems, on several occasions. Written by a lady*. London, 1713.

———. *Miscellany poems, on several occasions. Written by a lady*. London, 1713.

———. *The Anne Finch Wellesley Manuscript Poems: A Critical Edition*, edited by Barbara McGovern and Charles H. Hinnant. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1998.

———. *The spleen, a pindarique ode. By a lady. Together with A prospect of death: a pindarique essay*. London, 1709.

Gandy, Henry. *A conference between Gerontius and Junius. In which Mr. Dodwell's Case in view now in fact is consider'd*. London, 1711.

Grascome, Samuel. *Advice to pious Christians in times of schism and apostacy. Containing first, a resolution of a case of conscience, viz. Whether as Matters now stand, it be lawful to frequent our Parish-Churches for Communion in Divine Worship? With Answers to such Objections as are usually made in Favour of the Compliers. Secondly, a more particular consideration of their case who are deprived of the benefit of canonical ministers, to administer the Sacraments, and discharge other ministerial Offices among them. To which is added Considerations upon a Question, viz. What a Christian is to do who goes into a Country where the Clergy is unwarantable, or the Worship corrupt, or both? With Two Letters to a Friend upon the same Subject*. London, 1719.

[Harbin, George?]. *The hereditary right of the crown of England asserted; the history of the succession since the conquest clear'd; and the true English constitution vindicated from the misrepresentations of Dr. Higden's View and defence. Wherein Some Mistakes also of our Common Historians are rectify'd; and several Particulars relating to the Succession, and to the Title of the House of Suffolk, are now first publish'd from Ancient Records and Original Mss; together with an Authentick Copy of King Henry Viii.'s Will. By a gentleman.* London, 1713.

Thomas Hearne. *An account of all the considerable pamphlets that have been published on either side in the present controversy, between the Bishop of Bangor, and others, to the end of the year MDCCXVIII. With occasional observations on them.* London, 1719.

———. *The life of Mr. Thomas Hearne, of St. Edmund's Hall, Oxford; from his own MS. copy, in the Bodleian Library. Also an accurate catalogue of his writings and publications, from his own MS. Copy, which he designed for the Press. To Which Are Added, Several Plates of the Antiquities, &c. mentioned in his Works. Never Before Printed.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1772.

———. *Remarks and Collections of Thomas Hearne.* Volumes VIII, 1722-1725 and X, 1729-30; Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1907.

———. *The remains of Thomas Hearne: Reliquiae Hearnianae: being extracts from his MS diaries.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1966.

[Hickes, George?]. *An Apology for the New Separation.* London, 1691.

Hickes, George. *An Apology for the New Separation.* London, 1717.

———. *An Apologetical Vindication....* London, 1707.

———. *The Case of Infant Baptism.* London, 1685.

———. *A Collection of Sermons formerly preached by the reverend George Hickes, D.D.* 2 Volumes. London: 1713.

———. *The Constitution of the Catholick Church, and the nature and consequences of schism, set forth in a collection of papers, written by the late R. Reverend George Hickes, D.D.* Hickes. n.p., 1716.

———. *A Declaration made by the Right Reverend Dr. George Hickes, concerning the Faith and Religion in which he lived and intended to die: and referred to in his Will.* London, 1743.

———. *Grammatica Anglo-Saxonica.* Oxford, 1711.

- . *Last Will and Testament*. London, 1716.
- . “Preface.” In *Devotions in the Ancient Way of Offices: With Psalms, Hymns, and Prayers, for Every Day in the Week, and Every Holy Day in the Year, by Susanna Hopton*. 1717; London: Joseph Masters, 1846.
- . *Pretences of the Prince of Wales*. London, 1705.
- . *Queries relating to the Birth*. London, 1714.
- . *Several Letters between Hickes and a Popish Priest*. London, 1706.
- . *Several letters which passed between Dr. George Hickes, and a popish priest, upon occasion of a young gentlewoman’s departing from the Church of England to that of Rome. To which are added I. The answer of Dr. Bull, late Bishop of St. Davids, to the Bishop of Meaux’s queries. II. Mr. Leslie’s answer to the same queries. III. A letter written to an English priest at Rome. With an appendix containing several remarkable papers*. London, 1715.
- . *A second collection of controversial letters relating to the Church of England, and the Church of Rome, as they passed between an honourable lady, and Dr. George Hickes. To which is added a letter written by a gentlewoman of quality to a Romish priest upon her Return from the Church of Rome to the Church of England. And An Answer to some Queries sent by a Roman Catholick to a Divine of the Church of England. With An Appendix to the Controversial Letters*. London, 1710.
- . *Sermons on Several Subjects*, 2 vols. London, 1715.
- . *Some queries propos'd to civil, canon, and common lawyers. Publish'd in London, July 1712. In order to prove the legitimacy of the Pretender. With general remarks upon those queries*. London, 1712.
- . *A Sure Guide to the Holy Sacrament*. London, 1718.
- . *The Spirit of Enthusiasm*. London, 1709.
- . *The Spirit of Fanaticism*. London, 1710.
- . *Thirteen Sermons on Practical Subjects by the late George Hickes published by Nathaniel Spinckes*. London, 1741.
- . *Two treatises: One on the Christian Priesthood, the Other of the Dignity of the Episcopal Order*. London, 1707.

———. *Two Treatises: One on the Christian Priesthood, the Other of the Dignity of the Episcopal Order*, 2 vols., 3rd ed. London, 1711.

———. *Two Treatises: Treatises: One on the Christian Priesthood, the Other of the Dignity of the Episcopal Order*, 3rd Ed. London, 1715.

———. *A Volume of Posthumous Discourse ... with a preface by Nathaniel Spinckes*. London, 1726.

Hippolytus, *The Apostolic Tradition*. Edited by Gregory Dix. London: SPCK, 1937.

Hoadly, Benjamin. *An Answer to a Calumny Cast upon the Bishop of Bangor by the Reverend Dr. Sherlock, Dean of Chichester, At the Conclusion of his New Book, Entitled, A Vindication of the Corporation and Test Acts, etc.* London, 1718.

———. *An answer to the representation drawn up by the Committee of the Lower-House of Convocation concerning several dangerous positions and doctrines contain'd in the Bishop of Bangor's Preservative and Sermon. By Benjamin, Lord Bishop of Bangor*. London, 1718.

———. *The Jacobite's Hopes reviv'd by our late tumults and addresses: Or, Some Necessary Remarks upon a modest pamphlet of Mr. Lesly's Against the Government Entitled the Good Old Cause: Or, Lying in Truth, etc.* London, 1710.

———. *The nature of the kingdom, or church, of Christ. A sermon preach'd before the King, at the Royal chapel at St. James's, on Sunday March 31, 1717. By the Right Reverend Father in God Benjamin Lord Bishop of Bangor. Publish'd by His Majesty's Special Command*. London, 1717.

———. *The Original and Institution of Civil Government, discuss'd*. London, 1709 [or 1710].

———. *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. By the Right Reverend Father in God Benjamin, Lord Bishop of Bangor. Benjamin, Lord Bishop of Bangor*. London, 1716.

———. *The uninterrupted succession of the ecclesiastical mission asserted; and the appeal (in The preservative against the principles and practices of the non-jurors, &c.) to the consciences and common Sense of the Christian laity, discuss'd. Wherein several Antichristian Positions in that Pamphlet are examined, the necessity of the Ecclesiastical Mission is proved by the Holy Scriptures, and the Uninterrupted Continuance of it (here in Britain) from the Days of the Apostles to this our Age, is Historically deduced*. London, 1717.

[Hopton, Susannah?]. *A collection of meditations and devotions, in three parts. I. Meditations on the creation. II. Meditations and devotions on the life of Christ. III. Daily devotions and Thanks-Givings, &c. By the first reformer of the Devotions in the ancient way of offices; afterwards reviewed and set forth by the late Learned Dr. Hickes.* London, 1717.

John of the Cross, *Ascent of Mount Carmel*, translated by E. Allison Peers. Radford, VA: Wilder Publications, 2008.

Kapasoules, Samuel Patriarch of Alexandria. *Lachrymæ & suspiria Ecclesiæ Græcæ: or, the distressed state of the Greek Church. Humbly represented in a letter to her Late Majesty Queen Anne, from the Patriarch of Alexandria; by the hands of Arsenius Archbishop of Thebais, Now Residing in London.* London, 1715.

Kempis, Thomas à. *The Christian's Pattern: or, a Treatise of the Imitation of Jesus Christ. In four books. Written originally in Latin by Thomas à Kempis. Now render'd into English. To which are added, Meditations and Prayers, for Sick Persons. By George Stanhope, D. D. Dean of Canterbury, and Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty.* London, 1708.

Kempis, Thomas a. *The Christian Pattern: or, the Imitation of Jesus Christ. Vol. II. Being the genuine works of Thomas à Kempis. Containing Four Books, viz. I. The Sighs of a Penitent Soul. II. A short Christian Directory. III. Of Spiritual Exercises. IV. Of Spiritual Entertainments. Translated from the original Latin, and recommended by George Hickes, D.D. To which is prefix'd a large account of the author's life and writings, containing much of the History of those Times, never before set forth in English.* London, 1710.

Ken, Thomas. *An Exposition of the Church-Catechism, or the Practice of Divine Love.* Rev. ed. London, 1696.

———. *Lacrymæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanae: or A Serious and Passionate Address of the Church of England, to Her Sons, especially those of the Clergy.* London, 1689.

Kettlewell, John. *A compleat collection of the works of the Reverend and learned John Kettlewell, Five discourses on so many very important points of practical religion. To which are added four sermons, Publish'd by the Author in his Life-Time. The second edition. By John Kettlewell, late a Minister of the Church of England. With a Preface, wherein the Author's Character is attempted.* London, 1708.

———. *A compleat collection of the works of the Reverend and learned John Kettlewell, B. D. Formerly Vicar of Coles-Hill in Warwick-Shire. In two volumes. The several treatises printed from copies revis'd and improv'd by the author, a*

little before his death. To which is prefix'd, the life of the author. Wherein are contained many Remarkable Transactions of his Time; compiled from the Collections of George Hickes, D.D. and Robert Nelson, Esq; and Completed by a Friend of the Author at the Desire both of Dr. Hickes and Mr. Nelson. With an appendix of several original papers. London, 1719.

