

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

THE BANGORIAN CONTROVERSY

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE POST-GRADUATE SCHOOL
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
for the degree
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

FACULTY OF DIVINITY

by

Paul Bernard Hessert

May 1951



PREFACE

Long covered with seldom-disturbed dust, the books and pamphlets of the Bangorian Controversy are a monument to English Church life in the opening decades of the eighteenth century. Like many other monuments bequeathed to our day their ability to draw attention to the men who erected them can compel both admiration and disgust. But in any case they remind us, in spite of our neglect, of a dispute important enough to engage the great men of the Church of England for over three years. Now that the passions which inflamed the authors are gone, their words can speak more clearly of the issues vital in their day at least, and significant in ours.

The scope of the subject matter is astounding!

The bounds of authority, the nature of the church, its relation to the state, the rights of private judgment and its difficulties, the responsibilities of sincere inquiry, articles of communion, and in what sense they should be subscribed to, and by whom, the power of councils, the power of Convocation, the liberty of free-thinking, how a church and how a state should act towards Atheists and towards Deists, questions of toleration, of tests, of church establishments -- there was not one of these and such other kindred subjects which a writer in this controversy might not enter upon fairly and without wandering from his subject; even a historian who should once enter upon it would scarcely know where to stop.*

There the problem of organization is set forth as com-

* Charles J. Abbey, The English Church and Its Bishops, II, 13.

pletely as could be hoped. The clue for understanding the controversy lies in the perennial problem of defining the Christian church; and it is this which makes the controversy worth studying today. In this paper, the materials are organized about the doctrine of the church with the attendant notion of authority; and its natural corollary, the right to dissent. Of course the succession of writings took no such well-defined pattern, but they were all written in defence of the church. This approach to the controversy provides a structure about which the materials can be grouped with some hope of coherency and comprehensiveness.

The historical background material of Chapter I is not intended as an exhaustive treatment of the period, but is provided only to give some picture of the setting in which the controversy took place and some appreciation of the forces which created and sustained it. Chapter II gives the more or less chronological sequence of the controversy, an overall view in which separate writers can be related to the main trend of the argument. Chapters III and IV are more detailed treatments of the principal issues at point: authority and dissent. Chapter V is an attempt not to recapitulate the entire controversy, but to give some perspective to its arguments in relation to both its own setting and more recent criticisms.

In the case of quotations from the original sources, spelling, capitalization, and in most cases

punctuation, have been corrected to modern usage. Care has been taken, however, not to alter the meaning. An earnest endeavour has been made to make the spelling throughout the paper conform to British rather than American usage. The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary has been used as a standard. The Church of England is always referred to as "Church", while "church" is used as the more general expression. The Church of Christ, in the sense of an ideal, however, is also referred to as "Church". In most cases the meaning will be obvious, but any confusion in terminology here reflects the same confusion in the minds of the original writers. In the case of citations of anonymous works, if the work is attributed to an author by Halkett and Laing's Dictionary of Anonymous and Pseudonymous English Literature, or by Thomas Herne's contemporary bibliographies of the controversy, the reference is made under the author's name. Anonymous works, even when attributed to an author, are marked as such in the bibliography. Where no author is cited, works are listed as "Anon."

Sincere appreciation is extended to Principal Baillie and Professor Burleigh of New College for their criticisms and aid, to the library staffs of the New College, University, National, and Public Libraries for their patient help in securing the source materials, and to Miss Rowna Morrison for reading the manuscript.

Paul B. Hessert

Edinburgh,
March, 1951.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
PREFACE	ii
I. AN INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE COURSE OF THE CONTROVERSY	41
III. THE MAIN ISSUE OF THE CONTROVERSY:	
THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH	114
IV. THE PROBLEM OF DISSENT	176
V. CONCLUSION	226
Appendix A: The Nicholson Dispute	259
Appendix B: The La Pillonniere Dispute	262
Appendix C: Dean Sherlock's Side Dispute with Bishop Hoadly over his Reference to the Example of Christ	275
BIBLIOGRAPHY	282

CHAPTER I

AN INTRODUCTION

Coming when it did in history, shortly after the accession of the House of Hanover to the British throne, the Bangorian Controversy was involved in the whole picture of the English political and religious life of that day. To understand it as completely as it is possible to understand any occurrence two hundred fifty years after the event, one would need a knowledge of the whole complex development of English life, not only of that period itself, but of the years of turbulence which preceded it as well. A thorough investigation of such a panorama of history would require a lifetime of research.

Yet some appreciation of the subtle factors influencing the beginning and development of the controversy can be had by approaching it from three aspects of that history. The first of these is the conflict of the interests of Church and state which, if it was not climaxed, was certainly vividly dramatized by the separation of the Nonjurors from the Establishment in 1689. The second is the life of the English Church itself at this period of its history when the Dissenters had grown to such a proportion that their demands for toleration could no longer be either ignored or pushed aside with a complacent assertion of assumed

infallibility. And last, there is that factor which as a catalyst brought all the potentialities of the situation into reaction -- the clash of personalities. These three approaches to the controversy cannot be said to afford an exhaustive background to the subject; but they will serve to outline an answer to the question at hand as to why it came when it did and what it signified.

A. The Church-State Relation.

Temperley, in the "Cambridge Modern History," writes:

The religious motive, though not at first sight the most apparent, is still the deepest cause of the Revolution. In the Exclusion period, the people had shown that, if the choice had to be made, they preferred a Protestant sovereign with very large powers to a Catholic with very limited ones.¹

During the seventeenth century, the doctrine of non-resistance had come almost to characterize the attitude of Churchmen towards the king. Robert Sibthorpe stated the doctrine in a sermon which Archbishop Abbot refused to license, but which Laud subsequently did.

If princes command anything which subjects may not perform because it is against the laws of God or of nature, or impossible, yet subjects are bound to undergo the punishment without either resistance or railing and reviling; and so to

1 H. W. V. Temperley, "The Revolution and the Revolution Settlement in Great Britain (1) England," The Age of Louis XIV, "The Cambridge Modern History," vol. V, ed. by A. W. Ward; G. W. Frothero, and Stanley Leathes, (Cambridge: The University Press, 1908), p. 256.

yield a passive obedience where they cannot exhibit an active one.¹

Yet coupled with this doctrine was also an intense hatred of Popery. Lathbury asserts that in the time of Charles II, even Burnet and Tillotson subjected this opposition to Popery to the belief that "opposition to the prince could not be justified: and that the authority was in his person, not in the law."² But James' imprisonment of the seven bishops in the Tower in 1688 for failure to comply with the provisions of his second declaration of indulgence had opened their eyes to the fact that the king was trying to upset the Establishment.³ So in November of 1688 when James wanted the bishops to declare their abhorrence of William's proposed invasion "they told him," said Bishop Sprat, "they could not do it, for the prince might have a just cause of war, for what they knew."⁴ Lathbury's antagonism towards the Dissenters strongly colours his statements, but he does point out that the opposition to James' meddling came from the Church of England. "Whatever opposition was made to the usurpations of

1 Quoted by William Holden Hutton, The English Church from the Accession of Charles I to the Death of Anne (London: MacMillan and Co., Ltd., 1903), p. 27.

2 Thomas Lathbury, A History of the Nonjurors (London: William Pickering, 1845), p. 118.

3 Temperley, op. cit., p. 247.

4 Hutton, op. cit., p. 231. Those on hand were Archbishop Sancroft, and the Bishops of London, Rochester, Peterborough, and St. Davids, two of whom later became Nonjurors. John Stoughton, Ecclesiastical History of England: The Church of the Revolution (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1874), p. 31.

King James proceeded altogether from the clergy and one of the universities. The Dissenters readily and almost universally complied with him."¹

In December, 1688, at a meeting held in the Guildhall, a declaration promising William assistance in calling a new Parliament for "the welfare of England, the security of the Church, and the freedom of the Dissenters" was signed by the two archbishops, and the Bishops of Winchester, Ely, St. Asaph, Rochester, and Peterborough.² Compton, Bishop of London, was one of the seven who had invited the Prince of Orange to come over.³ Although Archbishop Sancroft had joined in asking William to restore peace, because of his oath to James he would give no further support to the Revolution, and he alone of the bishops would not wait on William, nor attend the House of Lords.⁴ At the meeting of the Convention on January 22, 1689, a day of solemn thanksgiving was declared and eleven of sixteen bishops, none of whom scrupled to do it, were appointed to draw up a suitable form of service.⁵

As to the settlement of the Revolution, ninety per cent of the clergy believed in hereditary monarchy, but they were divided into parties.⁶ (1) Clarendon and the

1 Lathbury, op. cit., p. 10.

2 Stoughton, op. cit., p. 53.

3 Ibid., p. 12.

4 Hutton, op. cit., p. 231.

5 They were the Bishops of London, Rochester, Norwich, Ely, Chichester, Gloucester, Bath and Wells, Peterborough, Lincoln, Bristol, and St. Asaph. Stoughton, op. cit., p. 73.

6 Ibid., p. 70.

High Church Tories wanted a regency with James as a nominal king. (2) Danby and a few Tories said James had abdicated so the crown should go to Mary. (3) The Whigs would declare the throne vacant and elect a king. (4) Halifax and the Moderates wanted the crown given to William and Mary.¹ But in a compromise move, Clarendon secured a Commons resolution that the throne was vacant both by James' bad government and by his flight.

Parliament formally accepted the unhistorical theory of an original contract between king and people, in opposition to the theory of Divine right originally developed as a counterblast to the Papal doctrine in politics. James was declared to have broken the contract; and the throne was conferred, without any pretence of religious sanction, upon the Prince and Princess of Orange.²

At the election of William and Mary, only Bishops Compton, Lloyd, Sprat, Hall, and Crew voted favourably.³

At this time, the Commons passed the Bill of Rights which limited the royal power and excluded Papists and those marrying Papists from the throne.⁴

Sancroft stubbornly held out for a regency, which meant two things: not only was he at odds with the action of the government, but he had abandoned his

1 Temperley, op. cit., p. 249. Stoughton says only the Bishops of London and Bristol were for filling the throne: the others voted for a regency. Stoughton, op. cit., p. 75. Lathbury declares that "with the exception of Burnet and some few Whigs, none of the clergy and people of England had the most distant idea of setting aside King James, though they wished to see a regency established." Lathbury, op. cit., p. 29.

2 Hutton, op. cit., p. 234.

3 Stoughton, op. cit., p. 77.

4 Temperley, op. cit., p. 251.

original doctrine of non-resistance.¹ When his chaplain, believing himself to have been given discretionary powers, prayed for the newly-elected king and queen, Sancroft commanded him either to desist or to stay away from Lambeth.² But it seems a poor bit of casuistry to maintain allegiance to a king and yet not be willing for him to rule. Although the Archbishop would have nothing to do with William and Mary, he "gave his commission to his suffragans, which virtually empowered them to crown the new sovereigns."³ Consequently the coronation was performed by Bishops Compton of London, Lloyd of St. Asaph, who was one of the men James had imprisoned in the Tower, and Sprat of Rochester, who had been a member of the High Commission.⁴

In March of 1689 James left France for Ireland to recover his dominions. He summoned Parliament to meet him there and circulated a declaration in England that the government was either to fight or to submit to the right king.⁵ There was little for the government to do but to impose an oath of allegiance on its members and employees. The words were, "I, A.B., do sincerely promise and swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to their Majesties King William and Queen Mary. So help me God."⁶ A further oath declared

1 Stoughton, op. cit., pp. 66f.

2 Ibid., p. 81.

3 Hutton, loc. cit.

4 Stoughton, op. cit., p. 99.

5 Ibid., pp. 144f.

6 Ibid., p. 80. Quoted from Parliamentary History, V, 111.

against the right of the people to do away with a king merely because he had been excommunicated by the Pope. There was discussion at that time as to whether the clergy were to subscribe to it. Burnet says that William was willing to dispense with the oath if the Dissenters would be freed of the sacramental test.¹ But feeling against the Dissenters was too high, so ecclesiastical persons were required to take the oath before August 1, 1689 on pain of suspension; then six months were allowed before deprivation scheduled for February 1, 1690. Lathbury treats the action of the government as unfair, saying that while "it was one thing to yield obedience to the new sovereign, it was another to transfer allegiance by an oath."² But because of the national character of the clergy, especially the higher clergy, in their relation to the government, it was as right to exact the oath from them as from the army. No provision was made for exempting other public officers: none could be made. And those who were so sensitive about oaths were the ones who had forced hard ones on the Presbyterians at the Restoration.³

Archbishop Sancroft refused the oath along with seven other bishops: Thomas Ken of Bath and Wells, John Lake of Chichester, Thomas White of Peterborough, Francis Turner of Ely,⁴ Robert Frampton of Gloucester,

1 Gilbert Burnet, History of His Own Time, a new edition (London: Reeves and Turner, 1883), p. 529.

2 Lathbury, op. cit., p. 47.

3 Stoughton, op. cit., pp. 89ff.

4 These five had been imprisoned in the Tower.

William Thomas of Worcester, and William Lloyd of Norwich.¹ In addition there were about four hundred of the lesser clergy, which Stoughton considers a remarkably small number.² These clergy remained in their places until the date set for their ejection. In the meantime, Sancroft granted a commission for the ordination of Burnet, since he refused to perform it himself.³ Cartwright of Chester joined James in Ireland, but died April 15, receiving the absolution of the Church of England. Thomas of Worcester died June 25 saying that he would rather be burned at the stake than take the oath.⁴ After the battle of the Boyne in July, 1690, William Sherlock, Master of the Temple, took the oath.⁵ Lake of Chichester died in August satisfied with the course he had taken, contending that passive obedience was a cardinal doctrine of the Church of England.⁶

When the sentence came due on February 1, 1690, most of the Nonjurors left their charges. Among them were George Hicke, Dean of Worcester, whose work The Constitution of the Catholic Church directly precipitated the Bangorian Controversy, Henry Dodwell, a pro-

1 Not to be confused with Lloyd of St. Asaph, one of the "Tower" bishops.

2 Stoughton, op. cit., p. 154.

3 When his own party objected, either he or someone else stole the document from the registrar's office. It was not recovered until after Sancroft's death when Burnet threatened legal action to verify his orders. Stoughton, op. cit., pp. 84f.

4 Ibid., pp. 146f.

5 Ibid., p. 161.

6 Ibid., pp. 146f.

fessor at Oxford, Jeremy Collier, and John Kettlewell. But Lloyd counselled the clergy to remain until they were judicially deposed,¹ and the remaining bishops stayed on at William's kindness for a year. To quote Burnet, "They all the while neglected the concerns of the Church, doing nothing, but living privately in their palaces."² As late as April, 1691, the bishops still lived in their palaces, but only Sancroft had to be evicted by a legal process.³

Sancroft left London in August of 1691, very bitter against the Established Church. He appointed Lloyd his vicar which started the schismatic church.⁴ For in 1694 George Hicke visited James at St. Germain's for two nominations for bishops, and accordingly was ordained by the deposed Bishops of Norwich, Peterborough, and Ely.⁵ James corresponded with Lloyd and Hicke as his accredited agents in his plans for an invasion.⁶ When Lloyd died, the militancy of the movement subsided, for besides Hicke, who, Stoughton says, "was as much a

1 Ibid., pp. 150f.

2 Burnet, op. cit., p. 565. When Burnet inquired if they would continue their duties if excused from the oath "they would give no answer; only they said, they would live quietly, that is, keep themselves close, till a proper time should encourage them to act more openly." Burnet had argued for toleration for the Nonjurors until he was convinced that in their loyalty to James, they were stirring up constant opposition to the government. Ibid., p. 530. Lathbury, however, charges Burnet with the "violent" government measures against the Nonjurors, with being a "Presbyterian council," and with holding "foreign", not English Reformation principles. Lathbury, op. cit., p. 69.

3 Stoughton, op. cit., pp. 169f.

4 Ibid., p. 189.

5 Ibid., p. 374.

6 Ibid., p. 375.

spiritual fanatic as any of the Presbyterian army chaplains, or any of Cromwell's troopers,"¹ there was no strong leader. Ken alone was still living; and when Bishop Kidder died (the man whom the government had put in his place in 1691, and who, incidentally, shared his income with Ken²), Ken welcomed Hooper, the new bishop, to the see of Bath and Wells³ saying that Hickeys was zealous to make the schism incurable.⁴

In admitting members of the Established Church into their communion, the Nonjurors used a "form of recantation" prepared by Kettlewell.⁵ Writers of the Nonjuror school stood for the priesthood of the clergy interpreted in the strictest sense, the literal sacrifice of the Eucharist, the miracle of consecration of the elements, the divine origin of the right of the clergy to tithes, and the exclusion from heaven of those excommunicated from the church. They further held the Church of England to be schismatic. They denied the validity of lay baptism and the value of repentance apart from priestly absolution.⁶ As time went on the

1 Stoughton, op. cit., p. 398.

2 Ibid., pp. 298ff.

3 Charles J. Abbey and John H. Overton, The English Church in the 18th Century (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1878), I, 109.

4 Ibid., I, 119.

5 Lathbury, op. cit., p. 120.

6 William E. H. Lecky, A History of England in the 18th Century (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1878), I, 86.

movement became less respectable,¹ and in 1717 it was divided by the usages controversy.²

The significant thing, however, about the Nonjurors is their contribution to the doctrine of the church.

"They realized," says Hutton,

far more vividly than most of their contemporaries the existence of the church as a distinct spiritual society, with laws of its own, whose connection with the state, however beneficial, was purely accidental; and, as a consequence, they insisted on the independence of the church of any power on earth in the exercise of her purely spiritual power and authority.³

Charles Leslie argued that if the church-state relation were set right, the Church would have nothing to fear from a Popish prince, for the king should have no authority in the Church: only in civil matters.⁴ A "notion that monarchs should be independent of parliaments associated itself with a notion that ministers of religion should be independent of human law."⁵ The Nonjurors did not want to sever completely the bond of the Establishment, and "an established church uncontrolled by the state would have meant an uncontrolled clergy, dictating to the laity alike on matters spiritual and political."⁶

1 John Stoughton, Religion in England under Queen Anne and the Georges (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1878), I, 177.

2 See Lathbury, op. cit.

3 Hutton, op. cit., pp. 237f. A discussion of this proposition in the light of the controversy will be found in Chapters II and III.

4 Abbey and Overton, op. cit., I, 91f.

5 Stoughton, The Church of the Revolution, p. 91.

6 George Macaulay Trevelyan, Blenheim (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1930), pp. 64f.

The part they played in the Revolution always embarrassed the High Church Tories who remained loyal to William. Burnet says their actions demonstrated their disaffection to the government, which made "many conclude that the clergy were a set of men that would swear and pray even against their consciences rather than lose their benefices; and by consequence that they were governed by interest and not principle."¹ William took little notice of the clergy, and showed little concern in church matters, so that it was rumoured that the king had no regard for religion or the Church of England.² Low-Churchmen, such as Burnet, were put into important positions -- the only method the government had to buttress itself.³ Consequently one can understand Lathbury's bitterness: "William did not find the Whigs as pliable as perhaps was expected. They thwarted him in some of his schemes: but in any step, calculated to weaken the Church or degrade the clergy, their support was readily and cordially yielded."⁴ One of the measures referred to is the Toleration Bill of 1689. William's hope was to free the Dissenters from the Test Act; failing in this, he was able to secure a degree of toleration for them. The bill provided that all Protestant Dissenters who did not deny the doctrine

1 Burnet, op. cit., p. 584.

2 Ibid., p. 589.

3 Trevelyan, op. cit., pp. 64f.

4 Lathbury, op. cit., p. 70.

of the Trinity as found in the Thirty-nine Articles were free from restrictions on worship, although their meeting houses had to be registered.¹

From the moment that William gave his assent to this act, that church [Church of England] ceased to be national in the sense in which it had been so before. The theory of its constitution underwent a revolution. It could no longer assume the attitude it had done, could no longer claim all Englishmen, as by sovereign right, worshippers within its pale; it gave legalized scope for differences of action -- for their growth, and advancement, and for the increase of their supporters in point of numbers, character, and influence.²

The second blow was the establishment of Presbyterianism in Scotland, which meant the abolishing of Episcopacy there.³ This resulted in the rather confused situation of having the same king a Presbyterian in one part of his dominion, and an Episcopalian in another.⁴ The result was that the Scottish Episcopalians joined the Jacobite cause.

On the death of James II, Louis XIV proclaimed the Pretender as James III, King of Britain. In England that action brought on the Abjuration Bill of 1702 which required of all holding a post in church or state an oath (1) denying the theory of hereditary right, (2) asserting not only that William and Mary were the lawful but also the rightful monarchs, and (3) abjuring the Pretender and his heirs as having no right or title

1 Hutton, op. cit., p. 247.

2 Stoughton, The Church of the Revolution, p. 120.

3 Burnet, op. cit., p. 541.

4 Abbey and Overton, op. cit., I, 24.

whatsoever to the crown. The act broke the old distinction many persons had made between king de jure and de facto,¹ and prevented the return of the Nonjurors who were prepared to come back into the Church on the death of James II.² When Anne came to the throne, however, many who before would not take the Oath of Abjuration now did so, professing satisfaction in her title. But even then some said her title was rightful by law, but not by birth, and so they were not abjuring fealty to James who had the right by birth.³

The early years of Anne's reign were characterized by the Whig ascendancy. A proposed bill against occasional conformity was defeated in 1703. But the lesser clergy, now bolstered by some of the Nonjurors who had returned to the Church, seeing preferments go to Whigs, set up a clamour about the danger the Church was in and the want of Convocations.⁴ Although the High Church party should have held steady, they sought the return of the "good days" of Charles II, and the opportunity to give both Whigs and Dissenters a "bad time."⁵ The disturbance created by the Lower House of Convocation was so great at the time of the union of the kingdoms, that the queen ordered the archbishop to prorogue Convocation until after the Treaty of Union

1 Trevelyan, op. cit., p. 159.

2 Stoughton, The Church of the Revolution, p. 255.

3 Burnet, op. cit., p. 707.

4 Ibid., p. 670.

5 Trevelyan, op. cit., pp. 327ff.

had been consummated.¹ Finally in 1710 the Whigs met their downfall by the prosecution of Henry Sacheverell, the notorious "church in danger" propagandist.

At the time of Anne's death, had the issue been only between Whigs and Tories, the Pretender would have come to the throne. Jacobitism, indeed, had its best chance of success during the years 1710-1714.² The general feeling of the clergy was in favour of the restoration of the Stuarts. "All the instincts, all the traditions, all the principles and enthusiasms of the Tory Party inclined them to the Stuarts, and, as Bolingbroke truly said, a Whig ascendancy in England could in that age only rest upon adventitious and exceptional circumstances."³ But as Bolingbroke discovered, the Pretender was a bigoted Roman Catholic, and even the High Church party could have no real union with him.⁴ The Popery of the Pretender threw the balance to the House of Hanover, that and the fact that the death of Anne found the Whigs organized and the Tories and Jacobites in confusion. George was proclaimed king; measures were taken to prevent the Pretender from landing; and in September the new king arrived.

At the time of his accession, High-Churchmen in

1 Burnet, op. cit., p. 806.

2 Abbey and Overton, op. cit., I, 64.

3 Lecky, op. cit., I, 156.

4 Ibid., I, 316.

London stirred up riots against him.¹ During Anne's reign the High Church party insisted on her hereditary as opposed to the parliamentary right to the throne. But George was a parliamentary king, so the High Church party had either to retract their words or stand aloof from the new dynasty.² Contested claims to the monarchy in Spain, Italy, Poland, and France at this same time shook the reverence for the throne, destroying its mystical sanctity, and brought the supreme authority into the arena of controversy.³ George as a royal personage could not claim the loyalty of the Church as did James. In 1715 the bulk of the clergy used their influence on behalf of the Pretender.⁴ The Tory Party was almost entirely Jacobite.⁵ But with the passing years passionate Jacobitism subsided. The new generation had not taken first oaths of loyalty to James II. The young Pretender was not the slave of Rome that his father had been, yet the clergy did not help him in 1745 as they had helped his father in 1715.⁶

The Church of England had played a major role in the Revolution. Its leaders had spear-headed the opposition to James II. But the Revolution, in turn, not

1 Abbey and Overton, op. cit., II, 383.

2 John H. Overton and Frederic Relton, The English Church: from the Accession of George I to the End of the Eighteenth Century (London: MacMillan and Co., Ltd., 1906), p. 12.

3 Lecky, op. cit., I, 218.

4 Abbey and Overton, op. cit., I, 89.

5 Lecky, op. cit., I, 316.

6 Abbey and Overton, op. cit., I, 102f.

only divided the Church between Jurors and Nonjurors, but drove a wedge of separate political loyalties between the High and Low Church parties of the Establishment itself. These loyalties had effects on religious doctrines as well as governmental issues. To appreciate them one must understand more of the life within the Establishment itself in this period.

B. The Church of England Itself.

"Two centuries of rival religious persecutions," says Trevelyan, "Catholic and Protestant, Puritan and Anglican, ending in the anti-Roman revolution of 1688, had aroused in England a movement of resistance to clerical claims of all sorts."¹ In reaction to this trend, the Churchmen clung all the more tenaciously to their claims. Burnet, in his final exhortation to the History of His Own Times said:

Learn to view Popery in a true light, as a conspiracy to exalt the powers of the clergy, even by subjecting the most sacred truths of religion to contrivances for raising their authority, and by offering to the world another method of being saved besides that prescribed in the Gospel. . . . I see a spirit rising among us too like that of the Church of Rome, of advancing the clergy beyond its due authority to an unjust pitch.²

Antagonism to the Church was no longer expressed in the form of puritan dissent, but in a latitudinarian protest against priestcraft.³ The Act of Uniformity had

1 Trevelyan, op. cit., p. 53.

2 Burnet, op. cit., p. 907.

3 Trevelyan, op. cit., p. 53.

driven the Puritans and Presbyterians from the Church, but even so, the clergy were divided into parties. The Low Church were for state control of the Church, no independent Lower House of Convocation, and ecclesiastical freedom not quite to the extent of the claims of the Nonconformists.¹ In the seventeenth century High-Churchmanship meant considering the Church of England as a great branch of the Catholic Church; but in the eighteenth century it meant a political establishment whose privileges were to be jealously guarded.² Yet this group was divided between the Jurors and the Non-jurors. Both parties claimed the privileges of establishment, but asserted the independence of the Church of government control, and held Convocation to be the successor to the Council of Jerusalem.³

Following on the Revolution, there was an attempt at comprehension within the Church of England. The Bishop of Lincoln thought that ordination by presbyters was valid, so that re-ordination would not be necessary to bring Dissenters back into the Church.⁴ Even Sancroft allowed his name to be attached to the movement, but Burnet says that comprehension was the hope of the Jacobites in order that they might have grounds for an outcry against the Establishment.⁵ But the general

1 Stoughton, Religion in England under Queen Anne and the Georges, I, 12.

2 Abbey and Overton, op. cit., II, 8f.

3 Stoughton, op. cit., I, 13.

4 Stoughton, The Church of the Revolution, p. 103.

5 Burnet, op. cit., p. 544.

atmosphere of the Commons -- even of the liberal Whig Churchmen -- was against the move; and even the Dissenters were not of one mind about it. Consequently the proposed Comprehension Bill of 1689 was a failure.¹

Although it was not possible to open the way for the return of the Dissenters to the Church, it was possible to relieve them from the burden of many of the laws against them. Burnet argued that it was high time that this was done, since, if persecution is to be carried on at all, it must be done to the degree of extirpation, otherwise it only produces malcontents within the society, who, if they gain power, may logically persecute those who have abused them.² The Whigs wanted easy treatment for even the Nonjurors.³ Yet the Commons fought through an amendment prescribing deprivation for all clergy who would not take the Oath of Allegiance. As time went on, toleration became more and more unpopular with the High-Churchmen. Burnet speaks of a "sort of clergy" who maintained "that the Church was in danger, till a prosecution of Dissenters should be again set on foot."⁴

But the problem of dissent was not one external to the Church of England. Even though the Presbyterians had been expelled, even though the failure of the movement towards comprehension kept them out, the Churchmen

1 Stoughton, The Church of the Revolution, p. 109.

2 Burnet, op. cit., p. 906.

3 Stoughton, op. cit., p. 95.

4 Burnet, op. cit., p. 595.

were seriously divided among themselves. This division is best illustrated by the dispute over Convocation. Each English Convocation consists of two houses: the upper made up of the bishops, presided over by the archbishop, and the lower, made up of delegates elected by the lesser clergy and presided over by a prolocutor elected by the Lower House itself. Convocation can meet only by authorization from the crown, and nothing it does has any binding power without the consent of the sovereign.¹ Convocation in William's reign was exceedingly troublesome, for the Lower House, dominated by the High Church party, began to make claims for independent action. In 1698 when William stopped the Trinitarian debates at the instigation of the bishops, the Lower House claimed the right to lay things before the king as a part of Parliament.² The Lower House claimed a right to originate any business whatsoever, to adjourn itself when and where it pleased, and the High Church party itself once divided over the question of obeying an order of the prolocutor to meet when the archbishop had prorogued both houses.³ The Upper House, on the other hand, decided that the Lower had no right to censure any book without its being consulted. The relation of the two houses is actually a matter of

1 Stoughton, The Church of the Revolution, pp. 268f.

2 Burnet, op. cit., p. 650.

3 Stoughton, op. cit., pp. 273-282. The Kirk of Scotland had already claimed its right to meet independent of the sanction of the crown. Burnet, op. cit., p. 576.

law, the law of the land which both parties interpreted wrongly.¹

"As the clergy had so long disputed with the diocesans, many said they acted as if they were Presbyterians, and set at nought Episcopal orders."²

Burnet says:

The Lower House, finding that by opposing the bishops in so rough, as well as in so unheard-of a manner they were represented as favourers of presbytery, to clear themselves of that imputation came suddenly into a conclusion that episcopacy was of divine and apostolic right.³

The Lower House wanted the bishops to define episcopacy in a High Church manner to silence the Low-Churchmen, or else to appear as not supporting the Establishment.⁴ Although the Lower House submitted the problem to the queen, it would not acquiesce in her judgment that it was subject to the archbishop's prorogation.⁵

The clamour of the Lower House culminated in the

1 Stoughton, Religion in England under Queen Anne and the Georges, I, 51, 58.

2 Ibid., I, 27. "If the most constant, contemptuous, and ostentatious defiance both of civil and ecclesiastical authorities be a result of the Protestant principles of private judgment, it may be truly said that the extreme high-church party, in more than one period of its history, has shown itself, in this respect at least, the most Protestant of sects. While idolizing episcopacy in the abstract, its members have made it a main object of their policy to bring most existing bishops into contempt, and their polemical writings have been conspicuous even in theological literature for their feminine spitefulness, and for their recklessness of assertion." Lecky, op. cit., I, 88.

3 Burnet, op. cit., pp. 726f.

4 Stoughton, Religion in England under Queen Anne and the Georges, I, 27.

5 Burnet, op. cit., p. 790.

Sacheverell affair. Lecky calls him "an insolent and hot-headed man, without learning, literary ability, or piety; distinguished chiefly by his striking person and good delivery, and by his scurrilous abuse of Dissenters and Whigs."¹ His cry was that the Low-Churchmen had jeopardized the security of the Church, and on no other basis than his party animus, accused them (including half of the most highly respected bishops) of immoral lives and unmentionable vices.² The decision of the Whigs to try him before the bar of the House of Lords for seditious libel proved their downfall, for the delay which was involved in such a procedure allowed ample time for arousing an active opposition to it. Atterbury defended Sacheverell and represented him as a martyr of persecution. Sacheverell was declared guilty, but his punishment was only a three-year suspension. The end of the trial found him the idol of the crowd which acclaimed him wherever he went. Anne made Atterbury a bishop in 1713, but refused to honour Sacheverell.

But the importance of the trial is that it marked the triumph of the Tories in the government and the High-Churchmen in the Establishment. The following year was enacted the bill against occasional conformity. "Dodwell feared that the Dissenters," says Lathbury,

1 Lecky, op. cit., I, 51.

2 Trevelyan, op. cit., p. 51.

by being admitted to occasional communion, might vote on Church matters as Churchmen, and then declare that certain doctrines were not those of the Church of England: and that such a proceeding might be deemed an act of the Church itself.¹

The act could not have been passed had not the Whigs traded their support for it in a move to defeat the negotiations that led to the peace of Utrecht. Even so it proved that the country was on the side of the High Church party.² Wright says, regarding the political loyalties of the church parties at the death of Anne, that "every sensible man saw that the contest between High Church and Low Church was in reality a struggle for the succession to the crown between the House of Stuart and the House of Hanover."³

At any rate, the accession of George and the triumph of the Whigs also meant a return to favour of the Low Church party. Consequently when Convocation began to censure the works of Bishop Hoadly, a Whig latitudinarian, although it may have had an undoubted right as Perry contends,⁴ the king ordered a prorogation. The government could not have the whole body of clergy against it.⁵ Lecky observes that this action put a stop to one great source of intolerance, and that no one objected to it. Even the banishment of Atterbury, the

1 Lathbury, op. cit., p. 197.

2 Lecky, op. cit., I, 94.

3 Thomas Wright, England under the House of Hanover, 2nd ed. (London: Richard Bentley, 1848), I, 9f.

4 George G. Perry, The History of the Church of England (London: Saunders, Otley, and Co., 1864), III, 288f.

5 Overton and Relton, op. cit., p. 19.

most brilliant and popular of the English bishops, by a bill of pains and penalties, met with no difficulty.¹ Convocation never met again, except formally, for over a hundred years, during a period containing many events which it might well have discussed with profit.²

The complex interplay of motives and ideas which makes the Church life of this period so confused was all embodied in the Bangorian Controversy which developed out of it.

C. The Personalities.

It was Benjamin Hoadly who somehow seemed to embody the glories and defects of the life of both Church and state in the first few decades of the eighteenth century. His life and writings caught up the conflicts within the Church and those between it and the state. Gibbon described him as "the object of Whig idolatry and Tory abhorrence."³ Hunt says, "We may seem to miss in him at times the fervour of deep religious feeling, but he is always genuine."⁴ Since it was about him that the whole Bangorian Controversy centred, it is well to have some picture of his life.

Strangely, when compared with his own views and

1 Lecky, op. cit., I, 251f.

2 Abbey and Overton, op. cit., II, 7.

3 Quoted from his Autobiography by Charles J. Abbey, The English Church and Its Bishops 1700-1800 (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1887), I, 13.

4 John Hunt, Religious Thought in England from the Reformation to the End of Last Century (London: Strahan and Co., 1870-73), III, 30.

actions, Hoadly's grandfather was a royalist who fled England for America in 1639. In 1654 he returned to Scotland as chaplain to the garrison of Edinburgh Castle. He spent his whole fortune (which amounted to about three hundred pounds) in the cause of the Restoration. The Bishop's father, Samuel Hoadly, eldest of twelve children, was born in New England in 1643. He was educated in Edinburgh, and later moved with the family to Kent in 1662 where he taught school.

Benjamin, the second son of Samuel, and the sixth of nine children by his second wife, was born in Westerham, Kent, November 14, 1676. He was educated by his father until he was admitted to St. Catherine's Hall, Cambridge in 1691. He received his B.A. degree in 1696 with seven terms indulged him ob gravissimam valetudinem; was elected fellow in 1697; and received his M.A. in 1699. During his undergraduate days he had contracted smallpox so severely that he was crippled for life. Doctors wanted to amputate his leg but were persuaded to save it. But he had always to use a cane or crutches to walk, and always preached kneeling on a stool. His early life was that of an invalid: it was only after he could afford a chaise for drives in the open air that he warded off a consumptive tendency and developed rather robust health.

Bishop Compton of London ordained him deacon in 1698 and priest in 1700. In 1701 when he was married to Sarah Curtis he resigned his fellowship and was

appointed to the lectureship of St. Mildred in the Poultry, in which he continued for ten years until he had preached it down to thirty pounds a year, as he "pleasantly observed."¹ In 1702 he obtained the rectory of St. Peter's Poor in Broad Street, largely through the recommendation of Dean William Sherlock of St. Paul's and Bishop Fleetwood.

His works in this early period were generally on the subject of the reasonableness of conforming to the Establishment. Some have felt that his later efforts on the behalf of the Dissenters marked a change of mind on his part,² but he says these works were "to vindicate the conforming clergy by vindicating the terms of conformity"³ as against the moderate Dissenters who held that conformity to the Church of England was itself lawful, but yet remained apart. In 1705 a sermon against the doctrine of passive obedience brought him a censure from the Lower House of Convocation.⁴ "From the date of this sermon, near fifty years ago," he writes, "a torrent of angry zeal began to pour itself out upon me, which, though for the present indeed very disagreeable, yet opened a way to such explications of the doctrine of it, and the reasonings about it, as have produced what

1 "Article Hoadly," The Works of Benjamin Hoadly, D.D., ed. by John Hoadly (London: John Hoadly, 1773), I, viii.

2 See George G. Perry, "Benjamin Hoadly," Dictionary of National Biography, ed. by Sidney Lee (London: Smith, Elder, and Co., 1897), XXVII, 16-21.

3 Hoadly, Works, I, xvi.

4 Lecky, op. cit., I, 50; Hutton, op. cit., p. 277.

at the end makes me not to repent of having preached it."¹ This early controversy over the rights of citizens was carried on chiefly with Dr. Atterbury who charged Hoadly with rebellion.²

Although the Lower House was dominated by the Tory High Church party, the government was still in the hands of Whigs. Accordingly, the Commons in 1709 recommended that the queen bestow some dignity in the Church on him "for his eminent services both to Church and state."³ Anne, however, did not comply. Indeed, the defeat of the Whigs after the Sacheverell affair left Hoadly without backing. After the trial the mob burned him in effigy.⁴

His preferment waited for the succession of the House of Hanover. In 1715 Hoadly was appointed to the Bishopric of Bangor.⁵ In 1716 he was made chaplain to

1 Hoadly, Works, I, xv.

2 Ibid., I, xiv.

3 Ibid., I, ix.

4 Abbey and Overton, op. cit., II, 380.

5 Whiston says of this occasion: "In 1716, Mr. Hoadly was made Bishop of Bangor. At which time I told his Lordship that he had now 500 l. (it proved 800 l.) a year to keep the (primitive) Christian religion out of England. And I think that he has, since he was made a bishop, (for he was a much better man before), abundantly verified my prediction. In the first place, he took the Bishopric of Bangor, and the 800 l. a year, which was intended to maintain a resident bishop in that diocese, and this for six entire years together, without ever seeing that diocese in his life, to the greatest scandal of religion. He then became a great writer of controversy, one of the most pernicious things to true Christianity in the world, as well as disagreeable to the peaceable temper of a good Christian." William Whiston, Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Mr. William Whiston (London: printed for the author, 1749), pp. 244f.

the king, having received a D. D. degree from Archbishop Wake. It is noted that when he went to court on the occasion of his appointment, he did not know his way upstairs, and sat waiting in the outside room until he was called.¹ He was consecrated bishop in March, 1716. Norman Sykes says that although the government exercised extremely poor judgment in this appointment, the blame falls directly on Hoadly himself. His friends thought a deanery would be better for him, for "crutches would look ungainly" in the House of Lords. He could not hope to visit his see which would require a man able to ride horseback on the winding paths of northern Wales. "The ineffectiveness of Hoadly as the bishop of any see was therefore predestined; and in this case the appointment was clearly made without the slightest regard for the discharge of episcopal duties."² Dean Sherlock alone, in the Bangorian Controversy, called attention to Hoadly's failure to visit Bangor,³ and this in an obviously abusive work to which he would not put his name. Hutton brands Hoadly as "a scandal to

1 Hoadly, Works, I, x.

2 Norman Sykes, Church and State in England in the XVIIIth Century (Cambridge: The University Press, 1934), pp. 361f.

3 "The freedom he takes with the venerable fathers of the primitive church shows that he can be very familiar on a slight acquaintance: and 'tis possible he may know no more of the modern clergy than of the ancient, and as little of both as he ever intends to know of those in his own diocese." Thomas Sherlock, Remarks upon the Lord Bishop of Bangor's Treatment of the Clergy and Convocation (London: E. Smith, 1717), p. 23. See the note on this work, p. 279.

the episcopate for his non-residence."¹ Yet the eighteenth century was more tolerant of absenteeism than is the twentieth, for the chief function of a bishop was thought to be that of a theologian rather than a pastor.²

It was during these years of his first bishopric that he was involved in the Bangorian Controversy. In 1716 Hicke's papers had been published posthumously. There were many attempts to defend the action of the government against the Nonjurors,³ but Hoadly felt these were all unsatisfactory because they did not go to the root of the matter. So in that same year his famous "Preservative" was published. Views of this work vary from "a marvelously able work"⁴ to "peculiarly obnoxious."⁵ In 1717 he preached the sermon "On the Nature of the Kingdom, or Church, of Christ" before the king, which was printed by special command. He says of this: "At whose request it was commanded to be published I know not; but I know that it was not, either directly or indirectly, from any desire of mine."⁶ The thought of the sermon was not new: two years before he had preached on the duty of Christians to inquire into matters of their faith and had said, "I should be sorry to find that amongst Protestants it should stand in

1 Hutton, op. cit., p. 260.

2 Abbey and Overton, op. cit., I, 32.

3 See chapter II.

4 Overton and Relton, op. cit., p. 15.

5 Lathbury, op. cit., p. 263.

6 Hoadly, Works, I, xx.

need of any apology to refer men to Christ himself for the fundamentals of Christ's religion, and not to any human constitution whatever."¹ Norman Sykes says even this was not original but only "repetition of the opinions current in the entourage of Clark."²

At any rate, these two works received the condemnation of the Lower House of Convocation. Lathbury childishly says, "Hoadly's work contained so much of what was unsound that several of its propositions were censured by the Lower House of Convocation."³ That explanation for the origin of the Bangorian Controversy is far too simple. Hoadly admittedly was not original: Arthur Sykes had written the same things earlier.⁴ Even Dean Sherlock, the chairman of the Lower House committee drawing up the charge, in 1712 had preached a doctrine which cannot be distinguished from the Bishop's.⁵ The real explanation lies in the opposition the High Church party in the Lower House gave Hoadly ever since his 1705 sermon. They distrusted his friendship with the Dissenters arising from his latitudinarianism,⁶ and his preferment on top of all this galled them.