———. *An Help and Exhortation to Worthy Communicating: Or, a Treatise Describing the Meaning, Worthy Reception, Duty and Benefits, of the Holy Sacrament and Answering the Doubts of Conscience, and other Reasons, which most generally detain Men from it. Together with suitable Devotions Added. 8th ed. London, 1717. .*

———. *The measures of Christian obedience: or, a discourse shewing, what obedience is indispensibly necessary to a regenerate state, and what defects are consistent with it; For The Promotion of Piety, and the Peace of Troubled Consciences. By John Kettlewell, late Vicar of Coles-Hill, in Warwickshire. London, 1709.*

Lake, Edward. *Officium Eucharisticum. A preparatory service to a devout and worthy reception, of the Lord's Supper, the one and twentieth edition. To which is added, a meditation for every day in the week. London, 1706.*

Law, William. *The Absolute Unlawfulness of the Stage-Entertainment fully Demonstrated. London, 1726.*

———. *A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life. 1728; London: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1951.*

———. *A Sermon Preach'd at Haslingfield in the County of Cambridge, on Tuesday, July 7, 1713. Being the Day Appointed by Her Majesty's Royal Proclamation for a Publick Thanksgiving for Her Majesty's General Peace. n.p, 1713.*

———. *Three letters to the Bishop of Bangor, 9th ed. London, 1753.*

[Leslie, Charles?]. *The Case of the Regale and Pontificate Satated, In the Relation of a Conference Concerning the Independency of the Churchas to Her Purely Spiritual Power and Authority. London, 1700.*

Leslie, Charles. *The Constitution, Laws and Government of England, Vindicated. In a letter to the Reverend Mr. William Higden. On Account of his View of the English Constitution, with respect to the Sovereign Authority of the Prince, etc. London, 1709.*

———. *A Letter from the Reverend Mr. Charles Leslie, Concerning the New Separation. London, 1719.*

- . *A View of the Times , their Principles and Practices: In the ... Rehearsals*. 5 vols. London, 1750.
- . *A Letter from a Gentleman in the City to his Friend in the Country, Concerning the threaten'd Prosecution of the Rehearsal, put into the News-Papers*. London, 1708.
- Lords Commissioners of Trade and Plantations. *Acts of Assembly, passed in the Caribbean Leeward Islands, from 1690 to 1730*. London, 1734.
- Middlesex Quarter Session. *Middlesex Quarter Session, Ad General Session' Pacis Domini Regis tent' pro Com Middlesexiae; apud Hicks Hall in St. John-Street, in Com' praedict' per adjorn' Die Jovis scilt' Sexto Die Deceembris, Anno Regni Georgii, nunc Regis Magnae Britanniae...* London, 1716.
- Nelson, Robert. *A companion for the festivals and fasts of the Church of England: with collects and prayers for each solemnity*. London, 1704.
- . *Transubstantiation Contrary to Scripture*. London, 1688.
- Nichols, John. *Biographical and Literary Anecdotes of William Bowyer... and of Many of his Learned Friends*. London, 1782.
- Nichols, John and Samuel Bentley. *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century, Comprising Biographical Memoirs of William Bowyer, Printer, and Many of his Learned Friends*, vol. 8. London: Nichols, 1814.
- Nichols, John. *Anecdotes Biographical and Literary of the Late Mr. William Bowyer, Printer. Compiled for private use*. London, 1778.
- . *Biographical and literary anecdotes of William Bowyer, Printer, F. S. A. and of many of his learned friends. Containing an incidental view of the progress and advancement of literature in this kingdom from the beginning of the present century to the end of the year MDCCLXXVII. By John Nichols, his apprentice, partner, and successor*. London, 1782.
- Oates, Titus [pseud.]. *A Tragedy, Called the Popish Plot, Reviv'd: Detecting the Secret League Between the Late King James and the French King: the Popish Conspiracy to Murder His Present Majesty King William: and the Wicked Contrivance for Adulterating the Coin of this Kingdom: with Many Other Hellish Practices: Dedicated to Sir Roger L'Estrange, the Fellows of St. John's College in Cambridge,(non Jurors) and the Rest of the Jacobite Crew*. n.p.
- Otridge, William. *A Catalogue of Many Thousand Volumes of Valuable Books in Many*

Languages, Arts and Sciences; in which are included the entire library of an eminent Counselor in the Law... which will be sold...on Monday December 21, 1767 by William Otridge. London, 1767.

Pepys, Samuel. *The Diary of Samuel Pepys M.A. F.R.S. Clerk of the Acts and Secretary to the Admiralty*, edited by Henry B Wheatley. London: George Bell & Sons, 1904.

Plotinus, *The Enneads*, translated by Stephen McKenna. New York: Faber and Faber, 1956.

Potter, John. *A Discourse of Church-government: Wherein the Rights of the Church, and the Supremacy of Christian Princes, are Vindicated and Adjusted*. London, 1711.

Seller, Abednego. *The History of Passive Obedience Since the Reformation*. Amsterdam, 1689.

Smith, Joseph. *The difference between the nonjurors and the present publick assemblies, not a real, but accidental schism*. London, 1716.

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 31st, 1717*. London, 1717.

———. *A Second Letter to the Lord Bishop of Bangor, In Vindication of the Former*. London, 1717.

Spinckes, Nathaniel. *The Article of Romanish Transubstantiation Inquired into and Disproved*. London, 1719.

———. *The Case Further Stated*. London, 1718.

———. *The Case Truly Stated*. London, 1714.

———. *Essay towards a Proposal for Catholic Communion Answered by Nathaniel Spinckes*. London, 1705.

———. *Mr. Hoadly's Measures of Submission to the Civil Magistrate Enquired into and Disproved*. London, 1711.

———. *The new pretenders to prophecy re-examined: and their pretences shewn to be groundless and false. And Sir R. Bulkeley and A. Whitro convicted of very foul practices, in order to the carrying on their imposture....* London: printed for Richard Sare, 1710.

———. *No Just Ground for Introducing the New Communion Office* London: printed for James Bettenham 1719.

- . *No Reason for Restoring the Prayers and Directions of Edward VI's First Liturgy*. London, 1717.
- . *No Sufficient Reason for Restoring the Prayers and Directions of King Edward the Sixth's First Liturgy, Part I . By a Nonjuror*. London, 1718.
- . *No Sufficient reason for restoring the prayers of Edward VI's First Liturgy*. London, 1718.
- . *Of Trust in God*. London, n.d.
- . *A reply to the vindication of the reasons and defence*. London, 1720.
- . *The Sick Man Visited* 1st ed. London, 1712.
- . *The Sick Man Visited*, 2 ed. London, 1717.
- . *The Sick Man Visited; and furnished with Instructions, Meditations, and Prayers for putting him in mind of his Change*. London, 1712.
- . *The True Church of England Man's Companion to the Closet*. n.p., 1721.
- Smith, T. *Catalogue of the Libraries of the Right Hon. Lord Teynham et al ... which will be sold by T. Smith and Son, booksellers, in Canterbury*. Canterbury, 1780.
- Stanhope, George. *The Christian's Pattern: or, a Treatise of the Imitation of Jesus Christ. In four books. Written originally in Latin by Thomas à Kempis. Now render'd into English. To which are added, Meditations and Prayers, for Sick Persons. By George Stanhope, D. D. Dean of Canterbury, and Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty*. London, 1708.
- Sykes, Arthur Ashley. *An Answer to the Nonjurors Charge of Schism Upon the Church of England*. James Knapton, at the Crown in St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1716.
- Taylor, Jeremy. *Holy Living* (1650) and *Holy Dying* (1651).
- Timperley, Charles Henry. *A Dictionary of Printers and Printing: With the Progress of Literature*. London: H. Johnson, 1839.
- Traherne, Thomas. *Centuries of Meditations*. 1903; New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.
- Turner, John, D.D. *An Essay on Ecclesiastical Authority: In which the Pretence of an*

Independent power in the Church, to a Divine Right in the Election of Bishops; To the Invalidity of Lay Deprivations; To the Inseparable Relation of a Bishop to his See; To an Obligation of continuing Communion with the Deprived Bishops; And Several other Things relating to the Nonjurors Separation from our Church, are particularly and impartially Examined. London, 1717.

Wagstaffe, Thomas. *The Necessity of an Alteration.* London, 1718.

“A weeks preparation toward a worthy receiving of the Lords Supper after the warning of the Church for the Celebration of the Holy Communion.” In *Meditations and Prayers for Morning and Evening, for every Day in the Week. Also Some Meditations to live well after the Receiving the Holy Sacrament.* London, 1718.

Welwood, James. *A Vindication of the Present Great Revolution in England, in Five Letters Pass'd Betwixt James Welwood, MD and Mr. John March...: Occasion'd by a Sermon Preach'd by Him on January 30 1688/9... for Passive Obedience and Non-resistance...* [London?], n.d..

Wesley, Susanna: *The Complete Writings*, edited by Charles Wallace (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997)

Williams, George. *The Orthodox Church of the East in the Eighteenth Century: Being the Correspondence between the Eastern Patriarchs and the Nonjuring Bishops.* London, 1868.

Online Archives

Eighteenth Century Collections Online.

<http://galenet.galegroup.com.spot.lib.auburn.edu/servlet/ECCO>

Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.

<http://www.oxforddnb.com.spot.lib.auburn.edu/>

Secondary Sources

Abbey, Charles John, and John Henry Overton. *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century.* London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1906.

Ady, Cecilia M. “The Post-Reformation Episcopate: From the Restoration to the Present Day.” In *The Apostolic Ministry*, edited by Kenneth E. Kirk, 433-460. London: Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd., 1957.

- Amussen, Susan Dwyer. *An Ordered Society: Gender and Class in Early Modern England*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 2006.
- Anderson, Michael. "The Emergence of the Modern Life Cycle in Britain." *Social History* 10, no. 1 (1985): 69-87.
- Apetrei, Sarah. "'Call No Man Master Upon Earth': Mary Astell's Tory Feminism and an Unknown Correspondence." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 41, no. 4 (2008): 507-523.
- Avis, Paul. *Foundations of Modern Historical Thought From Machiavelli to Vico*. Beckenham, Kent: Croom Helm, 1986.
- Aylmer, G. E. *The Struggle for the Constitution, 1603-1689*. London: Blandford Press, 1963.
- Bailey, Peter. "Leisure, Culture and the Historian: Reviewing the First Generation of Leisure Historiography in Britain." *Leisure Studies* 8, no. 2 (1989): 107-127.
- Baines, Paul and Pat Rogers. *Edmund Curll, Bookseller*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Bartlett, Alan. *A Passionate Balance: The Anglican Tradition*. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 2007.
- Bates, W. H. "Fourteen Nonjuring Clergymen in the Archdiocese of York." *Northern History* XLII, no.1 (March, 2005): 193-199.
- Beales, Derek. "The Eighteenth Century." In *St John's College Cambridge: A History*, edited by Peter Lineham, 162-219. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2011.
- Beddard, R.A. "The Loyalist Opposition in the Interregnum: A Letter of Dr Francis Turner, Bishop of Ely, on the Revolution of 1688." *British Institute of Human Rights* 40, (1967): 101-9.
- Beddard, R.A. "William Sancroft as Archbishop of Canterbury, 1677-1691." D.Phil. diss., University of Oxford, 1965.
- Benjamin, Walter. *On the Concept of History*. New York: Classic Books America, 2009.
- Benjamin, Walter. *Illuminations*. Edited by Hannah Arendt. Translated by Harry Zohn. New York: Schocken Books, 1969.

- Bennett, G.V. "Against the tide: Oxford under William III," In *History of the University of Oxford: Volume 5: 18th -century Oxford*, edited by L. S. Sutherland and L. G. Mitchell, 31-60. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- . "Conflict in the Church," In *Britain after the Glorious Revolution 1689-1714*, edited by Geoffrey Holmes. London: Macmillan, St. Martin's Press, 1969.
- . *The Tory Crisis in Church and State, 1688-1730: The Career of Francis Atterbury, Bishop of Rochester*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.
- . *White Kennett 1660-1728, Bishop of Peterborough: A Study in the Political and Ecclesiastical History of the Early Eighteenth Century*. London: S.P.C.K., 1957.
- Bennett, G. V. and J. D. Walsh. *Essays in Modern English Church History: In Memory of Norman Sykes*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1966.
- Berman, David. "The Jacobitism of Berkeley's Passive Obedience." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 47, no. 2 (April - June 1986): 309-319
- Black, Joseph. "The Rhetoric of Reaction: the Martin Marprelate Tracts (1588-89), Anti-Martinism, and the Uses of Print in Early Modern England." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* (1997): 707-725.
- Bluedorn, Allen C. *The Human Organization of Time: Temporal Realities and Experience*. Redwood City, California: Stanford University Press, 2002.
- Borsay, Peter. "The English Urban Renaissance: The development of Provincial Urban Culture c. 1680 - c 1760." *Social History* 2, no. 5 (1977): 581-603.
- Bowers, Toni. "Queen Anne Makes Provision." In *Refiguring Revolutions: Aesthetics and Politics from the English Revolution to the Romantic Revolution*, edited by Kevin Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker, 57-74. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.
- Braddick, Michael J. *State Formation in Early Modern England, c. 1550-1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Braddick, Michael J. and David L. Smith, eds. *The Experience of Revolution in Stuart Britain and Ireland: Essays for John Morrill*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Braun, Harald E. and Edward Vallance, eds. *Contexts of Conscience in Early Modern Europe, 1500-1700*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

- Brayshay, Mark, Philip Harrison, and Brian Chalkley. "Knowledge, Nationhood and Governance: The Speed of the Royal Post in Early-Modern England." *Journal of Historical Geography* 24, no. 3 (1998): 265-288.
- Brewer, John. *The Sinews of Power: War, Money and the English State, 1688-1783*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1989.
- Brooks, Douglas A. *From Playhouse to Printing House: Drama and Authorship in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Broxap, Henry. *A Biography of Thomas Deacon, the Manchester Nonjuror*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1911.
- . *The Later Nonjurors*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1924.
- Burke, Peter. "The Invention of Leisure in Early Modern Europe." *Past & Present* 146 (1995): 136-150.
- . *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe*. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing, 2009.
- Bursell, Rupert. "The Oath of Canonical Obedience." *Ecclesiastical Law Journal* 16, no. 2 (2014): 168-186.
- Carpenter, S. C. *The Church in England: 597-1688*. London: John Murray, 1954.
- Carter, Jane Frances Mary. *The Life and Times of John Kettlewell: With Details of the History of the Nonjurors*. Longmans, Green, and Company, 1895.
- Casiday, Augustine. "Anglicanism and Orthodoxy 300 years after the 'Greek College' in Oxford." *Studies in World Christianity* 13, no. 1 (2007): 91-92.
- Castelli, Elizabeth A. *Martyrdom and Memory: Early Christian Culture Making*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2004.
- Caudle, James " Defense of Georgian Britain: The Anti-Jacobite Sermon 1715-1746." In *The Oxford Handbook of the British Sermon 1689-1901* edited by Keith A. Francis, William Gibson, Robert Ellison, John Morgan-Guy, and Bob Tennant. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Caudle, James. "Preaching in Parliament: Patronage, Publicity and Politics in Britain, 1701–60." *The English Sermon Revised: Religion, Literature and History 1600-1750*, edited by Lori Anne Ferrell and Peter McCullough, 235-64. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000.

- Cavanaugh, Steve. "The Nonjurors: The Repudiation of Erastianism and the Recovery of Sacrifice" (www. http://anglicanuse.org/AngEmb-3-5_Cavanaugh_Nonjurors.pdf)
- Certeau, Michel de. *The Mystic Fable, Volume On: The Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Translated by Michael B. Smith. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.
- . *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Translated by Steven Rendall. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984
- Chadwick, Owen. *The Reformation*. Hammondsworth: Penguin Books, 1982.
- Chamberlain, Jeffrey S. *Accommodating High Churchmen: The Clergy of Sussex, 1700-1745*. Urbana: The University of Illinois Press, 1997.
- Champion, Justin A. I. *The Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken: The Church of England and its Enemies, 1660-1730*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Champion, Justin. "Decoding the Leviathan: Doing the History of Ideas through Images, 1651–1714." www.warwick.ac.uk
- . *Republican Learning: John Toland and the Crisis of Christian Culture, 1696-1722*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003.
- Christakis, Nicholas A. and James H. Fowler. *Connected: The Surprising Power of our Social Networks and How they Shape our Lives*. New York: Little Brown and Company, 2009.
- Clark, J.C.D. *English Society 1660-1832: Religion, Ideology and Politics during the ancien regime*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- . *English Society 1688-1832: Ideology, Social Structure and Political Practice during the Ancien Regime*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- . *The Language of Liberty 1660-1832: Political Discourse and Social Dynamics in the Anglo-American World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Clarke, Frederick Arthur. *Thomas Ken*. London: Methuen and Company, 1896.
- Claydon, Tony. "The Sermon Culture of the Glorious Revolution: Williamite Preaching and Jacobite Anti-Preaching, 1685-1702." In *The Oxford Handbook of the British Sermon 1689-1901* edited by Keith A. Francis, William Gibson, Robert Ellison, John Morgan-Guy, Bob Tennant. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Claydon, Tony. *William III and the Godly Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University

- Press, 1996.
- Coffey, John. *Persecution and Toleration in Protestant England, 1558-1689*. London: Longman, 2000.
- Colley, Linda. *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.
- . *In Defiance of Oligarchy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Collinson, Patrick. *The Religion of the Protestants*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- Condren, Conal. *Argument and Authority in Early Modern England: The Presupposition of Oaths and Offices*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Cornwall, Robert. "Charles Leslie and the Political Implications of theology." In *Religious Identities in Britain: 1660-1832*, edited by W. Gibson and R. G. Ingram, 27-42. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2005.
- . "Divine Right Monarchy, Henry Dodwell's Critique of the Reformation and Defense of the Deprived Nonjurors Bishops." *Anglican and Episcopal History* (1999): 37-66.
- . "The later Non-Jurors and the Theological Basis of the Usages Controversy." *Anglican Theological Review* 75, No. 2 (1993):166-186.
- . Review of Litvack, Leon 'John Mason Neale and the Quest for Sobornost' *Church History*, 65 (): 128-130.
- . "The Search for the Primitive Church: The Use of Early Church Fathers in the High Church Anglican Tradition, 1680-1745." *Anglican and Episcopal History* 59, no. 3 (1990): 303-329.
- . "The Theologies of the Nonjurors: A Historiographical Essay." In *Cromohs Virtual Seminars, Recent historiographical trends of the British Studies (17th-18th Centuries)*, (2006-2007): 1-7. Edited by Mario, et. Al. www.cromohs.unifi.it/seminari/cornwall_nonjuror.html?a?a
- . *Visible and Apostolic: The Constitution of the Church in High Church Anglican and Non-Juror Thought*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1993.
- Coroban, Costel. "Whigs, Tories and Jacobites during the Reign of King George I (1714-1727)." *Analele Universitatii Ovidius Constanta Seria Istorie* 5 (2008): 9-26.

- Corp, Edward. *A Court in Exile: The Stuarts in France, 1689-1718*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2004.
- . *The Jacobites at Urbino: An Exiled Court in Transition*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
- Coward, Barry. *The Stuart Age: England 1603-1714*. 2nd Edition. London: Longman, 1994.
- Cragg, Gerald R. *The Church and the Age of Reason 1648-1789*. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1970.
- Craig, William Lane. *Reasonable Faith: Christian Truth and Apologetics*. Wheaton, Illinois: Crossways Books, 2008.
- Crawford, Patricia. *Women and Religion in England 1500-1720*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Cross, Frank Leslie. *The Oxford Movement and the Seventeenth Century*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1933.
- Cruikshanks, Eveline, ed. *By Force or Default? The Revolution of 1688-89*. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishing Ltd., 1989.
- . *The Glorious Revolution*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Macmillan Press, 2000.
- , ed. *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1759*. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers Ltd., 1982.
- . "Religion and Royal Succession - The Rage of Party." In *Britain in the First Age of Party, 1680-1750* edited by Clyve Jones, 19-44. London: The Hambledon Press, 1987.
- Cruikshanks, Eveline and Edward Corp, eds., *The Stuart Court in Exile and the Jacobites*. London: The Hambledon Press, 1995.
- Cullman, Oscar. *Christ and Time: The Primitive Christian Conception of Time and History*, translated by Floyd V. Filson. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964.
- Daniélou, Jean, S.J. *The Bible and the Liturgy*. Ann Arbor: Servant Books, 1979.
- Darnton, "Robert. An Early Information Society: News and Media in Eighteenth-Century Paris" *The American Historical Review* 105, no. 1 (February 2000): 1-35.