The chief charge against Hoadly and Watson, however, has proceeded from their attainment of the eminence of the episcopate, without which

1 Hoadly, Works, I, xviii.

2 Norman Sykes, op. cit., p. 349.

3 Lathbury, op. cit., p. 264.

4 See pp. 54-56, infra.

5 See pp. 90-95, infra.

6 "Throughout his career Hoadly supported the demands of the Dissenters for the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts." Norman Sykes, op. cit., p. 341.

added significance of dignity, the profession of whiggism and latitudinarianism might have passed uncensured.¹

The Whigs feared a recurrence of the trouble of the Sacheverell affair, so the government put a stop to the procedure of Convocation against him.² So strong was the feeling that "the names of Snape and Sherlock, the two most violent of Hoadly's opponents, were struck from the list of the royal chaplains."³

Hoadly was a man the king delighted to honour.⁴ In 1720 he resigned the rectory of St. Peter's Poor, and in 1721 was translated to the see of Hereford. During this time he concurred in the sentence of Bishop Atterbury, but not for personal reasons. In 1723 he was translated to Salisbury, and resigned the rectory of Streatham, his most beloved retreat. On the death of Bishop Willis in 1734, whom he had succeeded at Salisbury, he was advanced to the see of Winchester which he held for twenty-seven years. He died quietly in his palace at Chelsea on April 17, 1761.

He was so happy to live long enough to reap the full earthly reward of his labours; to see his Christian and moderate opinions prevail over the kingdom, in Church and state; to see the Nonconformists at a very low ebb, for want of the opposition and persecution they were too much used to experience from both, many of their ministers desiring to receive their re-ordination from his own hands, and many of their congregations not able to support any minister amongst them, or

1 Norman Sykes, op. cit., p. 356.

2 Abbey, The English Church and Its Bishops, II, 18.

3 Thomas Lathbury, A History of the Convocation of the Church of England, 2nd ed. (London: J. Leslie, 1853), p. 456.

4 Overton and Relton, op. cit., p. 14.

else receiving extraordinary contributions from their brethren in London to that end; to see the general temper of the clergy entirely changed, the bishops preferring few or none of intolerant principles, and the clergy claiming no inherent authority, but what is the natural result of their own good behaviour as individuals in the discharge of their duty; to see the absurd trust of indefeasible hereditary right and of its genuine offspring, unlimited non-resistance (demonstrated by him to be founded neither in scripture nor reason) absolutely exploded; and the Protestant succession firmly fixed in the hearts and persuasions of the people as in the laws of God and the land.¹

Norman Sykes humorously introduces a wise measure of caution into his appraisal of the Church life of the time.

Portrayed in the mordant comments of Lord Hervey and Horace Walpole, and embellished by pertinent (if usually inaccurate) references to Bishops Hoadly and Watson, the typical prelate of the Hanoverian age has been paraded as an exact if unedifying parallel to the polite and eloquent Synesius, Bishop of Ptolemais, who "loved profane studies and profane sports, was incapable of supporting a life of celibacy, disbelieved the resurrection, and refused to preach fables to the people unless he was permitted to philosophize at home."²

Lathbury says Hoadly "was one of those latitudinarian Churchmen by whom the Church has been occasionally afflicted."³ "While the Church of England was in high esteem and reputation abroad," writes Canon Perry,

the government was eagerly bent on lowering its position and influence at home. In Hoadly they found a man who standing in the place of the bishop could argue against church government, and having accepted and subscribed creeds and confessions could yet denounce them as unnecessary.⁴

1 Hoadly, Works, I, xiif.

2 Norman Sykes, op. cit., p. 3.

3 Lathbury, History of the Nonjurors, p. 263.

4 Perry, op. cit., III, 314.

Why this untoward bitterness for Hoadly? Leslie Stephen attributes it to three causes: his opposition to sacerdotal privilege, his defence of the Dissenters, and the seeming laxity of his theology.¹ But a "really religious latitudinarian has no natural relationship with indifference to error."² Abbey speaks of his "reverence -- exclusive to a fault -- for the authority of Holy Writ."³ "His whole political and ecclesiastical theories may be summed up in a single formula. He denies the divine right theory, whether of priests or kings, in the only sense in which it can have any application to a specific political problem."⁴ The application in the "Preservative" of this proposition to the government in its deposition of James II did not provoke any extreme opposition: the theory of non-resistance was then dead in practice. But when, in the sermon, he applied that same proposition to the Church he stirred up a hornets' nest of opposition "until the combatants, wearied with the strife, ceased to engage in the contest, or were laid in the silent grave."⁵

From this polemic the visible church emerged, stripped not only of distinctions of polity, episcopalian and presbyterian, but of all corporate existence and authority over its members. It was reduced virtually to a voluntary association of

1 Leslie Stephen, History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century, 2nd ed. (London: Smith, Elder, and Co., 1881), II, 152f.

2 Abbey and Overton, op. cit., I, 263.

3 Abbey, The English Church and Its Bishops, II, 20.

4 Stephen, op. cit., II, 155.

5 Lathbury, History of Convocation, p. 456.

seekers after truth, united by the sincerity of their quest despite the diversity of religious profession.¹

Perry thinks he was opposed "not only to definite articles, but the whole status and very existence of the church."² Overton and Relton feel that the greatest drawback of his view of the church is its lack of a doctrine of the Holy Spirit, a characteristic shortcoming of eighteenth century theology.³

His opponents attacked rather what they read into the sermon than what was actually there. The sermon itself was restrained and almost innocuous if taken as the starting point, and not as the goal, of church development.⁴

"Probably no other sermon ever produced so voluminous a controversy, or excited in clerical circles so prolonged an agitation."⁵ The course of the controversy "was clouded and confused by verbal misunderstandings, arising in part perhaps from the occasional prolixity of Hoadly's style, but chiefly from the distorting influence of strong prejudices."⁶ Leslie Stephen maintains that it was chiefly Hoadly's style which kept the controversy alive.

His opponents charged him with assailing all church authority. He should have replied: I deny that the church can send a man to hell; I don't deny that it can and ought to censure him for immorality. But he chose to reply: that he had not denied all authority, but only absolute

1 Norman Sykes, op. cit., p. 350.

2 Perry, op. cit., III, 282.

3 Overton and Relton, op. cit., p. 16.

4 Ibid.

5 Lecky, op. cit., I, 251.

6 Abbey and Overton, op. cit., I, 31.

authority, or authority to which "the people are indispensably obliged to submit." His opponents replied that the insertion of the word "absolute" was a mere evasion intended to conceal his true sentiments.¹

Yet it was personal venom which insisted on taking the worst possible meaning of his ambiguity which perpetuated the controversy. Only personal rancour can explain the attacks of the Bishop's opponents on his character: the charges that he lied when he said he preached the sermon without anyone else's advice, that he kept a Jesuit in his family, that he believed Christ's example more fit for slaves than subjects.²

Over fifty writers engaged in the controversy at some time or other, but the chief opponents of the Bishop were William Law and Thomas Sherlock, Dean of Chichester. It has been said that except from a Non-juror's point of view, Hoadly's arguments would be very difficult to answer; and that is why Law was the most successful in the attempt.³

Law was born in 1686, the son of a grocer. He evidently showed considerable talent as a boy, for his parents sent him to the university. In 1705 he entered Emmanuel College, Cambridge, receiving his B.A. in 1708, and M.A. in 1712. In 1711 he was ordained and elected fellow. In April, 1713 he was suspended for making a speech espousing the Jacobite cause; and when George I

1 Stephen, op. cit., II, 161f.

2 See Appendices A, B, and C.

3 Overton and Relton, op. cit., p. 16.

came to the throne, he refused to take the Oath of Allegiance. Overton says this was natural: he had defended Anne's hereditary right, and when George came in as a parliamentary king, Law was too honest to change theories as other High-Churchmen did.¹ Law, although barred from office in the Church, did not withdraw from its communion, as had other Nonjurors.² There is some evidence that he even served a time as a curate.³

His first public work was the three letters in reply to Hoadly's writings in the controversy. Overton says they "were fully deserving of all the praise they received."⁴ They have the advantages and disadvantages of any defence of an extreme High Church position. Hoadly himself did not reply to them -- although Pyle and the younger Burnet did -- presumably because he did not want to call public attention to them. They were frequently omitted from bibliographies of the controversy (i. e., Life of Bishop Sherlock) and only became famous later when Law himself was famous on other grounds.⁵ In 1897 they were republished by Anglo-Catholic editors as William Law's Defence of Church Principles, although even earlier they were included in

1 John H. Overton, William Law, Nonjuror and Mystic (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1881), p. 12.

2 Stephen Hobhouse, William Law and Eighteenth Century Quakerism (London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1927), p. 256.

3 Leslie Stephen, "William Law," Dictionary of National Biography, XXXII, 236.

4 Overton, William Law, p. 30.

5 Overton and Relton, op. cit., p. 18.

a two volume collection entitled The Scholar Armed.¹ Perry says that this work of Law's "was a complete destruction of Hoadly's treatise."² This is typical of the eulogy bestowed upon it in recent years. Hobhouse, however, writes:

I am unable to discover any organic connection between Law's conception of the church in these letters and his very different conception of it in his later works. Above all there is a harshness, an intolerance, an artificiality about this extremely clever book, which grates upon the lover of the William Law of the Serious Call and the Spirit of Prayer.³

It is interesting to note that Law refers his readers back to these letters only once in a vague allusion.⁴

Law's real fame came with his reply to Mandeville's Fable of the Bees in 1723, and the Serious Call in 1728. He was unquestionably a devout man of integrity -- he must have been to have so influenced the Wesleys, and to have made Gibbon, whose father he had tutored, comment on his genuine Christian spirit.⁵ In 1737 he wrote in opposition to Hoadly's Plain Account of the Lord's Supper. "His assaults upon Hoadly, Mandeville, and Tindal could only have failed to place him in the front rank because they diverged too far from popular theories."⁶ It was only natural that he should have been engaged in controversy with Hoadly who gave

1 Overton, William Law, p. 20; Hobhouse, op. cit., p. 257.

2 Perry, op. cit., III, 303.

3 Hobhouse, op. cit., p. 259.

4 Ibid., p. 259, footnote 2.

5 Dictionary of National Biography, XXXII, 237.

6 Ibid., XXXII, 239.

expression to the position of the Low Church latitudinarian.

One of Law's friends in the Establishment was Thomas Sherlock, who tried to embarrass Hoadly into replying to Law.¹ Sherlock's career almost parallels that of Hoadly. He was the son of William Sherlock, Dean of St. Paul's and Master of the Temple, born in 1678. He went to Eton, then entered St. Catherine's Hall, Cambridge, where he was Hoadly's junior by two years. "It is said that their long rivalry began at Cambridge."² In 1704 he became Master of the Temple on his father's resignation, and retained that position with great popularity until a stroke of paralysis affected his speech in 1753 and forced him to resign it. In 1711 he was made chaplain to Anne. In 1714 he became Master of St. Catherine's Hall. After the

1 "As to his Lordship's complaint that I did not answer everything writ against me, before I pretended to step out like a new writer, I am surprised to hear it from his Lordship, who has discretion enough to let some things go unanswered; and particularly, Mr. Law's two letters; a writer so considerable that I know but one good reason why his Lordship does not answer him." Thomas Sherlock, The Condition and Example of our Blessed Saviour Vindicated (London: J. Pemberton, 1718), p. 62. Hoadly said that if Law is unanswerable, then Sherlock cannot answer his arguments either, even though the Dean admits that Law's doctrine of the uninterrupted succession of clergy is an unwarrantable extreme. Hoadly, "An Answer to a Late Book," Works, II, 691. Sherlock had spoken of the "labyrinths" of Hoadly's sermon, and the Bishop replies: "I never invited Mr. Law into my 'labyrinths' with a public assurance that I would undertake to show him the way out again." Ibid., II, 694.

2 William H. Hutton, "Thomas Sherlock," Dictionary of National Biography, LII, 93.

accession of George he preached a powerful sermon on behalf of the House of Hanover and in 1715 received the Deanery of Chichester.

In 1717 he was made chairman of the committee of the Lower House of Convocation which investigated Hoadly's works, and at this time he published an anonymous attack on the Bishop which for sheer vindictiveness was not equalled in the controversy.¹ His most famous work in the controversy, A Vindication of the Corporation and Test Acts was published in 1718. This work lost him the king's favour, and accordingly his name was dropped from the list of royal chaplains. When Hoadly agreed to reply to Law's propositions if Sherlock would make them his own,² the Dean had to back down. Sherlock could not afford to become publicly identified with Law, even though he offered his friend preferments,³ because he had his own eyes set on the bishopric.⁴ On the death of George I he again came into favour and was appointed to the see of Bangor. He was translated to Salisbury in 1734 (following Hoadly there), and to London in 1748. It is said he refused the Archbishopric of Canterbury because of his physical infirmity. He died in 1761, the same year as both Hoadly and Law, "in the last stages of bodily decay."⁵

1 See pp. 279f., infra.

2 Hoadly, "An Answer to a Late Book," Works, II, 695.

3 Overton, William Law, p. 18.

4 Ibid., p. 19.

5 Hutton, "Thomas Sherlock," Dictionary of National Biography, LII, 95.

He is stated in his later years to have regretted the part he took in the controversy, and to have refused to allow the pamphlets he wrote to be reprinted. Bishop Newton strongly denies this on the evidence of those who lived with him during the last years of his life.¹

It is said that he later advocated friendly relations with Dissenters.² His later works were extremely popular, and were esteemed among Catholics as well as Protestants. Sherlock's position on the church lay between that of Hoadly and Law: from his outspokenness and popularity it was almost inevitable that he, too, should have been caught up in the controversy.

In these men were embodied the doctrines that met in the Bangorian Controversy: the doctrine of divine right, expressed by William Law, dramatized by the loyalty of the Nonjurors to James II; the latitudinarianism of the Whig Churchmen, characterized by Benjamin Hoadly in his principles of both government and church; and the High-Churchmanship which found the compromises of establishment expedient and therefore necessary, characterized to a large degree by Thomas Sherlock. This, then, was the material of the controversy that at one time even caused a halt of London commerce.³

1 Dictionary of National Biography, LII, 94.

2 "Thomas Sherlock," The Encyclopaedia Britannica, 11th ed. (Cambridge: The University Press, 1911), XXIV, 850.

3 Hoadly, Works, II, 429.

CHAPTER II.

THE COURSE OF THE CONTROVERSY

Although the Bangorian Controversy must be seen as a part of the general church-state problem following the Revolution Settlement, its precipitating cause was the posthumous publication in 1716 of certain papers of Dr. Hickee, the Nonjuring Dean of Worcester. The originals were written to convince a certain "Sergeant at Law," wavering between the two church camps, of the truth and equity of the Nonjurors' position. The main paper consists of forty propositions known as the Constitution of the Catholic Church. Dr. Hickee bases his arguments on two concepts which he feels are fundamental to the issue: the divine right of kings, including the idea of non-resistance on the part of subjects, and the separation of the functions of church and state.

On the basis of the principle "allegiance follows the natural person of the prince"¹ Dr. Hickee argues that King James II was the rightful king of England and that so long as he was alive, English subjects owed their allegiance to him and could set up no other king in his stead. On his death the crown would be passed on to his natural descendants. Any attempt of his

¹ George Hickee, The Constitution of the Catholick (sic) Church and the Nature, and Consequences of Schism (name and location of publisher unknown, 1716), p. 3.

subjects to overthrow him, or to institute another king is an offence to God. But this same act becomes blasphemy against Christ when the usurping civil power demands that the state church pray for its continued success against the rightful prince. "I think it less heinous to be present at divine offices where Ave Maries, etc., are said, than at such offices wherein prayers are solemnly put up to God, that are contrary to his essential justice and righteousness, as lying is to his essential truth."¹

"By the rules or holy canons of the Church, any clergyman is to be deposed who speaks reproachfully of the king; and can his majesty suffer a greater reproach or injury from priest or people, than when they presume to pray against him in their common supplications and in their solemn assemblies?"² On this basis, he says, the Nonjurors saw fit to refuse to pray for a usurping sovereign, or to pledge their allegiance to him. They were then deposed from their positions, and other clergymen were appointed to fill the state-declared vacancies.

1 Ibid., pp. 8f.

2 Ibid., p. 181. The "Sergeant," in one of his replies, makes an interesting comment which Dr. Hicke ignores: "When one prince, by the success of war (which if not a divine decision, seems at least to be a present determination as to the subjects' submission) over-runs another, I must necessarily believe that the conquered prince (though conquest gives no right) has justly incurred the punishment inflicted (though I may not know why) and though subjects may not depose the prince by any law in our hereditary monarchy, yet the sovereign of all princes may, nay in righteousness too, with which all his unerrable determinations are undoubtedly attended." Ibid., p. 18f.

Not only was this deprivation invalidly accomplished, since the state has no real jurisdiction in the church, but the usurping bishops were irregularly appointed, there being no recommendation by King James, election by the cathedral chapters, or consecration with the metropolitan concurring (in this case the Archbishop of Canterbury, also a Nonjuror).¹ The usurping bishops and all those in communion with them are thereby schismatic.

In the Constitution of the Catholic Church Dr. Hickes develops what he feels is the true nature of the church. The church is Christ's body on earth, and its ministers are his vicegerents.² All men by baptism become members of this spiritual corporation -- kings and peasants alike.³ King and subject have equal obligations to the church which exerts its spiritual authority over them both.⁴ Spiritual and temporal functions must be kept under separate authorities; neither authority may displace the function of the other.⁵ Christians must resist all encroachments of the state over the church just as earnestly as they would defend the state in time of war.⁶ The consecration and placement of clergy is a church and not a state function.⁷

1 Ibid., p. 200.

2 Ibid., pp. 66f.

3 Ibid., pp. 69ff.

4 Ibid., p. 76.

5 Ibid., pp. 78f.

6 Ibid., pp. 81f.

7 Ibid., pp. 87f., 110.

Clergymen may be punished by civil law for civil offences, but may not be civilly deprived of their spiritual functions.¹ Similarly the church may inflict spiritual censures on offending state officials, but it may not stir up rebellion.²

All men, emperors and subjects alike, cease to be members of the church by excommunication, apostasy, open heresy, profession of doctrines destructive of the faith, or schism. This last consists in

withdrawing their subjection and obedience from the rightful bishops: and in bishops or church governors, in refusing or forsaking of communion or correspondence with their rightful fellow bishops without cause; or invading one another's spiritual principalities and jurisdictions contrary to the fundamental rights or laws of the sacerdotal or episcopal college, and that spiritual union wherein the polity of the sacerdotal college, and the being and well-being of the catholic church, as a society, doth consist.³

All God's promises are made to men only as they are members of this church, and no man, no matter how virtuous, not a member can claim them.⁴ In case of schism, Christians are called upon to examine the claims of the contending parties and to adhere to the rightful one regardless of any civil punishment inflicted on that action.⁵

The charge of Dr. Hicke that the whole Church of England was schismatic drew immediate protests. One of

1 Ibid., pp. 89ff.

2 Ibid.

3 Ibid., pp. 69f.

4 Ibid., pp. 72f.

5 Ibid., pp. 74f.

the earliest replies was that of Thomas Bennet, a regular controversialist in the Church, who in 1711 had written The Rights of the Clergy of the Christian Church against the Independent practice of lay-election of men for ordination or for a particular parish. In his reply to the Hickeys' papers he attempts to show that even granting the Nonjurors' principles, they were schismatic in separating from the Church of England. Bennet considers first those bishops who took the Oath of Allegiance and so were disowned by the Nonjurors. Since they were not proved heretical or schismatic by a synod of the church and so deprived, the only valid method according to the Nonjurors themselves, they remained true bishops and the Nonjurors were schismatic for separating from them.¹ He then draws a distinction between the schism of co-ordination and the schism of subordination. The former occurs between clergy of equal rank, in this case bishops, and conveys no "contagion" to the individual church members in their charge;² since the ordinary members are not responsible for their bishops' disputes. "Christians are united to Christ, and to one another, by virtue of their baptism; and so long as our baptismal covenant remains firm and good, we certainly retain a relation to Christ our head, and to our fellow members in other dioceses, how quarrel-

1 Thomas Bennet, The Nonjurors Separation from the Public Assemblys (sic) of the Church of England Examined, and Prov'd to be Schismatical, upon their own Principles, 2nd ed. (London: W. Innys, 1716), p. 7.

2 Ibid., p. 22.

some soever our own bishop may prove to the bishops of neighbouring sees."¹ In other words, a bishop may break away from the Catholic Church without necessarily carrying his flock with him into the schism. It would be schism of subordination, however, for a church member to withdraw himself from his bishop even though that bishop be guilty of the schism of co-ordination, yet has not been synodically deprived.²

No suffragan bishop has a right to succeed his principal without a regular introduction,³ and since the Nonjuring bishops ordained since the separation were and could be only suffragans, they certainly had no claim to a diocese. Where sees are uncontested, the present bishop is rightful, which was then the case throughout Canterbury and York.⁴ The issue is political, not religious, at heart. Since prayers to which certain parishioners object, prayers for the welfare of King George, are not imposed as terms of Church communion, objectors may refrain from saying Amen to them, but may not, on that account, withdraw from the Church without becoming guilty of schism.⁵

Bennet's attempted apology for the Established Church is notable because it is based on Nonjuring principles. But as later disputants pointed out, the

-
- 1 Ibid., p. 11.
 - 2 Ibid., pp. 16-18.
 - 3 Ibid., p. 58.
 - 4 Ibid., p. 60.
 - 5 Ibid., p. 47.

Church of England could not really be justified on those principles. This was the thesis of James Peirce, the moderate Nonconforming minister, in his letter to Dr. Bennet. The problem, he says, is that of maintaining communion not with the Catholic Church but with a national church. Dr. Bennet has failed to prove "that dioceses which are joined together in one national communion, may be schismatically separated from each other, and yet neither of them be separated from the national communion."¹ In a national church, the king is the centre of unity. How can this unity be maintained if two kings are separately acknowledged by two parties? How can the position of the state possibly be defended if one holds with Dr. Bennet that only synodical deprivation is valid, and that the bishops placed in filled sees were schismatic, though only co-ordinately so?² As to the question of immoral prayers for King George, it would have been better had Dr. Bennet vindicated King George's right, rather than helped salve men's consciences in attending worship which was supposedly immoral.³

Upon the whole, sir, I think I have shown you cannot defend the present public assemblies of the Church of England upon your principles; and that here is a necessity of your revoking the concessions you have made the Nonjurors, if you would do

1 James Peirce, A Letter to Dr. Bennet, Occasion'd by his Late Treatise concerning the Nonjurors Separation (London: John Clark, 1717), p. 9.

2 Ibid., p. 19.

3 Ibid., p. 51.

any service to the Church; for as for the government, I cannot perceive you designed it any. And after all the noise of your jus divinum, it seems impossible to defend the Church, without supposing it to be a parliamentary church and that the same power that makes bishops can unmake them also.¹

Peirce cannot refrain from remarking that if the doctrines of passive obedience and non-resistance are true, the Nonjurors are in the right; but if they are false, as he feels they are, the Church of England was schismatic for putting out the Dissenters in 1662 because they could not give assent to those doctrines.²

Another refutation of Hickes on an entirely different line is found in A Vindication of the Realm and Church of England, published anonymously, but attributed to Archbishop Wake. The author says that a prince may abdicate by actions as well as words, and no prince's actions were more an earnest of his abdication than were those of King James.³ Common and statute law agree that the lawful king is the king in possession of the government, although there may be a claimant with a better title to the crown.⁴ The Nonjurors demonstrated the weakness of their position by acquiescing under the rule of King William until the deprivations took place. Dr. Hickes; Dr. Ken, Bishop of Bath and Wells, Dr. Turner of Ely, even Archbishop Sancroft prepared to

1 Ibid., p. 54.

2 Ibid., pp. 54f.

3 William Wake, A Vindication of the Realm and Church of England from the Charge of Perjury, Rebellion, and Schism unjustly laid upon them by the Nonjurors: And the Rebellion and Schism shewn to lie at their own doors (London: J. Morphew, 1716), p. 17.

4 Ibid., p. 20.

take the Oath of Allegiance, but at the last minute were persuaded by friends not to do so, chiefly because they had been convinced that the Revolution government could not last.¹ God still has power to take a government from one prince and give it to another.² It would appear that this is what He had done, since the present government has been ruling for thirty years.³ Oaths of allegiance and deprivations are not new to the Church of England. Henry VIII, Elizabeth, Edward VI, and the Commonwealth all used them.⁴ Disloyal bishops could not possibly have properly performed their functions, many of which are of a civil character. These bishops lost only their civil rights, their honours and revenues, their right of sitting in Parliament, and their control of a particular diocese. Their spiritual powers were not taken away.⁵

That the bishops and clergy of this realm have certain estates, honours, and privileges, belonging to their benefices and promotions is merely from the grant, or allowance, of the civil magistrate. That they are bishops of such a diocese, or rectors of such a parish is solely the result of human disposition and authority. The king nominates the person who is to be made a bishop; he confirms the election of him by the clergy, as well as gives the clergy power to elect: he grants him the estate and honours annexed to his bishopric. And all these not only upon the supposition of fealty to be done for it, but with an express homage performed by every such bishop upon the account of his bishopric; and a solemn acknowledgment therein made that he

1 Ibid., pp. 22-25.

2 Ibid., p. 27.

3 Ibid., p. 31.

4 Ibid., pp. 39f.

5 Ibid., p. 49.

holds both his bishopric, and the possessions of the same, of the king and the imperial crown of this realm.¹

What the civil power gives, it may also take away.²

"As soon as any such bishops and ministers are removed from their dioceses and parishes, the relation ceases between them, the clergy and people; who are from thenceforth to look upon them no otherwise, than as if they were naturally dead."³

In earlier stages of the Nonjurors' dispute the speech of Thomas Merks (Merke), Bishop of Carlisle, against the deposition of kings had been circulated.⁴ Merke was a favourite of Richard II and may have defended Richard against Henry IV; but the speech attributed to him on this occasion was not known until one hundred fifty years later.⁵ At least the emphasis of the speech on divine right of princes regardless of their moral or administrative capacities⁶ and on the heretical nature of the doctrine of lawful resistance⁷ bear an uncomfortable atmosphere of "peculiar appropriateness" to the situation at hand. This defect had

1 Ibid., p. 50.

2 Ibid., p. 51.

3 Ibid., p. 52.

4 Thomas Merks, The Late Bishop of Carlisle's Speech against the Deposition of Kings and in Vindication of Hereditary Right, and the Lineal Succession to the Crown of these Realms (London: J. Morphew, 1714).

5 James Tait, "Thomas Merke," Dictionary of National Biography, XXXVII, 282-285.

6 Merks, op. cit., p. 7.

7 Ibid., p. 14.

been pointed out by White Kennet, later Bishop of Peterborough, in an open letter to the Bishop of Carlisle.¹

In a second letter to the Bishop of Carlisle, Kennet points out how factious the Nonjuring group is among themselves. It is to be seen in the varying reasons each principal gave for the separation.² With Hickes it was the heresy of resisting the prince. With Kettlewell it was the new Oath of Allegiance required. Hickes accused Kettlewell of "heretical depravity." With Dodwell it was the invalidity of lay-deprivations, and he thought the schism was ended when the deprived bishops died. With Ken it was the sacrilege of taking away episcopacy in Scotland. He felt that those who took the oaths did so with as good a conscience as he had in refusing them. Evidently he did not approve of the consecration of Hickes as a bishop.³ Speaking of the Nonjurors as a group Kennet writes: "They may, for a short time, agree as a political faction; but as a spiritual society, they were at first, and must be ever in confusion."⁴ He agrees with Peirce and Wake that it is building on false foundations to say that people may go to church yet refuse to participate in prayers expected of the whole congregation. But the traditional

1 White Kennet, A Letter to the Lord Bishop of Carlisle, concerning one of his Predecessors, Bishop Merks, 3rd ed. (London: Samuel Buckley, 1713),

2 White Kennet, A Second Letter to the Lord Bishop of Carlisle (London: Samuel Buckley, 1716), p. 20.

3 Ibid., p. 17.

4 Ibid., p. 32.



practice of the Church of England has been to pray for the king in power.¹ To the extreme Nonjurors who made extravagant charges of the heresy of the Established Church, he would simply refuse communion until they were more "in charity with their neighbours."² As to the jurisdiction of the civil power in church affairs, in Papal disputes of the past the civil powers had often told both the clergy and the people to which side they were to adhere.³

In the third letter to the Bishop of Carlisle, Kennet attempts to demonstrate that the English Church was originally separate from Rome, and embraced the whole nation with the civil lords supreme in the government of the Church.⁴ Disputes were referred to the Pope for his advice, but gradually that prelate assumed more and more authority, usually by officially "confirming" what had already been done by the English authorities, eventually claiming that nothing could be done without his confirmation. The stronger English kings remonstrated against this usurped Papal authority.⁵ The example of Bishop Merks established nothing for the Nonjurors, since he was lay-deprived and no schism resulted in his case.⁶ In the latter part of the letter,

1 Ibid., pp. 25ff.

2 Ibid., p. 29.

3 Ibid., p. 45.

4 White Kennet, A Third Letter to the Lord Bishop of Carlisle, Lord Almoner to His Majesty, upon the subject of Bishop Merks (London: Samuel Buckley, 1717), pp. 10f.

5 Ibid., pp. 11-26, passim.

6 Ibid., p. 98.

Kennet anticipates an issue of the Bangorian Controversy which later developed from this dispute. The Nonjurors, he writes, "would now make a church of Christian prince and ministers and people, to be in the ministers, without and against the prince and people, entirely different from the first Christian church imperial, that most ancient pattern of such a mixed body, such a uniform Christian society."¹ "The primitive church in the mouth of the Nonjuring separatists is the same as oral tradition with the Papists; it is an idol which is nothing, i.e. you know not what to make of it, where it began, how it obtained, what dissonant reports are made of it, why at all to be received when there is no scripture for it, what appeal can be made to it as a sole judge in a matter of salvation and faith?"² He jibes at the secrecy attendant upon Dr. Hickeys' ordination:

Hard is the fate of those poor people who are to be drawn into a separation called the true communion, upon the pretence of having the only true bishops, when they must not be told who those bishops are, nor when, where, how they were consecrated, or what powers were committed to them, or can be now visibly exercised by them; they may carry people where they please if they have brought them thus far towards implicit faith and obedience without reserve.³

The letter closes with a prediction that if the separation is not absorbed again by the Church of England, it will either end in Popery or dwindle to nothing.⁴

1 Ibid., p. 152.

2 Ibid.

3 Ibid., p. 144.

4 Ibid., p. 158.

The first answer to the Nonjurors to state definite principles and work from these to logical conclusions was the anonymous pamphlet An Answer to the Nonjurors' Charge of Schism upon the Church of England. It has since been attributed to Arthur Ashley Sykes, the latitudinarian divine who was involved in some dispute with his pen for virtually his whole life-time. Sykes affirms that the end of all government is security of the citizens' persons and property. A prince, no matter how debauched, who satisfies this end is not to be resisted; but when he acts inconsistently to this end he may be lawfully resisted and even deposed.¹ All government is a trust -- coronation oaths are the agreement of a prince to the terms of his trust -- and parties breaking the trust should be resisted.² Historically, even England has not believed in the doctrine of non-resistance, witness Queen Elizabeth's aid to the French Protestants, or King James I's aid to the Dutch in their fight against the Spanish.³ In conclusion, Sykes gives several propositions concerning the relation of the church to the state, of which these seem the most important. (1) Civil and ecclesiastical powers are equally the ordinance of God. (2) Ecclesiastical officers do not have such independent authority

1 Arthur Ashley Sykes, An Answer to the Nonjurors Charge of Schism upon the Church of England (London: James Knapton, 1716), p. 27.

2 Ibid., p. 10.

3 Ibid., p. 12.

that they do not have to give the state security for the use of it. (3) If a bishop refuses to give the usual required security to a state for his conduct, the civil authority ought and may secure the public good by depriving him of his office. (4) The magistrate cannot be guilty of schism for doing what is necessary for the public good.¹

In a sermon preached shortly after the publication of this pamphlet, Sykes went on to distinguish between the Kingdom of Christ and the kingdoms of this world. External force cannot be used to bring a man to Christianity, or to persecute him when he is a Christian to accept some disputed opinion.² No men in the Kingdom of Christ have absolute power to determine controversies. That power is not necessary, since disputable opinions are not to be made essential doctrines.³ Christ himself has once for all time laid down the laws of his Kingdom, and no man is to usurp that power, pretending a dominion over another's faith.⁴ Christ is heavenly priest, and strictly speaking can have no successor in the government of the church. "They who are sent by Christ or his Apostles to instruct mankind in the way to heaven are his ministers, are his servants; but can not with any justice of speech be called his successors."⁵

1 Ibid., p. 27.

2 Arthur Ashley Sykes, The Difference between the Kingdom of Christ and the Kingdoms of this World (London: James Knapton, 1717), pp. 7f.

3 Ibid., p. 9.

4 Ibid., p. 11.

5 Ibid., p. 14.

Although the kingdoms of this world rise and fall, that of Christ, by his own promise, cannot be destroyed, in spite of persecutions.¹ The Kingdom of Christ is compatible with mankind's civil interests, and so it is not in conflict with the state.² "True Christianity is nothing but the peaceable profession of faith and the practice of virtue" and therefore whatever powers a civil officer has in the church, they cannot extend to the essence of religion.³ No one single form of church government is necessary to Christianity.⁴ Because Christ's Kingdom is not of this world, arguments drawn from worldly kingdoms are not directly applicable to Christ's Kingdom.⁵ The true unity of the church is not absolute agreement on all controversial points, but rather a unity of the like mind of love.⁶ The thoughts of this sermon anticipated Benjamin Hoadly's contribution to the controversy and led the way for its later development around the doctrine of the church rather than on a justification of the Revolution government.

These works defending the Established Church have been discussed in detail, not only because they form the background out of which the Bangorian Controversy developed, but also because the very principles on which these defences are made are those which either

-
- 1 Ibid., p. 14.
 - 2 Ibid., p. 15.
 - 3 Ibid., p. 17.
 - 4 Ibid., p. 19.
 - 5 Ibid., pp. 22f.
 - 6 Ibid., pp. 23f.

questioned accepted patterns or which were themselves questioned in the dispute which followed.

The most famous answer to Dr. Hickee's propositions was Bishop Hoadly's "Preservative" published in 1716. In it Hoadly sought to avoid the weaknesses of the earlier replies to the claims of the Nonjurors, and benefitting from the arguments already advanced, he was able to make a much more successful if not original refutation. The similarities to Sykes' two works are apparent. The "Preservative" is certainly not an apology for the position taken by the Established Church. Hoadly bluntly says, "I will not allow them upon any terms that our present civil Establishment is unlawful, or that lay deprivations are invalid."¹ If a division could be made between the political and the religious phases of his argument, the first might be said to contain a justification of the Revolution Settlement and the right of the civil authorities to depose the offending clergy, while the second deals more with the doctrine of the church. Actually the two are so interwoven that such a distinction is extremely difficult to make, and Hoadly's own outline of his work is clearer: (1) the right of the present government based on the Protestant line of the royal family; (2) the relation of the civil power to the Established

¹ Hoadly, "A Preservative against the Principles and Practices of the Non-Jurors both in Church and State, or an Appeal to the Consciences and Common Sense of the Christian Laity," Works, I, 558.

Church; and (3) the spiritual tyranny of those who presume to Christ's place as Head of the church.

The doctrine of the divine right of kings is rightly fixed upon as the crux of the whole problem.

The first point with them [the Nonjurors] and that which stands them in most account, and that without which all their other arguments would have but little effect, hath always been the great and crying injustice of setting aside the Popish line, and fixing the succession to the crown in the Protestant branches of the royal family. If they could not persuade weak men and women to this, their schism and their churches would quickly disappear.¹

Even the Nonjurors would not oblige a nation to obey a king who was mad or an idiot, because the ends of government could not thereby be served.² In such a case, the ends of government would justify a nation in setting aside in the best manner possible any king so indisposed. In the effects to the nation, all incapacity is the same, and in the case under consideration the Popery of the one royal line justifies the nation in setting it aside as not conducive to the ends of government.³ The very fact that the Nonjuring bishops signed the invitation to the Prince of Orange showed how incapable they thought James was of governing the nation. Yet it was not just King James, but the whole Popish line that was rejected: their religion was their incapacity, not considered as such, but because of the consequences to which it led in their governing of the

1 Ibid., I, 563.

2 Ibid., I, 566.

3 Ibid.

nation.¹ The only alternative to the complete exclusion of the Popish line would be a perpetual regency, which would be either government by an elective kingdom, or by a family of subjects, the regent in this case being the real king.² But the effected solution was simply to give the crown to the Protestant line of the same royal family.³

In dealing with the relationship between the government and the Established Church, Hoadly first considers the particular case of the deposed bishops, and then generalizes about the rights of the civil government in such a case. According to the English Constitution, no matter what spiritual authority devolved upon the bishops at their ordination, the right to exercise that authority in a particular diocese came from the nomination of the king. Since this right is given by the supreme civil power, it may be taken away by that power. At their consecration the Nonjuring bishops solemnly acknowledged "that they had, and held their bishoprics and the possessions of the same, entirely, as well the spiritualities as temporalities thereof, only of the king's majesty, and of the imperial crown of this his majesty's realm."⁴ There is no doubt, then, that at their ordination the Nonjuring bishops were aware that the rightful civil power could deprive them both of

1 Ibid., I, 567f.

2 Ibid., I, 568.

3 Ibid., I, 569.

4 Ibid., I, 571.

their "spiritualities and temporalities."¹

Though the right to exercise an ecclesiastical office be not supposed to come, in the least degree, from the civil power; yet it may be taken away by the supreme civil power, just as life and property; and upon the same account, viz. if the continuance of it be inconsistent with the safety of the whole: and this, not by any spiritual power, but by a right inherent in it, and inseparable from it, to guard the society from being undone by ecclesiastical officers, as well as by laymen.²

Granting, therefore, that the state has no jurisdiction in the governing of the Church, it still has power under these specified conditions to depose clergymen from their positions.