- . *The Forbidden Best Sellers of Pre-Revolutionary France*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1995.
- . "What is the History of Books?" In *The Kiss of Lamourette: Reflections in Cultural History*, 111-135. New York, NY: W.W. Norton and Co. 1990.
- . *The Kiss of Lamourette: Reflections in Cultural History*. New York: W.W. Norton and Co. 1990.
- Davis, James Herbert. *Fénelon*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1979.
- De Vries, Jan. "The Industrial Revolution and the Industrious Revolution." *Journal of Economic History* 54, no. 2 (1994): 249-70.
- Debary, Thomas. *A History of the Church of England from the Accession of James II to the Rise of the Bangorian Controversy in 1717*. London: Bell & Daldy, 1860.
- Dickens, A.G. *The English Reformation*. New York: Schocken Books, 1964.
- Diefendorf, Barbara B. *Beneath the Cross: Catholics and Huguenots in Sixteenth-Century Paris*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Dix, Gregory. *The Shape of the Liturgy*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1945.
- Dodds, P.S., Duncan Watts, and Roby Muhamad. "An Experimental Study of Search in Global Social Networks," *Science* 301 (2003): 827-29.
- Dohrn-van Rossum, Gerhard. *History of the Hour: Clocks and Modern Temporal Orders*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.
- Dover, Wilson, J., ed. *The Schools of England: A Study in Renaissance*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1929.
- Dowden, John. "Note on the Original Documents containing, or relating to, the Proposals of the Nonjuring Bishops for a 'Concordate' with the Holy Orthodox Church of the East (1716–1725)." *The Journal of Theological Studies* 4 (1900): 562-568.
- D'Oyly, G. *The Life of William Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury*, 2 vols. London: John Murray, 1821.
- Duffy, Eamon. "The Shock of Change: Continuity and Discontinuity in the Elizabethan Church of England. In *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition: Continuity, Change and the Search for Communion*, edited by Stephen Platten, 42-64. Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2003.

- . *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England c.1400-1580*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.
- . *The Voices of Morebath: Reformation and Rebellion in an English Village*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001.
- Duyckinck, George Long. *The Life of Thomas Ken, Bishop of Bath and Wells*. n.p. General Protestant Episcopal Sunday School Union and Church Book Society, 1859.
- Eisenstein, Elizabeth L. *The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Elias, Norbert. *The Civilizing Process: The History of Manners and State Formation and Civilization*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1994.
- Eliot, T.S. *The Complete Poems and Plays 1909-1950*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1962.
- English, John C. "The Duration of the Primitive Church: An Issue for Seventeenth and Eighteenth-Century Anglicans." *Anglican and Episcopal History* 73, no. 1 (2004): 35-52
- Evans, Thomas Simpson, ed. *The Life of Robert Frampton, Bishop of Gloucester: Deprived as a Non-Juror 1689*. London: Longman, Green, and Co., 1876.
- Every, George. *The High Church Party, 1688-1718*. London: S.P.C.K., 1956.
- Evlogy, Metropolitan, and Fr Georges Florovsky. "The Orthodox Church and the Reunion of Christians." *The Orthodox Church* (1993): 307.
- Ezell, Margaret J. M. "Ann Halkett's Morning Devotions: Posthumous Publication and the Culture of Writing in Late Seventeenth-Century Britain." In *Print, Manuscript, and Performance: The Changing Relations of the Media in Early Modern England*, edited by Arthur F. Marotti, and Michael D. Bristol. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2000.
- Fairchilds, Cissie. *Women in Early Modern Europe 1500-1700*. Harlow: Longman, 2007,
- Farooq, Jennifer. "The Politicising Influence of Print: The Responses of Hearers and Listeners to the Sermons of Gilbert Burnet and Henry Sacheverell." In *Readers, Audiences, and Coteries in Early Modern England*, edited by Geoff Baker and Anne McGruer, 47-60. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Press, 2006.
- Fields, Rona M. "The Psychology and Sociology of Martyrdom." In *Martyrdom: The*

Psychology, Theology, and Politics of Self-Sacrifice, edited by Rona Fields. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger Publishers, 2004.

- Feiling, Keith. *A History of the Tory Party 1640-1714*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1950.
- Findon, John. "The Nonjurors and the Church of England 1689-1716." D.Phil diss. University of Oxford, 1977.
- Fletcher, Anthony, and John Stevenson, eds. *Order and Disorder in Early Modern England*. Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Ford, David Nash. *Royal Berkshire History*. <http://www.berkshirehistory.com/>
- Foucault, Michel, and Jay Miskowiec. "Of other spaces." *Diacritics* 16, no. 1 (1986): 22-27.
- Foucault, Michel. "Dream, Imagination and Existence." (1984). *Review of Existential Psychology & Psychiatry*, Vol 19, No. 1 (1984): 29-78.
- . "What is Enlightenment ?" ("Qu'est-ce que les Lumières ?"). In *The Foucault Reader*, edited by P. Rabinow, 32-50. New York, Pantheon Books, 1984.
- Fowler, James M. *Stages of Faith: The Psychology of Human Development and the Quest for Meaning*. San Francisco: Harper, 1981.
- Fox, Adam. "Remembering the past in early modern England: oral and written tradition." *Transactions - Royal Historical Society* (1999): 233-256.
- Freeman, Lisa A. "Jeremy Collier and the Politics of Theatrical Representation." In *Players, Playwrights, Playhouses: Investigating Performance, 1600-1800*. (Redefining British Theatre History.) Ed.
- French, David P. "Swift, the Non-Jurors, and Jacobitism." *Modern Language Notes* 72, no. 4 (April, 1957): 258-264.
- Friedman, Edwin H. *Generation to Generation: Family Process in Church and Synagogue*. New York: The Guilford Press, 1985.
- Fritze, Ronald H. "The English Reformation: Obedience, Destruction and Cultural Adaptation." *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 56, no. 1 (2005): 107-115.
- Funkenstein, Amos. "Collective Memory and Historical Consciousness." *History and Memory* 1, No. 1 (1989): 5-26.
- Gardner, W.B. "George Hickes and the Origins of the Bangorian Controversy," *Studies in*

Philology, 39 (1942): 65-78.

Gardner, William B. "The Life and Some Account of the Works of George Hickes," Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1946.

Garnett, R. "A Nonjuror's History of England" *The English Historical Review* 7, no. 25 (January, 1892): 114-116.

Garrioch, David. "Sounds of the City: the Soundscape of Early Modern European Towns." *Urban History* 30, no.1 (2003): 5-25.

Gascoigne, John. "Politics, Patronage and Newtonianism: The Cambridge Example." *The Historical Journal* 27, no.1 (1984): 1-24.

Gathorne-Hardy, Jonathan. *The Old School Tie: The Phenomenon of the English Public School*. New York: The Viking Press, 1977.

Gibaut, John. "Gifts from the Orient: Eastern Textual Influence in the Development of Anglican Liturgy." *Logos* 41 (2000): 269-314.

Gibson, William, and Robert G. Ingram, eds. *Religious Identities in Britain: 1660-1832*. Burlington, VT.: Ashgate Publishing, 2005.

Gibson, William. *The Achievement of the Anglican Church, 1689-1800: The Confessional State in Eighteenth Century England*. Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1995.

———. *The Church of England 1688-1832: Unity and accord*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2001.

———. "Dissenters, Anglicans and the Glorious Revolution: The Collection of Cases." *The Seventeenth Century* 22, no.1 (2007): 168-184.

———. *James II and the Trial of the Seven Bishops*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Gittos, Helen. *Liturgy, Architecture, and Sacred Places in Anglo-Saxon England*. Oxford University Press, 2013.

Glennie, Paul, and Nigel Thrift. "The Spaces of Clock Times." In *The Social in Question: New Bearings in History and the Social Sciences*, edited by Patrick Joyce, 151-174. London: Routledge, 2002.

———. "Reworking E.P. Thompson's Time, Work-Discipline and Industrial Capitalism'." *Time & Society* 5, no. 3 (1996): 275-299.

- . *Shaping the Day: a History of Timekeeping in England and Wales 1300-1800*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Goldie, Mark, and Clare Jackson. "Williamite Tyranny and the Whig Jacobites." In *Redefining William III: The Impact of the King-Stadholder in International Context*, edited by Esther Mijers and David Onnekink, 177-99. Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2007.
- Goldie, Mark, and Gordon J. Schochet. "Civil Religion and the English Enlightenment." *Proceedings of the Folger Institute Center for the History of British Political Thought* 5 (1993): 34.
- 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: John Donald, 1982.
- . "The Revolution of 1689 and the Structure of Political Argument." *Bulletin of Research in the Humanities* 83, no. 1980 (1980): 473-564.
- Goody, Jack. *The East in the West*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Gordon, Andrew, and Bernhard Klein, eds. *Literature, Mapping, and the Politics of Space in Early Modern Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Greaves, Richard L. "Concepts of Political Obedience in Late Tudor England: Conflicting Perspectives." *The Journal of British Studies* 22, no. 1 (1982): 23-34.
- Green, I. M. *The Re-Establishment of the Church of England 1660-1663*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Gregory, Brad. *Salvation at Stake: Christian Martyrdom in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Grisbrooke, W. Jardine. "The Nonjurors and William Law." In *The Study of Spirituality*, edited by Cheslyn Jones, Geoffrey Wainwright, and Edward Yarnold, 452-454. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Haber, Francis Colin. "The Aathedral Clock and the Cosmological Clock Metaphor." In *The Study of Time II*, 399-416. Berlin and Heidelberg: Springer, 1975.
- Haigh, Christopher. *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society under the Tudors*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Halasz, Alexandra. *The Marketplace of Print: Pamphlets and the Public Sphere in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

- Hall, Richard Andrew, and Sarah Richardson. *The Anglican Clergy and Yorkshire Politics in the Eighteenth Century*. York: University of York Borthwick Publications, 1998.
- Hamilton, Donna B. *Shakespeare and the Politics of Protestant England*. University Press of Kentucky, 1992.
- Hamilton, Sarah, and Andrew Paul Spicer, eds. *Defining the Holy: Sacred Space in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*. Burlington, VT.: Ashgate Publishing, 2005.
- Hamlin, Christopher. "A Time of Air and Place." *Annals of Science* 66, no. 1 (2009): 129-134.
- Hanson, Laurence. *Government and the Press, 1695-1763*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1936.
- Harlan, Earl. *Elijah Fenton, 1683-1730* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1937.
- Harmsen, Theodor. "Bodleian Imbroglions, Politics and Personalities, 1701–1716: Thomas Hearne, Arthur Charlett and John Hudson." *Neophilologus* 82, no. 1 (1998): 149-168.
- Harmsen, Theodor. *Antiquarianism in the Augustan Age: Thomas Hearne, 1678-1735*. Oxford: Peter Lang, 2000.
- Harris, R. W. *England in the Eighteenth Century, 1689-1793*. London: Blandford Press, 1963.
- Harris, Tim, Paul Seaward, and Mark Goldie, eds. *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1990.
- Harris, Tim. *Politics under the Later Stuarts: Party Conflict in a Divided Society 1660-1715*. London: Longman, 1993.
- . *Revolution: The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720*. London: Penguin, 2006.
- . *Restoration: Charles II and His Kingdoms, 1660-1685*. London: Allen Lane, 2005.
- Hawkins, Lucy Mary. *Allegiance in Church and State: The Problem of the Nonjurors in the English Revolution*. London: G. Routledge & sons, Limited, 1928.
- Hayley, Rodney L. "Cibber, Collier, and 'The Non-Juror'." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 43, no. 1 (1979): 61-75.

- Heal, Felicity. "The Idea of Hospitality in Early Modern England." *Past & Present* 102 (1984): 66-93.
- Hearnshaw, Fossey John Cobb, *The Social and Political Ideas of Some English Thinkers in the Augustan Age, A.D. 1650-1750: A Series of Lectures Delivered at King's College University of London during the Session of 1927-28*. London: George G. Harrap & Co. Ltd., 1928.
- Heidegger, Martin. *History of the Concept of Time: Prolegomena*, translated by Kiesel. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985.
- Herman, E. H. *The Meaning and Value of Mysticism*. 1915. Reprint, Kessinger Publishing, LLC., 2010.
- Hill, Christopher. *The Century of Revolution 1603-1714*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1980.
- Hirschberg, D.R. "The Government and Church Patronage in England, 1660-1760." *Journal of British Studies* 20, no. 1(Autumn 1980):138.
- Hobsbawm, Eric and Terence Ranger. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Holmes, Geoffrey S. "The Sacheverell Riots," *Past and Present* LXXII (1976): 55-85.
- . *Britain after the Glorious Revolution, 1689-1714*. London: Macmillan, 1969.
- . *British Politics in the Age of Anne*. London: Macmillan, 1967.
- . *Politics, Religion, and Society in England, 1679-1742*. London: The Hambledon Press, 1986.
- . *Religion and Party in Late Stuart England*. London: Historical Association, 1975.
- Holmes, Urban T. *What is Anglicanism?* Harrisburg, PA: Morehouse Publishing, 1982.
- Hoppitt, Julian. *A Land of Liberty? England 1689-1727*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Howdenshire History, "History of Snaith, Yorkshire."
<http://www.howdenshirehistory.co.uk/snaith-history.html> [accessed 26 November 2012.]

- Hoyles, John. *The Edges of Augustanism: The Aesthetics of Spirituality in Thomas Ken, John Byrom and William Law*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1972.
- Hume, Robert D. "Jeremy Collier and the Future of the London Theater in 1698." *Studies In Philology* 96, no. 4 (Fall 1999): 480.
- Hunter, David. "Handel among the Jacobites." *Music & Letters* 82, no. 4 (2001): 543-556.
- Hutton, Ronald. *The Stations of the Sun: A History of the Ritual Year in Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- . *The Rise and Fall of Merry England: The Ritual Year, 1400-1700*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Hylson-Smith, Kenneth. *High Churchmanship in the Church of England: From the Sixteenth Century to the Late Twentieth Century*. London: T. and T. Clark, 1993.
- Israel, Jonathan I. and Geoffrey Parker "Of Providence and Protestant Winds: The Spanish Armada of 1588 and the Dutch armada of 1688." In *The Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its World Impact*, edited by Jonathan I. Israel, 335-364. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Israel, Jonathan I. *Enlightenment Contested: Philosophy, Modernity, and the Emancipation of Man 1670-1752*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- James, Mervyn E. "Obedience and Dissent in Henrician England: The Lincolnshire Rebellion 1536." *Past and present* (1970): 3-78.
- . *Society, Politics and Culture: Studies in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Jasper, R. C. D. and G. J. Cumming. *Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed*. Collegeville, MN: A Pueblo Book, The Liturgical Press, 1987.
- Janet, Paul. *Fénelon, His Life and Works*. Port Washington, N.Y.: Kennikat Press, 1914.
- John Paul II. *Memory and Identity: Conversations at the Dawn of a Millennium*. New York: Rizzoli, 2005.
- Jones, Clyve. "The Bishops and the Extra Parliamentary Organization of the Whig Junto in the Reign of Queen Anne." *Parliamentary History* 22, no. 2 (2003): 183-186.
- , ed. *Britain in the First Age of Party, 1680-1750: Essays Presented to Geoffrey Holmes*. London: Hambledon Press, 1987.

- . "Debates in the House of Lords on 'The Church in Danger', 1705, and on Dr Sacheverell's Impeachment, 1710." *Historical Journal* 19 (1976): 759-771.
- . "The Vote in the House of Lords on the Duke of Ormond's 'Restraining Orders', 28 May 1712." *Parliamentary History* 26, no. 2 (2007): 160-183.
- Jung, C. G. *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung, Vol. II, Psychology and Religion: West and East*, translator R.F.C. Hull. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973.
- Kadane, Matthew. *The Watchful Clothier: The Life of an Eighteenth-Century Protestant Capitalist*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013.
- Kaplan, Benjamin J. *Divided by Faith: Religious Conflict and the Practice of Toleration in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University, 2007.
- Keene, Nicholas. "John Ernest Grabe, Biblical Learning and Religious Controversy in Early Eighteenth-Century England." *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 58, no. 4 (2007): 656-674.
- Kelley, Donald R., and David Harris Sacks, eds. *The Historical Imagination in Early Modern Britain: History, Rhetoric, and Fiction, 1500-1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Kennedy, Deborah. "The Radiant Throne: Religion and the Poetry of Anne Finch, Countess of Winchilsea" *Women's Writing* 18, no. 3 (2011): 423-440.
- Kent, Joan. "The Rural 'Middling Sort' in Early Modern England, circa 1640-1740: Some Economic, Political and Socio-Cultural Characteristics." *Rural History* 10 (1999): 19-54.
- Kenyon, J.P. *Revolutionary Principles: The Politics of Party 1689-1720*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Kettering, Sharon. *Patrons, Brokers and Clients in Seventeenth-Century France*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Kinsley, James. "Dryden's 'Character of a Good Parson' and Bishop Ken." *The Review of English Studies* 3, no. 10 (1952): 155-158.
- Kirk, Kenneth E. *Some Principles of Moral Theology and Their Application*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1921.
- . *The Vision of God: The Christian Doctrine of the Summum Bonum , Abridged Edition*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1934.

- Kishlansky, Mark. *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain 1603-1714*. London: Penguin, 1996.
- Klein, Kerwin Lee. "On the Emergence of Memory in Historical Discourse." *Representations* 69 (2000): 127-150.
- Knapp, James A. *Illustrating the Past in Early Modern England: The Representation of History in Printed Books*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2003.
- Kolbrenner, William D. "Gendering the Modern: Mary Astell's Feminist Historiography." *The Eighteenth Century* 44, no. 1 (2003): 1-24.
- . "Jacobite and High Church Appropriations." In *Milton, Rights, and Liberties*, edited by Christoph Tournu and Neil Forsyth, 99-112. Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang, 2007.
- Korsten, Frans, ed. *A Catalogue of the Library of Thomas Baker*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Kussmaul, Ann. *Servants in Husbandry in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- Lake, Peter. "The 'Anglican Moment'? Richard Hooker and the Ideological Watershed of the 1590s." In *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition: Continuity, Change and the Search for Communion*, edited by Stephen Platten, 90-121. Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2003.
- . *The Boxmaker's Revenge: 'Orthodoxy,' 'Heterodoxy' and the Politics of the Parish in Early Stuart London*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001.
- . "Calvinism and the English Church." *Past and Present*, 114 (1987).
- Lander, Jesse M. *Inventing Polemic: Religion, Print, and Literary Culture in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Langford, H.W. "The Non-Jurors and the Eastern Orthodox." <http://anglicanhistory.org/nonjurors/Langford.html>
- Langford, Paul. "Convocation and the Tory Clergy, 1717-61." In *The Jacobite challenge*, edited by Eveline Cruickshanks and Jeremy Black, 107-122. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers Ltd., 1988.
- Laski, Harold Joseph. *The Dangers of Obedience & Other Essays*. 1930; New York: Johnson Reprint Corp., 1968.

- . *Parliamentary government in England: A Commentary*. New York: Viking Press, 1938.
- Lathbury, Thomas. *A History of the Nonjurors: Their Controversies and Writings, with remarks on some of the Rubrics in the Book of Common Prayer*. London: William Pickering, 1845.
- Laudan, Laurens. "The Clock Metaphor and Probabilism: The impact of Descartes on English Methodological Thought, 1650–65." *Annals of Science* 22, no. 2 (1966): 73-104.
- Lawlor, Hugh Jackson. "Henry Dodwell." *The Irish Church Quarterly* 6, no. 23 (1913): 223-251.
- Legg, John Wickham. *English Church Life from the Restoration to the Tractarian Movement: Considered in Some of its Neglected or Forgotten Features*. London: Longmans, Green, 1914.
- Leighton, C. D. A. "Ancienneté among the Non-Jurors: a study of Henry Dodwell." *History of European ideas* 31, no. 1 (2005): 1-16.
- . "'Knowledge of divine things': A Study of Hutchinsonianism." *History of European Ideas* 26, no. 3-4 (2000): 159-175.
- . "The Nonjurors and the Counter Enlightenment: Some Illustration." *Journal of Religious History* 22, no. 3 (1998): 270-286.
- . "The Non-Jurors and their History." *Journal of Religious History* 29, no. 3 (2005): 241-257.
- . "The Religion of the Non-Jurors and the Early British Enlightenment: a study of Henry Dodwell." *History of European Ideas* 28, no. 4 (2002): 247-262.
- Lenman, Bruce. "The Scottish Episcopal Clergy and the Ideology of Jacobitism." In *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1759*, edited by Eveline Cruickshanks, 36-48. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers Ltd., 1982.
- Levis, R. Barry. "'Begin to grow rude and clamorous': English Politics and the Battle over Church Architecture, 1714–1760." *Journal of Church and State* 47, no. 4 (2005): 841-860.
- . "Render Unto Caesar: John Sharp and Ecclesiastical Politics, 1660-1715." Ph.D. diss., Pennsylvania State University, 1971.
- Linda S. York, "In Dens and Caves: The Survival of Anglicanism during the Rule of the Saints, 1640-1660." Ph.D. diss., Auburn University, 1999.