This idea is developed as he considers the general relationship between church and state. First of all, "Every civil government hath a right to everything necessary for its own defence and preservation;" and second, "No powers given by the Gospel to any of its ministers can include anything in them, inconsistent with the safety and preservation of the civil government."³ Public praying and preaching are normally a spiritual concern, but when they are directed against the civil government they become a civil matter and can only be regarded as treason or rebellion.⁴ So also the exercise of the episcopal office against the state is a civil, not an ecclesiastical matter. "The civil power hath a right to hinder by force all treason and sedition."⁵

1 Ibid.

2 Ibid., I, 574.

3 Ibid., I, 575.

4 Ibid., I, 581.

5 Ibid., I, 576.

Consequently "the deprivation we are now speaking of is nothing but hindering treason by force."¹

A rightful civil power hath a right, for the defence of the public, to imprison, to banish, or to execute any ecclesiastical officer, as well as any of the laity; and consequently to hinder him from the actual exercise of his office, if that will sufficiently consult the safety of the whole.²

So deprivation is a civil punishment inflicted on a civil account, as any of the more common punishments are.³

Hoadly argues that a king loses none of his civil powers when he becomes a Christian. God has declared himself in favour of civil government, and he could not approve any autonomous authority which would destroy such government.⁴ God gives powers to the clergy, but they are not independent of civil government. This does not mean that the government may hinder the preaching of the Gospel. It is no argument against a right if some think it implies more than it does and so abuse it.⁵ The Nonjurors are really asking for exemption from civil responsibility.⁶ This would make the state powerless in the matters which affect its security most, or would make it entirely subservient to the clergy.⁷ To claim that the Church requires a particular person to exercise an office would argue as much against clerical as

1 Ibid.
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid.
4 Ibid., I, 579.
5 Ibid., I, 580.
6 Ibid., I, 578.
7 Ibid., I, 582.

against lay deprivations.¹ Even the New Testament leaves no doubts that ministers as well as laymen remain subject to the civil power.²

The argument of the "Preservative" thus far is summed up in this paragraph:

The exclusion of the Popish line from all civil power over this nation was necessary, just, and lawful. That civil power, from which they were excluded, was justly lodged in the hands of the next Protestant heir. The supreme civil power, having then the true and proper authority of government, had a right to everything necessary to its own defence and preservation: and consequently, had a right to depose those bishops who refused to give any security of their allegiance, and actually set up another civil power in opposition to it. And the possessor of the crown, as certain a right to name others to succeed them in those bishoprics, as any former kings had before, to name those very deposed bishops.³

The Nonjurors really deny the power of any king over the Church.⁴

But when it comes to the matter of deciding which church is the proper one, that is, the Established Church or that of the Nonjurors, every man must judge for himself. The Nonjurors agree to this, but immediately qualify it, so that their principle is "that men have a right to judge about doctrine and worship if

1 Ibid., I, 582f.

2 Ibid., I, 583.

3 Ibid., I, 586.

4 Ibid. In speaking of the English procedure of electing bishops on the nomination of the king, Dr. Hickee had said, "I do not say this way and manner of electing a bishop is to be approved; I rather think it should be lamented as an imposition and tyranny exercised by the state over the Church of England; however this has really been her constitution ever since the time of King Henry VIII." Hickee, op. cit., p. 314.

they judge as we ourselves do; but if they differ from our judgment, they have no such right at all."¹ Actually a man need convince only himself of the position he takes, not every party contending with him as well. In their continued separation from Rome, the Nonjurors see no reason first to convince the Pope of their rightness, but only themselves.² "What was it that justified the Protestants . . . in setting up their own bishops? Was it that the Popish doctrines and worship were actually corrupt; or that the Protestants were persuaded in their own consciences that they were so? The latter without doubt."³ The Nonjurors are reminded not to cut the justification for the Reformation away from their doctrinal tenets.⁴

In continuing the argument, Hoadly reveals his own doctrinal position on the church. First of all, God makes his demands of men very clear to their understandings. In no way, either in scripture or by reason, has he required men to subject themselves to an uninterrupted succession of clergy.⁵ God's blessings and absolutions are to be expected from his own hands.⁶ He does not make these depend upon the fancies of fallible men, and only infallible men could grant authoritative benediction and absolution.⁷ Although the Apostles had such

1 Hoadly, op. cit., I, 587.

2 Ibid., I, 591.

3 Ibid., I, 590.

4 Ibid., I, 588f.

5 Ibid., I, 588.

6 Ibid., I, 592.

7 Ibid., I, 593.

powers, the present clergy do not have them; and one cannot, therefore, argue from the Apostles to present-day clergy.

To claim a right to stand in God's stead, in such sense, that they with all their infirmities, and prejudices, and mistakes about them, can absolutely and certainly bless some, or withhold a blessing from others; and that God Almighty hath obliged himself to bless, or not to bless, with their voice alone: this is the highest absurdity.¹

Since adherence to a particular communion, considered as such, cannot merit the favour of God, because doing anything against conscience merits God's anger, the favour of God must depend upon a man's sincerity. "The favour of God, therefore, follows sincerity considered as such, and consequently equally follows every equal degree of sincerity."² God's blessings depend on the condition of a man's heart, and not on the pronouncements of a priest: all a minister can do is to state plainly God's terms or conditions laid upon men.³ But sincerity carries with it an obligation that a man study the passages of the New Testament in which "the genius, and great design of the Gospel is purposely expressed. . . . They were written for you, and they need no interpreter."⁴

In all your civil concerns, the public good, the peace, the happiness of that society to which you belong, will easily and safely conduct you both to know and to do the will of God. In all

1 Ibid.

2 Ibid.

3 Ibid.

4 Ibid., I, 597.

your religious concerns, that affect your eternal salvation, and your title to God's favour, your rule is plain and evident. Christ is your sole Law-giver and your sole Judge as to these points. The Papists may excommunicate the Protestant Nonjurors. The Nonjurors may excommunicate the High-Churchmen, as well as all other British Protestants who pray for King George. These again may excommunicate, unchurch, unchristian those whose church government or worship differ from their own. And these again may exercise the same spiritual discipline wherever their terrors can extend themselves. . . . But it is in truth only from themselves that they can excommunicate: and this is very often their own crime and their own loss. But Christ himself, and his Apostles, have plainly told you what it is, and what alone, that shall cut you off from him; and declared a curse upon all who preach any other Gospel: and consequently, who add anything as absolutely necessary to his favour, which he hath not made so.¹

There was an immediate response as well as a reaction to the "Preservative" when it was published. On the one hand were those like John Shute Barrington who felt that for too long "the secular interest of the clergy has been taken for the spiritual interest of the laity,"² and he rejoiced that "indefeasible succession of priesthood and episcopacy" were being attacked now that the doctrines of passive obedience and non-resistance had fallen. And on the other hand there were those who agreed with Hoadly about the rectitude of the Revolution Church, but who feared the consequences of his attitude towards church discipline and authority. "If the regular succession of the clergy is denied, the evidence of the sacraments for the truth of religion is

1 Ibid., I, 596f.

2 John Shute Barrington, The Layman's Letter to the Bishop of Bangor (London: J. Roberts, J. Graves, A. Dodd, 1716), p. 35.

also denied."¹ Some, like Mathias Earbery, defended the most extreme claims of absolute authority in the church.² Others, like Nathaniel Marshall, maintained a middle position, criticising only the intolerance and sectarianism of the Nonjurors, and defending the principle of synodical action.³ It was this moderate position which Sykes attacked, scoffing at Marshall's fear of "unsettling men" by openly repudiating the doctrine of non-resistance.⁴ Determinations of men are not to be put on the same level with scripture, he said. A church which compels submission to her authority only breeds future strife because mere authority which is not infallible protects error with truth.⁵

Hoadly elaborated and clarified his doctrine of the church in his famous sermon "The Nature of the Kingdom, or Church, of Christ" preached in the royal chapel of St. James on March 31, 1717. It was this sermon which was the immediate cause of the controversy that engaged the minds of the clergy for the next few years. In the introduction of the sermon, Hoadly points

1 Anon., A Modest Enquiry into the Bishop of Bangor's Preservative against the Non-Jurors (London: C. Rivington, 1717), p. 26.

2 Mathias Earbery, The Old English Constitution Vindicated and Set in a True Light (London: n.p., 1717).

3 Anon., The Church and State Vindicated, and the Bishop of Bangor's Preservative Defended (London: J. Darby, J. Harrison, A. Dodd, 1717), and Nathaniel Marshall, A Defence of our Constitution in Church and State (London: William Taylor and Henry Clements, 1717).

4 Sykes, Some Remarks on Mr. Marshall's Defence of our Constitution in Church and State (London: James Knapton, 1717), pp. 30-54.

5 Ibid., pp. 68ff.

out that over a period of time words change their meanings. If we are to understand Christ, we must know the meanings he gave to the words he used.¹ For example, to St. James, religion meant personal virtue and integrity, and charity and beneficence exercised towards others. Now it has come to mean exactness in times, places, forms, and modes, variously determined by various men.² In many countries worship has lost its most essential quality of being "in spirit and in truth."³ Prayer was originally a "calm, undisturbed address to God" but now it means heat and flame to such degree that a man may be in the best disposition in the world to pray, and yet not feel devout enough according to popular standards.⁴ And the "love of God" which formerly meant doing God's will has now come to mean such violent passions and ecstasies that the ordinary Christian despairs of his devotion.⁵ Such a change has also come over the notion of the Church of Christ which formerly meant "only the number, small or great, of those who believed him to be the Messiah; or of those who subjected themselves to him as their King, in the affair of religion."⁶

As the Church of Christ is the Kingdom of Christ, he himself is King: and in this it is implied that he is himself the sole Law-giver to his

1 Hoadly, "The Nature of the Kingdom, or Church, of Christ," Works, II, 402.

2 Ibid., II, 403.

3 Ibid.

4 Ibid.

5 Ibid., II, 403f.

6 Ibid., II, 404.

subjects, and himself the sole Judge of their behaviour in the affairs of conscience and eternal salvation. And in this sense, therefore, his Kingdom is not of this world; that he hath, in those points, left behind him no visible, human authority; no vicegerents who can be said properly to supply his place; no interpreters upon whom his subjects are absolutely to depend; no judges over the consciences or religion of his people.¹

If any man on earth had these powers, he would be king instead of Christ. "Whoever hath such an authority of making laws, is so far a king: and whoever can add new laws to those of Christ, equally obligatory, is as truly king as Christ himself."² In human society legislators can always interpose if their laws are incorrectly interpreted by the judges; but Christ "never interposeth, since his first promulgation of his law, either to convey infallibility to such as pretend to handle it over again; or to assert the true interpretation of it amidst the various and contradictory opinions of men about it."³ As men have no right to add to Christ's laws, so also they have no right to increase the rewards and punishments of his subjects in matters of conscience and salvation.⁴ So the Church of Christ, or the Kingdom of Christ is

the number of men, whether small or great, whether dispersed or united, who truly and sincerely are subjects to Jesus Christ alone as their Law-giver and Judge in matters relating to the favour of God and their eternal salvation.⁵

1 Ibid.

2 Ibid.

3 Ibid., II, 405.

4 Ibid.

5 Ibid., II, 406.

Since Christ's Kingdom is not of this world, that must be evident from the nature and end of his laws as well as by the rewards and punishments which they sanction.¹ Force cannot be used to make a man love God. Whenever earthly rewards "worldly honours, posts, offices, pomp, attendance, dominion," or earthly punishments, "prisons, fines, banishments, gallies, and racks," are used, to that degree the kingdom is not Christ's but of this world.² Christ never used the secular arm to force men to follow him.³

Furthermore, since Christ's Kingdom is not of this world, it is useless to make comparisons with or draw analogies from present world kingdoms in considering it.⁴ In so far as men seek to follow Christ directly as he has made his will known in the Gospel, they may be assured of God's favour.⁵ To set up any other authority, to force outward unity of profession against conscience divests Jesus of his Lordship.⁶ A peace based upon suppression of honesty and understanding is not Christ's peace.⁷ All Christ's subjects are equally subjects, "equally without authority to alter, to add to, or to interpret his laws so as to claim the absolute submission of others to such interpretation."⁸

1 Ibid.
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid.
4 Ibid., II, 408.
5 Ibid.
6 Ibid., II, 408f.
7 Ibid., II, 409.
8 Ibid.

That the traditional views of the church had been challenged and challenged at their weak point was immediately evident. The flurry of conflicting pamphlets which followed the "Preservative" was small indeed compared to the blizzard of publications from parish priests, laymen, deans, and bishops which followed on the printing of Hoadly's sermon. The first efforts at refutation were confused ones, hastily composed by men who instinctively felt something to be amiss, but who could neither see the real issues to be faced, nor understand the new attitude of questioning toward doctrines that had been accepted without doubt in the past. Alexander Innes' discourses on the absolute authority of the church are an example. "The Church of Christ does not deny men the use of private judgment, in matters of salvation," he says, "but only blames those who abuse it, in opposition to her authority, and will not submit to those rules which she prescribes for their conduct and direction;"¹ yet a man must "try the spirits to see if they be of God." The atmosphere of calm and collected study never did prevail in the controversy which followed, and in the resulting furore of confused meanings, shocked faith, hurt feelings, and rash charges, months passed before what Hoadly was really saying, and what was essential to the doctrine of the

¹ Alexander Innes, The Absolute Authority of the Church, in Matters Relating to Conscience and Men's Right of Judging for Themselves (London: John Morphew, 1717), II, 7.

church were beginning to be understood.

When Hoadly's sermon was published, it was resolved to move against his view in Convocation, but in the meantime some other confutation had to be prepared. This was undertaken by Andrew Snape, Headmaster of Eton, in an open letter to the Bishop. Seventeen editions of this letter were published, but one may wonder about the real significance of this fact since the first edition came out on a Monday, and by Tuesday morning "Second Edition" had been added to the title page.¹

Snape first substitutes "cold and lifeless" for Hoadly's "calm and undisturbed" and so attacks the Bishop's notion of prayer. Most of the letter asserts the claims of church authority, but does not deny the right of private judgment in religious matters. To his mind, Hoadly has denied all authority to the church, and with one blast has destroyed church discipline, the laws protecting the Establishment from Papist and Dissenter alike, and worst of all, the very creeds themselves.²

A series of anonymous pamphlets answered Snape. They pointed out that at bottom, Hoadly and Snape agreed in allowing an individual to judge whether any church

1 Anon., A Letter to Dr. Snape, occasion'd by his Letter to the Bishop of Bangor (London: J. Roberts, 1717), p. 8.

2 Andrew Snape, A Letter to the Bishop of Bangor, Occasioned by his Lordship's Sermon Preached before the King, 2nd ed. (London: Jonah Bowyer, 1717), pp. 34f.

decree were agreeable to scripture or not;¹ that Hoadly had not denied the function of teachers or preachers.² It was ironically noted that Snape, who magnified the importance of church councils, did not respect the Council of Jerusalem's decree about refraining from blood, for the Headmaster's fondness for black puddings was notorious.³

Bishop Hoadly made his own defence, answering first Snape's comments on prayer, assuring the Doctor that he objected not to fervency but to extreme emotionalism in devotion.⁴ Since Christ has not granted the clergy a power of infallible interpretation of his laws, and only in this way could Christ be said to direct all their decisions, it is usurping Christ's place for any man to claim the right of absolute interpretation.⁵ If, as Snape observed, one is not to obey rulers when their instructions are contrary to Christ's, he is obliged to examine those instructions to see whether or not they are Christian. If they are and he obeys them, he does so, not because of the inherent authority of the rulers, but because of the authority of Christ.⁶ If the

1 Barrington, The Layman's Second Letter to the Bishop of Bangor, (London: J. Roberts, J. Graves, and A. Dodd, 1717), p. 32.

2 Anon., A Vindication of the Honour and Prerogative of Christ's Church, 2nd ed., corrected, (London: T. Warner, 1717), pp. 26f.

3 Anon., An Answer to a Letter to the Bishop of Bangor written by one Andrew Snap (sic), D.D. (London: T. Warner, 1717), pp. 15f.

4 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Reverend Dr. Snape's Letter to the Bishop of Bangor," Works, II, 410-417.

5 Ibid., II, 417.

6 Ibid., II, 418f.

authority is to be obeyed for its own sake, and not because it is consistent with Christ's commands, it has usurped Christ's place although it may command the same outward acts.¹ Because temporal sanctions do not really encourage true religion which is a matter of the spirit, Hoadly expressed himself against them and in favour of religious toleration.² In conclusion, he disavows any charge that he would do away with the Church of England.

If any one will infer from hence, that I argue against all right of appointing time, place, or ceremonies relating to religious worship; against the maintenance and support of those who officiate in the churches or assemblies of Christians; against the order or decency, or subordination belonging to societies of Christians; or anything against the interest of the Church of England: I answer that I not only do not own such consequences, but I really do not see them. As for the Church of England, I regard it as a noble part of the Catholic Church founded upon the noble claim of the right of Christians to judge for themselves.³

At this point William Law entered the controversy with A Letter to the Bishop of Bangor, but since it precipitated a new phase of argument, it will be considered separately. Joseph Trapp also sought to answer Hoadly with a sermon entitled "The Real Nature of the Church or Kingdom of Christ." Trapp was professor of poetry at Oxford, but held lectureships in several London churches. He has the same difficulty as Alexander Innes with the meaning of "absolute authority" which he seeks to defend. "There is (I still insist upon it) an

1 Ibid., II, 419.

2 Ibid., II, 425.

3 Ibid., II, 426.

indispensable obligation upon the subjects of Christ to an absolute obedience to the mere authority of the church in all those, and such like instances, when nothing appears contrary to the Word of God."¹ Gilbert Burnet, second son of the famous Bishop of Salisbury, made the weakness of Trapp's view evident.

If the gross of mankind are to judge of points of faith and practice, and the express declaration of the Word of God, they are to judge themselves what these points are, and not to take any one's word thereupon; if the church may not determine anything contrary to the scriptures, they are to judge whether such determinations of the church are contrary to scriptures or no: and this is all that is contended for by the Bishop, and you grant it to him; only when you please, and when you want it to serve your purpose, you reserve your grant.²

Dr. Snape again took up the controversy in a second letter. The first half of it is devoted to a discussion of prayer, Snape reaffirming his earlier contention that calm and undisturbed mean dull and lifeless in spite of Hoadly's explicit denial. He denies that the Church of Christ can, in any way, be made equivalent to the Kingdom of Christ. Although he will not surrender the right of private judgment, he is afraid lest "without any deference to authority" it will lead only to anarchy.³ He charges, claiming witnesses to back him, that Hoadly's sermon did not represent his own thought,

1 Joseph Trapp, The Real Nature of the Church or Kingdom of Christ (London: H. Clements, 1717), pp. 37f.

2 Gilbert Burnet, A Letter to the Reverend Mr. Trapp (London: Timothy Childe, 1717), pp. 27f.

3 Snape, A Second Letter to the Lord Bishop of Bangor in Vindication of the Former (London: Jonah Bowyer, 1717), pp. 53f.

but was submitted to a friend who recommended the insertion of the evasive "absolutely's."¹ Hoadly is again accused of aiming at the overthrow of the present civil sanction (Corporation and Test Acts) for the Church of England,² and is finally charged with harbouring a Papist in his home.³

Anonymous pamphlets answering Snape pointed out that Hoadly had actually advanced no new doctrine. The same things had been said before by Mr. Mede, Mr. Hales, Dr. Barrow, Archbishop Tillotson, Bishop Blackall, and Dr. Sherlock.⁴ Daniel Prat replied openly to Snape: "By absolutely, his Lordship means as he explains himself, both without limitation and without examination; nor has he endeavoured to persuade you otherwise. For if people are not to obey without reserve, as you own, then they are to examine."⁵ Daniel Whitby, the aged controversialist, also defended the Bishop. The two essential conditions for prayer, he asserts, are sincerity and permanency of desire, and these are not inconsistent with a calm and undisturbed mind.⁶ In a second

1 Ibid., pp. 40f. The consequences of this charge are discussed in Appendix A. The charge was dropped from the third edition of the letter.

2 Ibid., p. 65.

3 Ibid., p. 66. The results of this indictment are discussed in Appendix B.

4 Daniel Prat, Farther Remarks on the Reverend Dr. Snape's Second Letter to the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Bangor (London: Timothy Childe, 1717), p. 19.

5 Prat, An Answer to the Reverend Dr. Snape's Second Letter to the Lord Bishop of Bangor (London: Timothy Childe, 1717), p. 40.

6 Daniel Whitby, An Answer to the Reverend Dr. Snape's Second Letter to the ... Lord Bishop of Bangor, 2nd ed. (London: W. Churchill, 1717), pp. 4, 7.

piece, Whitby sets out to defend Hoadly's doctrine of the church. If the Gospel has not fixed all the terms necessary to salvation, the Church is wrong for saying that it has. If it has, then no decisions of men can affect those who comply with the Gospel's terms.¹ Only scripture can be the sole rule of faith, and this judged by the individual aided by the Holy Spirit.² This brought to a close that phase of the controversy involving Dr. Snape with the Bishop of Bangor, except for the results of the personal charges Snape had made.

William Law entered the controversy with a letter to the Bishop of Bangor concerning his sermon and answer to Snape's first letter. That this and the succeeding two letters are brilliant and crisp in style is not to be denied; but that they are the most logical writings of the controversy, as Leslie Stephen maintains,³ is highly questionable. The letters abound with personal attacks on Hoadly as well as on his doctrines. "There is not a libertine or loose thinker in England but he imagines you intend to dissolve the church as a society"⁴ is typical.

The first attack fell upon Hoadly's placing

1 Whitby, A Defence of the Propositions Contained in the Lord Bishop of Bangor's Sermon (London: James Knapton, 1718), pp. 10f.

2 Ibid., pp. 67f.

3 Dictionary of National Biography, XXXII, 236-240.

4 William Law, The Bishop of Bangor's Late Sermon and his Letter to Dr. Snape in Defence of it Answered (London: W. Innys, 1717), p. 2.

sincerity as the determiner of God's favour. Law ignores what the Bishop said about the obligation a sincere man is under to find and embrace the truth, and says that Hoadly really does not care what a man believes so long as he is not a hypocrite.¹

Quakers, Independents, Presbyterians, according to your Lordship, have as much reason to think their teachers as useful to them, and as true ministers of Christ, as those of the Episcopal Communion have to think their teachers. For 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.²

This is an interesting admission. Law believes in the authoritative administration of the sacraments by members of an uninterrupted line of clergy going back to the Apostles, who, as against the laity, seem to be taken for the real church.³ The last part of the letter concerns the notion of authority, and Law sets out to prove that Hoadly strikes against not only absolute, but all authority in the state as well as in the church.⁴

Gilbert Burnet was the first to answer Law. He shows that Law's interpretation of sincerity is quite different from Hoadly's,⁵ questions the dependence of

1 Ibid., pp. 3f.

2 Ibid., p. 10.

3 Ibid., p. 13.

4 Ibid., pp. 19, 20, 28.

5 Gilbert Burnet, An Answer to Mr. Law's Letter to the Lord Bishop of Bangor (London: Timothy Childe, 1717), pp. 5ff.

the sacraments upon a regular clergy,¹ and then discusses the problem of authority. If a man has a right to command action or belief on no other foundation than his authority, then it is absolute, for it may not be questioned. Authority over a man's conscience would be absolute, for it could leave nothing to which an appeal might be made. The real church is invisible, known but to God. The visible society of the church cannot have such absolute authority.² As to civil authority, it is not to be obeyed where it commands anything contrary to God's will; and when it commands according to God's will it is obeyed for the greater authority of God.³

The second answer to Law was by John Jackson⁴ who was evidently influenced by John Locke. His work is grounded on the principle that all government is based on the consent of the governed who form a compact to protect their lives and property. Since the civil government represents all citizens in covenant, it may have legal jurisdiction in religious affairs: the same people are involved in a national government and a national church.⁵ All powers of church government, like those of civil government, are derived from the

1 Ibid., pp. 15ff.

2 Ibid., pp. 24f.

3 Ibid., p. 38.

4 When Hoadly was Bishop of Salisbury, John Jackson applied to him for admission to orders, but he would not subscribe to the Prayer Book and Articles. Hoadly refused him. Dictionary of National Biography, XXVII, 20.

5 John Jackson, The Grounds of Civil and Ecclesiastical Government briefly Considered, and an Answer to Mr. Law's Letter to the Bishop of Bangor, 2nd ed. (London: James Knapton, 1718), p. 21.

people who institute them to preserve order and decency.¹ Religious toleration is to be granted to all who do not infringe on the rights of others.² Regarding Law's concept of authority he asks: "What authority can any one have over me if I am to judge whether his injunctions are right or not, and to obey or not obey accordingly?"³

The third reply to Law came from Thomas Pyle, a strong Whig, eloquent preacher, and friend of Hoadly and Sykes. He cannot see how permitting differing opinions in the Church will necessarily make confusion: "Otherwise, I am afraid there may be as much confusion, in many instances, amongst these very Church of England men as amongst any others."⁴

The second letter of Law set out to prove that the clergy have a power given them by God, a power necessary to the existence of the church, a power lodged nowhere else but with the clergy, a power passed down among them by an uninterrupted succession from Christ himself. One cannot be a complete partaker of the grace of Christ, even after baptism, unless he receives the authoritative benediction from the hands of those in succession to the Apostles.⁵ Law's words about the human agency in salvation are very impassioned, but they are not to the

1 Ibid.

2 Ibid., p. 36.

3 Ibid., p. 89.

4 Thomas Pyle, A Vindication of the Bishop of Bangor ... in Answer to the Exceptions of Mr. Law, 2nd ed. (London: John Wyat, 1718), p. 33.

5 Law, A Second Letter to the Bishop of Bangor (London: W. Innys, 1717), p. 2.

point of Hoadly's position which was a denial of the power of some men to withhold God's salvation from others. When the clergy exercise their powers against God's conditions, Law says, they are of no effect,¹ yet their ministrations are necessary and effectual to the salvation of mankind.² Uninterrupted succession is as historically certain as the scriptures themselves.³ In the "Preservative" Hoadly had written that uninterrupted succession was to be questioned, since both the Nonjurors and the Papists claimed to have the only true line. This statement Law twists to make Hoadly affirm that the Roman Church has such a succession while the Church of England does not.⁴

Thomas Pyle replied to this with A Second Vindication. He points out that Law's words do not consistently convey the same meanings throughout his letter.⁵ Repentance, faith, and baptism are all that are required for becoming a Christian. Our religion is based on a fact supported not solely by historical evidence, such as an uninterrupted succession of clergy as Law contends,⁶ but by the inward testimony of the Spirit as well;⁷ and "the Spirit bloweth where it listeth." Pyle was answered anonymously by a "minister of the Church of

1 Ibid., p. 48.

2 Ibid., p. 21.

3 Ibid., p. 100.

4 Ibid., p. 103.

5 Pyle, A Second Vindication of the Lord Bishop of Bangor (London: John Wyat, 1718), pp. 4f.

6 Law, Second Letter, p. 100.

7 Pyle, Second Vindication, p. 29.

England." That any man can have immediate authority from Christ to be a minister in the church apart from episcopal ordination is denied. Only one properly commissioned can receive Christ's blessings on his teaching efforts.¹ The validity of ordination does not depend on a man's moral qualifications.² Any ordination performed in the name of the Holy Trinity will be ratified by God. Even Novatus' orders were therefore valid.³ But excommunication can only be made from the visible society of the church. Beyond that it has no effect.⁴

Thomas Herne, under the pseudonym Phileleutherus Cantabrigiensis, attacked Law's doctrine of the Christian priesthood, basing his arguments on the Epistle to the Hebrews. "In Christianity there is no priest but Christ alone; nor any priesthood, strictly and properly speaking, or sacerdotal powers of oblation, intercession, or benediction in any men upon earth."⁵ To prevent eventual anarchy, no order in the church is given Christ's powers; but to prevent disorder, by the agreement of Christians, certain men may be set apart to perform public offices.⁶ Although the church may

1 P. Fuller, A Letter to the Reverend Mr. Pyle, occasioned by his Exceptions against Mr. Law's first Letter to the Bishop of Bangor (London: J. Bettenham, 1718), p. 9.

2 Ibid., p. 41.

3 Ibid., p. 40.

4 Ibid., pp. 42f.

5 Thomas Herne, The False Notion of a Christian Priesthood ... An Answer to Mr. Law's Second Letter to the Bishop of Bangor, 2nd ed. (London: James Knapton, 1718), p. 4.

6 Ibid., pp. 65ff.

absolve its own excommunications, it cannot "unmake a sinner," nor can an individual presbyter.¹

Gilbert Burnet again sought to refute Law. He holds that at ordination, a man receives the Holy Spirit to aid him in performing his duties, not to make him something he was not before.² The question is not what powers the Prophets and Apostles had, as Law seems to think; but whether the present clergy are really prophets and apostles.³ The rights of the clergy depend on the church, not on the succession considered independently.⁴

Thomas Herne, under his pseudonym, published translations of essays of Samuel Werenfels, professor at the University of Basle. In the essay on private judgment, Werenfels says that a man must decide to what authority he will give his obedience from among the various ones claiming it. If he can make this greatest of all judgments, and he certainly cannot avoid making it, he may be trusted to judge for himself in the many things that a church might want to judge for him.⁵ If a man had not this ability to judge, he could fall into

1 Ibid., p. 70.

2 Burnet, A Full Examination of Several Important Points Relating to Church-Authority, the Christian Priesthood, the Positive Institutions of the Christian Religion, and Church Communion (London: Timothy Childe, 1718), p. 29.

3 Ibid., pp. 78ff.

4 Ibid., pp. 153f.

5 Samuel Werenfels, Three Discourses: One, A Defence of Private Judgment; Second, Against the Authority of the Magistrate over Conscience; Third, Some Considerations Concerning the Reuniting of Protestants, trans. by Thomas Herne (London: James Knapton, 1718), p. 23.

every heresy that arose.¹ But private judgment must be trained by reading the Word of God, attending to instruction offered by the church, and praying for God's assisting grace.² Unless a magistrate has a better remedy than force to offer for errors of religious judgment in his subjects, he must tolerate them.³ A good church is the best argument against heresies.⁴ And so long as a man will not admit heretical conclusions from his premises, he may be shown to be a false reasoner, but not a non-christian. True church unity means mutual acceptance in love of the various church branches, not a forced uniformity of doctrine.⁵

The replies of Snape and Law to Hoadly's sermon were only a stop-gap measure until proper action could be taken by Convocation. Accordingly, on May 3, 1717 a committee was appointed in the Lower House to look into the Bishop's writings and particularize their complaint. The membership of this committee was as follows: Dean Mosse of Ely, and Dean Sherlock of Chichester; Dr. Cannon and Dr. Spratt, Archdeacons of Norfolk and Rochester; Dr. Davies and Dr. Barrell, proctors for the chapters of St. Asaph and Rochester; and Dr. Freind, Dr. Bisse, and Dr. Dawson, proctor clergy from

-
- 1 Ibid., pp. 32ff.
 - 2 Ibid., pp. 38ff.
 - 3 Ibid., p. 83.
 - 4 Ibid., p. 86.
 - 5 Ibid., p. 94.

Oxford, Hereford, and Salisbury. The report was brought before the house on May 10, and according to its title page was read and "voted, nemine contradicente, to be received and entered upon the books of the said house."¹ Bishop Hoadly in his "Answer to the Representation" denied that it had ever been made an act of the whole house.² Cardwell, however, feels that the original record, "qua perlecta, totus coetus unanimiter recepit et in librum actorum hujus coetus inseri voluit," justifies the title.³

The entire procedure of the Lower House of Convocation on this occasion was open to severe criticism. In the first place, it was acting without a license from the king in the matter. Whether this was absolutely necessary or not was disputed along with the major issues of the controversy. But it is a fact that Convocation members siding with the Bishop left the house rather than take part in what they considered an illegal debate, much less censuring action.⁴ Consequently, there was no one to speak against the report when it was delivered. The king, however, issued an

1 A Report of the Committee of the Lower House of Convocation, 2nd ed. (London: J. Morphew, 1717), title page.

2 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Representation drawn up by the Committee of the Lower House of Convocation," Works, II, 448.

3 Edward Cardwell, Synodalia (Oxford: The University Press, 1842), II, 829.

4 Herne, A Letter to the Reverend the Prolocutor, being an Answer to ... a Letter from the Prolocutor to the Reverend Dr. Edward Tenison (London: J. Roberts, 1718), p. 10.

order for the prorogation of Convocation on hearing of the intentions of the committee. Hoadly was charged with instigating this action, but there is no evidence to dispute his sincerity when he declared that the action was taken "not only without my seeking; but without so much as my knowledge, or even suspicion of any such design, till it was actually resolved and ordered."¹ Certain it was, however, that the government could not stand idly by when its acknowledged supporter, a bishop of the Established Church, was to be publicly censured.

But in the second place, the procedure taken to prevent the question of the legality of the action from arising smacked of expert manipulation. Edward Tenison, Archdeacon of Carmarthen, had prepared a protestation against the action of the house which he intended to deliver at the May 10 sitting, the same one at which the committee's report was received. Very strangely, this meeting, apparently well-advertised only among the committee's supporters, was held one and a half hours earlier than usual, so that when Tenison arrived at ten, the prorogation order had been read, although not until the report had been received.² Hence the silencing of all opposition, so that Dean Mosse could say: "We are sufficiently assured that there was not

1 Hoadly, "Answer to the Representation," Works, II, 448.

2 Edward Tenison, A Protestation made on the 14th Day of February, 1717/18, in behalf of the King's Supremacy and the Protestant Doctrines (London: J. Wyat, 1718), p. 27..

the least offer at a protestation by any member, not so much as a word said in defence of the Bishop's doctrines."¹

Dr. Tenison, however, renewed his protests. On November 8, the next scheduled meeting day, he waited from nine to half-past eleven, when, with only six members present, the prolocutor entered the chair and read the schedule of prorogation before any other action could be taken. On February 14, the next meeting, Tenison was the only one present when the prolocutor arrived after the clock had struck twelve. Others who had been present to support Tenison could not wait so long and had left. He began to read his protestation, but while he was reading, the prolocutor said he would not receive it, and read the order of prorogation.²

The prolocutor, Dr. Stanhope, made an attempt to answer Tenison. The Lower House, he said, customarily proceeded with its business even though a prorogation had been sent down from the bishops, but it never entered into any action after long recesses when only another prorogation was expected.³ He was late at the February meeting because he had been visiting the Archbishop at Lambeth, and finding the Thames rough, had to return in his coach which had to be harnessed.⁴ Thomas

1 Robert Mosse, The Report Vindicated from Misreports (London: J. Morpew, 1717), p. 26.

2 Tenison, op. cit., pp. 37f.

3 George Stanhope, A Letter from the Prolocutor to the Reverend Dr. Edward Tenison, Archdeacon of Car-marthen (London: J. Morpew and R. Sare, 1718), pp. 7, 9.

4 Ibid., p. 18.

Herne pointed out that the Thames must have been rough on his arrival as well, and that the morning he was to preside over the Lower House was no time to go calling on the Archbishop.¹

Actually the movement of the house to accept the report of their committee did not mean that they approved of the censure of Bishop Hoadly. Receiving and approving were admittedly two different things.² Entering the report on the books was only to preserve it, and was not meant to preclude further debate. Hoadly himself said he looked forward to answering personally before the house any of its objections.³ Of course, the prorogation made this impossible. And yet, although the house did not necessarily give its approbation to every particular in the report, that document did contain "matter worthy of farther and fuller deliberation; and agreeable in the main, to the sense of the house as it had been expressed in the instructions given to their committee."⁴

Beyond these criticisms of the action of the house, however, was the fundamental one of why the committee had pounced upon Bishop Hoadly when it admitted in its report that other books and writers also needed censuring.

1 Herne, op. cit., p. 33.

2 George Stanhope, The Prolocutor's Answer to a Letter from a Member of the Lower House of Convocation, entitled The Report Vindicated from Misreports (London: R. Sare, 1718), pp. 40ff.

3 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Representation," Works, II, 448.

4 Stanhope, op. cit., p. 43.

An anonymous writer asked why open attacks on church doctrine such as denial of the validity of lay-baptism, the exalting of sacerdotal powers, and a defence of the doctrine of transubstantiation were not rather criticised.¹ The common defence was that the case of a bishop of the Church required more urgent attention because of the greater influence he would have towards evil compared with a writer of no name or reputation. The case of the Bishop was all the more insidious, it was said, because no one detected anything wrong with the sermon on just hearing it, so skillfully deceitful had Hoadly been in composing it!²

The report criticised Hoadly under two heads: (1) that his doctrine subverted all government and discipline in the Church of Christ, and (2) that it impugned the regal supremacy and the authority of the legislature in cases ecclesiastical.³ The first criticism was that under the pretence of exalting the Kingdom of Christ, Hoadly left the church without visible human authority.⁴

If the doctrine contained in these passages be admitted, there neither is nor hath been since our Saviour's time any authority in the Christian church in matters relating to conscience and salvation, not even in the Apostles themselves; and

1 Anon., Short Remarks on a Letter from the Reverend the Prolocutor of the Lower House of Convocation, &c. to a Reverend Member of the Late Committee (London: Timothy Childe, 1718), p. 29.

2 Mosse, op. cit., p. 10.

3 Report of the Committee, pp. 3f.

4 Ibid., p. 4.

all acts of government in such cases have been an evasion of Christ's authority, and a usurpation upon his Kingdom.¹

Moreover, the Bishop omitted the preaching of the Word and the proper administration of the sacraments from his definition of the church.

We observe that as in the sermon all rulers and judges in the visible church are laid aside; so in the book ["Preservative"] all church communion is rendered unnecessary in order to entitle men to the favour of God; and every man is referred in these cases to his private judgment as that which will justify even the worst choice he can make.²

Hoadly's doctrine of sincerity obliterated any distinction of intrinsic truth, making all methods of salvation equal. Making God alone the judge of men puts an end to all church authority or obligation to external communion.³ Not only has the authority of the church been impugned, but Hoadly objects to any action of the government in religious matters. By decrying the use of temporal rewards and punishments he has set religion and irreligion on equal foot in the world.⁴

Since, then, there are in the church no governors left; in the state none who may intermeddle in the affairs of religion; and since Jesus Christ himself never doth interpose; we leave it to your Grace and your Lordships to judge whether the Church and Kingdom of Christ be not reduced to a mere state of anarchy and confusion in which every man is left to do what is right in his own eyes.⁵

The Bishop not only condemned the abuse of authority;

1 Ibid., p. 5.

2 Ibid., p. 7.

3 Ibid., p. 9.

4 Ibid., p. 11.

5 Ibid., p. 13.

he even denies its use. Such was the report of the committee of the Lower House of Convocation.

Strangely enough, the first dispute resulting from the publication of this report did not involve Bishop Hoadly directly, but was rather waged between Dean Sherlock and Arthur Sykes. Sykes raised the question as to why Hoadly had been singled out for censure when the Dean himself, a member of the committee, had preached the very same doctrines in a sermon before the lord mayor on November 5, 1712. In this sermon Sherlock had tried to delineate the powers of the church governors and those of the civil magistrates. He concluded that the spiritual nature of the church precludes its use of temporal power in religious matters.

'Tis just reasoning, I think, to infer from the spiritual nature of Christ's Kingdom, and the spiritual powers of his ministers on earth, that temporal punishments are not proper to enforce the laws and edicts of Christ's Kingdom.¹

The civil magistrate, on the other hand, does have power to preserve the public peace, but his judgments can be based only on men's outward actions and not on the principles from which they may arise.

As to mere difference of opinion, which ends only in speculation, or influences only the internal acts of the mind, or produces only such external acts as no way concern the public peace, I see

¹ Sherlock, A Sermon Preached before the Right Honorable the Lord-Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of London, at the Cathedral Church of St. Paul, on November the 5th, 1712 (London: J. Pemberton, 1717), p. 8.

not how the magistrate can interest himself in them.¹

Neither church nor state has any right to impose penal laws in matters of a purely religious nature. "But where men build upon religious doctrines or practices destructive of civil government, they must answer to God for perverting religion, and to the magistrate for disturbing the public."² Sykes' method was to take the passages of Hoadly's works quoted in the report, and arrange next to them in a parallel column passages from Sherlock's sermon which said virtually the same things. He concludes by asking: "Can the positions in your sermon escape the same censure if the Bishop must be censured?"³

Sherlock's defence, which he made in several successive letters under Sykes' continual prodding, tries to maintain both sides of the argument at once. On the one hand he insists that civil punishments may be added to God's proscriptions against moral sin, but he does not answer the question which his sermon had raised: whether a man is to be punished only for committing murder, or for thinking murder to be right as well.⁴ He thinks the magistrate should be allowed to discourage

1 Ibid., p. 11.

2 Ibid., p. 15.

3 Sykes, A Letter to the Reverend Dr. Sherlock, one of the Committee of Convocation (London: R. Burleigh, 1717), p. 22.

4 Sherlock, An Answer to a Letter sent to the Reverend Dr. Sherlock, &c. relating to his Sermon Preached before the Lord-Mayor, (London: J. Pemberton, 1717), p. 6.

irreligion by the use of negative discouragements such as then were in use against the Dissenters.¹ Yet men's consciences are not to be overruled.² The Dean would call attention to what he had said in his other sermons as well as in the one under consideration.³

In his second letter, Sykes reminds Sherlock that it was just as unfair to judge Hoadly by his one sermon as to judge the Dean by his November 5 sermon. He raises the question of the Corporation and Test Acts which continued to rage through this controversy into the next decades. According to Sherlock, a man should be free to hold his religious opinions so long as he does not harm the state. Why then, should religion, communion in the Church of England, be regarded as a proper qualification for office?⁴ But more fundamentally, to which religion shall the magistrate lend his support? His own? The Dean's? Or is the magistrate inherently of the "true religion"?⁵ To this letter Bishop Hoadly added a postscript stressing the points of agreement between the Dean and himself. Neither would deprive the magistrate of his civil powers. Both regard temporal punishments as unsatisfactory means to enforce Christ's laws, because these deal with inner motives which the

1 Ibid., p. 20.

2 Ibid., p. 29.

3 Ibid., pp. 26f.

4 Sykes, A Second Letter to the Reverend Dr. Sherlock, being a Reply to his Answer, 2nd ed. (London: James Knapton and Timothy Childe, n.d.), p. 37.

5 Ibid., p. 39.

magistrate has no sure way of discovering, whereas he can deal with outward actions as they affect the good of society.¹

Sherlock replied to his postscript by observing that if the very nature of the laws of Christ precludes any additions to them by men, then Hoadly is shouting a ridiculous warning.² So also, Christ can never be deposed as King until he is divested of his divine power.³ Outward actions are the concern not only of civil laws, but of religion as well. The magistrate should be a man of religion if he is to perform his office effectively.⁴ It is the nature of Hoadly's doctrine to encourage contempt of even proper authority. No attempt to rectify the abuses of authority should be permitted to destroy it completely. The Dean charges that Sykes is engaged in the controversy only because he was hired by Hoadly.⁵

Sykes denied this, and countercharged that Sherlock had never really proved that the principles he condemned with the committee were different from those of his sermon.⁶ Although men cannot actually usurp Christ's

1 Hoadly, "Postscript to a second Letter from Dr. Sykes to Dr. Sherlock," Works, II, 583-587.

2 Sherlock, Some Considerations Occasioned by a Postscript from the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Bangor, 2nd ed. (London: J. Pemberton, 1717), p. 16.

3 Ibid., p. 74.

4 Ibid., pp. 40f.

5 Ibid., p. 76.

6 Regarding this point Lathbury says: "In my opinion, Sykes succeeded in proving the inconsistency of Sherlock, for I cannot perceive any difference between the views of the sermon on the 5th of November and those of the Bishop of Bangor." History of Convocation, p. 457.

power, he said, they may make a pretension to it, witness the Inquisition in Italy and Portugal.¹ If temporal sanctions are wrong when added to Christ's laws, they are wrong no matter who employs them.² What is more, "no arguments which you can produce will hold good to prove that the magistrate may enforce true religion, but will equally prove it lawful to enforce a false one."³ There lies the real danger and the point at issue. In his attempt to protect religion, the magistrate may actually debase it, as when the sacrament is made a qualification for office by the Test Act.⁴

Sherlock's self-contradictions were clearly demonstrated in a work by Charles Norris. The contradictions lie not only between the seven-year old sermon and his recent writings, but within the latter themselves. So the magistrate at one time is said to regard outward actions only; at another that he is to maintain the honour of God, and that laws regarding outward actions only are not proper directions for a moral agent. In some passages Hoadly and Sherlock agree that so long as he does not disturb the community, a man is not to be punished for belief or disbelief.⁵ But

1 Sykes, A Third Letter to the Reverend Dr. Sherlock (London: James Knapton and Timothy Childe, 1717), p. 16.

2 Ibid., p. 65.

3 Ibid., p. 68.

4 Ibid., p. 87.

5 Charles Norris, A Dialogue between Dr. Sherlock, Dean of Chichester: and Dr. Sherlock, Master of the Temple (London: J. Roberts, 1718), p. 18.

Sherlock does not consistently hold this position.

The Dean would not have the Papist punish the conscience of the Protestant; but he would have the High Church Protestant punish the Dissenting Protestant. The Papist is not to oppress the Protestant's conscience with the articles of purgatory, transubstantiation, auricular confession, etc. Yet the Dean would have his church communion, his uninterrupted succession of the ministry, his divine hierarchy, etc., urged home to the Dissenters. As if the same premises do not call for the same inference; or that the Dean of Chichester enjoyed a privilege to make the law of God speak persecution, or indulgence, at his pleasure.¹

A second work of Norris' was called the Reconciler. In this he tries to show the real similarity of the views of the contending parties. The High Church group will defend church authority, but when they explain what they mean, they reach practically the same position Hoadly has. Either his adversaries mean what he means, or their words are without meaning.²

At this point in the controversy, Hoadly published his answer to the committee's representation.³ In the

1 Ibid., p. 21.

2 Norris, The Reconciler; or the Bangorian Controversy (London: W. Boreham, 1718), p. 40.

3 The opinions of this work vary considerably. "Few unprejudiced persons could carefully read his 'Answer to the Representation of the Committee of Convocation' without acknowledging that his statements were grossly misinterpreted, and that inferences which his words by no means justified were presumed to follow from them." Abbey and Overton, op. cit., I, 33f. On the other hand Perry says: "It is marked by a constant endeavour to evade the real points in dispute, to recede under the shelter of verbal pretexts from the plain and obvious sense of what he had written, and instead of boldly standing by his positions to retreat from them without being discovered by means of rhetorical artifices and skillfully concealed sophistries." op. cit., III, 302.

introduction he speaks for an open discussion of the issues involved, asserts that he has fixed no new meaning on his words, complains of bad treatment from many pulpits, and declares that by his efforts he wants only to serve the Gospel, the church, and human society.¹ He complains of the treatment he has received from Convocation because of the committee's blanket statement that some of his other doctrines, not specified, also needed censure; and because his writings in defence of the Church had been singled out, rather than obvious attacks on its very existence.² His own summary of the argument will clarify the intent and content of the "Answer."

The world has now seen from my defence under the first head of the charge against me that I have denied to the church no governors but what are, in effect, absolute governors over the consciences and religion of Christ's people; that I have denied no censures but such as pretend to be decisive and to affect the condition of Christians with respect to the favour of God and eternal salvation: not the right of judging, an open notorious sinner to be unworthy of the solemn tokens of church-communion, but the right of judging, censuring, and punishing the servants of another master in quite another sense; that I have denied no authority but that to which Christians are absolutely and indispensably bound to submit their conduct; none, but that which is declared to oblige them either to profession, or to silence against their own consciences: that is, no authority but what is perfectly inconsistent with the supreme authority of Christ himself in his own Kingdom; no authority but what this reformed Church of England has itself thrown off; and upon the opposition to which it is entirely founded.

1 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Representation," Works, II, 448-450.

2 Ibid., II, 568f.

The world has seen from my defence under the second head of the charge against me that I have "excluded the temporal powers from any right to encourage true religion or discourage the contrary" in that sense only in which it would be injurious to true religion to grant it, and wholly foreign to and inconsistent with the office of the civil magistrate as such.

It has now appeared that I have excluded Christ from direction in his own Kingdom in those particulars only in which it has pleased him to exclude himself; and in that sense in which these worthy persons, together with all Protestants, constantly themselves exclude him.

I leave it therefore for the world to judge whether I have by my doctrine "reduced the Church and Kingdom of Christ to a mere state of anarchy and confusion" in any sense but that in which all Christians, and all members of this Church, and all that have reformed from the usurpations of Popery, if they will be consistent with themselves, must do it.¹

The "Answer" closes with an appeal to God that if his teaching is false, it may come to nought; but that if it is good and true, it may triumph over his own imperfections of expressing it as well as all attempts to stop its progress.²

There were four principal defences of the action of Convocation, three by members of the committee and a fourth by Mr. Stebbing. The first of these came from the prolocutor himself as a reply to Dr. Mosse's anonymously published letter. The committee, he declares, were sincere and gave Hoadly fair treatment: no one in the house ever objected that his writings had been misunderstood.³ Questions are then raised about whether a

1 Ibid., II, 557f.

2 Ibid., II, 582.

3 Stanhope, The Prolocutor's Answer to a Letter, p. 23.

Christian in an important state position may not use his power and influence to benefit the church, do good to Christians, and prevent church enemies from coming to power.¹ An anonymous author answered yes, provided these things are borne in mind: (1) All Christians must be treated impartially. (2) The church may actually be harmed if men adhere to her for only selfish reasons. (3) Dissenters are not only Christians as well as Churchmen, but they are no longer professed enemies of the government, as Dr. Stanhope would make them appear.² Another anonymous reply said that Hoadly spoke against a real danger, and cites a passage from a sermon by Dr. Bisse in which he holds that it is as important to submit to the clergy when they interpret scripture as to believe in the inspiration of the Apostles.³ A third reply was an anonymous buffoonery implying that Hoadly had attacked all learning (he had said that learned men disputed more about doctrine than ignorant men) and had placed Jews, Turks, Mohammedans, and Christians on the same ground religiously.⁴

The second defence of the committee was by Robert Cannon. He admits that he was offended with Hoadly

1 Ibid., pp. 61-67.

2 Anon., An Answer to the Five Important Queries contained in Mr. Prolocutor's Postscript to his Answer to a Letter (London: J. Morphew, 1718), pp. 5, 7f, 13.

3 Anon., Short Remarks on a Letter from the Reverend the Prolocutor, pp. 4f.

4 Anon., A Brief Consideration of Two Passages in the Bishop of Bangor's Answer to the Committee (London: J. Morphew, 1718), pp. 8, 20f.

before the sermon was preached.¹ His principal argument is that Christianity can succeed in the world only through the agency of national churches which can be maintained only by the support of the civil magistrate. He upbraids the Bishop for destroying the traditions of the Church. The reply to Cannon was anonymous, but it pointed out that the Articles have nowhere made salvation depend upon what human authority has ordained. Baptism is effected by the use of water and the Trinitarian formula, not by the authority of the minister.² The answer to this by Thomas Dawson, also a member of the committee, was extremely bitter. Hoadly is represented by him as the "greatest disturber" of church unity, the "most fatal subverter" of the Establishment who is now "disputing away the very foundations of faith, and resolves to unhinge the best of churches at once."³ All Dissenters are described as mortal enemies of the Church and government, and horrors of comprehension are pictured with supposedly lurid details such as some clergy wearing the surplice, others not; some standing at communion, others kneeling. At the close Dawson picks up Snape's charge about Hoadly's harbouring a Jesuit, and reproduces the penal laws of England

1 Robert Cannon, A Vindication of the Proceedings of the Lower House of Convocation (London: J. Fox, B. Barker, C. King, 1717), p. 17.

2 Anon., An Exposition of the XXXIV Article of Religion, of the Traditions of the Church (London: J. Roberts, 1718).

3 Thomas Dawson, Suspiria Sacra: or the Church of England's Memorial (London: C. Rivington, 1718), the dedication.

relative to such behaviour.¹ A second work of his, published anonymously, was inspired by Hoadly's intention to collect patristic authorities relative to his views. Here the Bishop is charged with being an Independent in disguise, and with impugning the Godhead of the Saviour.² Two discourses follow, one in favour of Roman Catholics, the other a defence of the Independent position, both pretended to be supports for the Bishop of Bangor.

The third defence by a committee member was offered by Sherlock, who, under the stimulus of Sykes' last reply, produced a vindication of the Corporation and Test Acts. He declares it was the whole purpose of Hoadly's sermon to secure their repeal.³ The original Test Act, he says, was made to keep both Papists and Dissenters out of the government, and the only part the sacrament plays is to show whether a man is of the communion of the Church of England or not.⁴ No honest person would commune with one church while he was a member of another.⁵ The purpose of the act was only self-defence: "The intent was to keep Dissenters out of the state, not to force them into the Church."⁶ Wicked men

1 Ibid., pp. 46ff.

2 Dawson, An Introduction to the Bishop of Bangor's Intended Collection of Authorities (London: J. Bowyer, 1718), pp. ii, xxf.

3 Sherlock, A Vindication of the Corporation and Test Acts (London: J. Pemberton, 1718), preface.

4 Ibid., p. 9.

5 Ibid., p. 17.

6 Ibid., p. 83.

may debase the sacrament to obtain privilege, but the law itself does not pervert it. Denunciations are thrown at Mr. Peirce. Then Sherlock lifts a sentence from one of Hoadly's works in his earlier dispute with Francis Atterbury: "The example of our Lord is much more peculiarly fit to be urged to slaves -- than to subjects,"¹ and says that this shows that Hoadly will scruple at nothing to remove any obstacle in his way.² This led to a separate dispute aside from the main issues of the controversy.³

The Dissenters' response to Sherlock's Vindication was immediate and came from several quarters. In general, the replies stressed these points: (1) that men may differ in religious opinions and usages without subverting Christianity or the church; (2) that a national church should be representative of the nation and not just of some factions within it; and (3) that the Dissenters are and have been staunch supporters of the government and the cause of freedom.

Moses Lowman wrote particularly for the cause of the occasional conformist whom Sherlock had represented as a dishonest evader of the law. Men, he writes, are occasional conformists with good consciences. They use the sacrament as it was originally intended to be used,

1 Taken from Hoadly's Answer to Dr. Atterbury, p. 65.

2 Sherlock, Vindication, p. 116.

3 This side dispute is treated separately in Appendix C.

as a bond of mutual love among all Christians.¹ The practice is older than the Test Act, and was encouraged by Bishop Williams of Chichester. But if men incur guilt because they partake of the sacrament to obtain an office, then a Church of England man may be just as guilty as a Dissenter.² The whole matter of this discussion of the Corporation and Test Acts is a deliberate attempt to lead the controversy off the original issue: whether Christ alone is King in his Kingdom.³

Peirce, not being an occasional conformist, took a different line in his reply. Men are not joined to the church by law, but by persuasion, he asserts. On this basis the Church of England separated from the legally established Church of Rome, and on the same basis the Dissenters have left the Church of England.⁴ Sherlock has not only falsified the history of the movement; he has deliberately misrepresented Peirce's words, and examples are then enumerated. Still other replies attacked the prostitution of the sacrament by closing it to some Christians and by making it a civil test. The essential thing about the Lord's Supper is to receive the bread and wine in communion with a congre-

1 Moses Lowman, The Principles of an Occasional Conformist Stated and Defended (London: John Clark, 1718), pp. v, 4f.

2 Ibid., pp. 14f.

3 Lowman, A Defence of the Protestant Dissenters, in Answer to the Misrepresentations of Dr. Sherlock (London: John Clark, 1718), p. 3.

4 Peirce, Some Reflections upon Dean Sherlock's Vindication of the Corporation and Test Acts (London: John Clark, 1718), p. 21.

gation in the same faith in Jesus Christ. To add further conditions -- that it must be received as one kneels, that only Church of England people are welcome -- is an affront to Christ.¹

After some time, Hoadly's "The Common Rights of Subjects" appeared. In this work he inquires into the nature of the sacrament as a test, and reaffirms that its use as such is a perversion of its true nature.

I now speak again in the same manner: thinking that it wants nothing but eye-sight to see that an action ordained as an instrument without which no person shall command a regiment is ordained by this act to something else besides the remembrance of Christ's death.²

But, moreover, if it is becoming to a Christian to receive the sacrament according to the usage of the Church of England as Sherlock has said, then so doing proves only that a man is a Christian, not that he is a supporter of the entire present Ecclesiastical Constitution.³ Even supposing that the test really performed its objective, Sherlock has not yet proved that all Dissenters should be excluded from the government. To say at the same time that the Establishment should be agreeable to the sense of the nation, but that to get the sense of the nation impartially, only those who agree with the present Establishment must be consulted

1 Anon., A Letter to Dr. Sherlock, concerning the Wickedness and Injustice of Making any Addition to a Divine Institution (London: S. Baker, 1718), p. 15.

2 Hoadly, "The Common Rights of Subjects Defended: and the Nature of the Sacramental Test, Considered," Works, II, 708.

3 Ibid., II, 705, 784.

is to argue in a circle.¹ Past difficulty with Nonconformists did not arise from their legal status anyway,² although Sherlock's distorted version of church history would make them the sole cause of the rebellion against King Charles I. If toleration is not a right belonging to the Dissenters, Parliament had no right to grant it: if it is their right, then it was restored at the Revolution and belongs to them now.³

Sherlock in his answer repeats the misrepresentations of Peirce, complains of the "violent attack" upon himself,⁴ and charges Hoadly with libelling the government by writing against the laws in the public press. He then traces the laws relating to the Church through the confused years immediately following the Restoration and reaches the conclusion that all Dissenters (even those who helped restore Charles to his throne) and Papists were to be excluded from the government by means of the sacramental test.⁵ If there is such a group such as Hoadly describes, who could take the sacrament in the Church of England yet not approve of the Ecclesiastical Constitution in its entirety, that proves only that the means selected by the legislature to eliminate all Nonconformists was defective, not that

1 Ibid., II, 786.

2 Ibid., II, 755.

3 Ibid., II, 782.

4 Sherlock, An Answer to the Lord Bishop of Bangor's Late Book; entituled, The Common Rights of Subjects Defended, &c. (London: J. Pemberton, 1719), preface.

5 Ibid., pp. 1-22, passim.

such was not their intention.¹ But in his concern to trace out past legislation, Sherlock failed to answer whether it was right now to exclude the Dissenters from the government, or to use the sacrament as a test for purposes of exclusion, or to depend upon such means to preserve the Establishment.

Mr. Peirce renewed his charge of misrepresentation against the Dean, particularly since after his error had been pointed out, Sherlock not only made no apology, but continued the misrepresentations in all subsequent editions of his book.² The original works of Peirce are open for inspection: one can only agree with the famous Nonconformist that Sherlock is not to be trusted when he quotes another author.³

Moses Lowman reviewed the same period of church history as the Dean but reached quite other conclusions, namely that past exclusion was specifically for public safety and not for the protection of the Church. Were Sherlock correct in his interpretation, however, the right of the case is not proved: the burning of heretics had a long and sustained tradition.⁴ Thus that part of the controversy dealing with the Corporation and Test

1 Ibid., pp. 22ff.

2 Peirce, The Charge of Misrepresentations maintained against Dean Sherlock's Preface to his Answer to the Lord Bishop of Bangor's Late Book (London: John Clark, 1719), p. 12.

3 Ibid., p. 40.

4 Lowman, Remarks on Dr. Sherlock's Answer to the Lord Bishop of Bangor's Late Book (London: John Clark, 1719), p. 23.

Acts wore its way to an end. But Bishop Hoadly consistently worked for their repeal, even as late as 1736.

The fourth defence of the Report was undertaken by Henry Stebbing who was not a member of the committee which had framed it. He says, "I am verily persuaded that it is his Lordship's real sentiment that the church hath no authority and consequently that it was, in his sermon, his intention to deny that she hath any."¹ He agrees that the church does not have an absolute authority to compel men, but by misunderstanding Hoadly's phrase "affairs of conscience and eternal salvation" to include every act of life,² he reaches the above conclusion. Daniel Prat pointed out this mistake to him. He also demonstrated the great differences between those who had written in support of the committee, differences often as large as those between the committee and Hoadly.³

Stebbing's second work was occupied with the problem of sincerity. Sherlock's preface defines sincerity as acting according to present persuasion without investigation,⁴ and that definition, so contrary to Hoadly's

1 Henry Stebbing, A Defence of the First Head of the Charge of the Committee of the Lower House of Convocation against the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Bangor (London: Henry Clements, 1718), p. 73.

2 Ibid., pp. 11, 22.

3 Prat, A Review of the Most Considerable Writers in the Great Controversy with the Bishop of Bangor (London: Timothy Childe, 1719), pp. 84ff.

4 Stebbing, Remarks upon a Position of the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Bangor concerning Religious Sincerity, preface by Sherlock, 2nd ed. (London: Henry Clements, 1718), p. vii.

thoughts, leads the argument astray. Stebbing feels that sincerity wrongly rules out a consideration of the intrinsic goodness of each of several choices.¹ George Legh, writing pseudonymously, observed that sincerity is not a once-for-all-time accomplishment, but is an attitude of mind to be employed afresh every day.² To Stebbing's objection that by the doctrine of sincerity God's rewards would attend the sincere heathen and Christian equally, John Balguy answered that God's favour, resting on all truly sincere men, is not to be confused with his rewards which depend upon the improvement each man makes on his position. There is little merit in embracing orthodoxy only as an opinion.³ But if a man is to prefer the words of the clergy to his own sincerity, as Stebbing has implied, what assurance does he have that the hearts of spiritual governors are less deceitful than his own?⁴

Following the replies to his first two works, in the preface to Miscellaneous Observations Stebbing reaches the strange conclusion that although the church by excommunication can declare a man out of God's favour, a man would do well to suffer this, to be cut off from

1 Ibid., p. 8.

2 George Legh, A Letter from Edinburgh to Dr. Sherlock rectifying the Committee's Notions of Sincerity, 2nd ed., corrected (London: J. Roberts, A. Dodd, J. Fox, 1718), p. 15.

3 John Balguy, Silvius's Letter to the Reverend Dr. Sherlock (London: J. Roberts, 1719), p. 25.

4 Pyle, An Answer to Mr. Stebbing's Remarks concerning Religious Sincerity and Church Authority (London: J. Wyat, 1719), p. 38.

God's covenanted promises made only through the church, rather than do something enjoined by the church but forbidden by his conscience, which might entail God's wrath.¹ In the same work he supports an uninterrupted succession as the only regular one, yet admits that the Dissenters may receive blessings from their ministers too.² He concludes by discussing Hoadly's doctrine of the church. Pyle replied to each part of this work, defending the Bangorian positions.³

William Law replied to Hoadly's "Answer," ridiculing the doctrine of an invisible church. The church, he affirms, consists of good and bad men not to be separated until the Last Judgment.⁴ But when he argues for church authority, Law says the power of excommunication exists to turn offenders out of the church, thereby keeping it pure.⁵ In discussing the nature of the church he becomes involved in the circular argument which says: that is the true church which fulfils the Church of England's definition of a true church, and no other can be.⁶ Law received only an anonymous reply

1 Stebbing, Miscellaneous Observations: or, Remarks upon Some Scattered Passages in the Bishop of Bangor's Answer to the Representation (London: Henry Clements, 1718), pp. iff.

2 Ibid., p. 21.

3 Pyle, An Answer to Mr. Stebbing's Miscellaneous Observations (London: J. Wyat, 1719).

4 Law, A Reply to the Bishop of Bangor's Answer to the Representation of the Committee of Convocation (London: William and John Innys, 1719), pp. 9, 13.

5 Ibid., p. 112.

6 Ibid., pp. 216f.

exposing his false reasoning.¹

About this time there was a small flurry of excitement over the publication of a letter purported to be written by Archbishop Wake to a friend in Zurich, lamenting the sad condition of the English Church which was being pulled down by one of her own bishops. Wake took no notice of this either to confirm or to deny it, but there were several letters in his defence, showing that such a style of writing was not characteristic of the Archbishop, nor were the doctrines involved such as he entertained in his known writings.²

In his charge to the clergy of his diocese in July of 1719, John Potter, Bishop of Oxford, warned against what he termed the "great dangers" to the Church.³ Since practically all of these were gross misrepresentations of Hoadly's doctrines, but sufficiently clear to indicate their source, the Bishop of Bangor called on Potter to name the authors propounding such ridiculous ideas. In his defence, Potter says he was speaking against "grievous doctrines lately propagated

1 Nicholas Amhurst, A Letter to the Rev'd Mr. Law, Council for the Committee of Convocation, and the Two Famous Universities; in a Cause depending between them and the Bishop of Bangor (London: J. Roberts, 1719).

2 Herne, A Short Vindication of the Ld Archbishop of Canterbury from the imputation of being the Author of a Letter lately printed at Zurich, concerning the state of religion in England (London: J. Roberts, 1719); also, Thomas Gordon, A Letter to the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury. Proving that His Grace cannot be the Author of the Letter to an eminent Presbyterian Clergyman in Swisserland (sic) . . . , 3rd ed. (London: J. Roberts, 1719).

3 John Potter, The Bishop of Oxford's Charge to the Clergy of his Diocese at his Triennial Visitation, in July 1719 (London: George Mortlock, 1720).

amongst us,"¹ is surprised that anyone should take that personally, and feels it is a great injustice to be asked to name particular writers.² Because Hoadly had also requested scripture references from Potter, he charges that the Bishop of Bangor does not approve of the Articles of the Church.³ He inconsistently maintains that church councils give the true interpretation of doctrine, but are not infallible.⁴ He names only Sykes as the man who affirmed that no error was punishable so long as it did not result in an evil practice. This last charge was based on The Innocency of Error which had been published about five years earlier and which evidently influenced Hoadly's thought on sincerity. As his defence, Sykes demonstrated Potter's deliberate misrepresentations and showed that Potter's "grievous doctrines" were little more than products of his imagination conceived to throw odium on the Bangorian cause.⁵

The last phase of the controversy developed over a sermon on church authority preached by Francis Hare, Dean of Worcester. He declares in the sermon that the

1 Potter, A Defence of the late Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Oxford, July, 1719 (London: George Mortlock, 1720), p. 4.

2 Ibid., p. 13.

3 Ibid., p. 43.

4 Ibid., p. 57.

5 Sykes, A Vindication of the Innocency of Error, &c. from the Misrepresentations of the Lord Bishop of Oxford in his late Charge and the Defence of It (London: James Knapton, 1720).

powers of church governors may be deduced from scripture, from the practice of the early church, and from the nature of society.¹ Difficult passages of scripture are to be submitted to church governors for interpretation, but should they declare false doctrine members are not to obey them.² Those who disobey them, however, are not free from guilt unless they have used the best means possible to know the truth. This the Dissenters obviously have not done, else they would subscribe to the true position of the Established Church!³

Daniel Neal attacked him for his unfairness to the Dissenters.⁴ John Rogers produced a treatise showing that the ideas of the visible and invisible church are not mutually exclusive, and that the extent and powers of each may be set forth in an orderly manner.⁵ Sykes, by treating Rogers' proof-texts in their contexts, reached different conclusions; but he is most effective in showing that the "common reason of mankind" upon which much of Rogers' argument depends is no adequate foundation for Christian doctrine since it only repro-

1 Francis Hare, Church Authority Vindicated, in a sermon preached at Putney, May 5, 1719, 4th ed., corrected (London: J. Roberts, 1720), pp. 24f.

2 Ibid., p. 38.

3 Ibid., p. 39.

4 Daniel Neal, A Letter to the Reverend Dr. Francis Hare, Dean of Worcester, occasion'd by his reflections on the Dissenters in his late Visitation Sermon and Postscript (London: John Clark, 1720).

5 John Rogers, A Discourse of the Visible and Invisible Church of Christ, 3rd ed., corrected (London: Tho. Woodward, 1720).

duces the status quo which may be right or may not.¹ Hoadly's method of rebuttal was to examine Hare's scripture references and show that they supported no such elaborate authority as Hare had contended. If the scriptures are the sole rule of faith, he says, it is ridiculous to say that the church can give them equally authoritative interpretations which all must accept on pain of excommunication. That would make the interpretation the rule.² The Dean has it that a man is sincere only when he agrees with Francis Hare.³

Hare's reply came as an anonymous satirical defence of Hoadly's sermon, excusing it as a work of haste and immature thought.⁴ Hoadly gave it an anonymous answer, reminding his readers that Hare had promised to be straightforward in his part of the controversy and was now remiss.⁵ Hare had the last word, however, in a tedious vindication of his own interpretation of scripture passages, as against Hoadly's notes. He closes by saying:

1 Sykes, The Authority of the Clergy and the Liberties of the Laity stated and Vindicated. In Answer to Mr. Rogers's Discourse of the Visible and Invisible Church of Christ (London: James Knapton, 1720).

2 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Reverend Dr. Hare's Sermon, intituled, 'Church Authority Vindicated,'" Works, II, 864.

3 Ibid., II, 874.

4 Hare, A New Defence of the Lord Bishop of Bangor's Sermon . . ., 2nd ed., corrected (London: Jonah Bowyer, 1720).

5 Hoadly, "The D--n of W-----r still the same: or his new Defence of the Lord Bishop of Bangor's Sermon, &c.," Works, II, 918, 920.

Here then I take my leave of his Lordship and of all that he has writ, or ever shall write in this controversy which, as managed on his part, is the most jejune and barren, the loosest and most trifling, the most unnecessary and unprofitable, that was ever brought upon the stage.¹

Thus ended the three-year controversy waged over the doctrine of the church, a controversy in which all parties wrote ostensibly in defence of that body they unwittingly made appear ridiculous.

¹ Hare, Scripture Vindicated from the Misinterpretations of the Lord Bishop of Bangor: in his answer to the Dean of Worcester's Visitation Sermon concerning Church Authority (London: Jonah Bowyer, 1721), p. 164.

CHAPTER III

THE MAIN ISSUE OF THE CONTROVERSY:

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH

Section 1. The Anti-bangorian View of the Church as a Visible Society.

It has already been noted that with the publication of Bishop Hoadly's sermon, the controversy shifted from the subject of the Revolution and deprivation of the Nonjuring clergy to the doctrine of the church itself. Hoadly in this sermon defined the Church of Christ as

the number of men, whether small or great, whether dispersed or united, who truly and sincerely are subjects to Jesus Christ alone as their Law-giver and Judge in matters relating to the favour of God and their eternal salvation.¹

It was the thought of the sermon summarized in these words which stirred the men of the Church of England, and even the Nonjuror Law to rise to the defence of the Church of Christ as a visible congregation. These opponents of the Bishop could not agree among themselves in many details, but they succeeded in outlining a picture of the church which in its essential features is straightforward.

First it was pointed out that an unqualified identification of the church with the Kingdom of God was misleading. Though the Kingdom could depend upon

¹ Hoadly, "The Nature of the Kingdom," Works, II, 406.

a heavenly government for its order, the church on earth needed to have some visible constitution, some way of identifying it, of being able to lay a finger on it so to speak, as well as some earthly authority to hold it together.¹ Sincere Christians, even by Hoadly's understanding of them, will make a "visible" profession of their faith. Such professors, considered as a body, constitute the church on earth, and consideration must be given to it for its regulation and supervision.² The only way a man may appear to be Christian on earth is by joining this body of those who have made their visible profession.³ Moreover, Christ's promises to men, important ones such as that found in Matthew 18:20, come to them only as they identify themselves with this body on earth.⁴ How then can one belong to Christ and not belong to the company of his followers on earth organized into a society?⁵ Dean Hickee, extreme as he often was in his aggressive defence of the Nonjurors, voiced the position common to the defenders of the church as an earthly society.

All the promises of the Gospel are made to Christians as actual members of the church; . . . no man, how eminent soever for personal virtues, can in the ordinary way of salvation claim the benefit of them before he is a member of the church; no man who . . . ceases to be a member can lay any claim to them . . . , not so much as

1 Snape, A Second Letter, p. 45.

2 Law, A Reply, p. 7.

3 Ibid., p. 160.

4 Fuller, op. cit., p. 21.

5 Law, A Reply, p. 32.

the remission of sins.¹

It was Hoadly's apparent neglect of the organized church on earth to which the committee of Convocation called attention.

He omits even to mention the preaching of the Word, or administering the sacraments; one of which, in the words of the twenty-seventh Article of our Church, is a "sign of regeneration or new birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive baptism rightly, are grafted into the church."²

Hoadly had ignored the government of the body of professing Christians, particularly the order of the clergy, "the bishops and governors of the Church of Christ; those by whom the power of the keys and of administering the holy sacraments have been perpetuated and continued in the Church of Christ, from the days of the Apostles to this present time."³

A. The Order of the Clergy.

"Babel scheme" was the contemptuous phrase thrown at the Bishop's conception of the church which to his opponents seemed so devoid of order.⁴ Snape called attention to the scriptural metaphors applied to Christians on earth. They are called the Temple of God, but "can a heap of uncemented stones compose such a building fitly framed?" They are compared to a family. "In

1 Hickee, op. cit., pp. 72f.

2 Report of the Committee, p. 7.

3 Innes, op. cit., I, 6.

4 Hare, A New Defence, p. 23.

that there must be stewards and other governing servants of different degrees to preserve a good economy."¹ The church is made up of the laity and the clergy, and with the latter is lodged the overall authority which is spiritual, and so not conferred by men.² The scriptural admonition to "be subject to one another"³ is not a levelling term, warned Dean Hare. It means be subject to whom submission is due.⁴

In the Christian church this submission is due the clergy, instituted by God. As God is the supreme King, and Christ is his Son under him, so the clergy fall under a continuous and like gradation of titles.⁵ Christ is the Head of the church, and to this degree one may say that the church is also Christ's Kingdom, but he has commissioned others to reign in his stead upon earth.

This Sacerdotal Sovereign has committed the government and administration of his Kingdom to ministerial priests, who, as I must often put you in mind, are the vicars, substitutes, legates, or vicegerents of the regal, sacerdotal Lord and Master in his kingly as well as his priestly office, throughout all the districts and dominions of his Spiritual Kingdom on earth.⁶

These priests are only qualified vicegerents, however; that is, they do not have all the powers of Christ himself. Nevertheless, they are commissioned by Christ to

1 Snape, A Letter, p. 23.

2 Potter, A Defence of the Late Charge, pp. 68f.

3 Ephesians 5:21.

4 Hare, Scripture Vindicated, p. 27.

5 Hare, A New Defence, p. 34.

6 Hickee, op. cit., pp. 66f.

serve for him.¹ It consists

with the goodness and justice of God to depute men to act in his Name, and be ministerial towards the salvation of others; and to lay a necessity upon his creatures of qualifying themselves for his favour and receiving his graces by the hands and intervention of mere men.²

It is also manifest that the priesthood is a grace of the Holy Ghost; that it is not a function founded in the natural or civil rights of mankind; but is derived from the spiritual authority of the Holy Ghost, and is as truly a positive institution as the sacraments.³

Because of this divine institution of the clergy, the Nonjurors felt they could not submit to a deprivation by merely human authority.⁴

Bishop Hoadly's opponents saw the scriptural foundation for the institution of the clergy in the several recorded passages where Jesus commissioned his disciples: Matthew 16:18-19, 28:18-20, and John 20:21-23. Not only were the disciples themselves commissioned, said the Anti-bangorians, but they in turn were thereby given the power to commission others; for Christ, having ascended to heaven, could no longer give his commission to men directly.⁵ The laying on of hands by elders conveys the power of the Holy Spirit to other men who must take up the work of the disciples, namely governing the church, and these are thereby as truly called and sanctified "as if they had received an

1 Stebbing, A Defence of the First Head, p. 19.

2 Law, A Second Letter, pp. 20f.

3 Ibid., p. 28.

4 Hickes, op. cit., p. 93.

5 Fuller, op. cit., p. 8.

immediate or miraculous commission."¹ They have the same powers.² "There is an absolute necessity of a strict succession of authorized ordainers from the Apostolical Times, in order to constitute a Christian priest."³ This alone marked the difference between the Church of England clergy and those of the Independents and Presbyterians.⁴

The validity of this commission is unaffected by the recipient's moral qualifications or his complete lack of them.⁵

Though the consecration [of Novatus] was scandalous and irregular, yet being performed in the name of the Holy Trinity by those who were duly commissioned for that purpose, most certainly 'twas valid. . . . The act of consecration God would ratify because [it was] performed in his Name and by virtue of his commission.⁶

So it was that the idolatry of Rome did not affect her orders, and the direct line of apostolic succession could be passed on to the clergy of the Church of England.⁷ Although the Roman orders were valid, they were no longer regular, for only the Church of England bishops were the true successors to the Apostles!⁸ The existence of the present episcopal order, by its very nature an exclusive one, proves the succession to

1 Law, A Second Letter, p. 7.

2 Snape, A Letter, p. 19.

3 Law, A Second Letter, p. 29.

4 Law, The Bishop of Bangor's Late Sermon, p. 10.

5 Fuller, op. cit., p. 41.

6 Ibid., p. 40.

7 Ibid., pp. 8, 12.

8 Anon., A Modest Enquiry into the Bishop of Bangor's Preservative, p. 30.

be uninterrupted.¹ It is as sure as the canon of scripture.² Stebbing granted that the succession could be handed down by presbyters as well as bishops, but he positively denied that the power was lodged in the congregation (as the Independents maintained), or was conveyed by the direct action of the Holy Spirit (on which the Quakers depended), or could be conferred by the magistrate (Erastianism).³

The first duty of this body of clergy is preaching and teaching God's Word. There was little controversy over this point, for the Bangorians did not doubt the value of the teaching function. Even for them Christ was not the immediate or sole teacher.⁴ But there was some difference over the question of how far that teaching had to be accepted by the laity. The general opinion of Hoadly's opponents was that in all doubtful cases, the word of the clergy was final.⁵ Stebbing thought there could be no authority behind this power of interpretation if ordinary laymen were allowed to pass judgment on it.⁶ Even if the minister were regarded as a guide, a guide still has more authority than a follower.⁷

The second duty of the clergy is presiding at meet-

1 Law, A Second Letter, p. 84.

2 Ibid., p. 100.

3 Stebbing, Miscellaneous Observations, pp. 17f.

4 Rogers, op. cit., p. 28.

5 This point will be discussed more fully in Chapter IV.

6 Stebbing, A Defence of the First Head, p. 26.

7 Rogers, op. cit., p. 39.

ings and offering up prayers. The dispute waxed warmer over this issue, not over the need for order in the public assemblies which both parties acknowledged, but over the extent to which these meetings and these prayers depended on the clergy for their efficacy. They affected the ordinary member from the very start of his Christian life. A baptized sinner is more in the favour of God than an unbaptized good man, wrote one of the Church supporters, for by this act a man is enrolled in the church in heaven as well as on earth.¹ Although the validity of lay-baptism was questioned, the Church of England accepted it as admissable. But Law held that something more was necessary to make one a complete partaker of the grace of Christ, namely "authoritative benediction" by a clergyman.