- Litvack, Leon. *J.M. Neale & the Quest for Sobornost*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1994.
- Lossky, Nicholas. "Lancelot Andrewes: A Bridge between Orthodoxy and the Wesley Brothers in the Realm of Prayer." *Orthodox And Wesleyan Scriptural Understanding And Practice* (2005): 149.
- Lossky, Vladimir. "Holy Tradition: The Source of the Orthodox Faith." *The Orthodox Church* (1993): 195.
- . *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*. London: James Clarke & Co., Ltd., 1973.
- Lougee, Carolyn C. *Le Paradis des Femmes: Women, Salons, and Social Stratification in Seventeenth-Century France*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976.
- Macaulay, Thomas Babington. *The History of England from the Accession of James II. 1856*; Philadelphia: Henry T. Coates & Co., n.d.
- MacCulloch, Diarmaid. "The Church of England 1533-1603." In *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition: Continuity, Change and the Search for Communion*, edited by Stephen Platten, 18-41. Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2003.
- . *The Later Reformation in England, 1547-1603*. 2nd Ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001.
- . *Thomas Cranmer: A Life*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996.
- Mack, Phyllis, *Visionary Women: Ecstatic Prophecy in Seventeenth-Century England*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.
- Macray, William Dunn. "Letter from George Hickes, DD, Dean of Worcester." *The English Historical Review* 2, no. 8 (1887): 752-754.
- Manley, Lawrence. *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Marfany, Joan-Lluis. "The Invention of Leisure in Early Modern Europe." *Past & present* 156 (1997): 174-191.
- Marsden, Jean I. "Female Spectatorship, Jeremy Collier and the Anti-Theatrical Debate" *English Literary History*, 65, No. 4 (Winter 1998): 878-898.
- Marshall, Paul A. "The Calling: Obedience, Duty, Labour and God in the 16th and 17th Century England." PhD diss., 1979.

- Marston, Edward. *Sketches of Some Booksellers of the Time of Dr. Samuel Johnson*. London: Oak Knoll, 1902.
- Mascuch, Michael. *Origins of the Individualist Self: Autobiography and Self-Identity in England 1591-1791*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996.
- Maslen, Keith and John Lancaster (eds.) *The Bowyer Ledgers: The Printing Accounts of William Bowyer Father and Son Reproduced on Microfiche, With a Checklist of Bowyer Printing 1699-1777, A Commentary, Indexes, and Appendixes*. London: The Bibliographical Society, 1991.
- Maslen, Keith. *An Early London Printing House at Work*. New York: The Bibliographical Society of America, 1993.
- May, James E. "Recent Studies of Censorship, Press Freedom, Libel, Obscenity, etc., in the Long Eighteenth Century, Published c. 1987-2009." The Bibliographical Society of America (2010). <http://www.bibsocamer.org/BibSite/May/May-Censorship.pdf>
- Mayor, John E. B. *Life of Ambrose Bonwicke*. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, and Company, 1870.
- McGovern, Barbara and Charles H. Hinnant, eds. *The Anne Finch Wellesley Manuscript Poems: A Critical Edition*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1998.
- McGovern, Barbara, *Anne Finch and Her Poetry*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1992.
- Michalski, Sergiusz. *Reformation and the Visual Arts: The Protestant Image Question in Western and Eastern Europe*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Miller, Edward. *Portrait of a College: A History of Saint John the Evangelist in Cambridge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Miller, John. *The Glorious Revolution*. Edinburgh: Pearson Education Ltd., 1997.
- Mokyr, Joel. *The Enlightened Economy: An Economic History of Britain 1700-1850*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009 .
- Monod, P. K. *Jacobitism and the English People, 1688-1788*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- . "Jacobitism and Country Principles in the Reign of William III." *Historical Journal* 30, no. 2 (1987): 289.
- . "The Politics of Matrimony: Jacobitism and Marriage in Eighteenth

- Century England." In *The Jacobite Challenge*, edited by Eveline Cruickshanks and Jeremy Black, 24-41. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers Ltd, date?
- Monod, Paul, Murray Pittock, and Daniel Szechi, *Loyalty and Identity: Jacobites at Home and Abroad*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010
- Moody, Jennifer Joy. "In His Image: The Ideal Woman of Seventeenth-Century France" Ph.D. diss, Auburn University, 2003.
- Moorman, J.R.H. *A History of the Church in England*. London: Adam and Charles Black, Ltd., 1976.
- Moran, Joe. "History, Memory and the Everyday." *Rethinking History* 8, no. 1 (2004): 51-68.
- More, Paul Elmer, and Frank Leslie Cross, eds. *Anglicanism*. New York: MacMillan Company, 1957.
- Morrill, John. "The Sensible Revolution." In *The Anglo-Dutch Moment : Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its world impact*, edited by Jonathan I. Israel. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Moss, Candida R. *Ancient Christian Martyrdom: Diverse Practices, Theologies, and Traditions*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012.
- Muir, Edward, and Mark W. Konnert. "Ritual in Early Modern Europe." *Renaissance and Reformation/Renaissance et Réforme* 23, no. 2 (1999): 76-78.
- Mullet, Charles F. "Religion, Politics, and Oaths in the Glorious Revolution." *The Review of Politics* 10, no. 4 (1948): 462-474.
- Namier, Lewis. *England in the Age of the American Revolution*. London: Macmillan & Co., 1930.
- . *The Structure of Politics at the Accession of George III*. London: Macmillan & Co., 1929.
- Nazir-Ali, Michael. "The Vocation of Anglicanism." *Anvil*, 6, no. 2 (1989): 113-34.
- Neill, Stephen. *Anglicanism*. Hammondsworth: Penguin Books, 1958.
- Nicholls, Mark "The Seventeenth Century." In *St John's College Cambridge: A History*, ed. Peter Lineham, 94-219. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2011.
- O’Gorman, Frank. *The Long Eighteenth Century: British Political and Social History*

- 1688-1832. London: Hodder Arnold, 2007.
- Ogg, David. *England in the Reigns of James II and William III*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.
- Ollard, Richard. *Pepys*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1974.
- . *Samuel Pepys and his Circle*. London: National Portrait Gallery, 2000.
- Overton, John Henry. *Life in the English Church (1600-1714)*. London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1885.
- . *The Nonjurors: Their Lives, Principles, and Writings*. London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1902.
- . *William Law, Nonjuror and Mystic: Author of 'A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life' &c. Formerly Fellow of Emmanuel College, Cambridge*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1881.
- Ozment, Steven. *The Age of Reform 1250-1550: An Intellectual and Religious History of Late Medieval and Reformation Europe*. Yale: Yale University Press, 1980.
- Padley, Kenneth. "Rendering unto Caesar in the Age of Revolution: William Sherlock and William of Orange." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 59 (2008): 680.
- Pailin, David A. "British Views on Religion and Religions in the Age of William and Mary." *Method & Theory in the Study of Religion*, 61, no. 4 (1994): 349-375.
- Paton, David M., ed. *Essays in Anglican Self-Criticism*. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1958.
- Patterson, Annabel M. *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984.
- Patterson, W. B. *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Pawley, Christine. "Beyond Market Models and Resistance Organizations as a Middle Layer in the History of Reading", *Library Quarterly* 79, no.1 (2009): 73-93.
- Peck, Linda Levy. *Court Patronage and Corruption in Early Stuart England*. Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1990.
- Perry, Ruth. *The Celebrated Mary Astell: An Early English Feminist*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1986.

- Peters, Kate. *Print Culture and the Early Quakers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Pettigrove, Glen. "Meekness and 'Moral' Anger," *Ethics*.22, no. 2 (January 2012): 354.
- Philip, I. G. "Oxford and Scholarly Publication in the Eighteenth Century." *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 2, no. 2 (1979): 123-137.
- Phillips, Elaine Anderson. "Creating Queen Mary: Textual Representations of Queen Mary II." *Restoration: Studies in English Literary Culture, 1660-1700* 37, no. 1 (2013): 61-75.
- Pignot, H el ene. "A trip to the origins of Christianity: Sir Paul Rycaut's and Rev. Thomas Smith's accounts of the Greek Church in the seventeenth century." *Studies in Travel Writing* 13, no. 3 (2009): 193-205.
- Pincus, Steve, *1688: The First Modern Revolution*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.
- . *England's Glorious Revolution, 1688-1689: A Brief History with Documents*. New York: Bedford-St. Martin's, 2006.
- Pinnington, Judith. *Anglicans and Orthodox: Unity and Subversion, 1559-1725*. Leominster: Gracewing, 2003.
- Pittock, Joan H. "Thomas Hearne and the Narratives of Englishness." *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 22, no. 1 (1999): 1-14.
- Pittock, Murray G.H., *Jacobitism*. Basingstoke: Macmillan Press, 1998.
- Platten, Stephen, ed. *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition: Continuity, Change and the Search for Communion*. Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2003.
- Plumb, J.H. "The Commercialization of Leisure in Eighteenth Century England." In *Birth of Consumer Society*, edited by Neil McKendrick, 275-280. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1982.
- . *The Origins of Political Stability: England 1675-1725*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1967.
- Plumptre, Edward Hayes. *The Life of Thomas Ken, DD: Bishop of Bath and Wells*. London: Wm. Isbister, 1890.
- Pocock, J.G.A. "Post Puritan England and the Problem of the Enlightenment." In *Culture and Politics from Puritanism to the Enlightenment*, edited by Perez Zagorin, 91-111. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980.