By authoritative benediction we do not mean any natural or intrinsic authority of our own, but a commission from God to be effectual administrators of his ordinances, and to bless in his Name. . . . Thus when the bishop is said to confer grace in confirmation, this is properly an authoritative benediction, because he is then as truly doing what God has commissioned him to do as when a prophet declares upon what errand he is sent.²

This power is due solely to a man's superior degree in the ministry. One may be a great evangelist, as was Philip the deacon, may even be able to work miracles, but he cannot grant the Holy Spirit to others without being in the direct line of succession from the

1 Fuller, op. cit., p. 40.

2 Law, A Second Letter, p. 32.

Apostles.¹ Even prayer is more effectual with God when offered by his appointed clergy.²

Hoadly had said that the power of forgiving sins rested with God alone, and that ministers could only declare God's prescribed conditions under which men could be forgiven. The famous Chillingworth, whom both parties quote as an authority second only to scripture, had said:

Since Christ for your benefit and comfort hath given such authority to his ministers, upon your unfeigned repentance and contrition, to resolve and release you from your sins, why should I doubt, or be unwilling to exhort and persuade you to make your advantage of this gracious promise of our Saviour's?³

Even Law showed his confusion on this point, however.

Although he would regard the declaration of absolution of the clergy as the declaration of God-authorized men and therefore effectual with God,⁴ the clergy could make mistakes, in which case God kept his own counsels and was not obliged to enforce the clerical declarations.⁵ "They do not assume to themselves a power to damn the innocent, or to save the guilty."⁶ But yet this exception is said in no way to invalidate this particular power of the clergy.

The administration of the sacraments is one of the clerical duties included in public ministrations. Only hallowed hands may dispense the sacraments. Without

1 Law, A Second Letter, p. 2.

2 Rogers, op. cit., p. 42.

3 Stanhope, The Prolocutor's Answer, p. 29.

4 Law, A Second Letter, p. 58.

5 Ibid., p. 48.

6 Ibid., p. 21.

administration by priests in an uninterrupted succession the sacraments lose their efficacy.¹

The third duty of the clergy is the rule or government of the church. The power of the keys, said Dean Hare, means the right of the clergy to accept men for or to reject them from the earthly communion, and these decisions are ratified by God.² The committee of the Lower House regarded the clergy as those appointed to rule over the people as both law-givers and judges.³ "It is no invasion of Christ's regal power," wrote Dr. Snape, "for those he has commissioned to act under him in spirituals, to make new spiritual laws, not inconsistent with his, and to enforce them with proper sanctions."⁴ Rogers felt that this legislative power applied only to the externals of religion, that it did not extend to the inward beliefs of mind or heart.⁵ And further, he felt that the individual member considered solely in his personal relationship to Christ had a right to judge of its lawfulness, but not as a member of a visible congregation whose superiors he must obey if he were to remain a member.⁶ Although the power of the clergy to rule in the church is God-given and God-directed, the clergy are not to lord it over their con-

1 Fuller, op. cit., p. 34. The sacraments, considered as one of the properties of the visible church on earth, are discussed on pp. 124-126.

2 Hare, Church Authority Vindicated, p. 18.

3 Stebbing, Miscellaneous Observations, p. 30.

4 Snape, A Second Letter, p. 60.

5 Rogers, op. cit., pp. 43, 50.

6 Ibid., pp. 66, 70ff.

gregations. "They call themselves ministers, not magistrates, and the rules canons, not laws; they claim not dominion but direction; spiritual discipline, not coercive jurisdiction."¹

In summary, then, the order of the clergy is an institution of God for the teaching and administration of his church on earth. He has given his ministers special powers by the gift of the Holy Spirit which is conveyed solely through the agency of an uninterrupted succession from the Apostles. Their acts of ministration, whether preaching, teaching, presiding at meetings, offering up prayers, conveying the Holy Spirit to new members, administering the sacraments, or governing the organized body of Christians, all bear a peculiar effectiveness with God. As Christ's vicegerents upon earth, they speak in his Name, act under his direction, declare with his authority. In them lies the real unity of the church. To refuse obedience to them is to reject Christ. Without them, in short, there could be no earthly church, nor without them could men find their way to Christ's heavenly Church.

B. The Sacraments.

According to the Articles of the Church of England, one of the characteristics of the true church on earth

¹ Hare, Church Authority Vindicated, p. 45. A discussion of discipline in the church as a congregation will be found on pp. 126-131.

is the proper administration of the sacraments. This was mentioned by the committee in their censure of Bishop Hoadly, but it never became a major issue in the controversy as did the questions of church discipline and the order of the clergy in which it was apparently swallowed up. The Bangorians denied not that the sacraments were God-appointed means of grace, but that they depended for their efficacy upon the officiating clergy, and that any conditions could be set up for people to receive them other than those declared by our Lord in the scriptures. But the fact that Hoadly omitted them from his definition of the church made some feel that they were among the additions to which the Bishop had alluded which over the centuries had come to be attached to the conception of the church.¹ "It is the sacraments which chiefly constitute the church," wrote Law, "so no distinctions or divisions can with any tolerable propriety be applied to the church but such as may also be applied to the sacraments that constitute the church."² "What is the Christian religion but a method of salvation where the chief means of grace are offered and dispensed by human hands?"³

At the same time it must be remembered that for the Church defenders the sacraments are in the control of the clergy. The sacraments may be refused people for

1 Stebbing, Miscellaneous Observations, pp. 39ff.

2 Law, A Reply, p. 16.

3 Law, A Second Letter, p. 14.

purposes of church discipline, and this cuts them off from God's grace. Yet "if persons are unjustly denied the sacraments they may humbly hope that God will not lay the want of them to their charge."¹ Neither would Law say that they were ex opere operato, "because all who partake of them do not infallibly obtain grace."²

C. Church Discipline.

Hoadly's opponents generally agreed that the analogy of the church as a society to other earthly societies could not be pushed in all details; but they stoutly maintained that in one case the analogy held: namely, that of church discipline. Both the Kingdom of Christ and the kingdoms of this world are held together by set rules.³ And it must be understood that this discipline is not only that of an earthly society, but has effects in heaven as well. To say that God's favour does not depend on man's judicial pronouncements is to subvert all discipline,⁴ was their common opinion. And this naturally follows from their position that one must belong to a visible congregation in order to be enrolled among the saints in heaven.

The church claims authority to make rules in indifferent matters and a right to judge offenders, for a

1 Law, A Second Letter, p. 51.

2 Ibid., p. 42.

3 Stebbing, Miscellaneous Observations, p. 47.

4 Anon., A Modest Enquiry into the Bishop of Bangor's Preservative, p. 36.

right to make laws implies that they shall be obeyed.¹ This authority to make rules is lodged with the clergy,² and may be divided into two categories: (1) prescribing standards of belief; and (2) regulating the externals of worship and order. All parties agreed that the scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation. Most of these things are plain and obvious so that any Christian may judge of them. It is this foundation of simple truth which allows a people to judge their church and to demand reformation should that be necessary.³ In this sense, the power of prescribing standards of belief is "an indisputable right to declare saving truths to be saving truths, and damnable heresies to be damnable heresies."⁴ But in abstruse points where the meaning is not obvious, the church has a right to determine any matter under dispute so long as the decision does not conflict with any of the obvious passages of scripture.⁵ These decisions are made by the clergy of the church meeting in council and may be depended upon as a true, though not an absolutely infallible interpretation.⁶ Dean Hare respected these judgments so highly that he thought individuals should either submit to them, or else maintain silence.⁷ This was perhaps put-

1 Stebbing, A Defence of the First Head, p. 78.

2 Ibid., p. 81.

3 Trapp, op. cit., p. 27.

4 Hare, Scripture Vindicated, p. 125.

5 Trapp, loc. cit.

6 Potter, A Defence of the Late Charge, p. 57.

7 Hare, Scripture Vindicated, p. 129.

ting the matter too strongly. The general position was that private judgment was to be respected.

If ministers of Christ in their personal capacity teach doctrines repugnant to the scriptures, they are not to be hearkened to. If the collective body of the clergy, legally assembled, agree upon any determinations or decisions, if they frame any articles or canons contrary to what we are taught in the holy scriptures, they cannot bind the conscience.¹

Yet it was naively assumed that no honest person would judge contrary to the church, as the Anti-bangorians' handling of the problem of the Dissenters demonstrated.

About rules for regulating the externals of worship and order there was little dispute. Both parties agreed that some definite arrangements had to be made for the time, place, and manner of public worship. The only question was to what extent these determinations could be made actual terms of communion. The general answer was that in indifferent matters, that is, in those where there are no explicit scriptural directions, the church could prescribe anything not contrary to scripture and all Christians were obliged to obey.² "We are taught by the Gospel to obey the commands both of our spiritual and temporal superiors in all things lawful."³ God has made it our duty to obey our church governors in their directions for worship and their prescriptions over all things relating to religion.⁴

1 Snape, A Letter, pp. 25f.

2 Stebbing, A Defence of the First Head, p. 44.

3 Snape, A Letter, p. 28.

4 Law, A Reply, p. 70.

The church has also a right of judging men according to not only the laws of Christ, but also these laws made by the church, for these are regarded as derived directly from Christ's authority. "We say that Christ is not sole judge of their behaviour, for the church has a right to judge of the behaviour of men with respect to the laws of Christ."¹ Although the church cannot pretend to judge men's consciences which are open only to God, it can judge outward actions. So a man may believe what he likes, and that is God's concern; but when he preaches heresy, then it is the concern of the church.² This right of judging is not presumptive on the part of the clergy. "'Tis one thing to judge the behaviour of men by a plain law, acknowledged and received by the offender himself; and 'tis another thing to pretend to a power to interpret absolutely, unlimitedly, etc. the doubtful or obscure laws."³

The right to judge implies a right to discipline offenders. So far as the church is concerned, it may impose only spiritual punishments. "'Tis just reasoning, I think, to infer from the spiritual nature of Christ's Kingdom, and the spiritual power of his ministers on earth, that temporal punishments are not proper to enforce the laws and edicts of Christ's Kingdom."⁴ Temporal punishments are those such as fines, imprisonment,

1 Sherlock, An Answer to a Letter, p. 57.

2 Innes, op. cit., I, 23f.

3 Sherlock, An Answer to a Letter, p. 57.

4 Sherlock, A Sermon, p. 8.

flogging, etc.; spiritual punishments are those such as a refusal of the sacraments and excommunication from the church, and, in the case of clergy synodically deprived, deprivation.

The question arises: are these spiritual punishments effective only within the society of the church, or does God enforce them supernaturally as well? Here opinion was divided. Stebbing felt that the church, able to judge only by externals, could not meddle with the favour or anger of God.¹ Since the punishment was chiefly that of ostracism, if wrongly meted out, it could not be corrected until the Day of Judgment. But the more general opinion was that the punishments of the church had their effects in heaven as well. "The act of exclusion is as effectual towards the taking from them all the privileges of Christians, and as truly making them aliens from the Kingdom of God, as the act of admission first entitled them to all the benefits of church communion."²

Though the church can only censure and declare, yet since it is as truly commissioned to censure in God's Name as Jonah was sent in God's Name, there is as much reason to dread the consequences of neglecting the church as of not repenting at the message or preaching of any prophet from God.³

Excommunication may add to God's punishment of a man, for it warns the sinner to repent, and God will take

1 Stebbing, Miscellaneous Observations, p. xii.

2 Law, A Reply, p. 113.

3 Ibid., p. 129.

account of this warning in judging him.¹ Mathias Earbery said of clerical deprivation: "The effects of it are invisible, the Spirit leaves the person deprived, and the secret and ineffable workings of God's grace peculiar to his priestly character desert him."²

Although church censure might add to God's displeasure against an unrepentant man by giving him ample warning of his danger and so making his sin even more willful, God's ultimate judgment is determined by the guilt or true repentance of the offender, not by the action of church authorities.³ The divine effect takes place only with a right sentence of excommunication; and a wrong sentence is itself a transgression against God.⁴ So Rome's thundering anathemas against the Protestants can have no "validity or effect farther than the denial of external commerce."⁵ And yet this should cause no one to think lightly of the pronouncements of the church as it exercises its powers of discipline.

D. State Establishment.

The Bishop of Bangor's opponents were certain that he had cut away the roots of the church when he made the Christian dependent solely upon Christ, looking to Him alone for judgment determining eternal salvation;

1 Law, A Reply, p. 130.

2 Earbery, The Old English Constitution, p. 89.

3 Rogers, op. cit., p. 76.

4 Law, A Reply, p. 144.

5 Fuller, op. cit., pp. 42f.

but they were certain that he had likewise destroyed any encouragement of religion by the civil authorities. "He declares," complained the committee in their report to the Lower House of Convocation,

that to encourage religion by temporal rewards is to act contrary to the interest of true religion, as it is opposite to the maxims on which Christ founded his Kingdom. This is to set the worship of God and the neglect of it, religion and irreligion, on an equal foot in the world, as if, because they shall hereafter be distinguished by rewards and punishments of the Great Judge, therefore the magistrate was excluded from interposing with rewards and punishments to distinguish them here, and tied up from expressing any concern for his honour by whom and under whom he beareth rule.¹

The church admittedly has no temporal power, but the state does have power which may rightly be used in the interests of religion.²

The situation must be considered first where Christians have come into control of a national government and its attendant powers. Since all Christians, peasants and emperors alike, as Dean Hickee urged, are subject to the spiritual authority of the church,³ this power must be used under the church's spiritual direction, though it may easily be strong enough to invade the rights of the church.⁴ God has given Christians national power to replace miracles which upheld the church in the Apostolic Age.⁵ "'Tis thus God manifests his providential care: 'tis thus Christ verifies his

1 Report of the Committee, p. 11.

2 Sherlock, An Answer to a Letter, pp. 31f.

3 Hickee, op. cit., p. 76.

4 Ibid., p. 82.

5 Snape, A Second Letter, pp. 60f.

promise to his Church, in raising up such protectors, and putting it into the heart of kings and legislators to establish true religion."¹ The result is that that church is made official to which the ruling power owes its allegiance, and it is now "blessed" with temporalities, gifts of income from the government to the clergy and attached to particular positions in the church, such as a bishopric or parish.

But second, although the church thus gains the support of the government, it in turn must support the government which has befriended it. Innes assumed "that the government of the state is calculated for the preservation of the church, and that of the church reciprocally for the preservation of the state."² The government assumes the proportions of a direct institution by God, and Christians are called on to obey it through such doctrines as the divine right of kings, passive obedience, and non-resistance. Clergy and magistrate find their powers and obligations enmeshed. The clergy now exercise their office only under the regal authority.³

Shall not the crown, for example, be allowed to nominate bishops when 'tis to the king that they owe their temporalities? Shall not the state make laws for the better government of the clergy when it is to the laws of the state they owe the assignments of their parishes, and the assurance of their maintenance?⁴

1 Snape, A Second Letter, p. 63.

2 Innes, op. cit., II, 16.

3 Cannon, A Vindication of the Proceedings, p. 42.

4 Hare, Scripture Vindicated, p. 103.

A parishioner does not communicate with his minister nor receive him as such merely because he is a priest of the Christian church, duly ordained to that office, but because he is also legally constituted the minister of his parish.¹

The state is not supposed to usurp the spiritual government of the church: that is, the clergy considered in their God-appointed roles. It cannot, for example, make a priest or a bishop.² But neither is the church allowed to interfere in state matters, even when the government commands its citizens to do something contrary to the laws of God.³ Any challenge to the state is also a challenge to the church: a revolution becomes a heresy. This was the exact charge the Nonjurors made to the Established Church following the Revolution of 1688.⁴

Third, the interests of the church and state now having become so closely identified, individual citizens are considered subject to the church, not because of their admittance by baptism, entirely or even primarily, but because of their citizenship in a state which is in a mutual embrace with the church.

The whole frame and constitution of our Church is built upon this foundation: that the Church and realm of England is one and the same body, under one and the same head and authority; that every man here is so far considered as a member of that body both in its civil and Christian capacity and character, so to be subject and liable, not only to civil punishments, but also to ecclesiastical

1 Wake, A Vindication of the Realm, p. 52.

2 Hickes, op. cit., p. 89.

3 Merks, op. cit., p. 14.

4 Hickes, op. cit., p. 181.

censures. All recusants of all kinds though they declare themselves not to be members of the Church of England, though they are not baptized, and should profess infidelity, are as liable as much as those who join in public communion with us. It is indeed impossible that there should be a national church under any common authority, order, and regulation upon any other foot, and the whole of our ecclesiastical discipline is founded upon this ground, that our religious constitution is certainly and evidently good and unexceptionable; consequently, that it is a plain duty of everyone here to conform, and the duty of such as are not yet sensible of that obligation to remove all obstacles whatever they be to their conformity, as being faulty and criminous while they do not.¹

Or, as Thomas Dawson put it: "A rebel to the Church was never a good subject to the state;"² and quoted the advice given to Augustus upon his settlement of the empire: "that he should follow constantly the established religion of his country; for all innovations would foment sedition in the state and be a means to subvert his government."³

Although many benefits accrued to the church by its establishment, benefits such as prestige, and the temporalities mentioned, the one which seems most to have come to the minds of Hoadly's opponents was this bulwark to church discipline. The church itself can not inflict temporal punishments. But whatever concerns the peace of the community is the proper province of the civil magistrate and he may use his temporal powers to secure that peace.

1 Cannon, op. cit., p. 41.

2 Dawson, Suspiria Sacra, p. 37.

3 Ibid., dedication.

The truth of the matter lies in a very narrow compass: the church has no right to impose penal laws upon any account; in matters of a purely religious nature, the state has no right neither (sic): but of such matters perhaps there may be great scarcity in the world; for the passions of men work themselves into their religious concerns, and the controversy grows insensibly into a struggle for power and superiority, and often breeds convulsions that shake the very constitution of the civil government.¹

The magistrate, judging only by outward actions, is not to inquire into a man's motives. Pure religion is not his concern, nor does it interfere in his right of maintaining community peace.² Although there is a law of the church against murder, it being also an offence against society, it properly falls within the magistrate's jurisdiction. So one may say that the magistrate does add sanctions to Christ's laws, by adding hanging to whatever punishment God might inflict on the murderer.³

But further, order in the national church is essential to order in the government, so the magistrate may well claim a right to maintain church peace and unity. The magistrate may and should support the clergy of the church when they judge and censure any of its members. Spiritual disciplines were effective only when Christians were few in number and ostracism was an effective punishment. But for present conditions, wrote Dean Hare, shall not the civil power make regulations for church censures and join lay-judges with those

1 Sherlock, A Sermon, p. 12.

2 Ibid., pp. 13f, 15.

3 Sherlock, An Answer to a Letter, p. 6.

of the church in ecclesiastical causes, when it has given such a weight and force to the censure by the civil sanctions annexed to them?¹

It was this fusion of church and civil discipline that made the problem of the Dissenters inevitable. Yet Dr. Snape could confidently affirm that to advise a separation of these two "would be too like the advice you know who gave our Saviour, to cast himself down from the pinnacle of the temple."²

To belong to Christ's Church, to summarize the thought of Hoadly's opponents, means to belong to a visible society on earth. This society, or congregation, is controlled by God through his appointed clergy. To them is given the right of teaching, administering the sacraments, and governing. They are responsible for discipline. But to maintain this the better, they may and should accept the support of the civil government wherever it is sympathetic. Yet it must be remembered that what really makes the church is this body of clergy upon whom it depends for its contact with God and Christ.

1 Hare, Scripture Vindicated, p. 103.

2 Snape, A Second Letter, p. 63.

Section 2. The Bangorian View of the Church as an Invisible Fellowship.

"As the Church of Christ is the Kingdom of Christ," declared Bishop Hoadly in his famous sermon,

he himself is King: and in this it is implied that he is himself the sole Law-giver to his subjects, and himself the sole Judge of their behaviour in all affairs of conscience and eternal salvation. And in this sense, therefore, his Kingdom is not of this world: that he hath in those points left behind him no visible human authority, no vicegerents who can be said properly to supply his place, no interpreters upon whom his subjects are absolutely to depend, no judges over the consciences and religion of his people.¹

The church is

the number of men, whether small or great, whether dispersed or united, who truly and sincerely are subjects to Jesus Christ alone as their Law-giver and Judge in matters relating to the favour of God and their eternal salvation.²

Many differences set the Bangorians off from their opponents in the controversy, questions of faith and practice, discipline and even creed; but most, if not all of these differences can be traced to the two concepts of the church which the two parties envisaged. While the Bangorians saw it as a direct fellowship with Christ, their opponents thought of it chiefly as a visible earthly society. The two views, as such, are not mutually exclusive. But to the men warmly engaged in the dispute they seemed to be. Because Christ's

1 Hoadly, "The Nature of the Kingdom," Works, II, 404.

2 Ibid., II, 406.

Kingdom is not of this world, said Sykes flatly, all arguments drawn from worldly kingdoms are not directly applicable to Christ's Kingdom.¹ Although in a sense the Kingdom of Christ is another name for his eternal dominion over the universe, much of that universe is enslaved to Satan in fact.

But the church is that part of the world which hath thrown off the yoke of the usurper, and by a solemn profession surrendered itself to the authority of Christ, its rightful Lord and Sovereign. And in this strict and proper sense it is that the church is represented in scripture as the Kingdom of Christ.²

The Bangorians distinguished between being in communion with Christ, and being in communion with a particular set of professing Christians.³ Hoadly himself thought he was defending the "universal, invisible Church of Christ," which follows from his definition; and therefore he could not quite understand why the committee of the Lower House should try to make everything he had said about it refer to the Church of England.⁴ Thomas Bennet, replying to Hicke's papers, had said that Christians are united to Christ and to each other through baptism, a bond which clerical disputes could not disturb.⁵

1 Sykes, The Difference between the Kingdom of Christ and the Kingdoms of this World, pp. 22f.

2 Prat, Remarks on the Reverend Dr. Snape's Second Letter to the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Bangor (London: Timothy Childe, 1717), p. 12.

3 Pyle, A Second Vindication, p. 55.

4 Hoadly, "Answer to the Representation," Works, II, 480.

5 Bennet, op. cit., p. 11.

Whoever agree in the same faith, the same hope, the same baptism that the Lord Jesus taught, do preserve unity amongst them, though the nation were divided into a million of congregations with as many different forms and ceremonies.¹

External communion, said Gilbert Burnet, is the outward visible sign of our fellowship with Christ.² It exists for the mutual encouragement of individual Christians, and as an expression of their witness in the world.³ The only obligation to external communion is that of a conscience which owns Christ alone as its Lord.⁴

All that the Bishop and his supporters say about the clergy, sacraments, discipline, and state establishment of the church must be seen in the light of this fact: that for them the church consists primarily as a fellowship of believers, established and maintained by their individual relationships to Christ, and only secondarily as a visible earthly society with an organization and government of its own.

A. The Order of the Clergy.

"By the church, Doctor," taunted one of Snape's critics, "did not you mean the clergy? Confess, you did. If the church be what the Bishop says, the clergy are scarce the thousandth part of it."⁵ The differences

1 Anon., A Letter to Dr. Snape, p. 6. Cf. Sykes, The Difference between the Kingdom of Christ and the Kingdoms of this World, pp. 23f.

2 Burnet, A Full Examination, p. 238.

3 Sykes, The Authority of the Clergy, pp. 66f.

4 Burnet, A Full Examination, p. 244.

5 Anon., A Letter to Dr. Snape, p. 30.

between the Bangorians and their opponents are nowhere more evident than in their comparative views of the order of the clergy.

The Bangorian position was that the clergy hold their offices only in order to prevent confusion and irresponsibility among the body of Christians. In the first place, Christians have an obligation laid upon them to witness for Christ; and their provision for a body of clergy, by joining together as a group and commissioning some for the task, is one way of fulfilling this obligation. The intervention of men is to a degree necessary for our salvation, for we cannot be saved without believing, nor believe without having the Gospel preached to us; nor could we be preached to unless men were sent for the purpose.¹ In the second place, as these individual Christians meet together for common worship and service, some men must be set apart to manage these common functions. The powers of the clergy delegated to them by the body of Christians derive from the need that all things in the society be done decently.²

But this is not to say that the clergy serve the church only as elected officers of any other society might serve that society. The clergy do have a commis-

1 Herne, The False Notion of a Christian Priesthood, p. 54.

2 Burnet, A Full Examination, p. 154.

sion from God.¹ At ordination men receive the assistance of the Holy Spirit for carrying out their duties.² If the Bangorians are not very explicit on this point, it is because they took the divine commission for granted: they argued only against the regrettable extremes to which the notion of that fundamental and essential commission had been carried. But even this divine aspect of the commission was mediated through the church as a whole. "They who are sent by Christ or his Apostles to instruct mankind in the way to heaven are his ministers, are his servants, but cannot with any justice of speech be called his successors."³

The argument against presumptions of the clergy took the form of a denial of four terms which were used to describe the ministry. In the first place, the clergy could not be said to be true vicegerents of Christ. Christ has an absolute power over all men, but this power is not granted to men for their use save as they are also granted an infallibility for its direction, which none of the Anti-bangorians ever claimed.⁴ To say that the clergy carry on Christ's work in his stead is sheer blasphemy if understood literally,⁵ and is at best

1 Anon., A Vindication of the Honour and Prerogative of Christ's Church, pp. 26f; Burnet, A Letter to the Reverend Mr. Trapp, p. 18.

2 Burnet, A Full Examination, p. 29.

3 Sykes, The Difference between the Kingdom of Christ and the Kingdoms of this World, p. 14.

4 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Reverend Dr. Snape's Letter," Works, II, 417; "An Answer to the Representation," Works, II, 459.

5 Burnet, A Full Examination, p. 124.

a high-strained metaphor if taken in a figurative sense.¹

To avoid anarchy and confusion that would arise in Christ's Kingdom and Church from setting up others with regal or sacerdotal powers in them beside Christ the sole King and Priest, 'tis asserted that no particular order of men have such powers.²

Secondly, the clergy cannot be said to be apostles in the sense that the original Twelve or St. Paul were. The Bangorians thought of the Apostles as under the complete and direct supervision of Christ, endowed with his authority so that their declarations were really the declarations of Christ.³ These powers were not theirs, however, to convey to other men, so the office ceased in the first century.⁴ It would be Popery to claim that the Apostles' successors had the same powers as they did when under Christ's direct supervision.⁵

Thirdly, the clergy cannot, strictly speaking, be said to be priests. None of the New Testament terms for the ministry imply a true sacerdotal function, said Herne.⁶ The Levitical order of Judaism was not carried into Christianity. Drawing on the thought of the Epistle to the Hebrews, he wrote: "In Christianity

1 Anon., A Letter to the Scholars of Eaton (sic): Occasioned by their Master Dr. Snape's Letter to the Bishop of Bangor (London: J. Roberts, 1717), p. 31.

2 Herne, The False Notion of a Christian Priesthood, p. 68.

3 Whitby, A Defence of the Propositions, p. 14.

4 Herne, op. cit., p. 21; Burnet, A Full Examination, p. 22.

5 Prat, An Answer to the Reverend Dr. Snape's Second Letter, p. 35.

6 Herne, op. cit., p. 37.

there is no priest but Christ alone, nor any priesthood strictly and properly speaking, or sacerdotal powers of oblation, intercession, or benediction in any men upon earth."¹ Christ alone continues "the only priest and mediator whose intervention is made necessary to our salvation."² If any metaphorical sense is given to the priesthood, as when we are exhorted by St. Paul to offer up our bodies as a reasonable sacrifice, it belongs to all Christians in general, and all Christians are called on to exercise the functions of intercession and benediction.³

And last, the clergy cannot be said to be magistrates under Christ as civil officers are magistrates under kings, for Christians are obliged to obey the clergy only so far as their decrees are consistent with the will of Christ. A civil magistrate may use the king's penalties to enforce his laws, but no clergyman dare presume to enforce Christ's laws with his supernatural penalties.⁴

Strictly speaking, Christ can have no successors in the government of the church. Christ . . . himself in person presides over the church, and continues with it to the end of the world. We are all united to Christ our Head, and cannot consistently with Christian liberty call any man master here on earth.⁵

1 Herne, The False Notion of a Christian Priesthood, p. 4.

2 Burnet, A Full Examination, p. 100.

3 Herne, op. cit., p. 12.

4 Sykes, The Authority of the Clergy, pp. 236-240.

5 Sykes, The Difference between the Kingdom of Christ and the Kingdoms of this World, pp. 13f.

From the Bangorians' conception of the ministry it was obvious that they should attach no importance to an uninterrupted succession, except as it provided a convenient method for the continuation of that ministry. "To affirm that bishops have the sole power of confirming and ordaining is only affirming something of human appointments, things settled by the church for its own edification, and has no relation to the disposal of God's grace."¹ They found, first of all, no explicit directions for an uninterrupted succession in the New Testament, and for anything so critical as the Anti-bangorians had made this, they felt that the scriptural basis would need to be very clear.

Neither the instituted method of Levitical priesthood in the Old Testament, nor any expressions in the New can, without a manifest strain and abuse upon their plain meaning and design, be concluded to prove an absolute necessity of an uninterrupted line of regular episcopal hands (regularly so-called), towards the being of the Christian visible (much less invisible) church in general, or of any church in particular.²

Clergymen, not being apostles, prophets, or priests, require neither a direct commission from Christ (such as St. Paul's), nor continuance in an uninterrupted succession from Christ.³ "God and Christ have not made the terms of Christian salvation to depend upon any succession of the hierarchy or any particular form of

1 Burnet, A Full Examination, p. 163.

2 Pyle, A Second Vindication, pp. 76f.

3 Sykes, The Authority of the Clergy, p. 77;
Burnet, op. cit., p. 294.

church government."¹

Secondly, they could not see any real necessity for such a succession. The powers of the clergy are not some quasi-physical substance which must be conveyed by physical contact, wrote Sykes.² Christians

received a form of government in the church from the Apostles and kept to it in the main, but did not think themselves so tied up to it as not to alter anything as emergencies required, which appears plainly in their having laid aside the order of deaconesses instituted by the Apostles themselves.³

If it is maintained as some of the Churchmen insisted, said Pyle, that heretical or wicked ordinations (such as Novatus') are valid by virtue of the laying on of episcopal hands

as that which in itself gives a certain and indelible character, they then maintain that God, in the validity of the Christian ordinances, has put more stress upon one external circumstance than upon all the substantial ends, purposes, and designs of those ordinances, or upon all the moral qualifications of Christians. Than which nothing can be more derogatory to the wisdom and holiness of our profession.⁴

Supposing uninterrupted succession (and the Anti-ban-gorians, except for Henry Stebbing, saw episcopacy as the only valid form of it) to be necessary, had no bishops reformed at the time of the Reformation, the work would have been at a standstill.⁵ Were it necessary, the Church of Scotland and Continental reformed churches

1 Jackson, op. cit., p. 23.

2 Sykes, The Authority of the Clergy, p. 82.

3 Burnet, An Answer to Mr. Law's Letter, p. 16.

4 Pyle, A Second Vindication, p. 78.

5 Pyle, A Vindication, p. 27.

would be no churches.¹ Civil authority, too, comes from God, but whoever imagined that there must be an uninterrupted line of kings going back to King Saul?²

In the third place, the Bangorians denied that there was such a thing as an uninterrupted succession. The church at Corinth had apparently existed for the first century without an episcopal government.³ God does not base our salvation upon anything we can have no sure evidence of, and he has certainly not kept up a clear proof of uninterrupted succession.⁴ It is not a question of being unaware of any interruption: if the succession is essential to salvation, we must be positive there has never been any interruption. It was questioned whether the history of the reformation of the Church of England would stand a rigorous examination from this point of view.⁵ One believer in the succession had even warned that it would bear no close examination.⁶

Hoadly had been severely criticised for calling uninterrupted succession a trifle and nicety. He defended himself in his "Answer to the Representation":

What I have bestowed these words upon is a regular uninterrupted succession made absolutely

1 Sykes, The Authority of the Clergy, p. 84.

2 Pyle, A Vindication, pp. 30f.

3 Pyle, A Second Vindication, p. 77.

4 Hoadly, "A Preservative," Works, I, 588.

5 Burnet, An Answer to Mr. Law's Letter, pp. 21ff.

6 John Balguy, Silvius's Examination of Certain Doctrines Lately Taught and Defended by the Reverend Mr. Stebbing (London: J. Roberts, 1718), p. 33.

necessary to the favour of God; without which, the sincerest Christian shall not arrive at the happiness of heaven. The laying such a stress upon what can never be proved, upon what our Saviour never laid any weight upon with respect to the future state of his subjects, this I call laying stress upon what is truly with respect to the terms of salvation a trifle.¹

The Bangorians saw the clergy not as a separate, self-contained and self-sufficient order of the church, but as a function of church life as a whole. The church gives the minister his authority: it does not receive its authority from him.² Because it is a church matter, no individual can assume the office on his own initiative. The validity of the Christian ministry is not founded upon a succession from Rome, but "on the great and only authoritative rule of scripture, and the revealed rule of him who alone is its Lord, Master, and Law-giver."³ It is enough that the order of the clergy "is for the benefit of Christian churches or congregations; and must therefore, so long as it is so, be approved of by God."⁴

If this sounds loose in contrast to the order of the clergy as conceived by their opponents, one must consider the powers and duties which the Bangorians saw in the ministry. They saw first the right to teach and preach, and on this point they differed little from

1 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Representation," Works, II, 485.

2 Jackson, op. cit., p. 76.

3 Pyle, A Second Vindication, p. 80.

4 Burnet, A Full Examination, p. 294.

their opponents.¹ They were more explicit in stating the limitations of this function, however. Ordaining a man does not necessarily improve his reason, warned Sykes.² The true Christian teacher and preacher constantly refers his students and hearers back to the Bible and Christ: he must never presume to say "this is the law of Christ and you must understand it my way."³ The greatest respect one can pay a teacher is to compare him with Christ, and to accept or reject his teaching accordingly.⁴

The Bangorians agreed further that a second duty of the clergy was presiding in meetings and offering up prayers, but they denied that any peculiar efficacy rested in these by virtue of their being performed by the clergy. The intercessory prayers of a clergyman are no different from those of any other man,⁵ except, perhaps, as he makes audible the prayers of a whole congregation. The prayers of another man, whether he is of the clergy or laity, can bring a person such temporal blessings as hearing the Gospel, and repentance, but cannot affect God's attitude towards him.⁶ "Pardon or absolution is God's act alone; his ministers neither do,

1 Anon., A Vindication of the Honour and Prerogative of Christ's Church, pp. 26f.

2 Sykes, The Authority of the Clergy, p. 113.

3 Anon., An Answer to a Letter to the Bishop of Bangor, p. 11.

4 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Representation," Works, II, 476.

5 Burnet, A Full Examination, pp. 108f.

6 Herne, The False Notion of a Christian Priesthood, pp. 58ff.

nor can, in any other sense, confer it than by declaring or repeating the conditions of it already fixed by God himself."¹ God's grace is determined by the condition of the recipient, not by clerical pronouncements.² It is absurd, said Hoadly, to think that God has obliged himself to bless or not bless with the voice of fallible and even prejudiced men.³

As to the sacraments, the decency of having them performed by the clergy should not be confused with a necessity of having them so administered.⁴ The essential things about baptism are the water and the use of the Trinitarian formula, not the authority of the officiating minister.⁵ The only authority necessary to the sacraments is Christ's command to observe them. Christians away from all regular ministers should appoint someone to administer them, and Christ's blessing will be on them.⁶ The justification for a stated ministry is order, not special powers.⁷

For the Bangorians, the governing of the church cannot be said to be a third function of the clergy in anything like the sense their opponents gave it. Government is a function of the whole church and does not belong solely to the clergy as a sort of royal

1 Pyle, A Second Vindication, p. 36.

2 Burnet, A Full Examination, p. 124.

3 Hoadly, "A Preservative," Works, I, 593.

4 Sykes, The Authority of the Clergy, p. 129.

5 Anon., An Exposition of the XXXIV Article of Religion, pp. 26f.

6 Burnet, An Answer to Mr. Law's Letter, p. 19.

7 Sykes, op. cit., p. 136.

family of the fellowship.¹ Likewise, discipline is a right of the church as a whole.² Even in matters of faith the example of the first general church council at Jerusalem was to include both laity and clergy.³ The clergy may,

if they have grace, be very useful to the souls of men as well by enforcing those laws [of Christ] upon their minds, so far as they are obvious to their understandings, and stirring them up to a cheerful obedience to them, as by exercising all other duties of their function.⁴

These teachings and rulings are always subject to review by the individual member who, if he obeys them, must do so not on the authority of the clergy considered as such, but on their agreement to the will of Christ as he knows it.⁵ All Christ's subjects are "equally without authority to alter, to add to, or to interpret his laws so as to claim the absolute submission of others to such interpretation."⁶ But this should not destroy our respect for the clergy: it only takes it from their persons and puts it on their function.⁷

In summary then, for the Bangorians the order of

1 Pyle, An Answer to Mr. Stebbing's Remarks, p. 80.

2 Jackson, op. cit., pp. 26f.

3 Sykes, The Authority of the Clergy, p. 168.

4 Anon., A Rod for the Eaton (sic) Schoolmaster's Back; or, a Letter from a Country School-boy to Dr. Snape, occasioned by one from him to the Bishop of Bangor (London: J. Roberts, 1717), pp. 17f.

5 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Representation," Works, II, 455.

6 Hoadly, "The Nature of the Kingdom," Works, II, 409.

7 Anon., Remarks upon Dr. Sherlock's Answer to Mr. Sykes (London: R. Burleigh, 1718), p. 62; Hoadly, "An Answer to the Representation," Works, II, 473.

the clergy is a convenience of the church for the purpose of order and decency, deriving its powers from the church as a whole. God's blessings rest with it to enable it to carry on its work, but it has no peculiar efficacy with God in what it does. Its judgments are not absolute, but are to be compared with the known will of Christ by each believer. No one single form of its organization is necessary to it, so long as its duties are efficiently and effectively performed.

B. The Sacraments.

"The sacraments are institutions of our Saviour," wrote Gilbert Burnet, "which in obedience to him we are obliged to observe."¹ They are therefore necessary, not in themselves, but because Christ gave them to us, and we must be loyal to him.² The sacraments belong, moreover, to the universal church, and not to a single set of Christians. One partakes of them as a member of Christ's mystical body.³ This is important to note, for it figures in the controversy over the Dissenters and the Corporation and Test Acts. The natural conclusion to be drawn from seeing a man at the dispensation of the Lord's Supper, said Hoadly, is that he is a Christian, and not necessarily a Church of England man.⁴

1 Burnet, A Full Examination, p. 84.

2 Ibid., p. 165.

3 Ibid., p. 167.

4 Hoadly, "The Common Rights of Subjects Defended," Works, II, 802ff.

The sacraments are true means of grace, bringing God's blessing to men; but the Bangorians are especially emphatic to point out that the sacrament as a whole is the means of grace and not the elements considered by themselves. Grace is mediated through the recipient's heart. The cup is not converted into the means of grace.¹ Law had confused the sacrament with the elements, declared Herne.²

Because the sacrament was understood as a whole, no special significance was attached to the consecration of the elements. It was pointed out that although thanksgiving was to be offered, no New Testament text said anything at all about a "consecration."³ Consequently, there was nothing about the sacraments, either the Lord's Supper or baptism, which required a special body of clergy, much less an uninterrupted succession. "Whoever therefore performs them as Christ has commanded is the minister of them, and authorized by Christ to perform them, because it is agreeable to Christ's will and intent that he should so do."⁴ If only particular persons could administer them, Christ certainly would have left more detailed instructions.

The sacrament of the Lord's Supper is still to be administered, and it may be rightly and duly,

1 Burnet, A Full Examination, p. 43.

2 Herne, The False Notion of a Christian Priesthood, p. 45.

3 Sykes, The Authority of the Clergy, p. 129; Burnet, op. cit., p. 41.

4 Burnet, An Answer to Mr. Law's Letter, p. 15.

devoutly and acceptably administered by hands that know no more of an uninterrupted succession than they do of conjuring bread and wine into something they were not before.¹

Certain persons are set aside for the administration only for the considerations of order and decency.

The sacraments certainly do not constitute the church, as Law had maintained. But Burnet was perhaps extreme in saying that the sacraments were only generally necessary to salvation and not absolutely so.² Although it was held that they were necessary, it was also held that anyone meeting the conditions Christ had laid down was to be free to participate in their observance: no further restrictions could be made, such as kneeling, saying certain prayers, or swearing certain oaths.

C. Church Discipline.

Church discipline, according to the Bangorians, belongs to the church as a whole and not exclusively to the clergy.³ The voice of the clergy was important to them only as it gives expression to the mind of the congregation.

Though anyone may declare what he takes to be the terms of the Gospel and wish that others may faithfully observe them, yet anyone may not do this in the name of the whole church or congregation unless he be appointed to that office. Though every man may do it, it is no man's business and proper employment but his who is set apart for it.⁴

-
1. Pyle, A Second Vindication, p. 17.
 2. Burnet, A Full Examination, p. 164.
 3. Jackson, op. cit., pp. 26f.
 4. Burnet, op. cit., p. 57.

This is certainly no excuse for the clergy to become lords over the congregations, for Christ was ever reminding his disciples that he who would be greatest must be servant of all.¹

The need for discipline arises from the need for order and decency, but this need for order must never be over-emphasized. When St. Paul spoke of order in the assemblies, he was referring to such things as not having one man interrupt another in public worship.² One must be careful not to say that Christ desires "a greater order than what is consistent with the right and duty of all his subjects to examine whether what is commanded be contrary to his will, and to act accordingly."³ One of the best arguments for authoritative interpretations of the Bible is that ignorant men can not judge properly of abstruse points of faith. But has Christ really made his will so obscure?⁴ Are we certain that God is not satisfied with a simple faith based on the plain passages of scripture?⁵ And to these questions may be added another: is absolute uniformity of belief and manner of worship essential to the fellowship of the church? Popery is the logical outcome of an affirmative answer to that question.⁶ The fact that the

1 Anon., An Answer to a Letter, p. 10.

2 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Representation," Works, II, 562.

3 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Reverend Dr. Snape's Letter," Works, II, 420.

4 Whitby, A Defence of the Propositions, p. 36.

5 Werenfels, Three Discourses, p. 29.

6 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Reverend Dr. Hare's Sermon," Works, II, 900.

Bangorians raised these questions indicates their general attitude towards the problem of church discipline.

Their opponents maintained that among the powers of the clergy was that of legislating in matters of faith. But the Bangorians worked from the premise that Christ had delivered the faith perfect and complete, once and for all. If a man, or even an angel, preach any other Gospel, he is anathema.¹ "Hath the Gospel fixed the terms on which the favour or displeasure of God depend, or hath it not?" asked Daniel Whitby.

If it hath not, it cannot contain all things necessary to be known for our salvation, as our Church saith it doth. If it hath fixed these terms, then no decisions of men can affect the state of Christ's subjects complying with those terms his Gospel hath fixed.²

To say that decisions of present councils are necessary to salvation is to say that Christ was remiss in his directions to his disciples.³ Since these great matters are fixed however, no church should ask more from men for entrance into her communion than the Gospel asks for salvation.⁴

Hoadly said if the superiors of the church claimed an authority which would not presume on Christ's authority or wisdom, he would not be against it.⁵ Such authority lies in the powers of the clergy to recommend

1 Quoted by Sykes, The Difference between the Kingdom of Christ and the Kingdoms of this World, p. 11.

2 Whitby, A Defence of the Propositions, pp. 10f.

3 Ibid., p. 51.

4 Jackson, op. cit., pp. 41f.

5 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Representation," Works, II, 460.

interpretations and opinions to their people.

General councils may recommend to the faithful such things as they esteem most for the interest of religion, and the weight of many grave and learned men agreeing in any decision will make the rest of mankind to examine that point with more than ordinary care, and a wise man will pay so much deference to their opinion as not to dissent from it but upon substantial reasons; farther power than this it is impossible an assembly of fallible men should have.¹

All that church authority hopes to do is to tell men the will of Christ, and they can judge its accuracy from the gospels.² Since councils are but fallible, their decisions must always give way to plain texts of scripture or to demonstrative reason.³ Yet even this power of "legislation" in the faith belongs to the church, and not to bishops or presbyters singly.⁴

The other legislative power which the opponents assigned to the clergy was that of making rules in external matters where there was no clear word of Christ. Included in this power was the right to regulate the time, place, and manner of public worship. After speaking of the impossibility of adding anything to the faith Bishop Hoadly wrote:

If any one will infer from hence that I argue against all right of appointing time, place, or ceremonies relating to religious worship, against the maintenance and support of those who officiate in the churches or assemblies of Christians,

1 Anon., An Answer to a Letter, p. 15.

2 Burnet, An Answer to Mr. Law's Letter, p. 32.

3 Jackson, op. cit., p. 51.

4 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Reverend Dr. Hare's Sermon," Works, II, 845ff.

against the order, or decency, or subordination belonging to societies of Christians, or anything against the interest of the Church of England: I answer that I not only do not own such consequences, but I really do not see them.¹

But it is the mark of a narrow spirit to insert controversies of faith into the worship of the church under the guise of regulating external circumstances.² Even in the matter of externals, private judgment is not to be outlawed.³ It must be remembered that such regulations are made only by the authority of men "for the maintenance of order, according to the diversity of countries, times, and men's manners," and are not God's unquestionable pronouncements.⁴ The authority of the church in externals is essentially a civil authority, for it arises from the human society. Its end is religious worship, but that does not make it religious in itself.⁵

There is no authority on earth which can overrule a man's conscience, for if there were, there could be no question of right or wrong. If a man have a right to command action or belief on nothing more than his authority, that authority is then absolute.⁶ It was such an authority as this that the Bangorians disclaimed in the church. In other words, nothing the church does

1 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Reverend Dr. Snape's Letter," Works, II, 426.

2 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Reverend Dr. Hare's Sermon," Works, II, 891.

3 Sykes, The Authority of the Clergy, p. 174.

4 Anon., An Exposition of the XXXIV Article, p. 13.

5 Pyle, An Answer to Mr. Stebbing's Remarks, p. 66.

6 Burnet, An Answer to Mr. Law's Letter, p. 25.

can be put on the same level with the actions of Christ, none of its decisions can be equated with his decrees, none of its activities are exempt from being judged by his standards. "If it were so," said Hoadly in his sermon,

that any such absolute vicegerent authority either for the making of new laws [of Christ], or interpreting old ones, or judging his subjects in religious matters were lodged in any men upon earth, the consequences would be that what still retains the name of the Church of Christ would not be the Kingdom of Christ, but the kingdom of those men vested with such authority. For whoever hath such an authority of making laws is so far a king: and whoever can add new laws to those of Christ, equally obligatory, is as truly a king as Christ himself is; nay, whoever hath an absolute authority to interpret any written or spoken laws, it is he who is truly the law-giver, to all intents and purposes, and not the person who first wrote or spoke them.¹

If it be protested that under God no such authority could exist, the Bangorians would reply, no: but men have pretended to it with disastrous results, witness the rejection of Christ because none of the Pharisees or doctors of Mosaic law believed in him, or the inquisitions to maintain prayers in a foreign tongue to multitudes of beings, or the efforts to prevent the rising of the reformed Church of England.² "If the authority of the church in controversies of faith consists in a power to hinder all further controversy on points in which she has interposed," said Sykes, "then

1 Hoadly, "The Nature of the Kingdom," Works, II, 404.

2 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Representation," Works, II, 571f.

'tis impossible in the nature of things ever to reform any errors once admitted by the church."¹ Popery is evidence that councils have erred, therefore "no articles, creeds, or any other acts of general councils absolutely bind the consciences of Christians as such."²

Church discipline includes the idea of judging members and passing censures on offenders. The standard is the moral law of Christ. Hoadly had been accused of denying this right to the church by making Christ alone the judge over conscience. He denied the accusation:

A right to judge that an open sinner against the moral laws of Christ as an open sinner and not worthy of being owned as one of the Christian society I have never denied to every Christian, much less to those whose office it is to administer holy things and who therefore must judge for themselves that it is not proper for them to acknowledge as Christians those who openly and notoriously live in a violation of the moral laws of Christ.³

So the clergyman can refuse the sacrament to people he feels are unworthy of it. But the power of excommunication from the society of Christians does not lie in the minister, but in the society as a whole.⁴ Even so, this judgment and punishment must be meted to an offender as a brother, and not as an enemy.⁵

Judgment is relatively simple when both the offender

1 Sykes, Some Remarks on Mr. Marshall's Defence of our Constitution, p. 18.

2 Barrington, The Layman's Second Letter, p. 38.

3 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Representation," Works, II, 470.

4 Herne, The False Notion of a Christian Priesthood, p. 26.

5 Sykes, The Authority of the Clergy, p. 287.

and the judge recognize the same standard,¹ but extreme caution is necessary in proceeding against a man with erroneous but sincere opinions.² A large degree of freedom must be allowed in even fundamental matters "for what is abomination to the Protestant is fundamental to the Papist."³ "'Tis one thing to argue against enforcing the worship of God, another thing to argue against enforcing this or that particular way of worshipping him and no other."⁴

There are difficulties involved in judging matters of outward action, but the problem is immeasurably increased when the church attempts to judge a man's conscience. If it were possible at all, the church should have this authority; but it simply is not possible.⁵ Christ's Kingdom is taken out of his hands "whenever they [Churchmen] erect tribunals and exercise a judgment over the consciences of men and assume to themselves the determination of such points as cannot be determined but by One who knows the hearts."⁶

1 Pyle, An Answer to Mr. Stebbing's Remarks, p. xx.

2 George Legh, The Case of an Erroneous Conscience represented in a new Light (London: J. Roberts, 1719), p. 4; Balguy, Silvius's Examination of Certain Doctrines, p. 21.

3 Ibid., p. 25.

4 Legh, A Letter to the Reverend Mr. Stebbing; being remarks upon his late book relating to Sincerity, with a Postscript concerning the Authority of the Church (London: J. Roberts, 1718), p. 21.

5 Prat, A Review of the Most Considerable Writers, p. 4.

6 Hoadly, "The Nature of the Kingdom," Works, II, 405.

As to the enforcement of these judgments, the Bangorians and their opponents agreed that the church could inflict only spiritual punishments and grant only spiritual rewards. But the Bangorians went further to say that Christ's laws cannot be enforced by the temporal punishments of the civil power either. "It is not in the power of men, by all the temporal good things of this world united together, to encourage religion in the essentials of it, though it be in their power, by annexing some of them to what they call religion, to destroy or hurt the very vitals of it."¹ "It is the law of men as it is the same material action useful to society, but it is religion and Christ's law solely as it is practised upon a principle of religion and a sense of duty."² No worldly motive can create those inward essentials which make an action acceptable to God.³ The sanctions of Christ's laws are universal and unfailing.⁴ No civil punishment could hope to be so, and therefore it can never be a sanction to Christ's laws. For a man may obey the civil law, but if it is not for conscience' sake, he disobeys Christ.⁵

This is the fundamental reason why external force is forbidden in the Kingdom of Christ.⁶ It would make

1 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Representation," Works, II, 508.

2 Whitby, A Defence of the Propositions, p. 12.

3 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Representation," Works, II, 508f.

4 Ibid., II, 503.

5 Ibid., II, 535.

6 Sykes, The Difference between the Kingdom of Christ and the Kingdoms of this World, p. 7.

the beginning of wisdom not the fear of the Lord, but the fear of men. Christ's laws are not to be enforced by any methods he has not enjoined.¹ That eliminates not only all cruel and inhuman punishments, but all civil reinforcements to church discipline as well.

If the spiritual Kingdom of Christ can be truly supported by temporal encouragements, or the real enemies to a spiritual kingdom be restrained by temporal penalties, I profess I am as much for them as any man living, even in that Kingdom which is not of this world. But hitherto, I acknowledge, I never yet met with any, even modern divine, Juror or Nonjuror, High or Low, Churchman or Dissenter, that fixed the flourishing estate of the Church of Christ, or the spiritual Kingdom of Christ, upon the encouragements of temporal honour and profit.²

Nor can the church claim divine reinforcements of her censures. It is one thing, said Hoadly, to judge by a plain acknowledged law, received by the offender; but something entirely different to judge

so as to pretend to determine other men's consciences and other men's religion; or so as to pretend to fix their condition, or at all affect it, in the eyes of God.³

God does not make his wrath or his mercy depend upon the judicial decisions of fallible men.⁴ The Bangorians and their opponents agreed that excommunication wrongly administered had no effect with God.⁵ But then it was pointed out that no church ever thought her judicial

1 Prat, Farther Remarks, p. 20; Jackson, op. cit., p. 35.

2 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Reverend Dr. Snape's Letter," Works, II, 425.

3 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Representation," Works, II, 465.

4 Hoadly, "A Preservative," Works, I, 588.

5 Pyle, A Second Vindication, pp. 73ff.

sentences took effect with God if they were wrong, for no church ever thought her judicial sentences were wrong.¹ God is not more angry with a wicked man when he is excommunicated, nor would he be less angry if the man were not excommunicated.²

The subjects of Christ's Kingdom are . . . such as yield a sincere obedience to his laws; and no excommunication whatsoever can exclude those from continuing good subjects of that body of which Christ is the Head; and these alone are of the church invisible, and living members of his Body.³

But if God is not obliged to enforce every act of church discipline, neither can the church affect God's acts of discipline. It can absolve its own excommunications, but it cannot unmake a sinner.⁴ Fallible men cannot distinguish unerringly between sincere repentants and hypocrites, so they cannot really absolve a man from sin.⁵ They can only pronounce God's conditions for forgiveness and leave men to his righteous judgment.

The church then, the Bangorians maintained, has a power of discipline which belongs to it as a body. No changes can be made in Christ's laws, no interpretations can be made absolutely binding, no rulings in externals can be equated with the Gospel by the church. It can

1 Prat, A Review of the Most Considerable Writers, p. 22.

2 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Representation," Works, II, 465.

3 Whitby, An Answer to the Reverend Dr. Snape's Second Letter, p. 28.

4 Herne, The False Notion of a Christian Priesthood, p. 70.

5 Anon., The Church and State Vindicated, p. 41; Burnet, A Full Examination, p. 145.

only recommend interpretations and make rulings for order, continually pointing men to Christ as their only ultimate law-giver. It may judge its people in outward matters, but never can read the depths of the human heart. Its censures must be spiritual, that is, taking effect within the society of the church; for civil sanctions cannot enforce the divine commands, and divine sanctions cannot be discharged on the judgments of men who are at best still fallible.

D. State Establishment.

"If the necessity of external communion does not arise from human laws, we cannot be obliged to any particular communion by human laws."¹ The Bangorians approached the problem of state establishment of the church from a point of view entirely different from that of their opponents. They started with the proposition that no man is bound to a church by virtue of the obedience he owes to the laws of the state.²

The only justification for civil government, said Bishop Hoadly, is the preservation of the good of society.³

The great end of his [the magistrate's] office is to guard against those who never concern themselves with what they ought, or ought not to do,

1 Anhurst, A Letter to the Reverend Mr. Law, p. 47.

2 Peirce, Some Reflections, p. 21.

3 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Representation," Works, II, 518.

against those who have no principle in them to govern their actions higher than the fear of worldly punishment.¹

The magistrate concerns himself with the outward actions of the citizens and punishes transgressions as such. He does not punish vice as a sin, or as against the "principles of religion properly so-called."² "The magistrate concerns not himself with the future punishment of theft, nor any ways considers it as a breach of the law of Christ. His power is limited to the good of the commonwealth, and his sanctions solely regard that."³

All citizens of the state are subject to the magistrate in his responsibility to maintain the public peace. "The Gospel hath left civil government as it found it; and hath . . . put its ministers, and preachers, as far as the ends of civil government reach, equally under its authority with all others."⁴

Though religious rights and spiritual powers consequent upon them are in their natures different from and independent of civil rights and powers; yet the exercise of them with respect to all modes, circumstances, and rules or canons, which are of a civil nature, must ever be subordinate to the just laws of the civil power, never to interfere with its rightful jurisdiction, nor ever pretend to exempt the persons, or civil property, either of the laity or clergy, from the service and dominion of the civil state.⁵

So public praying and preaching are normally a religious matter, but when they are directed against the state,

1 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Representation," Works, II, 543.

2 Ibid., II, 575.

3 Sykes, A Second Letter, p. 31.

4 Hoadly, "A Preservative," Works, I, 579f.

5 Jackson, op. cit., p. 21.

they assume a civil significance.¹ Is it reasonable to think, asked Archbishop Wake in reviewing the case of the Nonjurors, that the government could have tolerated rebellion in the highest Church circles?² The civil authority has a right to do whatever is necessary for its defence,³ even to take an ecclesiastical office from a man,⁴ or to exclude from the government men whose principles would upset civil authority, such as the Papists.⁵ The regard is not to the religion of the man, as such, but to his actions based upon that religion.⁶

But although the civil government has all the power necessary to maintain order, it has no authority at all in matters of religion: "it reaches to nothing essential in Christianity, to nothing relating to religion any farther than as it concerns the state."⁷ It goes beyond its bounds when it attempts to enforce religious prescriptions.⁸ It makes no difference whether the magistrate happens to be Christian or not.

Every civil magistrate, considered as a civil magistrate, is ordained for the same purpose and vested with the same powers. Therefore, a civil magistrate who believes in Jesus Christ, considered as a civil magistrate, can no more add wordly

1 Hoadly, "A Preservative," Works, I, 581.

2 Wake, op. cit., p. 43.

3 Hoadly, op. cit., I, 575.

4 Ibid., I, 574.

5 Anon., A Letter to Dr. Snape, pp. 26f; Hoadly, "An Answer to the Reverend Dr. Snape's Letter," Works, II, 426.

6 Burnet, An Answer to Mr. Law's Letter, p. 40.

7 Sykes, The Difference between the Kingdom of Christ and the Kingdoms of this World, p. 17.

8 Sykes, The Authority of the Clergy, p. 184.

sanctions to Christ's laws, properly speaking, than any other civil magistrate can who does not believe in him. For as to the essentials of their civil office, they are just the same. The believing in Jesus Christ makes no difference in this case: only it adds the motives of another life to engage him to perform his office, his civil office, conscientiously and uprightly.¹

"'Tis not an imaginary opinion of benefits which possibly he may be able to attain which will authorize the use of his power to other interests and other ends than what he received his commission for."²

The Bangorians had three main objections to the establishment of a church, and the first of these was that external force, such as the magistrate might employ, could not serve the purposes of true religion. It was first questioned whether power to force compliance by temporal penalties to religious prescriptions was really necessary to the subsistence of the church in order and peace.³ "It can be no crime," Hoadly said, "to set the worship of God and the neglect of it, religion and irreligion, upon an equal foot in the world in that sense in which Christ himself has put it so."⁴ But secondly, as Whitby observed, "Seeing the favour of God especially depends upon our loving him with all our heart, mind, and soul, 'tis certain that no magistrate can command us thus to love him, because he cannot know

1 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Representation," Works, II, 534.

2 Sykes, A Second Letter, p. 9.

3 Anon., An Answer to the Five Important Queries, p. 26.

4 Hoadly, op. cit., II, 515.

whether we do thus love him or not."¹ The magistrate can control only a man's outward behaviour, and this may be rank hypocrisy.² The end result of establishment is exactly what the opponents of the Bangorians had arrived at: that a man must commune with the Church of England not because he is a Christian, but because he is an Englishman.³ Christ is dethroned in his Church.⁴ Must the orthodox magistrate then tolerate religious errors in his subjects? Yes, was the answer, if he have no alternative other than force which is no real remedy at all.⁵ The glory of Christianity is its ability to triumph without the use of worldly machines.⁶

The second objection was this: the Church Universal is something greater than any one earthly congregation, and to elevate one such congregation, suppressing all others, is no real service to the Church Universal. This argument was important at that time when establishment of one church meant the outlawing of all others.⁷ A magistrate may use his powers for the good of Christians, but he must do so "without partiality and unreasonable distinctions, upon account of any differences in mere

1 Whitby, An Answer to the Reverend Dr. Snape's Second Letter, pp. 10f.

2 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Reverend Dr. Hare's Sermon," Works, II, 897.

3 Hoadly, "The Common Rights of Subjects Defended," Works, II, 740.

4 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Reverend Dr. Snape's Letter," Works, II, 421f.

5 Werenfels, Three Discourses, p. 83.

6 Dawson, An Introduction, p. 17; this argument is quoted by Dawson, however, only to mock it.

7 This important point is discussed in Chapter IV.

opinions or externals of religion."¹ If the established church is to represent the religion of the people of a nation, then it dare not court only one party of those people. His opponents said that the power of the state was to replace the miracles which supported the early Christians; but "a miracle was never wrought," answered Hoadly, "to raise presbytery above episcopacy, or public prayer without a form above public prayer with a form, or the contrary; or one confession of faith amongst differing Christians above another."² It is ridiculous to say that in order to be a Christian in England one must belong only to the Church of England.³ John Jackson thought that the magistrate should not favour one religion above another, whether natural, Jewish, or Christian.⁴

The third objection can best be put in the form of a question as Sykes raised it: what is the religion the magistrate is to support? his own? Are all magistrates automatically of the true religion then?⁵ "No arguments which you can produce," he said, "will hold good to prove that the magistrate may enforce true religion but will equally prove it lawful to enforce a false one."⁶ At one time Popery was established in England

1 Anon., An Answer to the Five Important Queries, p. 5.

2 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Representation," Works, II, 519.

3 Burnet, A Full Examination, p. 281.

4 Jackson, op. cit., p. 31.

5 Sykes, A Second Letter, p. 39.

6 Sykes, A Third Letter, p. 68.

and it still was in France, Italy, and Spain.¹ An enforced establishment in Turkey prevents a Turk from becoming a Christian, or even a Jew.² Establishment makes all reformation rebellion and all governmental reform heresy.

True religion is then best maintained according to God's will when it is the magistrate's great care to restrain and punish all such outward actions as are violations of its practical rules; and also injurious to the members of civil society, considered as such, committed to his care: and as to professions and worship, when he keeps his subjects not only from destroying, but from injuring one another in the least degree upon account of their mutual difference in religion or worship.³

But the Bangorians went further to point out the implications of the fusion of church and state in an establishment which their opponents would rather have forgotten. John Shute-Barrington made religion virtually a patriotic cult: "To a true member of the Church of England, a Nonconformist who will hazard his life and fortune for his king and country is more of the Church of England than he who communicates with it and is ready to destroy it."⁴ That is no doubt an extreme position, but White Kennet, who cannot be considered a real Bangorian, had pointed out that in a national church, bishops and clergy are only a part of it, even

1 Hoadly, "The Common Rights of Subjects Defended," Works, II, 699.

2 Burnet, A Full Examination, pp. 133ff.

3 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Representation," Works, II, 518.

4 Barrington, The Layman's Letter, p. 43.

in its government. King and Parliament are the supreme governors,¹ for the church is made up of prince, clergy, and people.² "In consideration of receiving protection, etc. from a Christian magistrate" the church "may modify her just powers and make diverse concessions to him."³ If there is to be a civil establishment, then the magistrate "should preside and have the same direction in, and cognizance of, all ecclesiastical affairs."⁴ The only logical centre of unity in a national church is the king.⁵ In the "Preservative" Hoadly had pointed out to the Nonjurors that if they would accept the benefits of establishment, they must accept its consequences as well.

So to this particular branch of our constitution it is manifest that whatever power or authority is conferred upon bishops by spiritual persons at their consecration, [yet] the right of executing or exercising this in the particular dioceses ariseth originally from the nomination of the king. This nomination is vested in the crown by the laws and is ultimately resolved into the supreme authority of the nation. Consequently, therefore, as they allow that what is given may be taken away by the same authority, the right to execute the episcopal office in a particular diocese, coming in our constitution from the civil power, may be taken away upon great occasions by the same supreme power.⁶

He was speaking of the Nonjuring bishops, but the implications extend much further:

-
- 1 Kennet, A Third Letter, p. 27.
 - 2 Ibid., p. 152.
 - 3 Marshall, op. cit., p. 37.
 - 4 Jackson, op. cit., p. 21.
 - 5 Peirce, A Letter to Dr. Bennet, p. 9.
 - 6 Hoadly, "A Preservative," Works, I, 570.

All the world knows that they themselves had upon their knees solemnly and devoutly acknowledged that they had and held their bishoprics and the possessions of the same, entirely, as well as the spiritualities and temporalities thereof, only of the king's majesty and of the imperial crown of this his majesty's realm.¹

"The point is not," commented Hoadly, "whether this be right and fitting, but whether this was not in fact our constitution."² The anonymous "remarker" quoted Dr. Barrow as agreeing with this position of Hoadly's: "An ecclesiastical society may lawfully for its support use power, policy, wealth, in some measure to uphold and defend itself, but a constitution needing such things is not divine, but so far as it doth use them is no more than human."³ Hoadly himself said that to the extent "worldly honours, posts, offices, pomp, attendance, dominion," or punishments, "prisons, fines, banishments, gallies, and racks" were used, the kingdom was not Christ's but only of this world.⁴ "I hope it is no crime," he said, "not to approve of every law in the statute book: or at least, not to take my notions of the true interest of religion from acts of Parliament."⁵

Although the Bangorians did not set out to define

1 Hoadly, "A Preservative," Works, I, 570f.

2 Ibid., II, 570.

3 Prat, Farther Remarks, p. 23. (Italics mine).

4 Hoadly, "The Nature of the Kingdom," Works, II, 406.

5 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Representation," Works, II, 550.

a visible congregation as a church, in the controversy they called such a congregation, as well as the invisible fellowship, a church, and it is possible to draw an overall picture of the way they conceived it. In the first place, men join in earthly communion as their outward expression of their inward relation with Christ. For purposes of order and convenience this body organizes itself and selects certain men to perform specified functions within the organization. These men are the clergy and derive their power from the church itself. They have no powers inconsistent with Christ's supreme Kingship over its members and they may not alter the faith which he has delivered once for all time. The church has a power of discipline within itself, but this does not affect God's judgment, nor can it be enforced by civil authority, for civil authority per se is not a part of the church. All men in a nation are responsible to the civil government for any of their actions which assume a civil character. It is possible for a church and government to make mutual concessions for mutual protection and favour, but to the extent that a body of men depends upon this purely civil support, it can no longer be identified with the church.

The opponents of the Bangorians presupposed that there could be only one earthly society corresponding to the one heavenly fellowship, and this earthly society was held together by a closely knit organization. They assumed that so far as England was concerned, the Church

of England was this society. But the Bangorians insisted on taunting them with the question that past experience from the Reformation would not permit them to ignore. That question was this: what shall be said then for the man who, exercising the right of judgment which they could not help but allow, finds that this earthly society is disobeying Christ? It is to the problem of dissent as it was debated in the Bangorian Controversy that the next chapter will be devoted.

CHAPTER IV

THE PROBLEM OF DISSENT

Section 1. The Right to Dissent.

It was the common assumption of the Bangorians and their opponents that the foundation for both the Christian faith and church lay in the Holy Scriptures. Although the Churchmen held a high regard for tradition, it was William Law alone who suggested that tradition could stand on anything like an equal footing with scripture.¹ "Our Church has sufficiently declared," said Trapp, "that no church has authority to determine anything contrary to the scriptures."² The parts of scripture dealing with salvation are very important, but relatively few and these easy to understand.³ "If the governors [of the church] declare false doctrine . . .,"⁴ recurs again and again in these writings, and it has meaning only if the scriptural foundation, ancient and permanent, is assumed to lie behind it as a standard. The power of all governors is limited by the Word of God.⁵ It is most important to note this position of the Anti-bangorians, for the dispute over the right to dissent could not have developed without it.

1 Law, A Second Letter, p. 100.

2 Trapp, op. cit., p. 27.

3 Hare, Church Authority Vindicated, p. 35.

4 Ibid., p. 38.

5 Snape, A Second Letter, p. 53.

As it might have been expected, the Bangorians were more explicit in their references to the scriptural basis for church and faith. "The determinations of the church or ecclesiastical governors of any age since the Apostles' time . . . must give place whenever it appears that they interfere with, or contradict any one plain text of scripture."¹

The belief of this truth, that the scriptures contain the rule of faith, arises wholly from the nature and necessity of the thing itself, and the truth of that assertion depends on the same arguments that prove the authenticity and truth of the scriptures themselves.²

The Bible is the source of our persuasions about religion.³ Because the scriptures are the sole rule of faith, church authority can never stand as high as they. Ecclesiastical interpretations of them are never so important as they themselves, else the interpretations become the real rule of faith.⁴

If you send them [men] to the church for the interpretation of the scriptures, either you must send them only to the church of the present age as it stands divided into Eastern and Western, Popish and Protestant, Lutheran and Calvinistic churches, and then you must certainly inform them which of those parties may be depended on for their instruction in all things necessary to be believed and done; or you must send them to the church of all ages, including that of the Apostles, and then you must first teach them what was the doctrine of the Apostles, and so you send them back to their writings, which yet you say is not sufficient to acquaint them with their doctrines without these interpreters. Again, you must send

1 Jackson, op. cit., p. 51.

2 Burnet, A Full Examination, p. 295.

3 Anon., The Church and State Vindicated, p. 24.

4 Sykes, Some Remarks on Mr. Marshall's Defence, p. 78.

them to the true church, and so must teach them some certain rules by which to know to whom that title doth belong; now one note of this kind being conformity to the doctrine of the Apostles, you must send them back to the scriptures to learn that doctrine.¹

The Church of England would have men check even the decisions of the general councils by reference to scripture.²

All this of course implies that "if the church may not determine anything contrary to the scriptures," men themselves "are to judge whether such determinations of the church are contrary to the scriptures or not."³ Hoadly was specific in his reply to Dr. Snape's first letter:

Now, sir, if I am not to obey when their [church governors] instructions are contrary to Christ's (as you declare in this place), then I am under a strict obligation to examine whether their instructions are contrary to Christ's or not: unless you will order me to take their word absolutely that they are so. If I am to examine these, I am to be determined in it by my own judgment and conscience, and not by theirs. If I find their instructions agreeable to the will of Christ, I obey them. Why? Not because of their authority, but because of Christ's authority. I obey him, not them, by your own rule here laid down.⁴

The reply of Dr. Snape to this paragraph of Hoadly's gave the basic position of the Anti-bangorians. It is a difficult position to define, however, for there seems to be a contradiction at the heart of it. "I am

1 Whitby, A Defence of the Propositions, p. 16.

2 Ibid., pp. 67f.

3 Burnet, A Letter to the Reverend Mr. Trapp, pp. 27f.

4 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Reverend Dr. Snape's Letter," Works, II, 418f.

as little desirous as your Lordship to debar men the use of their reason or to hinder them from examining the doctrines they are to be taught, whether they are agreeable to scripture or not," he wrote, "but cannot consent to the giving up all religion merely to private judgment without any deference to authority."¹ Men are to use their freedom of judgment but not in opposition to the authority of the church.² Mathias Earbery thought men had a right to judge of the simple things, but in complex matters they were to accept the resolutions of the church.³ Trapp spoke of an "indispensable obligation upon the subjects of Christ to an absolute obedience to the mere authority of the church" in every case where nothing appeared contrary to God's Word.⁴ That we are to judge the lawfulness of church injunctions, said Law, does not mean that we do not owe them obedience.⁵ The only explanation for this straddling of what seems to be a dilemma is that the Churchmen were so sure they alone were right that they thought any who judged contrary to them could be only heretics or apostates.⁶

But at bottom, wrote Hoadly, such limitations come down to this: "that they are capable of using them [scriptures] who are disposed and resolved to find nothing in them contrary to what their superiors find;

1 Snape, A Second Letter, p. 56.

2 Innes, op. cit., II, 7.

3 Earbery, The Old English Constitution, p. 95.

4 Trapp, op. cit., pp. 37f.

5 Law, The Bishop of Bangor's Late Sermon, p. 25.

6 Dawson, Suspiria Sacra, p. 41.

and they are incapable who go to them without this submissive and humble spirit."¹ This, he added, is exactly the situation in Popish countries. Free judgment is actually the defence of orthodoxy, however, for otherwise church members would be obliged to follow erroneous clergymen into heresy.² Even if a man submits to church authority, it is his judgment which determines to which church he shall submit. If a man is able to judge whether or not Rome is infallible, he is able to judge of the essential matters which Rome would determine for him.³ The same consideration would apply to a man's obeying any church's decrees. Free investigation is certainly no perpetrator of stupidity and ignorance as Dean Hare had charged.⁴ If it were better for men not to question their ministers, then it would be best for the membership of the church to be made up of beings without reason.⁵ Not even lack of learning can release a man from the necessity of making his own choices.⁶ "There can, therefore, be no such thing as submitting our understandings out of humility or out of laziness to any other men whatsoever in points relating to eternal salvation" unless one will assume that Christ did not deliver his will in these matters, or else did not make

1 Hoadly, "The Common Rights of Subjects Defended," Works, II, 731.

2 Werenfels, op. cit., p. 33.

3 Ibid., p. 23.

4 Hoadly, op. cit., II, 746.

5 Anon., Short Remarks on a Letter, p. 33.

6 Pyle, An Answer to Mr. Stebbing's Miscellaneous Observations, pp. 47ff.

it clear.¹

"It is therefore an indisputable part of Christian liberty that everyone be allowed to search the scriptures and to judge freely of the sense of them, according to that latitude wherein Christ hath left them."² But to say that men have this freedom of judgment does not mean that anything they decide is correct, any more than the right of a member of Parliament to vote on questions before the house means that there is no right or wrong side to those questions.³ Nor does it mean that no account is to be taken of the testimony of those with more experience in the matter at hand.

The opinion of a man's great wisdom, sagacity, and skill may be the ground of assent in some cases. But the authority of name is not proper to convince men's understandings or to make them believe anything where they think they have evidence to the contrary.⁴

In order to understand the implications the Bangorians drew from this right of private judgment, one must understand what they meant by religious sincerity. In the "Preservative" Hoadly had asked the Nonjurors, "What is it that justified the Protestants . . . in setting up their own bishops? Was it that the Popish doctrines and worship were actually corrupt, or that the Protestants were persuaded in their own consciences that

1 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Representation," Works, II, 579.

2 Jackson, op. cit., p. 53.

3 Hoadly, op. cit., p. 491.

4 Sykes, Some Remarks on Mr. Marshall's Defence, p. 84.

they were so? The latter without doubt."¹

Your title to God's favour, therefore, 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.²

"The favour of God, therefore, follows sincerity, considered as such, and consequently equally follows every equal degree of sincerity."³ Sincerity carries with it, however, an obligation to search for the truth, especially in the passages of the New Testament.⁴

The reaction to this doctrine was immediate, and it was maintained throughout the controversy. The doctrine of sincerity was misunderstood by Hoadly's opponents and was often maliciously misrepresented. Alexander Innes equated sincerity with craftiness or blind zeal.⁵ Sherlock, in a preface to one of Stebbing's works, said:

By sincerity, in the present case at least, he [Hoadly] means no more than a man's acting according to his present opinion, without considering whether such opinion arises from the due exercise of reason, or from passion and prejudice.⁶

William Law said of it:

If a man be not a hypocrite, it matters not what religion he is of. Not only sincere Quakers, Ranters, Muggletonians, and Fifth Monarchy men are as much in the favour of God as any of the Apostles; but likewise sincere Jews, Turks, and Deists are

1 Hoadly, "A Preservative," Works, I, 590.

2 Ibid., I, 593.

3 Ibid.

4 Ibid., I, 597.

5 Innes, op. cit., I, 9.

6 Sherlock, preface to Stebbing's Remarks upon a Position, p. vii.

upon as good a bottom, and as secure of the favour of God, as the sincerest Christian.¹

Even late in the controversy he charged, "The heartiest enemy it [Christianity] has will thank you for thus defending it."² If the persuasion of the Protestants were founded upon anything but the truth, it would not justify them before God;³ although a man should leave his church if he is convinced that it is sinful.⁴ The extent to which conclusions were read into Hoadly's propositions and then taken for the Bishop's own thought is evident in the report of the committee.

If sincerity as such (i.e. mere sincerity) exclusive of the truth or falsehood of the doctrine or opinion be alone sufficient for salvation or entitle a man to the favour of God, if no one method of salvation be in itself preferable to another, the conclusion must be that all methods are alike in respect to salvation or the favour of God.⁵

"When men once come to be free to profess what religion they please, they will soon take the liberty to be of no religion at all," stormed Thomas Dawson.⁶

Henry Stebbing alone of the Anti-bangorians showed sympathy to the doctrine. In his first consideration of the matter, influenced no doubt by Dean Sherlock, he listed four evil consequences of it: (1) it puts all "methods of religion" on the same footing; (2) it destroys the meaning of intrinsic goodness in any one

1 Law, The Bishop of Bangor's Late Sermon, pp. 3f.

2 Law, A Reply, p. 214.

3 Ibid., p. 211.

4 Ibid., p. 203.

5 Report of the Committee, p. 8.

6 Dawson, Suspiria Sacra, p. 45.

religion; (3) it justifies a man's worst choice; and (4) it renders church communion unnecessary for the favour of God.¹ But in his next work he wrote that a sincere man, even though he is wrong, will no doubt receive a reward from God, although he cannot lay any claim to it since God's conditions for reward are specifically contained in the Gospel.² He reached the rather strange conclusion that at times it might be better for a man, following the dictates of his conscience, to cut himself off from the covenanted promises of God in the church rather than incur the wrath of God by doing something he feels is forbidden.³ Overall, Stebbing held that sincerity secures one from all fear of God's displeasure; that it entitles one to certain rewards; but that it does not entitle one to such a high degree of reward as one who did not err would receive.⁴

There was no dispute over the belief that in acting against his conscience a man "must act with a base and dishonest mind and an intention to do evil."⁵ In this regard Balguy identified sincerity with what St. Paul called "a willing mind."⁶ "I defy you," said Burnet, "to give any other reason to a Jew, or to any one, for obeying Christ, than this, that he thinks he ought to obey him."⁷

1 Stebbing, Remarks upon a Position, p. 2.

2 Stebbing, Miscellaneous Observations, p. xxii.

3 Ibid., pp. iff.

4 Balguy, Silvius's Examination, p. 2.

5 Whitby, A Defence of the Propositions, p. 26.

6 Balguy, Silvius's Letter to the Reverend Dr. Sherlock, (London: J. Roberts, 1719), pp. 7ff.

7 Burnet, A Full Examination, p. 270.

Religious sincerity is a real disposition and endeavour to know the will of God and the true way of his worship by making the best use of our faculties and of all helps afforded us by Providence for that purpose, and to practise accordingly.¹

But conscience cannot be taken as a guide in such important matters as religion and salvation unless it is properly informed. Three means for informing the conscience are reading the Word of God, harkening to instruction, and praying for God's assisting grace.² Religious sincerity requires using all the means God has placed at one's disposal to know his will.³ A sincere conscience can never be an accomplished fact once for all time, however. It is always the present condition of his sincerity which will justify or condemn a man.⁴ The search for truth must go on continually.⁵ This is the answer to Sherlock's objection that a man is sincere when he acts "according to his present judgment as informed by all the means he has used to inform it aright."⁶ So sincere heathen will be rewarded with the uncovenanted mercies of God,⁷ but if they have heard the Gospel and still remain heathen, they are condemned. "It is nothing but the want of sincerity that makes any

1 Pyle, A Vindication, p. 7.

2 Werenfels, op. cit., p. 38.

3 Prat, Farther Remarks, pp. 41f.

4 Pyle, An Answer to Mr. Stebbing's Remarks, p. 30.

5 Legh, A Letter from Edinburgh to Dr. Sherlock Rectifying the Committee's Notions of Sincerity, 2nd ed., corrected (London: J. Roberts, A. Dodd, J. Fox, 1718), p. 15.