- Pollock, Linda. "'Teach her to live under obedience': The Making of Women in the Upper Ranks of Early Modern England." *Continuity and Change* 4, no.2 (1989): 231-258.
- Poole, Robert. *Time's Alteration: Calendar Reform in Early Modern England*. London: Taylor & Francis, 1998.
- Porter, Roy. *The Creation of the Modern World: The Untold Story of the British Enlightenment*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2000.
- . *Enlightenment: Britain and the Creation of the Modern World*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2001.
- Powicke, Frederick Maurice. *The Reformation in England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963.
- Pugh, Walter Creston. "The Usagers Controversy," M.A. Thesis, Philadelphia Divinity School, 1919.
- Questier, Michael C. "Loyalty, Religion and State Power in Early Modern England: English Romanism and the Jacobean Oath of Allegiance." *The Historical Journal* 40, no. 2 (1997): 311-329.
- Rack, Henry. "'Christ's Kingdom Not of this World': The Case of Benjamin Hoadley versus William Law Reconsidered." *Studies in Church History: Church Society and Politics*, 12:275-92. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1975.
- Raymond, Joad. *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Rex, Richard. "The Crisis of Obedience: God's Word and Henry's Reformation." *The Historical Journal* 39, no.4 (1996): 863-894.
- Rice, Hugh A. L. *Thomas Ken, Bishop and Non-juror*. London: S.P.C.K., 1958.
- Rivers, Isabel. "William Law and Religious Revival: The Reception of a Serious Call" *Huntington Library Quarterly*. 71, no. 4 (December 2008), 635-36.
- Rogers, Nicholas. *Whigs and Cities: Popular Politics in the Age of Walpole and Pitt*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Rogers, Pat. *Pope and the Destiny of the Stuarts: History, Politics, and Mythology in the Age of Queen Anne*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Roorda, Daniel Jeen. "Contrasting and Converging Patterns: Relations between Church

- and State in Western Europe, 1660-1715." In *Britain and The Netherlands*, edited by A.C. Duke, 134-153. Den Hague: Springer Netherlands, 1982.
- Rose, Craig. *England in the 1690s: Revolution, Religion and War*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1999.
- . "'Seminaries of Faction and Rebellion': Jacobites, Whigs and the London Charity Schools, 1716–1724." *The Historical Journal* 34, no. 4 (1991): 831-855.
- Rosoux, Valérie. "The Politics of Martyrdom." In *Martyrdom: The Psychology, Theology, and Politics of Self-Sacrifice*, edited by Rona M. Fields. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2004.
- Rowell, Geoffrey. *The Vision Glorious*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.
- Rozemond, Keetje. "The Orthodox Churches and the West," In *Studies in Church History* edited by Derek Baker. London: Basil Blackwell, 1976.
- Runciman, Steven. "The British Non-Jurors and the Russian Church'." In *The Ecumenical World of Orthodox Civilization; Russia and Orthodoxy: III. Essays in honor of Georges Florovsky*, edited by Andrew Blane, 155-57. The Hague: n.p.,1974.
- . *The Great Church in Captivity: A Study of the Patriarchate of Constantinople for the Eve of the Turkish Conquest to the Greek War of Independence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.
- . "The Greek Church under the Turks." *Journal of Religious History* 3, no. 4 (1965): 347-354.
- Rupp, Gordon. *Religion in England, 1688-1791*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.
- Sachs, William L. *The Transformation of Anglicanism: From State Church to Global Communion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Salter, James L. "The Books of an Early Eighteenth-Century Curate." *The Library* 5, no. 1 (1978): 33-46.
- Sanna, Guglielmo. "The Eighteenth Century Church of England in Historical Writing." In *Cromohs Virtual Seminars, Recent historiographical trends of the British Studies (17th-18th Centuries)*, 2006-2007: 1-6. Edited by Mario Caricchio, et al. http://www.cromohs.unifi.it/seminari/sanna_church.html?a
- Sauter, Michael J. "Clockwatchers and Stargazers: Time Discipline in Early Modern Berlin." *The American Historical Review* 112, no. 3 (2007): 685-709.
- Schneer, Cecil. "The Rise of Historical Geology in the Seventeenth Century." *Isis* 45, no.

3 (1954): 256-268.

Schochet, Gordon J. "II. Patriarchalism, Politics and Mass Attitudes in Stuart England." *The Historical Journal* 12, no.3 (1969): 413-441.

———. *The Authoritarian Family and Political Attitudes in 17th-Century England: Patriarchalism in Political Thought*. Rutgers: Transaction Publishers, 1988.

Schulz, Alison Bryn. *Freedom and Obedience: State and Church in Late-Seventeenth and Early-Eighteenth Century English Political Pamphlets, with a Focus on the Life and Work of George Hickes*. Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1997.

Secretan, Charles Frederick. *Memoirs of the Life and Times of the Pious Robert Nelson*. London: John Murray, 1860.

Sefton, Henry. "The Scottish Bishops and Archbishop Arsenius" In *The Orthodox Churches and the West: Papers Read at the Fourteenth Summer Meeting and the Fifteenth Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society*, edited by Derek Baker. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1976.

Sharp, Richard. "'Our Common Mother, the Church of England': Nonjurors, High Churchmen, and the Evidence of Subscription Lists." In *Loyalty and Identity: Jacobites at Home and Abroad*, edited by Paul Monod, Murray Pittock, and Daniel Szechi, 167-179. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

———. "100 Years of a Lost Cause: Nonjuring Principles in Newcastle from the Revolution to the Death of Prince Charles Edward Stuart" *Archaeologia Aeliana*, 5th series, viii (1980): 35-55.

———. "New Perspectives on The High Church Tradition: Historical Background 1730-1780." In *Tradition Renewed: The Oxford Movement Conference Papers*, edited by Geoffrey Rowell, 4-23. London: Darnton, Longman and Todd, 1986.

Sheldrake, Philip. *A Brief History of Spirituality*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2008.

Sherlock, Peter. *Monuments and Memory in Early Modern England*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2008.

Sherman, Stuart. *Telling Time: Clocks, Diaries, and English Diurnal Form, 1660-1785*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.

Sirota, Brent, *The Christian Monitors: The Church of England and the Age of Benevolence, 1680-1730*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014.

- . "“The Leviathan Is Not Safely to Be Angered”: The Convocation Controversy, Country Ideology, and Anglican High Churchmanship." In *Religion and the State: Europe and North America in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, edited by Josh B. Stein and Sargon G. Donabed. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2012.
- Smith, Bruce R. *The acoustic world of early modern England: attending to the O-factor*. University of Chicago Press, 1999.
- . Smith, Bruce R. "The soundscapes of early modern England." In *Hearing history: A Reader*, edited by Mark M. Smith. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2004.
- Smith, Hannah. "English ‘Feminist’ Writings and Judith Drake’s ‘An Essay in Defense of the Female Sex’ (1696).” *The Historical Journal* 44 (September, 2001): 727-747.
- . "Mary Astell, A Serious Proposal to the Ladies (1694), and the Anglican Reformation of Manners in Late-Seventeenth-Century England." In *Women, Identities and Communities in Early Modern Europe*, edited by Susan Broomhall and Stephanie Tarbin, 31-48. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2008.)
- Smith, Hilda L. *All Men and Both Sexes: Gender, Politics, and the False Universal in England, 1640-1832*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002.
- . *Reason's Disciples: Seventeenth-Century English Feminists*. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1982.
- Smith, James David. "The Bowdler Collection as a Resource for the Study of the Nonjurors." In *The Founders' Library University of Wales, Lampeter, Bibliographical and Contextual Studies: Essays in Memory of Robin Ryder*, edited by C. W. Marx. Lampeter: *Trivium* 29 and 30.1997.
- . *The Eucharistic Doctrine of the Later Nonjurors: A Revisionist View of the Eighteenth-Century Usages Controversy*. Cambridge: Grove Books, 2000.
- . "The 'Pamphlet War' of the Nonjurors 1717-1725: A Case Study in Early Eighteenth-Century Religious Polemic." *Lampeter Trivium*, 35 (2004): 63-86.
- Smyth, Adam. "Almanacs, Annotators, and Life Writing in Early Modern England." *English Literary Renaissance* 38, no. 2 (2008): 200-244.
- Sowerby, Scott. *Making Toleration: The Repealers and the Glorious Revolution*.

- Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2013.
- Spaeth, Donald A. *The Church in an Age of Danger: Parson and Parishes, 1660-1740*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Speck, W. A. *The Birth of Britain: A New Nation 1700-1710*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1994.
- . *Reluctant Revolutionaries: Englishmen and the Revolution of 1688*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Spellman, W.M. *The Latitudinarians and the Church of England, 1660-1700*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1993.
- Spiegel, Gabrielle M. "Memory and History: Liturgical Time and Historical Time." *History and Theory* 41, no. 2 (2002): 149-162.
- Springborg, Patricia. "Mary Astell (1666-1731), Critic of Locke" *The American Political Science Review*, 89, no. 3 (September 1995): 621-633.
- Sproul, Robert Charles. *Classical Apologetics: A Rational Defense of the Christian faith and a Critique of Presuppositional Apologetics*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1984.
- Spurr, John. "The Church of England, Comprehension and the Toleration Act of 1689," *English Historical Review* (1989): 927-946.
- . *English Puritanism 1603-1689*. Basingstoke: Macmillan Press, 1998.
- . "Latitudinarianism and the Restoration Church." *The Historical Journal* 31 (March 1988): 61-82.
- . *The Post-Reformation: Religion, Politics and Society in Britain, 1603-1714*. Harlow: Longman, 2006.
- . "Rational Religion in Restoration England," *The Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol. 49, No. 4 (October 1988): 563-585.
- . *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991.
- Stanwise, Ralph Joseph. *The Literature of Non-resistance and Passive Obedience in the Latter Stuart Period (1680-1688)*. Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1972.
- Starkie, Andrew. *The Church of England and the Bangorian Controversy, 1716-1721*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2007.

- . "William Law and Cambridge Jacobitism, 1713–16." *Historical Research* 75, no. 190 (2002): 448-467.
- Stevens, David Harrison. *Party Politics and English Journalism 1702-1742*. New York: Russell & Russell, 1967.
- Stewart, Larry. "Samuel Clarke, Newtonianism, and the Factions of Post-Revolutionary England." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 42, no. 1 (1981): 53-72.
- Stone, Lawrence. *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England, 1500-1800*. New York: Harper and Row, 1977.
- Stoughton, John. *Ecclesiastical History of England: The Church of the Revolution*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1874.
- Straka, Gerald M. *Anglican Reaction to the Revolution of 1688*. Madison: The State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1962.
- . "The Final Phase of Divine Right Theory in England, 1688-1702." *English historical review* (1962): 638-658.
- Stranks, C.J. *Anglican Devotion: Studies in the Spiritual Life of the Church of England between the Reformation and the Oxford Movement*. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1961.
- Strickland, Agnes and Elisabeth Strickland. *The Lives of the Seven Bishops committed to the Tower in 1688*. London: Bell and Daldy, 1866.
- Sutherland, James Runcieman. *The Restoration Newspaper and Its Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Sykes, N. "Benjamin Hoadly." In *The Social and Political Ideas of Some English Thinkers of the Augustan Age*, edited by F.C.J Hearnshaw. London: George G. Harrap & Co. Ltd., 1928.
- . *Church and State in England in the Eighteenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1934.
- . *From Sheldon to Secker*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959.
- . *Old Priest and New Presbyterian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957.
- . *William Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957.
- Symonds, Robert Wemyss. *A History of English clocks*. Harmondsworth: Penguin

Books, 1947.

Szechi, Daniel. *1715: The Great Jacobite Rebellion*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006.

———. "Constructing a Jacobite: The Social and Intellectual Origins of George Lockhart of Carnwath" *The Historical Journal* 40, no. 4 (1997): 977-996..

———. *George Lockhart of Carnath 1689-172: A Study in Jacobitism*. East Linton, Scotland: Tuckwell Press, 2002.

———. "The Jacobite Theatre of Death," In *The Jacobite Challenge*, edited by Eveline Cruickshanks and Jeremy Black. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers Ltd., 1988.

———. *Jacobitism and Tory Politics 1710-14*. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, Ltd, 1984.

Tavard, George. *The Quest for Catholicity*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1964.

The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church. London: Oxford University Press, 1958.

Thomas, D.O. "Benjamin Hoadly: The Ethics of Sincerity," *Enlightenment and Dissent*, 15 (1996): 71-88.

Thomas, Keith. "Age and Authority in Early Modern England." *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 62 (1976) 214-244.

———. "Health and Morality in Early Modern England." In *Health and Morality* edited by Allan M. Brandt and Paul Rozin, 15-34. London: Routledge, 1997.

———. *Man and the Natural World: Changing Attitudes in England 1500-1800*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin, 1991.

———. *Religion and the Decline of Magic: Studies in Popular Beliefs in Sixteenth and Seventeenth-Century England*. London: Penguin, 1971.

Thompson, E. P. *Customs in Common*. New York: New Press, 1991.

———. "Time, Work-Discipline, and Industrial Capitalism." *Past & Present* 38 (1967): 56-97.

Thompson, Kimberly Louise. "Bishop Thomas Ken, Conscientious Nonjuror." Ph.D. diss., Miami University, 1981.

- Thomson, Ann. *Bodies of Thought: Science, Religion, and the Soul in the Early Enlightenment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Thornton, Martin . *Christian Proficiency*. New York: Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1959.
- . *English Spirituality: An Outline of Ascetical Theology According to the English Pastoral Tradition*. London: SPCK, 1963.
- Travers, J. and Stanley Milgram. "An Experimental Study in the Small World Problem," *Sociometry* 35, no. 4 (1969): 425-443.
- Trevelyan, George Macaulay, and William Huse Dunham. *A Shortened History of England*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1959.
- Trevelyan, George Macaulay. *The English Revolution 1688-1689*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1939.
- Trevor-Roper, Hugh. *Archbishop Laud*. London: Phoenix Press, 2000.
- . "Pietro Giannone and Great Britain" *The Historical Journal* 39, No. 3 (Sep., 1996): 657-675.
- Tribble, Evelyn B. *Margins and Marginality: The Printed Page in Early Modern England*. Charlottesville, VA: The University of Virginia Press, 1993.
- Turner, Roger Turner, "Bonds of Discord: Alternative Episcopal Oversight Examined in the Light of the Nonjuring Consecrations" *Ecclesiastical Law Journal* 3, no. 17 (1995): 398-409.
- Tyacke, Nicholas, ed. *England's Long Reformation: 1500-1800*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2011.
- . "Puritanism, Arminianism, and Counter-Revolution." In *The Origins of the English Civil War*, edited by Conrad Russell, 119-143. New York: Barnes and Noble Publishers, 1973.
- Underdown, David E., and Anthony John Fletcher. *The Taming of the Scold: The Enforcement of Patriarchal Authority in Early Modern England*. Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Underhill, Evelyn. *Mysticism: A Study in the Nature and Development of Man's Spiritual Consciousness*. New York: Meridian Books, 1955.
- Vallance, Edward. *The Glorious Revolution 1688: England's Fight for Liberty*. New York: Pegasus Books, 2008.

- Vickery, Amanda, *Behind Closed Doors: At Home in Georgian England*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.
- Virgin, Peter. *The Church in an Age of Negligence: Ecclesiastical Structure and Problems of Church Reform, 1700-1840*. Cambridge: James Clarke & Co., 1989.
- Walker, A. Keith. *William Law: His Life and Work*. London: S.P.C.K., 1973.
- Wallace, Charles Jr.. "The Prayer Closet as a 'Room of One's Own': Two Anglican Women Devotional Writers at the Turn of the Eighteenth Century." *Journal of Women's History* 9, no. 2 (1997): 108-121.
- Walmsley, Robert. "John Wesley's Parents: Quarrel and Reconciliation" *Proceedings of the Wesleyan Historical Society*, 29 (1953): 50-57
- Walsh, John, Colin Haydon, and Stephen Taylor, eds. *The Church of England c. 1689-c. 1833: from toleration to Tractarianism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Walsham, Alexandra. *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1999.
- . *Providence in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- . *The Reformation of the Landscape: Religion, Identity, and Memory in Early Modern Britain and Ireland*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Wand, J.W.C. *The High Church Schism: Four Lectures on the Nonjurors*. London: Faith Press, 1951.
- Ward, William R. "Anglicanism and Assimilation: or Mysticism and Mayhem in the Eighteenth Century." In *Crown and Mitre: Religion and Society in Northern Europe Since the Reformation*, edited by William Mungo Jacob and Nigel Yates, 81-91. (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1993.
- Ware, Kallistos. *The Orthodox Way*. Revised ed. Crestwood, N.Y.: St Vladimir's Seminary, 1995.
- Wahrman, Dror. *Mr. Collier's Letter Racks: A Tale of Art and Illusion at the Threshold of the Modern Informational Age*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Warner, Rex. *English Public Schools*. London: Collins, 1956.
- Werner, Meike G. "Book History as the History of Literature" *The Germanic Review* 76 (2001): 283-289.

- Wesley, Susanna. *Susanna Wesley: The Complete Writings*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Wheatley, Henry B. ed., *The Diary of Samuel Pepys M.A. F.R.S. Clerk of the Acts and Secretary to the Admiralty*. London: George Bell & Sons, 1904.
- Wigelsworth, Jeff. "The Sleeping Habits of Matter and Spirit: Samuel Clarke and Anthony Collins on the Immortality of the Soul." *Past Imperfect* 9 (2001): 1-24.
- Williams, George, *The Orthodox Church of the East in the Eighteenth Century: Being the Correspondence between the Eastern Patriarchs and the Nonjuring Bishops*. London: Rivingtons, 1868.
- Williams, Rowan. "God's Time." In *A Ray of Darkness*, 39-43. Boston: Cowley Publications, 1995.
- _____. *Teresa of Avila*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2004.
- _____. *Anglican Identities*. Cambridge, Mass.: Cowley Press, 2003.
- Wills, John E., Jr. *1688: A Global History*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2001.
- Wills, Rebecca. *The Jacobites and Russia, 1715-1750*. East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 2002.
- Wilson, Frederick William. *The Importance of the Reign of Queen Anne in English Church History*. Oxford: B.H. Blackwell, 1911.
- Wilson, Kathleen. *The Sense of the People*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Wilson, T. Bagot, Josceline Fitz-Roy. *Colonel James Grahme of Levens: A Biographical Sketch of Jacobite Times: Compiled from Contemporary Letters and Papers at Levens Hall*. London: W. Kent, 1886.
- Woolf, Daniel R. *Reading History in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- . "Speech, Text, and Time: The Sense of Hearing and the Sense of the Past in Renaissance England." *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 18, no. 2 (1986): 159-193.
- Wordsworth, Christopher. *Social Life at the English Universities in the Eighteenth Century*. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, and Company, 1874.

- Wrightson, Keith. *Earthly Necessities: Economic Lives in Early Modern Britain, 1470-1750*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.
- Yandell, Cathy M. *Carpe Corpus: Time and Gender in Early Modern France*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2000.
- Yates, Nigel. *Anglican Ritualism in Victorian Britain: 1830-1910*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- . *Eighteenth-century Britain: Religion and Politics 1714-1815*. London: Pearson Education, 2008.
- Yould, Guy Martin. "The Origins and Transformation of the Non-Juror Schism, 1670-1715." Ph.D. Diss., University of Hull, 1979. .
- Young, B. W. "'The Soul-Sleeping System': Politics and Heresy in Eighteenth-Century England." *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 45, no. 1 (1994): 64-81.
- . *Religion and Enlightenment in Eighteenth Century England: Theological Debate From Locke to Burke*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- . "William Law and the Christian Economy of Salvation," *The English Historical Review* 109, no. 431 (April 1994): 308-322.
- Zaret, David. *Origins of Democratic Culture: Printing, Petitions, and the Public Sphere in Early-Modern England*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- Zernov, Nicolas. *Eastern Christendom: A Study of the Origin and Development of the Eastern Orthodox Church*. New York: Putnam, 1961.
- Zerubavel, Eviatar. *Time Maps: Collective Memory and the Social Shape of the Past*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012.
- Zook, Melinda. *Protestantism, Politics, and Women in Britain, 1660-1714*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.
- . "Turncoats and Double Agents in Restoration and Revolutionary England: The Case of Robert Ferguson, the Plotter." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 42, no. 3 (2009): 363-378.