6 Ibid., p. 17.

7 Pyle, An Answer to Mr. Stebbing's Miscellaneous Observations, p. 23.

man to whom it is fairly propounded reject the Christian revelation."¹ The crucifiers of Jesus were not sincere, for it is said of them, "they hated the light because their deeds were evil."² Sincerity can never be equated with carelessness or culpability.³ One dare not believe just as he pleases: he must search for the truth.⁴

Just as God makes allowance for the sincere heathen, so also he makes allowance for the sincere Christian who has an erroneous conscience not caused by his own negligence. "Error as error is not sin:" the sinfulness of error consists in continuing in it through one's own fault.⁵ Can any Christian be deprived of his salvation through no fault of his own? asked John Balguy,⁶ and then answered his own question: "No involuntary errors, whether speculative or practical, can deprive him of the rewards of the Gospel."⁷ This phase of the doctrine was best treated by Arthur Sykes who was called to defend his Innocency of Error against the attack of Bishop Potter. Error, he maintained, when it exists after an earnest and sincere search for truth, is not culpable.⁸ Heresy is not a matter of the understanding but of the

1 Prat, Farther Remarks, p. 33.

2 Ibid., pp. 34f.

3 Sykes, The Authority of the Clergy, pp. 40f.

4 Ibid., p. 56.

5 Legh, The Case of an Erroneous Conscience, p. 17.

6 Balguy, Silvius's Examination, p. 5.

7 Ibid., pp. 12f.

8 Sykes, The Innocency of Error Asserted and Vindicated, 2nd ed., corrected (London: J. Wyat, 1715), pp. i-x.

will.¹

Will a man that mistakes any doctrine of Christianity be quite out of the favour of God on account of such his mistake? Shall his errors, taken up after an exact enquiry, supposing them to be in matters of utmost consequence, make him obnoxious to the wrath of God? These would be enquiries worth your Lordship's trouble.²

Does this mean, then, that the Bangorians destroyed the distinction between right and wrong? The answer is no. If rectitude is demanded of a man, it must be of the sort he can attain in this world, else God demands the impossible.³ But how can a man know what is right in itself, save in his sincere searches?⁴ Counting noses is no approach to truth, said Sykes, for then the Christian would be wrong in every pagan country.⁵ To say that a man is sincerely in the wrong has no meaning from his own viewpoint.⁶ And to say that a man should do, not what is right in his own eyes, but what is right in another man's puts an end to all conscience and fear of God.⁷ Yet the Bangorians made a distinction between the favour and the rewards of God. By favour, they meant God's approval.⁸

A Quaker truly conscientious and sincere is in

1 Sykes, The Innocency of Error, p. 29.

2 Sykes, A Vindication of the Innocency of Error, p. 37.

3 Legh, A Letter to the Reverend Mr. Stebbing, pp. 1-6.

4 Legh, The Case of an Erroneous Conscience, p. 22.

5 Sykes, The Authority of the Clergy, p. 25.

6 Legh, A Letter from Edinburgh, p. 24.

7 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Representation," Works, II, 564.

8 Pyle, An Answer to Mr. Stebbing's Remarks, p. 10.

no danger of not being accepted of God, though he may not be entitled to as great a degree of reward as other Christians who have more talents to improve.¹

Even an orthodox Christian will not be rewarded for his orthodoxy, but for "the care he has taken and the improvements he has made."² Those without error are admittedly closer to God.³

But how can a man be sure that he has left no stone unturned in his search for the truth? How can he know that he has the truth even in orthodoxy? To these questions John Balguy answered that only by deep repentance can a man make up for failures in his sincerity. No man can repent of something which he feels is right, but each man can realize that ultimately, whatever his opinion, he stands before God. For salvation in Christ does not mean carrying out the minutiae of a new law: the salvation of the best man is still by grace.⁴

It has been noted in the last chapter that no opinions of a man, however sincere, could excuse him from the provisions of the civil law. The doctrine of sincerity refers only to a man's relation to God, but consequently to the church as well in so far as it is not made a purely human organization. Although a man may not be forced into external communion, if he is sincerely trying to follow Christ, he will be led into

1 Herne, The False Notion of a Christian Priesthood, p. 94.

2 Balguy, Silvius's Letter, p. 25.

3 Ibid., p. 18.

4 Ibid., pp. 12f.

it by his conscience.¹ If faith is really catholic there need be no fear of private judgment.² But this does not mean that all Christians must be in the same church organization.³ There is no evidence that the hearts of spiritual governors are less deceitful than our own in their commands that every Christian must join with them.⁴ Even Law had said:

The necessity of being in external communion does not oblige us to be in communion with the Pope, or any number of bishops as such whose authority we may happen to be born under, but it obliges us to be in that communion which is that way or method of salvation which Christ has instituted.⁵

What is this right way? Legh replied that the answer depends upon the man giving it. Dean Sherlock said it was his because he sincerely believed it to be so. Calamy said it was the Dissenters', because he believed it so. Sherlock said that his was proved by scripture. Calamy would reply that that was but his interpretation of scripture, for it is not said anywhere therein that the Church of England is the only true church.⁶ In short, a man must determine these matters for himself. The whole Bangorian Controversy must be understood in its setting of a traditional established church. The questions which arose and the arguments which were presented have little meaning unless understood in this

1 Pyle, An Answer to Mr. Stebbing's Remarks, p. 21.

2 Werenfels, op. cit., pp. 50f.

3 Herne, The False Notion of a Christian Priesthood, p. 89.

4 Pyle, op. cit., p. 39.

5 Law, A Reply, pp. 216f.

6 Legh, A Letter from Edinburgh, p. 19.

context. In this light, then, Sykes' statement that the right of an individual to judge of religious matters must include his right to dissent from the church is significant.¹

So far as the church is concerned, said Hoadly, dissent upon religious principles should not be treated in the same way as deliberate disregard of church discipline.²

I fear the want of charity in those who exclude all from the favour of God who after sincere enquiry and honest industry, through weakness of judgment, dare not join with us in external communion is a greater sin than simple Nonconformity.³

One level of dissent concerns the purely external matter of arrangements for public worship. Thomas Dawson mentioned with disgust the inclusion in one fellowship of some wearing the surplice and some not; some standing, some sitting, others kneeling at the Lord's Supper; some using the sign of the cross in baptism, others not.⁴ Against this view the Bangorians maintained that communion should be open to all who would accept it on Christ's terms.⁵ In what primitive text, asked Hoadly, is the present order of service to be found, that it should be regarded as so sacrosanct?⁶ "Human traditions

1 Sykes, The Authority of the Clergy, p. 31.

2 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Representation," Works, II, 560.

3 Whitby, A Defence of the Propositions, p. 27.

4 Dawson, Suspiria Sacra, pp. 9f.

5 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Reverend Dr. Hare's Sermon," Works, II, 904.

6 Ibid., II, 911.

or rites and ceremonies are not to be esteemed matters of conscience or salvation."¹

But dissent also has its deeper level of basic belief. "Can anything be necessary to any man," queried Pyle, "but so far as there are offered to that man reasonable grounds of persuasion?"² "To believe what appears untrue seems to me impossible: to profess what we believe untrue, I am sure is damnable."³ To make any man go against his conscience is to force him to desert the true faith and love of Christ for the sake of an external communion which is really supposed to be the outward expression of an inward belief.⁴ If a church try to suppress those who disagree with it, it only engages itself in self-delusion.

'Tis a mistake to imagine that liberty produces differences of opinions and notions. For the real difference only begins then to appear, not to be. Men differ in sentiments long before the liberty is granted; and if difference of opinions be a real prejudice to the Church of Christ, the church is really prejudiced as much without, as with that liberty.⁵

The Bangorians had already denied an authority to the church such as would require an absolute submission from all members.⁶ But not only did they assert the right of a man to hold his own counsels, they maintained

1 Anon., An Exposition of the XXXIV Article, p. 20.

2 Pyle, A Second Vindication, p. 54.

3 Dawson, An Introduction, p. 6. Dawson quotes this statement only to deride it.

4 Burnet, A Full Examination, p. 240.

5 Sykes, The Authority of the Clergy, p. x.

6 Burnet, A Letter to the Reverend Mr. Trapp, p. 17.

that he was not obliged to keep them to himself. "The authority of the church cannot be a power to hinder any man, whether of the clergy or laity, from publishing his sentiments."¹ To deny this is to label the Reformation illegal rebellion.²

The Anti-bangorians asserted, first, that the Church could not adapt itself to the pleas of dissenting Christians by allowing any latitude of belief or practice.

To bring in comprehension is nothing else but in plain terms to establish a schism in the Church by law, and so bring a plague into the very bowels of it, . . . a plague which shall eat out the very heart and soul and consume the vitals and spirits of it; and this to such a degree that in the compass of a few years, it shall scarce have any visible being or subsistence, or so much as the face of a national church to be known by.³

But as this policy only bred sects, since, as Sykes pointed out, if men must leave the Church in order to believe what they find in scripture they will inevitably join themselves into groups outside the Church,⁴ they further asserted that all those leaving the Church of England were guilty of schism, and that their departure from the visible congregation was a sign of their expulsion from the Church of Christ in heaven.⁵ It is a false logic, wrote Law, to say that "we separated from the Church of Rome because such separation was our duty,

1 Sykes, Some Remarks on Mr. Marshall's Defence, p. 67.

2 Sykes, The Authority of the Clergy, p. 302.

3 Dawson, Suspisia Sacra, p. 11.

4 Sykes, op. cit., p. 150.

5 Hare, Church Authority Vindicated, p. 38.

therefore the fanatics may separate from the Church of England, though such separation is a sin."¹ Christians must not agree to anything against their sincere persuasion, but present sect groups, said Dean Hare, are not sincere or else they would agree with the Established Church!² It was only in this way that the Churchmen, recognizing the right in theory of Christians to judge for themselves in matters of faith and practice, could at the same time hold their position, their Church, to be the only right one.

Such assertions, replied the Bangorians, only begged the question of the infallibility of the English Church. The spirit of intolerance and absolutism is the spirit of Popery, it was affirmed.³ One of Snape's critics warned, "I believe, Doctor, you know there is such a thing as Protestant Popery."⁴ It was sarcastically suggested that "had King James thought fit to set up an infallibility at Lambeth, instead of submitting to that at Rome, and to recognize the authority of our clergy at home, instead of that abroad, we should have been very passive under all this."⁵ "I disdain the poor sophistry of claiming that mere authority to ourselves," wrote Hoadly, "which we deny constantly to others."⁶

1 Law, A Reply, p. 87.

2 Hare, Church Authority Vindicated, p. 39.

3 Anon., A Letter to the Scholars of Eaton, p. 39.

4 Anon., A Letter to Dr. Snape, p. 29.

5 Amhurst, A Letter to the Reverend Mr. Law, p. 5.

6 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Reverend Dr. Snape's Letter," Works, II, 422.

There are only two alternatives: either private judgment must be allowed, including the right to dissent, or else one must follow the directions of his superiors in whatever religion is enjoined, a procedure which ignores entirely any consideration of intrinsic goodness of religions.¹

From the fact that there must be a particular visible church, it does not follow that there must be one national church, said Peirce.² Christians visiting reformed churches abroad are expected to communicate with them, as the Churchmen admitted. What can this mean but that there are true branches of the Universal Church?³ "As for the Church of England, I regard it as a noble part of the Catholic Church, founded upon the noble claim of the right of Christians to judge for themselves."⁴ Nor is differing practice any bar to participation in this wider fellowship, for cathedral and parish practice differ within the Church of England.⁵ Churches are formed when men who agree in their religious beliefs and practices join together.⁶ So long as they are based on scripture they are true members of the Church Universal which embraces a wide range of opinions.

1 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Representation," Works, II, 489.

2 Peirce, Some Reflections, p. 20.

3 Lowman, The Principles of an Occasional Conformist, pp. 28f.

4 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Reverend Dr. Snape's Letter," Works, II, 426.

5 Lowman, op. cit., pp. 39f.

6 James Gray, Reasons for Abrogating the Corporation and Test Acts (London: R. Robinson, 1718), pp. 2f.

Each group, however, must recognize the claims of the others.¹ No single one can say that it alone, exclusive of these others, is the Church of Christ.² Members of one, by communing occasionally with another demonstrate their acceptance of this fact.

The occasional conformist both supposes and declares that his being of the one Church of Christ does not confine him to communicate with one part of it only; but on the contrary, he is to own that one Church in every sound part of it, and profess it his duty (as it is an article of his creed), to own the communion of saints.³

In other words, these groups which had been forced out of the Church of England were regarded as as true members of the Universal Church on earth as the Church of England itself.

It was this recognition of the Dissenting congregations which marked the Bangorians in distinction to their opponents. "Men are not supposed to be of one church and communicate with another," wrote Dean Sherlock.⁴ He could say this only as he assumed that there was only one true visible congregation and all others making the claim were false. Naturally, his own, the established Church of England was that true one. But here it must be remembered that the bond between church and state had been based on the fact that the nation was

1 Lowman, The Principles of an Occasional Conformist, p. 26.

2 Burnet, A Full Examination, p. 245.

3 Lowman, A Defence of the Protestant Dissenters, p. 42.

4 Sherlock, A Vindication, p. 16.

under one government and in one church. It was inevitable, therefore, from the fact of the establishment that any consideration of the Dissenters, even on religious principles, would lead ultimately to the question of this church-state relationship. And so the controversy, after ranging over the whole doctrine of the church, settled again on the same issue in which it started in the dispute over the claims of the Nonjurors.

Section 2. The Relation of the Dissenters to the Establishment and to the Government.

The political implications of Bishop Hoadly's doctrine of making Christ the sole judge of men in regard to eternal salvation were sensed quite early in the dispute. Dr. Snape, in his first letter to the Bishop, had written:

If it were true that no men upon earth have a power of enacting laws with penal or promissory sanctions in matters of conscience, this would equally strike at all incapacitating laws in force, not only against Protestant Dissenters, but Papists too: neither the one nor the other, it seems, are (sic) to be laid under such exclusive forfeitures, or negative discouragements. Christ's Kingdom is not of this world, and none of the "engines of this world" are to be employed either for or against his subjects.¹

But it remained for Dean Sherlock to stress this aspect of Hoadly's doctrine, which he did by a "vindication" of the Corporation and Test Acts. In the preface to this work, he says:

1 Snape, A Letter to the Bishop of Bangor, pp. 30f.

It is now, I think, generally agreed on all hands that the design of the Bishop of Bangor's sermon before the king was to make way for the repeal of the Test Act. . . . A clear state of this case might be of service to the friends of our constitution and guard them against the prejudices and popular outcries raised against those statutes which are the security of the Established Church, and the envy of those who hate it.¹

It is difficult to say whether Hoadly's set purpose in his sermon was to ask for the repeal of these acts. His later writings certainly showed his sympathy with such an action. In his answer to Dr. Snape he wrote that it would be ridiculous if every Christian minister had first to consult the laws of Parliament before he could preach the Gospel, and should have to trim his message to agree with what Parliament had ordained.² "How hard soever it bears upon those acts is not the business of one who speaks what he thinks to be the truths of the Gospel to dispute."³ If the acts are unchristian, it is the duty of Christian men to see that they are repealed,⁴ and to this proposition Dean Sherlock agreed, at least in words.⁵

It has been noted that the Bangorians would not deny that the Dissenting congregations had as good a claim to the title "church" as the Establishment itself did. Therefore they could see no reason why these

1 Sherlock, A Vindication, preface.

2 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Reverend Dr. Snape's Letter," Works, II, 422.

3 Anon., A Rod for the Eaton Schoolmaster's Back, p. 20.

4 Ibid.

5 Sherlock, op. cit., p. 2.

groups should have been regarded as subversive. But their opponents, judging on the supposition of their own infallibility, and so viewing these groups as essentially anti-church, could see no good cause for tolerating them. Toleration of all sects, Christian and pagan, was Julian's method of persecuting the church, declared Dean Hare.¹ Because of the fact of the establishment, and because rigorous persecutions such as characterized the Spanish and Italian Inquisitions were out of the question in eighteenth century England, the assertion of the claims of the Church of England came as a denial to the Dissenters of any place of influence in the government. Anyone "perverting religious truth" should be made incapable of any office in the state, as well as be denied the privileges of the church, said Bishop Potter in his charge to his clergy.²

On the supposition that there must be some fixed and settled government in every nation, and that the government of the state is calculated for the preservation of the church, and that of the church reciprocally for the preservation of the state (as in the present case we must suppose it to be), the plain and natural inference is this, that to admit any one to have a share in the one who is an enemy to the other is what is inconsistent with common sense, as well as with the nature of our constitution, and the true way to have perpetual convulsions and divisions in church and state.³

The primary concern, therefore, of men of this persuasion, was to keep the Dissenters out of the state,

1 Hare, Scripture Vindicated, p. xix.

2 Potter, The Bishop of Oxford's Charge, p. 14.

3 Innes, op. cit., II, 16f.

rather than to force them back into the Church.¹ The fear was that should the Dissenters come to power, they would institute persecutions of all those who had been hindering them. Hence the dictum that "places of power and trust should be in the hands of such only as were well-affected to the ecclesiastical constitution."² If the nation could set aside the rights of one line of the royal family in the interest of its own security, any claim of civil rights on the part of individual subjects as against national security was purely anachronistic.³

In defence of his 1712 sermon which was so often used as a basis for ridiculing his seemingly varying opinions, Dean Sherlock said that the magistrate's power in religious matters extended to external actions only,⁴ but that in this his power took no regard of the principles on which external actions were based, so as to "secure the magistrate from being insulted by men who pretend to act according to their conscience."⁵ The magistrate had no power to force others to join him in his religious opinions, but he did have the right of self-protection.⁶ Negative persuasions, such as the

1 Sherlock, A Vindication, p. 83; but Sherlock shows confusion at this point. Cf. An Answer to the Lord Bishop of Bangor's Late Book, pp. 25f.

2 Sherlock, A Vindication, p. 6.

3 Ibid., p. 28.

4 Sherlock, An Answer to a Letter, p. 9.

5 Ibid., p. 29.

6 Ibid., p. 20.

disqualifying acts enjoined, were not instruments to force compliance.¹ Governmental action against the Dissenters was not considered persecution but merely self-defence.² It was only an attempt to keep "professed enemies to Christianity" out of positions of power!³

Both parties recognized this position as the true state of affairs regarding Papists in England. Papists were avowed enemies of Protestant governments as unbelievers were not, it was thought.⁴ Hoadly's "Preservative" was first of all a justification of the setting aside the Popish line of the royal family. But the regard even here was not to the religion considered as such, but to the attitude towards the civil government which it engendered.⁵ Yet even the situation with the Papists could be argued, for it was the Papists who enacted the fundamental laws of the English government.⁶ To say that persecution of them comes not on religious but civil grounds would allow Nero and Diocletian to be canonized as just magistrates.⁷

But if there was any question at all concerning the Papists, there was certainly a large one concerning the

1 Sherlock, An Answer to a Letter, p. 20.

2 Sherlock, A Vindication, p. 30.

3 Dawson, An Introduction, p. xv.

4 Anon., An Answer to the Five Important Queries, pp. 9ff.

5 Hoadly, "The Common Rights of Subjects Defended," Works, II, 788.

6 Dawson, An Introduction, p. 49. The whole treatise is quoted in derision.

7 Ibid., pp. 74f.

reality of a disaffection of the Dissenters to the government. Sherlock stated his position thus:

Either no government has a right to preserve itself against the disaffection of any subject, or else [that] every government has a right to exclude from offices of power and trust such as shall render themselves justly suspected of disaffection to the public.¹

The evidence he accepted as valid to prove "disaffection to the public" was disaffection to the Established Church.² The Bangorian answer to Sherlock was simply that his syllogism was wrong in its minor premise.

But how will it at all follow that because those particular persons who are declared enemies to the state, to the civil state and civil government of a nation, are incapable by this of holding offices in it and justly treated as such by the governors; therefore, a body of men perfectly well-affected to the civil state and zealous for a civil government which has been settled many years may as justly be excluded in the gross because they are not so well-affected to one particular church which happens to be the ecclesiastical constitution of the same country?³

Although Peirce and Lowman, being Nonconformists, cannot in a strict sense be called Bangorians, their position is akin to that of Bishop Hoadly. Peirce wrote:

'Tis the interest of any government to preserve all its subjects; and therefore in such cases of extreme necessity private rights are justly submitted to the public good: nor can any one have reason to reprove at this, since he is liable to be in the same case and to reap the same benefit by it; whereas the depriving men of their natural rights, merely for the sake of their religion, can be of no service at all to the public.⁴

1 Sherlock, A Vindication, p. 24.

2 Ibid., p. 15.

3 Hoadly, "The Common Rights of Subjects Defended," Works, II, 723f.

4 Peirce, Some Reflections, p. 17.

The truth is, there is nothing forfeits the rights of the one or the other [prince or subject] but what is contrary to the interest and welfare of the community. And since there is nothing of this nature in the principles or practices of the Dissenters, and the worshipping God according to the dictates of their own consciences is so far from being a fault that 'tis their duty, there can be no reason they should for the sake of religion be deprived of any privileges or advantages which belong to all good subjects.¹

Moses Lowman, too, protested against the thesis that Dissenters were enemies of the government.

I hope it may now appear to all that are not immovable in party prejudice that the principles and behaviour of the Dissenters are not what the Dean would represent them to be, not so dangerous to the peace of church and state. That they do not desire civil privileges to back their arguments with force and power, and impose their sentiments of religion on the Church; but that they are friendly to the equal liberty and peace of mankind: that they are not for imposing anything on the consciences of others; and only desire an impartial liberty of acting according to their own.²

Civil officers should be chosen for their capacity to serve the public, and not for religious opinions which do not affect the public good.³ This does not mean that religious men should not be sought to fill public offices. Although religious men are to be chosen for magistrates, the emphasis must be on the character of the man and not on the particular church or Christian denomination from which he comes. All who make an equal profession

1 Peirce, The Interest of the Whigs with Relation to the Test Act (London: R. Burleigh, 1718), pp. 23f.

2 Lowman, A Defence of the Protestant Dissenters, p. 30.

3 Sykes, A Third Letter, p. 43.

have equally a right to be chosen and employed in offices: which I recommend to their observation who may perhaps sometimes imagine from mere sounds and professions that the principles of some are more for their purpose than mine are.¹

It was only natural in this controversy over the problem of the Dissenters that the historical basis for the chief enactments against them, namely the Corporation and Test Acts, should be discussed. A short review of the circumstances behind the passing of the acts is therefore in order. The new Parliament of 1661 following on the Restoration was extremely reactionary. It not only returned the bishops to the House of Lords and restored ancient ecclesiastical customs, but also excluded the Nonconformists from municipal office by the Corporation Act.² Every member of a corporation was required to take the Oath of Allegiance and Supremacy, declare against the Solemn League and Covenant, and take the sacrament according to the rites of the Church of England within one year after his election to office.³ But the importance of this act to the problem of nonconformity was immeasurably increased by the enactment at the same session of the Act of Uniformity which was made more rigorous the following year. By this act the body of dissenters was swelled by all those elements of the

1 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Representation," Works, II, 521.

2 W. F. Adiney, "Nonconformity," Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, ed. by James Hastings (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1937), IX, 386.

3 "Test Act," Encyclopaedia Britannica, 14th ed. (London: The Encyclopaedia Britannica Co., Ltd., 1929), XXI, 976.

Established Church who could not assent to the new Prayer Book, or who were not episcopally ordained;¹ that is, the Presbyterians, the Episcopalians who feared a return of Romanism, and the Independents and Baptists who, had they been consistent, should not have been in an established church anyway.² Some two thousand of the Church's clergy were ejected only to become Nonconformists. The Conventicle and Five-Mile Acts were subsequently passed to limit the activities of these ejected clergy.³

In 1672 Charles II granted a dispensation to the minority religious groups, ostensibly for the relief of the Nonconformists, but very likely for the benefit of the Papists. In consequence, Parliament passed the Test Act which required of all persons filling any governmental office, civil or military, the Oath of Allegiance and Supremacy, a positive declaration against transubstantiation, and receiving the sacrament according to the rites of the Church of England within three months after admittance to office.⁴ It was this measure which committed the Dissenters to political opposition.⁵ In 1678 the act was extended to peers as

1 Hutton, The English Church, p. 191. By requiring reordination, the Act of Uniformity was unique in the history of the Church of England. See Abbey and Overton, op. cit., I, 383.

2 Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, IX, 387f.

3 Ibid., IX, 389.

4 Encyclopaedia Britannica, 14th ed., XXI, 976f.

5 Hutton, op. cit., p. 207.

well. In 1687 James II issued a declaration of indulgence, probably for the benefit of the Roman Catholics, but on any account to break the power of the Establishment.¹ Although the Nonconformists stood to benefit by it, and, indeed, 3500 availed themselves of its provisions within five months, the majority did not approve the king's action which overruled Parliament. In 1688 came the second such indulgence which was commanded to be read in the churches, and this time the Nonconformists backed the seven bishops who refused to submit to the king.²

It was the desire of William and Mary that both the Corporation and Test Acts be repealed when they came to power, but the prevailing sentiment was against this. The requirement of the Oath of Allegiance to the new king and queen brought a new development in nonconformity: the Nonjurors, who did not separate because of their disagreement with the Church, but because of the required oath to a king they considered only a usurper. The Toleration Act of 1689 took away the penalties of the legislation against dissent, but did not legalize it. Attempts at comprehension within the Establishment were stopped by the actions of the High Church party.³ In 1711, by a Whig manoeuvre to thwart the Peace of Utrecht,

1 John Pollock, "The Policy of Charles II and James II," The Age of Louis XIV, "The Cambridge Modern History," V, 235.

2 Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, IX, 389.

3 Ibid.

the Occasional Conformity Act was passed which was aimed at Nonconformists who satisfied the religious qualification for public office by taking the sacrament in the Church of England, but who still attended their dissenting meetings. In 1714 the Schism Act was passed whose purpose was to close the schools of the Nonconformists who had been banned from the universities. So strong was the feeling in the government against the Dissenters at this time, that had not Queen Anne died bringing an end to the Tory rule, the Act of Toleration would probably have been repealed.¹

At the time of the Bangorian Controversy, however, the purpose and use of the Corporation and Test Acts was far from clear. The first question was whether they had been designed to protect the government or the Church. Sherlock took the position that they were primarily intended for the defence of the Church.

These acts then being made for the security of the Church as by law established, i.e. for the security of the ecclesiastical constitution of the realm, the intention plainly was to keep Nonconformists of all sorts (whose principles and affection to their own ways cannot but lead them to use any power put into their own hands to the hurt of the Established Church, from which they have separated) out of offices civil and military, and out of the government and direction of corporations. . . . His Lordship may please to observe that affection to the established government includes a concern for the public peace both of church and state, and that these acts, though especially regarding the Established Church, are yet in the sense and eye of the law acts for the preservation

¹ Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, IX, 390; Lecky, op. cit., I, 97.

of the established government of these realms, which was always understood to include matters ecclesiastical as well as civil.¹

So also Somerville spoke of the acts as necessary to protect the Establishment.²

But at the same time, the raillery against the Dissenters was more on the basis of their use of civil power. Corporation officers were in no position to change the Establishment.³ "God knows," wrote Dawson, "the understandings of these men [Dissenters] are so small, their prejudices so strong, and their enthusiasms so vain, that they are perfectly unqualified for anything that requires a generous and public spirit (government, i.e.)."⁴ To the charge that the Dissenters would abuse power if they had it, James Peirce answered:

As all men have the truest notions of the right use of power when they are out of it, and are apt to abuse it when they have it; 'tis the wisdom of any government to limit the use of power according to the notions of those who have it not, and not to regard the fair promises of one or another party, but to take care that no one party shall abuse power to oppress and injure the other.⁵

The thought of the Anti-bangorians was tempered by their belief that it was the Dissenters who were responsible for the death of Charles I and the confusion of the Commonwealth. The second question in the dispute

1 Sherlock, A Vindication, p. 5.

2 Somerville, Reasons against Repealing the Occasional and Test Acts and Admitting the Dissenters to Places of Trust and Power (London: J. Morphew, 1718), p. 6.

3 Hoadly, "The Common Rights of Subjects Defended," Works, II, 770.

4 Dawson, Suspiria Sacra, p. 29.

5 Peirce, Some Reflections, p. 29.

involved the origin and nature of the dissenting movement. "Are we strangers to the temper of a Dissenter?" asked Dawson.¹ Although Sherlock grudgingly admitted that there were civil causes for the death of the king and the later extravagances, he charged the Dissenters with primary responsibility. At the Restoration "the cruelties, the oppressions and devastations of many years were all buried in silence and oblivion: private resentments and private injuries were given up to the public good."² The people, however, tried to protect themselves from any recurrence of such a tragedy by enacting the Corporation Act which "was made to keep the power out of those hands which had used it, so very ill."³ Keep them servants, counselled Somerville, for they are unruly masters.⁴

But as Hoadly and others pointed out, the remonstrances against both mitre and crown were carried on by Churchmen, constant ones, and by a Parliament of them.⁵

In truth, in the House of Peers there were only the Lords Say and Brook; and in the Commons House Mr. Fiennes and young Sir Harry Vane, and shortly after Mr. Hambden, who were enemies to the whole fabric of the Church. As for the rest, they were Churchmen.⁶

The Corporation Act which Sherlock insisted was for the preservation of the peace of the Church was passed a

1 Dawson, Suspiria Sacra, p. 3.

2 Sherlock, A Vindication, p. 35.

3 Ibid., p. 37.

4 Somerville, op. cit., p. 14.

5 Hoadly, "The Common Rights of Subjects Defended," Works, II, 754.

6 Lowman, A Defence of the Protestant Dissenters, p. 13.

year before the Act of Uniformity drove the subsequent Nonconformists from the Establishment. In other words, the Corporation Act was really against the doctrine of the lawfulness of taking up arms against the king, and the Solemn League and Covenant.¹ Sherlock's answer to this was that the law did not come into effect until March 25, 1663, after the ejection of the dissenting clergy, for to have received the sacrament from their hands would not have proved true conformity.² Until it came into effect, commissioners were given power to reject those who took the required oaths but not the sacramental test "if they thought it expedient for the public safety."³ Lowman pointed out that the words "for the public safety" and not "for the protection of the Church" seemed to nullify Sherlock's first contention; and, moreover, that the power of appointing the commissioners in question lay with the king who certainly did not regard the Dissenters as dangerous.⁴

The third question developed directly from the second. It was whether the intention of the Corporation and Test Acts was really to keep the Dissenters from all positions of influence, or whether that was only an accident in the pursuit of another purpose. It was the

1 Lowman, A Defence of the Protestant Dissenters, pp. 32ff.

2 Sherlock, An Answer to the Lord Bishop of Bangor's Late Book, pp. 7ff.

3 Ibid., p. 12.

4 Lowman, Remarks on Dr. Sherlock's Answer, pp. 16, 18.

Presbyterians who had stood up against the king for the rights of the people, and it was they who were instrumental in bringing back Charles II.¹ The king had openly expressed his great satisfaction to them.² The troubles were suppressed before the Corporation Act was passed, and if peace and equity reigned, as Sherlock said, then there was certainly no reason for the acts.³ Shaftsbury and others knew that the sacramental test would cut off Papists but not Dissenters.⁴ For until the new Prayer Book with its revised rites had been so drastically enjoined by the Act of Uniformity and its revision, the rites of the Church of England were not objectionable to the great body of those who later became Dissenters. It was Sherlock's opinion, however, that the Nonconformists could not subscribe to the other provisions of the Corporation Act either, and that this was clearly foreseen when the act was passed.⁵

There was more doubt about the purpose of the Test Act, primarily because of the circumstances which provoked it. It was believed that Charles was trying to restore Popery. At the time it was enacted, Papists objected that it was made solely against them.⁶

1 Peirce, Some Reflections, p. 25.

2 Hoadly, "The Common Rights of Subjects Defended," Works, II, 758.

3 Ibid., II, 759f.

4 Anon., Dr. Sherlock's Vindication of the Test Act Examined, and the False Foundations of it Exposed (London: S. Popping, J. Harrison, and A. Dodd, 1718), p. 35.

5 Sherlock, An Answer to the Lord Bishop of Bangor's Late Book, pp. 18ff.

6 Anon., Dr. Sherlock's Vindication, p. 13.

There was no intention that it should be put in execution against the Dissenters; on the other hand, they were assured by the Earl of Shaftsbury and Duke of Buckingham and other great men who pushed forward the act in Parliament, that they should have a clause inserted in their favour in some other act in the same session.¹

The motive at the time was civil protection, not the defence of the Church.² The Bishop of Salisbury's speech in the House of Lords pointed out that the Dissenters helped pass the Test Act as a security for Protestantism.³ But even with the Test Act, Parliament must surely have considered that it would take effect against the Dissenters.⁴ And since the Act of Toleration, the test had been bound upon the Dissenters.⁵

Apart from the historical circumstances lying behind the creation of this legislation, another question was discussed: were the acts still necessary?

The real thing in dispute is this: whether fences for exclusion ought not to be proportioned to times, men, and circumstances, or must remain always the same against people who are not the same? Whether the taking in of Dissenters into a capacity of places in the state be now either a certain or probable introduction to anything that will ruin this Protestant Church?⁶

It was Sherlock's contention, of course, that it would.

Have any of the Dissenters declared that they are for maintaining the Church as by law established? No certainly; the utmost that has been pleaded in

1 Anon., Dr. Sherlock's Vindication, p. 9.

2 Ibid., p. 16.

3 Lowman, Remarks on Dr. Sherlock's Answer, p. 20.

4 Sherlock, A Vindication, pp. 56f.

5 Sherlock, An Answer to the Lord Bishop of Bangor's Late Book, pp. 13ff.

6 Anon., An Answer to the Five Important Queries, p. 15.

their behalf is that their principles . . . amount to those of a general toleration to all peaceable subjects. . . . This declaration for toleration stands only upon the authority of the Dissenters' address to the king, an authority they are not willing to abide by in all cases.¹

In addition, Sherlock held that the Test Act, being a part of the laws of the Established Church at the time of the union of Scotland and England, could not be changed since one of the provisions of the treaty of union was that the established religion of neither country was to be altered.² It was asserted that no man had any natural right to share in government anyway: that is only a privilege conveyed by a gracious prince.³ Admitting Dissenters into the army would only breed Iretons and Cromwells!⁴ Dawson warned that a general toleration was a trick of the Papists to seize control of the government.⁵

As against these positions the Bangorians and Dissenters held that there was no good reason for equating present-day Nonconformists with the Presbyterians and Independents of a century earlier.⁶ Furthermore, as Hoadly pointed out, it was ridiculous to "protect" the government from Dissenters by excluding them from office when even the former trouble did not arise because they

1 Sherlock, A Vindication, p. 38.

2 Ibid., pp. 60ff.

3 Somerville, op. cit., p. 12.

4 Ibid., pp. 39f.

5 Dawson, Suspiria Sacra, p. 15.

6 Anon., An Answer to the Five Important Queries, p. 15.

held office.¹ The only logical measure of protection would be to exclude them from parliamentary elections.² Second, the men who were conscientious enough to suffer for the sake of religion have the type of integrity which is needed in governmental positions of responsibility.³ The government is weakened when some of the nation's most capable men are not permitted to serve it.⁴ Then, too, the Dissenters are staunch supporters of the government as was demonstrated by their conduct in the 1715 rebellion. If they could be relied on in a time of national crisis, asked Peirce, why not now?⁵ Actually, being deprived of office was a punishment for something which was no real offence -- a difference in religious opinion -- which even Sherlock admitted was wrong if this difference did not harm the community.⁶ Repealing the Test Act would actually strengthen the Anglo-Scottish union, since it would remove the stigma placed on the Kirk of Scotland.⁷ Toleration, said Hoadly, was either a right of the Dissenters, or it was not: if it was, the Revolution restored this; if it was not, then the legislature had no right to grant it.⁸ Peirce complained that it was the Test Act itself "that

1 Hoadly, "The Common Rights of Subjects Defended," Works, II, 755.

2 Ibid., II, 756.

3 Anon., A Letter to Dr. Sherlock, p. 39.

4 Peirce, The Interest of the Whigs, p. 29.

5 Ibid., p. 31.

6 Hoadly, op. cit., II, 727f.

7 Peirce, op. cit., p. 34.

8 Hoadly, op. cit., II, 782.

put the whim in the heads of the Tories that all civil offices of right belonged to the Church of England, and that no man as a good subject could be qualified for them, unless he was a staunch Churchman."¹

Hoadly pointed out further that it was only arguing in a circle to base the Established Church on the opinions of only those who were agreeable to the present Established Church.² In fact, the whole background of recent writing on the Test Act seemed to imply that it was a sin to look for improvement in the Church, said Peirce.

I put it to the Dean, whether he takes it to be a sin for any man, without violence and tumult, by keeping himself quietly in his own place and calling, to endeavour an alteration of the government of the Church of England as 'tis now lodged in spiritual courts? If it be not, why might not men who had taken the Covenant be thought obliged thereby to endeavour it?³

Against such thought the Anti-bangorians held that only the present Church of England would guarantee the degree of toleration which the Dissenters then enjoyed.⁴

Much of the dispute over the Corporation and Test Acts centred on the practice of occasional conformity. The foundation of this conflict was the belief that a man could not belong to one church and commune with another, because he believed that his church alone was the one True Church. Sherlock was shocked to learn that

1 Peirce, The Interest of the Whigs, p. 11.

2 Hoadly, "The Common Rights of Subjects Defended," Works, II, 786.

3 Peirce, Some Reflections, p. 37.

4 Somerville, op. cit., p. 21.

the Dissenters thought that the Church of England's terms for communion were sinful.¹ Peirce in turn reminded him that separation would be meaningless if the separatists saw nothing wrong in the original body.

For my own part, I frankly declare my own judgment, that unscriptural terms cannot be lawfully imposed, and no power on earth has a right to make more necessary to communion than Christ has to salvation, wherein the Dean knows the Dissenters are not singular.²

Although Peirce took the position that the Establishment's terms of communion being unlawful, a Dissenter of integrity would not commune with it, Lowman represented the more moderate position that the Church of England was another valid branch of the Church Universal, and that one was only acknowledging this fact by communing with her.³ "Will they be ashamed," he asked, "to sit at meat there where Christ is not ashamed to sit?"⁴ A man may think it proper to kneel at communion, he observed, without thinking it wrong not to kneel.⁵ Bishop Burnet had held the same position when the bill against occasional conformity was brought up in 1703:

I ventured to say that a man might lawfully communicate with a church that he thought had a worship and a doctrine uncorrupted, and yet communicate more frequently with a church that he thought more perfect. I myself had communicated with the churches of Geneva and Holland, and yet at the same time communicated with the Church of

1 Sherlock, A Vindication, p. 40.

2 Peirce, Some Reflections, p. 39.

3 Lowman, The Principles of an Occasional Conformist, pp. vii-xi.

4 Ibid., p. 7.

5 Ibid., p. 39.

England; so, though the Dissenters were in a mistake as to their opinion which was the more perfect church, yet allowing them a toleration in that error, this practice might be justified.¹

The situation with Papists is quite different, because they do not regard the Church of England as a true church at all.²

Sherlock, however, regarded communion with the Church of England as proof of a man's good affection to the Establishment alone, and therefore evidence of the fact that he could be trusted with governmental power. The problem at the time of enacting the laws, he said, was to find a test which would prove a man's good affection to the Established Church.

In this view, the sacrament of the Lord's Supper naturally offered itself; 'tis that part of religious worship which the generality of Christians perform with the greatest devotion, and to which they think themselves most obliged to approach with sincerity and uprightness of heart. To this may be added that as a distinction was intended to be made between those who approved and those who did not approve the ecclesiastical constitution of these kingdoms, so it was well known that the latter had as strong prejudices against the usages of the Church in the celebration of the sacrament as against any other usage of it whatever, and yet were supposed to have the same awful reverence for the institution itself, so that it was reasonably presumed that no Dissenter of any sort would easily be led to such an act of insincerity as receiving the sacrament in a manner condemned by himself.³

It was supposed that no man would in such manner receive it but a member of the Church of England.⁴

1 Burnet, History of His Own Time, p. 741.

2 Lowman, The Principles of an Occasional Conformist, p. xii.

3 Sherlock, A Vindication, p. 7.

4 Ibid., p. 9.

Receiving the sacrament according to the usage of the Church of England is not the qualification for an office, within the intent of the act, but only the proof of such qualification: the qualification required is that the person . . . be well-affected to the ecclesiastical state and constitution of these realms, and the receiving the sacrament according to the rites of the Established Church is the proof or test required that he is so.¹

The Dean therefore could not understand the religious argument for occasional conformity at all, and regarded it only as a deliberate evasion of the Test Act.

When the doctrine of occasional conformity for places prevailed, it broke in upon this evidence just as the doctrine of equivocation and mental reservation broke in upon the evidence of an oath; and there was the same reason for the legislature to take notice of and prevent the one abuse, as the other.²

Consequently he felt that the legislature was entirely justified in passing the Occasional Conformity Act which imposed severe penalties on government employees who satisfied the requirements of the Test Act, but who later attended a religious meeting not authorized by the Established Church where more than five people besides the family were present.

The occasional bill therefore is only a guard to the Test Act; and those who plead for the repeal of this bill only, do in effect desire that all men may be at liberty to give the proof required by the law of their adherence to the Established Church, and yet be at liberty not to adhere to it. Whether this can proceed from a concern for sincerity, or for the honour of the Gospel institution, I leave the world to judge.³

1 Sherlock, A Vindication, p. 9.

2 Ibid., p. 17.

3 Ibid., p. 18. Note the reference to Hoadly's doctrine of sincerity.

Against this view Lowman held that occasional conformity was not a new thing. "There was no evidence which the former acts required broke in upon by the doctrine of occasional conformity; nor any sort of equivocation or mental reservation in the persons that practised it."¹ Dr. Williams, who was afterwards Bishop of Chichester, had tried to show the lay Dissenters that communing with the Church of England was neither illegal nor morally wrong.² Hoadly agreed that the practice was not a novelty arising with the passing of the Corporation and Test Acts.³ The legislature which enacted them must surely have been aware of this fact.⁴

Since the practice was not new, it was not intended as an evasion of the law. For obeying the express words of the law cannot be said to be an evasion of it. Furthermore, the acts did not suppose that all government employees would approve of everything within the Church, for they permitted family conventicles, though no more than five outsiders could be present.⁵ Why should it be thought more greedy for Dissenters to seek office than Churchmen?⁶ Sherlock's last word in this

1 Lowman, A Defence of the Protestant Dissenters, p. 40.

2 Lowman, The Principles of an Occasional Conformist, p. 4.

3 Hoadly, "The Common Rights of Subjects Defended," Works, II, 718f.

4 Lowman, The Principles of an Occasional Conformist, pp. vf.

5 Hoadly, op. cit., II, 719.

6 Ibid., II, 724.

phase of the controversy was that although occasional conformity may not have been criminal, it still broke in on the Test Act like a mental reservation.¹ Lowman said that was sheer falsehood.

Upon the whole, this is so plain in fact that if for the future the practice of the occasional conformist shall be represented as scandalous because 'tis supposed a new invention to evade the Test Act, and which gives offence to all good Christians and the best of the Dissenters; the authors of it must bear to be told it is not true in fact, and can only be supported by a scandalous falsehood.²

It was a further contention of the Bangorians and their supporters among the Dissenters that the sacramental test was no guarantee of a man's good affection to the Established Church, even with those who never attended a Nonconformist meeting.

Undoubtedly a man may receive the communion according to the usage of the Church of England and never worship God in any other way than that prescribed by the Act of Uniformity, and yet think many things in the present ecclesiastical constitution not only capable of amendment but deserving a reformation.³

What actually would have barred Nonconformists from the government would have been a solemn oath of allegiance to the Establishment.⁴ It was the integrity of the Nonconformists regarding the oaths required in 1662 that forced over two thousand of the clergy from the Church.⁵

1 Sherlock, An Answer to the Lord Bishop of Bangor's Late Book, pp. 59f.

2 Lowman, The Principles of an Occasional Conformist, p. 10.

3 Lowman, A Defence of the Protestant Dissenters, p. 43.

4 Hoadly, "The Common Rights of Subjects Defended," Works, II, 701ff.

5 Peirce, Some Reflections, p. 36.

As the law stood, however,

any man who will, from a mercenary principle, take this sacrament shall enjoy the public post, whether atheist, deist, Papist, heathen, or Mohammedan: the formality complied with, the church membership is enquired after no further.¹

"It is somewhat strange," wrote Lowman, "that men are to be accounted in communion with a particular church only because they are properly in communion with no church at all."² Sherlock's reply to this, crass as it now sounds, was that the government wanted to keep out only the Papists and Dissenters, and the case was obvious in regard to them!³ He thought that a group, such as Hoadly described, of those who were loyal to the Church of England, yet who did not approve of it in all details, was non-existent.⁴

A further development of this phase of the controversy, and one which linked it again to the main issue of the doctrine of the church, was the consideration of the use of the sacrament as a test for the employment of men in civil and military offices. The first point, raised in a clear form by the Dissenters, but to which Hoadly also had shown sympathy in his earlier remarks on the Church of Christ and its sacraments, was that the Church of England had emulated Popery by setting up the observance of the sacrament so that many devout people

1 Anon., Dr. Sherlock's Vindication, p. 39.

2 Lowman, The Principles of an Occasional Conformist, p. 15.

3 Sherlock, An Answer to the Lord Bishop of Bangor's Late Book, pp. 22f.

4 Ibid., pp. 24f.

could not thus receive it.¹ The essential thing is to receive the bread and wine in communion with a congregation who share the same faith in Jesus Christ; but now externals have been imposed on that observance so that only Church of England people are made welcome. If any one objects to this, then he is no longer regarded as worthy to serve the nation.² Sherlock's reply was that the legislature considered "the receiving of the sacrament according to the rites of the Church of England not only as lawful, but as commendable in a Christian, and therefore they can in no sense be charged with tempting men to sin."³

But this, as Hoadly pointed out, was giving up the whole case for the Test Act as against Dissenters. He agreed that seeing a man partake of the sacrament, even in the Church of England, showed him only to be a Christian who recognized that church as a true member of the body of Christ.⁴ But this statement of Sherlock's could be only a slip on his part, because he had so strenuously laid the emphasis on "the rites of the Church of England," arguing with Lowman that the test could not have been enforced before the ejection of the Nonconformists from the Establishment in 1662.⁵ In

1 Gray, *op. cit.*, pp. 5f.

2 Anon., A Letter to Dr. Sherlock, pp. 15-25.

3 Sherlock, A Vindication, p. 66.

4 Hoadly, "The Common Rights of Subjects Defended," Works, II, 802ff.

5 Sherlock, An Answer to the Lord Bishop of Bangor's Late Book, p. 10.

other words, Sherlock blundered into the inconsistency of saying at the same time: (1) that the test lay in the words "according to the usages and rites of the Church of England;" (2) that so receiving the sacrament proves one to be well-affected to the ecclesiastical constitution and therefore qualified for governmental offices; yet (3) that this is not a prostitution of the sacrament because any Christian (presumably even dissenting ones) could so receive it.¹

The second point, however, dealt with the use itself of the sacrament as a test for civil office. "The end of the sacrament," wrote Sykes,

is . . . to remember the death of Christ and to testify our Christian charity to one another. Of what then can this be a test, unless of this, that we remember Christ's sufferings for our salvation, and that we are in charity with all men?²

Hoadly said, "An action ordained as an instrument without which no person shall command a regiment is ordained by this act to something else besides the remembrance of Christ's death."³ Good affection to the whole ecclesiastical constitution is an inward disposition which cannot be made a qualification for office because it cannot be rightly appraised. One who obeys the law (and it must be remembered that Sherlock objected more to Dissenters, apparently, than atheists) does so when he performs the outward duty required by the law. Therefore the sacra-

1. Anon., A Letter to Dr. Sherlock, p. 13.

2. Sykes, A Third Letter, p. 87.

3. Hoadly, "The Common Rights of Subjects Defended," Works, II, 708.

ment is made the qualification for office.¹ The test thus breeds hypocrisy in those for whom the office is all-important, and who are not true Christians;² and this is the direct responsibility of the legislature.³

Sherlock, had, in a sense, anticipated this last objection. "If the government take it to signify what it does naturally signify," he wrote of the sacrament, "they are guilty of no impiety."⁴ The question, however, was did the government take it to signify what it naturally does? The Occasional Conformity Act was passed so that all might see that the Test Act was to allow only Church of England men in the government.⁵ Moreover, the Dean admitted the evident abuses of the law, but saw no way of remedying the situation.⁶ The sacramental test yielded the most probable evidence of good affection to the Establishment, an evidence far more trustworthy than the use of an oath would produce.⁷ In any case, the use of religion as a civil test, to which Hoadly objected, would also be involved in the enjoinder of an oath.⁸ Yet the Bishop did not object to the use of an oath.⁹

1 Hoadly, "The Common Rights of Subjects Defended," Works, II, 705, 715.

2 Ibid., II, 712.

3 Ibid., II, 794.

4 Sherlock, A Vindication, p. 74.

5 Ibid., p. 75.

6 Ibid., p. 19.

7 Sherlock, An Answer to the Lord Bishop of Bangor's Late Book, pp. 28ff.

8 Sherlock, A Vindication, p. 70.

9 Hoadly, op. cit., II, 713.

It seems to me that the actual use of oaths in human society is so entirely founded upon the political principles of reason and the common good of mankind with respect to their vital concerns only, that were it not for this, they would be forbidden by religion in all cases, as they are in some. And it is one thing, I think, for a practice not to contradict the principles of religion, and another thing for it to be performed on the principles of it.¹

But to use the sacrament as a test is to use it for an entirely different end than that for which Christ instituted it.² Sherlock overlooked this difference and tried to make out that Hoadly was against using religion in any way in a test, even as that involved in an oath.³

The two views were not reconciled. On the one hand, the Bangorians held that there were branches of the church as a society which were equally valid to the degree they adhered to Christ's Gospel and instructions, that religious uniformity was not necessary to a stable government, and in particular, that the Dissenters could be loyal and useful to the government of England without embracing all the tenets of the Church of England; that to the extent the Church of England was made only instrumental to the government, to that degree it was perverted from its God-appointed function. On the other hand, the Anti-bangorians, asserting the claim of

1 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Representation," Works, II, 523.

2 Ibid., II, 523f.

3 Sherlock, A Vindication, p. 93.

"one government-one church", were bound to reject the religious Dissenters from the government and the political "dissenters" from the Church; and to allow no extenuating circumstances to prejudice the application of this principle.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

On the surface it might appear that the views of the church espoused by the Bangorians and their opponents could be reconciled by considering that the former were describing the church as an invisible fellowship, while the latter were treating it as a visible society on earth. This approach to a reconciliation seems to be all the more practicable when one notices Hoadly's recurring remark that he was describing not an earthly church, but rather the relationship between an individual and Christ that made him a member of this invisible fellowship, and that he had no intention of attacking the Church of England.¹ It was on this basis that John Rogers attempted to show that the two approaches to the understanding of the church were not mutually exclusive. In relation to Christ, he said, every man stands on a level; but Christ has also ordained a visible society in which some have special authority given them by him.² The ministers, to whom this authority is granted, may make entrance requirements for prospective members of the society, but these cannot affect the relation of the soul with Christ.³ In this

1 For example, see Hoadly, "An Answer to the Reverend Dr. Snape's Letter," Works, II, 426.

2 Rogers, op. cit., p. iv.

3 Ibid., pp. 100-102.

society no one can impose upon other men a doctrine which Christ has not made obligatory, something forbidden by Christ, or an indifferent action which Christ has not empowered him to impose.¹ Each member may judge the lawfulness of these acts of church government. If he considers them wrong, he must withhold his active obedience, but must submit passively to the punishment provided.²

A second approach to a reconciliation is to treat the whole controversy as a mere battle of words between men who believed substantially the same things. So Whiston wrote in his memoirs, "The debate between the Convocation and the then Bishop of Bangor came to no other issue, that I know of, than to make all wise men sensible they had both run into great extremes, while neither side would recede from their own imaginations."³ Very early in the dispute the similarity between Snape's and Hoadly's positions on church authority had been mentioned.

A man must have more than common penetration to see where the difference lies between your Lordship and the Doctor as to this point: your Lordship says, Christ has left no absolute judge over our consciences; and the Doctor mentions all who claim any rule among us, and says they cannot bind the conscience; words, if anything, more full on the side of your Lordship's meaning.⁴

So also Charles Norris said that when the Anti-bangorians

1 Rogers, op. cit., p. 108.

2 Ibid., p. 113.

3 Whiston, op. cit., p. 313.

4 Barrington, The Layman's Second Letter, p. 32.

explained what they meant by church authority they said practically the same things as the Bishop.¹ But Snape and the others rejected most vehemently any suggestion that at bottom they agreed with Hoadly's views.²

It is true to the facts of the situation to say that both these attempts at reconciliation had a limited validity. Reading the succession of pamphlets, one is impressed both by the similarities of the two parties and by the vituperation of the Anti-bangorians which would indicate that the chief object of their antagonism lay in the person and not the thought of Bishop Hoadly. But at the same time, one cannot explain away certain fundamental differences which would require a change of mind on the part of one or both of the parties in order to effect any real reconciliation. These differences were probably most manifest in the discussion of the relation of church to state, but their foundation lay in the more subtle question of the right to dissent, which in the actual course of the controversy had long been hidden in a confusion of references to authority and conscience.

Although both parties admitted that some in the visible church would not see salvation, while perhaps others outside its fold, professing Christ in their hearts, would; it was Bishop Hoadly alone who gave that

1 Norris, The Reconciler, p. 40.

2 Note Sherlock's dispute with Arthur Sykes over this very point, pp. 90-94, supra.

conception of the "invisible church" a practical expression in his doctrine of sincerity. Much, of course, can be said against it: much was said against it. The chief objection was that it would open the gates of heaven too wide, making for indifference within the earthly church, and destroy the fundamental distinction between right and wrong. Sincerity was probably an unfortunate word for Hoadly to have chosen to express his meaning. It implies frankness and honesty, and as his opponents pointed out, a man could be quite frank about himself, yet be quite wrong and out of favour with God. But it is the doctrine and not the word which needs to be considered. Perhaps "single-mindedness" would be a better term, and yet that does not completely contain the idea.

In simplest terms, Hoadly meant that a man can believe only what he himself feels to be right, that when he has used the means within his power to enlighten his understanding and acts accordingly -- since no man on earth can do more -- there is no further tribunal except God's which can judge him with eternal consequences. Of course, if one could speak from God's viewpoint, one might say that even such a man was still wrong. But the important point, one which the Anti-ban-gorians never seemed to grasp, is that no one, not even a clergyman of the Church of England, can speak from God's point of view. After all evidence has been sifted and weighed by two equally "sincere" men who differ in their conclusions, only God can declare who is right and

who is wrong. Christ alone is Judge in matters of the "favour of God and eternal salvation."¹

The implications of this to the concept of the visible society of the church on earth are tremendous. The consideration of the relation of pagans to God was an interesting side issue, but was not relevant to the problem at hand. Even Law who thought that Hoadly had let the Mohammedan slip into Christ's Kingdom² would no doubt agree that God "would have mercy upon whom he would have mercy." The real question concerned the Dissenters who, on Christian grounds, claimed as good a title, if not better, to the favour of God as any Churchman. And Churchmen, trying to discuss this question, found Hoadly pushing them into an awkward and uncomfortable position between the Church of Rome and the Dissenters as the B term of the relation A is to B as B is to C.

Indeed, the real alternative to Hoadly's views of the church was the extreme High Church position. If the Dissenters were in the wrong, as the Anti-bangorians asserted, the question arose as to what their error was. It could not be their reliance on the Bible, or their creeds, for in these matters they were in harmony with the Church of England. Law admitted that the only difference lay in the fact that the Dissenters lacked

1 Hoadly, "The Nature of the Kingdom," Works, II, 406.

2 Law, The Bishop of Bangor's Late Sermon, pp. 3ff.

episcopal ordination in an uninterrupted apostolical succession.¹ The arguments for and against that succession have been discussed, but it is only fair here to ask how the High Church theory bore out in practice. The logical outcome of it would have meant a greater effectiveness of the clergy in the succession, since they alone were supposed to carry Christ's delegated authority and power. But as Hoadly had said earlier, since there were no visible differences between High Church clergy and others in the efficacy of their ministrations, to credit them with greater powers was pure presumption.²

The power of looking into men's hearts, and therefore of pronouncing the forgiveness of sins, might be granted to Peter along with the equally miraculous power of healing the sick; but Atterbury, who could not cure a Pope of one twinge of toothache, could certainly not excuse Chartres one minute of hell-fire.³

Sparkling as Law's defence of the powers of the clergy was, one must always ask just what he means and whether his position is any more tenable than Hoadly's admittedly loose conception of the church. But although the Church of England men writing against the Bangorians might welcome Law's help, still they could not make his ideas their own, as Hoadly pointed out to Sherlock.⁴ The chief opposition to the Bangorians in the controversy did not have the advantage of this High Church position.

1 Law, The Bishop of Bangor's Late Sermon, p. 10.

2 Hoadly, "A Preservative," Works, I, 594.

3 Stephen, History of English Thought, II, 159.

4 Hoadly, "An Answer to a Late Book," Works,

The Dissenters, regardless of their differing views among themselves, were lumped together as outsiders to the Church of England, and it was this that was the centre of attacks upon them. In other words, the argument most often pushed against them was not that their clergy were irregularly ordained, or that their doctrine was unchristian, or that they failed to pray or were irreverent, or even that their work failed to find divine ratification by God's blessing, but more simply that they were not subject to the external organization of the Church of England. Although strict High-Churchmen such as Law might object that their clergy not being in the true apostolical succession, their sacraments were non-effectual, many staunch Churchmen, including not only Bishop Burnet but also Dean Sherlock, could say nothing of the kind. The Dean's opposition to the Dissenters seems to focus on the political activities of the Presbyterians and Independents during the reign of Charles I and the Commonwealth.

This fact is most important to note, for one would expect to find opposed to Hoadly's conception of the church as the Kingdom of Christ where he alone reigned some definite picture of the one church on earth which alone was the Church. Instead there is only a grudging admission that the Continental reformed churches as well as the Scottish Kirk are true churches regardless of their differing practices; yet a protest that the Dissenters, whose practices were not different from these,

could have no claim to the title. In England only the Church of England was the true Church. The Anti-ban-gorians ostensibly were defending the claims of the church as an earthly society (not societies), yet outside of the provisions of the English Establishment they had very little conception of what the society of the church meant. They could speak with zeal about the Church of England, about the Reformation, but an impenetrable cloud seems to have covered the life of the church for the centuries between their own time and the periods of the Apostles and early church Fathers, as well as the fellowship of all believers throughout the world. This statement that they failed to understand the church on earth is not just surmise, but is borne out by the report of the committee of the Lower House of Convocation, which charged that Hoadly had subverted all government and discipline in the Church of Christ and had impugned the regal supremacy and the authority of the legislature in causes ecclesiastical.¹ The importance that the relation of these two charges took in the minds of Hoadly's opponents is found in their fear that the Dissenters would obtain a place of influence in the government and so change the Church of England.²

At the same time, Hoadly's questioning whether political establishment was the constitutive element of the church, visible or invisible, and his doctrine of

1 Report of the Committee, pp. 3f.

2 Sherlock, A Vindication, p. 38.

sincerity which raised the question as to whether religious censure of other Christian groups was glorifying God in any way, certainly was instrumental in destroying one of the foundations of the incapacitating laws. Although sect groups may plead for toleration, nothing is gained until the plea finds advocates in the dominant church. So like Bishop Burnet a generation earlier, Hoadly took the cause of the Dissenters to himself. "Though his writings are heavy, dull, and devoid of originality¹ they did excellent service in their day for the cause of civil and religious liberty."² If the foundation of certainty for the Dissenter and Churchman was the same, namely "sincerity" as Hoadly conceived it, then there was no good reason for either one persecuting the other.

It is a tribute to Hoadly's skill as a disputant, that when the Churchmen objected to this argument, he simply brought before their eyes their own separation from Rome. In the "Preservative," the first work of the controversy, he pointed out that the Protestants had never justified themselves in the eyes of the Papists for separating at the Reformation, and were under no necessity to do so. In this they acted on the principle that a man must be convinced in his own mind.³ Conse-

1 An overdrawn statement, certainly.

2 "Benjamin Hoadly," The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, editor-in-chief, Samuel M. Jackson (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1909), V, 301.

3 Hoadly, "A Preservative," Works, I, 590f.

quently, when the Churchmen opposed the separation of the Dissenters (although they had in fact forced it by the Act of Uniformity of 1662), they were taking the same position the Papists held towards the Church of England: that they were the one true Church, and if separation from them came about, it was not from religious causes, but from sheer human perversity. And in their espousal of the incapacitating acts, which they claimed to be the only support for the Establishment,¹ they did in fact justify the theory on which inquisitions and persecutions had been waged by the Papists on the Protestants. Moreover, while the Church of England did not claim infallibility as Rome did, it assumed that it made no mistakes.

It is important that this be noted, for if Hoadly's view of the church is looked on as confused and ill-defined, one must also look at the view urged against it, a view which on principle (since both parties vociferously expressed a hatred of Popery) could not be distinguished from the Roman position. The Churchmen never attempted to deal with the dilemma with which the Bangorians confronted them, either horn of which would have condemned them. If they held the view that Dissenters were not justified in leaving their organization because they could see no reason for it, then they brought to themselves in their continued separation from Rome the condemnation of being schismatic by party spirit alone.

¹ Sherlock, A Vindication, preface; also Snape, A Letter to the Bishop of Bangor, pp. 30f.

On the other hand, if they admitted the right of private judgment and the right to dissent to justify their own position, then they were hard put to justify their persecution -- which although mild, was still persecution -- of the Dissenters. In fact, they did both, and did neither, which shows that unlike Hoadly, they never really saw the issue which faced them.

One more thing needs to be considered before looking at the Bangorian doctrine of the church: namely, the effect of establishment on the Church of England. This phrase is redundant, and therein lies the crux of the issue. If the term "church" had a universal significance to the minds of the Anti-bangorians, they might have distinguished between "church" and "Church of England." But rather than speak of the church in England, they spoke of, and invariably thought of, the Church of England. Now perhaps this is a small point to emphasize, yet it greatly influenced the controversy; for whenever the Bangorians mentioned "church," their opponents immediately added in their own minds "of England," an addition which generally led the argument astray, as the Bishop himself noted.¹ If one attempts to understand what distinctions the name Church of England stood for, he is confronted with three possibilities. (1) The Church of England had an episcopal type of government and order of clergy, and this fact was urged against

1 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Reverend Dr. Snape's Letter," Works, II, 426.

reformed churches of the Genevan pattern, as well as the Dissenters. (2) It had a standard of doctrine in the Thirty-nine Articles, and this was urged against the other episcopal state churches and the Papists. (3) It was established by the government of England as the one valid church in the realm and received governmental support as such.

This last point is the main one: it was the origin of the exclusiveness which characterized that body. Nationalism was confused with the Kingdom of God. From reading Hoadly's opponents, one has the feeling that they believed the church could become universal only when the English Establishment should be spread throughout the world. Even this would not have been so bad had the Establishment included the English Christians as a whole. But from 1662 on, the establishment was only that of a party, which made it all the more exclusive. The Dissenters having been forced out, there was little desire for their return.

This establishment had two very real effects in Church life. First, the government of the Church no longer lay with that Church itself. To this statement one might oppose the doctrine which lay behind the establishment -- one people, one church, one nation -- and say that the voice of the civil government in Church affairs was none other than the voice of the Church itself. But one must remember such things as the Act of Uniformity of 1662 which was enacted by a reactionary

government and which led to the loss of [over] two thousand clergy who up to that time were a part of the Church and who should have had a voice in its governing. And one must remember the deprivation of the Nonjurors, which although it may have been justified by the exigencies of the situation, still meant that men of sound doctrine in all other matters were held to be incapable of ecclesiastical rank because of their political loyalties. This must always be considered as one reads the claims of men of the Establishment to the powers and rights of the Apostles.

Second, the establishment meant that men were members of the Church by reason of their citizenship rather than religious conviction. This is nowhere more baldly put than in Cannon's statement that profession of infidelity excused no one from the dominion of the Church.¹ In other words, the Church of Christ in England had, and/or could have, among its nominal members not only those whom God alone knew to be hypocrites, but professed infidels as well; not to mention both parties in this very controversy.

The Act of Toleration of 1689, which could have been predicted at the time of the passing of the Act of Uniformity in 1662 -- that, or a rigorous persecution, brought to an end the idea of a national church. Although the Church of England could still benefit

1 Cannon, op. cit., p. 41.

materially from the establishment, it could no longer claim all Englishmen as within its jurisdiction. That might have given reason for a purge within its own body, but again the fact of establishment prevented any such thing. Instead, the government foisted upon it, supposedly as its leaders, men who received only its scorn and condemnation, such as Hoadly himself.

Now with all this in mind, one is prepared to consider the charge that Hoadly, in his sermon, had "denied pointblank that there is any such thing as a visible Church of Christ."¹ Indeed, considering this background that sermon and the later writings in defence of it would appear to be a crusade to remind men that the Church should be the Church of Christ, that it was really those who looked to Christ alone as their King, Law-giver, and Judge no matter where they lived --

the number of men, whether small or great, whether dispersed or united, who truly and sincerely are subjects to Jesus Christ alone as their Law-giver and Judge in matters relating to the favour of God and their eternal salvation.²

This Church by its nature was never meant to be "of this world," dependent upon worldly force, subservient to human ambitions, at the complete mercy of fallible governors. Thus did Hoadly and those who supported him hold up to men's apprehension and conscience the ideal of the Church as Christ's Kingdom over which he did in

1 The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, V, 301.

2 Hoadly, "The Nature of the Kingdom," Works, II, 406.

fact, as well as in theological theory, bear rule.

Moreover since this early work in the controversy was a sermon and not a studied and exhaustive treatise on the nature of the church, it cannot be expected that in all ways it would be a final and complete declaration of what the church is. One therefore does not miss a reference to the sacraments, or the preaching of the Word, certainly both essentials of the church on earth, as one reads it. Sermons are characteristically dialectic. The opprobrium cast on the Church of England of that day, however, is that its clergy could not comprehend a picture of the ideal Church apart from the actual Church of England. Their enthusiasm for the Establishment had made them forget that it was only an approximation to the True Church, and that in many points it stood needful of improvement.

If it be protested that this was not so, that the Anti-bangorians were only trying to protect the church as a society from dissolution by abandonment of all practical considerations in a mistaken attempt to bring heaven on earth, the evidence of their controversial writings is ample to answer that protest. They did, it is true, admit that God was not bound to sustain their wrong decisions in matters of church discipline; yet they also insisted that excommunication from the society meant expulsion from the Kingdom of God.¹ God was

1 Hare, Church Authority Vindicated, p. 18.

expected to honour the legislation of the Church in matters of both faith and externals of worship in his judgments of men.¹ Refusing to kneel at the Lord's Supper was sufficient to bring the wrath of God down on a man. Another case in point is their treatment of the Dissenters. So concerned were they about the relation of the Dissenter to the Establishment that they overlooked a consideration of the relation of the Dissenter to God, which was certainly not less important. Even William Law was quite amused at Hoadly's notion of an "invisible church" apart from the organization which God meant should include the evil and the good until the Day of Judgment.² And Sherlock could see no justification for communion with the Church of England and some other church at the same time.

It was this identification of the actual with the ideal that lay behind the doctrine of passive obedience. Although politically, the triumph of the Prince of Orange had made it ludicrous, it still reigned in many a High-Churchman's mind. Hoadly's opposition to this doctrine in 1705 had brought him into his first conflict with Convocation; and as one notes again and again the Anti-bangorian admonition that men be subject to duly constituted authority, one feels an undercurrent of opposition to any questioning, however devout, of its prerogative. The Established Church had lost the power

1 See pp. 126-131, supra.

2 Law, A Reply, p. 13.

of self-criticism, and it was not willing to find it with a latitudinarian leading the search.

From this point of view, then, it appears that Hoadly was justified in the thought behind his sermon. It became an attack on the Church of England only when that Church's governing body made it so. Actually it was only one example of a host of writings he had produced in favour of religious toleration as against the bigotry of his own Church. "In his pachydermatous fashion," wrote Leslie Stephen, "Hoadly did some service, by helping to trample down certain relics of the old spirit of bigotry."¹ After all, he was only making explicit the right of private judgment which the Churchmen did not deny men, but which they did not understand. And if the Churchmen could marshall "church authority" as a necessity for the preservation of the earthly society, Hoadly could marshall the facts and eloquence to prove that by protecting the society, authority had too often succeeded in destroying its reason for being.

It was authority which crushed the noble sentiments of Socrates and others in the heathen world, and prevented the reception of them amongst men. It was authority which hindered the voice of the Son of God himself from being heard, and which alone stood in opposition to his powerful arguments and his divine doctrine; whilst it was a more moving question amongst the people to ask, "Do any of the Pharisees, or doctors of the Mosaical law believe in him?" than to ask, "Whether ever man spake, or lived, or worked wonders like him;" and whilst excommunication, or being put out of the synagogue was the mark set upon those who should embrace his religion. It was authority among heathens which

1 Stephen, History of English Thought, II, 153.

afterwards put all the stop to Christ's profession which this world could put. And when Christians increased into a majority, and came to think the same method to be the only proper one for the advantage of their cause, which had been the enemy and destroyer of it, then it was the authority of Christians which, by degrees, not only laid waste the honour of Christianity, but well nigh extinguished it from amongst men. It was authority which brought in all that merciless heap of useless and burdensome fopperies: prayers in an unknown tongue, prayers to multitudes of beings, and the whole lead of absurdities and depravations of true religion under which the Christian people were in captivity till they became gross and weighty enough at last to break the props that supported them. It was authority which recommended and guarded them by disgraces and by inquisitions, by making it infamous, or terrible to any to oppose them. It was authority which would have prevented all reformation where it is, and which has put a barrier against it wherever it is not. It was human authority in religion which alone set up itself against the beginnings of this Church of England itself and which alone now contests with it the foundation upon which it stands. This authority was first exercised in little by those who were so far from pretending to such enormities, as it afterwards arrived at, that they would have detested and abhorred the thought of them. And so it will be, for ever, and everywhere. The calling in the assistance of mere authority, even against errors or trifles, in religious matters, at first, will by insensible degrees come to the very same issue that it has been ever hitherto seen to end in. And how indeed can it be expected that the same thing, which has in all ages and in all countries been hurtful to truth and true religion amongst men, should in any age or in any country become a friend and guardian of them; unless it can be shown that the nature of mere authority, or the nature of man, or both, are entirely altered from what they have hitherto been.¹

So would Hoadly appear as the champion of true spirituality in a Church which identified what was with what should be.

Apart from the controversy which would justify

¹ Hoadly, "An Answer to the Representation," Works, II, 571f.

many statements that could not stand by themselves, however, does the charge, made not only by his contemporaries, but by more recent authors as well, that Hoadly failed to appreciate the visible church still hold? Did Hoadly so picture the ideal Church that he left the church in the world without any substantial foundation? Here one must carefully distinguish between what the Bishop actually said, even in somewhat ambiguous terms, and what his critics thought he said, or would like to have believed he said. "His opponents attacked rather what they read into the sermon than what was there."¹

He said that Christ did not convey infallibility to men, and did not assert the one true interpretation of his laws for the church.² He was credited with saying that Christ never acted in his Kingdom, or Church, at all.³ He said, because Christ did not so act, no man could presume to punish another man in matters "purely of conscience and eternal salvation," for this was Christ's sole prerogative.⁴ He was charged with wanting to do away with all discipline in the earthly church.⁵

It would appear rather that his purpose was to show the limitations of church authority in matters even of discipline. "We can answer them," he wrote,

1 Overton and Relton, op. cit., p. 16.

2 Hoadly, "The Nature of the Kingdom," Works, II, 404.

3 Snape, A Letter to the Bishop of Bangor, p. 18.

4 Hoadly, op. cit., II, 405.

5 The Report of the Committee, pp. 3f.

that we can never think Christ's Church so well-governed a society, as when Christ's laws govern it; that we have not said one word against the order, or the good government of it; but only asserted the right and duty of all Christians to consider the laws of Christ himself, because we are sure of his displeasure if we obey any authority upon earth contrary to his will; and that we are for all order and good government consistent with that right of not obeying against our own consciences, which he did not, to be sure, destroy by any images of order and decency under which his Church is represented.¹

He said as bishop he claimed no powers inconsistent with this contention.² Only the Church of Rome claimed power to command "absolute" obedience.³ But the Church of England could interpret Christ's laws for its people, and maintain order, without saying that its interpretations were the only valid ones, or that there was no higher interest of Christians than order in the visible church.⁴ It was the bigotry of assuming, even though perhaps denying in words, infallibility against which he spoke. A judge, he said, must have ability to pass sentence; and in matters for which the sentence involves eternal life or death, only Christ can be Judge.⁵ If no one claims this power, well and good; but it was against such presumption that he wrote,⁶ and not against the right of censuring moral offenders.⁷ A church may say

1 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Reverend Dr. Snape's Letter," Works, II, 420.

2 Ibid., II, 421.

3 Ibid., II, 423.

4 Ibid.

5 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Representation," Works, II, 463.

6 Ibid., II, 464.

7 Ibid., II, 466.

that a particular man is not worthy of its fellowship, but it can never say that God has cast that man aside, nor that he should do so. For while St. Paul cautioned against judging the servant of another man before whom alone that servant stood or fell, he counselled the Corinthians to punish those who notoriously offended against their own consciences and the plain moral laws of Christ.¹

Nor had he ever held that all church communion was unnecessary to entitle men to God's favour. That men are to obey Christ alone is the thesis of his sermon, but this is not to say that men are not obligated to church communion. This objection of his opponents, contemporary and modern, seems to be based on a belief that church communion is not necessitated by loyalty to Christ at all, but by some external authority. And as Hoadly pointed out, if church communion is to be determined by "lawful governors," then thought, choice, or sincerity on the part of the individual have nothing to do with it.²

What I say is, that "a man's title to God's favour must depend upon his real sincerity in the conduct of his conscience, and of his own actions under it." What they represent as mine is that "no one method of religion is, in itself, preferable to another."³

Here again, intruding from the controversy, is an illus-

1 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Representation," Works, II, 467.

2 Ibid., II, 487.

3 Ibid., II, 490.

tration of the fact that the Anti-bangorians had no concept of the ideal Church. They were constantly denying that a man could have some higher authority than the Church of England itself for communing with it, or for leaving it to commune with some other church. Hoadly said that it was because one method was better than another that each man had to make a choice, that it was wrong for any group to prevent him from choosing.¹

Encouraging men to study the Word of God, he said, is a better way to help them judge aright than persecutions and excommunications of supposed heretics.²

This material has been given in detail in order to show that Hoadly was fairly explicit in his "Answer to the Representation" as to where he stood on the question of church communion. Consequently, Perry's judgment that it represented an attempt "to recede under the shelter of verbal pretexts from the plain and obvious sense of what he had written" seems to have resulted from his own disappointment in finding that Hoadly in no sense believed the "dangerous doctrines" which had been attributed to him after the publication of his sermon.³ Hunt says, "It was not at all difficult to see what Hoadly intended."⁴ It is evident in the "Answer" that Hoadly had not attacked the whole fabric of the visible

1 Hoadly, "An Answer to the Representation," Works, II, 491.

2 Ibid., II, 498.

3 Perry, History of the Church of England, III, 302.

4 Hunt, op. cit., III, 35.

church, or denied its necessity, or undermined its proper authority. One wishes that the Anti-bangorians had not avoided in appeals to order and decency the issues he raised. Posterity would perhaps have been less confused. Order and discipline are important, said Hoadly, but there is such a thing as laying too much stress upon them. Had they been paramount to the life of a Christian, Christ would have been more explicit in his references to them.¹

The Bangorians did have a contribution to make to the doctrine of the church.

Hoadly was pleading for simplicity as against over-elaboration of authority, and was the pioneer of those who in our own day raise the cry, Back to Christ, oblivious in both cases of what has been the actual method of historic development, namely, the Christ as interpreted, to say the least, by St. Paul and St. John. Hoadly lived in pre-critical days, and must not therefore be judged too harshly by us.²

The Bangorians were trying to affirm that men must be active in their religion: confronted by issues of life, they were required to make decisions for which God held them personally accountable. This was urged against the implicit, and to a good extent explicit, belief and teaching of the Churchmen as a whole, that the ordinary Christian had only to attend worship services, and these difficult problems would be handled for him by men more capable of making the necessary choices. Such a position,

¹ Hoadly, "An Answer to the Representation," Works, II, 559f.

² Overton and Relton, op. cit., p. 16.

no doubt originally taken up in a sympathetic concern for the average man, the Bangorians felt was fundamentally wrong. It would seem that their doctrine, then, would lead them to cultivate lay participation in church life, seeing that the great problems of religion and the fellowship of the church were not the burden of the clergy alone. They did, indeed, insist that church discipline be a function of the church as a whole, rather than the sole prerogative of the clergy,¹ and held that even clerical orders were not independent of the fellowship as a whole.² But the revival of the religious interest of the lay people had to wait several decades until a burning passion for individual souls could be joined with this intellectual appreciation of the old reformed doctrine of the priesthood of all believers.

Here then this matter must rest. The details of the controversy on these points can be checked by anyone for himself. But two ideas stand out which, notwithstanding personal animosities, would in themselves have separated Hoadly and his supporters from the general thought of the Anti-bangorians who were a majority in the Church. First, there is the conception of the Church as the Kingdom of Christ, the universal ideal to which the best church on earth was only an approximation. And second, very closely related to this is the clear appre-

1 See pp. 154, 160, supra.

2 See pp. 140-151, supra.

ciation that no earthly church, being but an approximation to the ideal, could ever quite speak with the voice of God. Not realizing how imperfect it was, the Church of England moved against Bishop Hoadly, ostensibly for saying these things.

The valid objection to Hoadly, however, for it can not be applied directly to his supporters, did not lie in the realm of idea at all, but in that of practical conduct. And it is sufficient judgment on the Church of his day that this objection, once mentioned by Dean Sherlock in an obviously bitter pamphlet published anonymously, was never taken up so as to be urged against him. Charles Norris in the Reconciler suggested that if the Bangorians were not quite so eager for preferments in the Church, their words about the use of the "engines of this world" in the Church of Christ could be taken more seriously.¹ This is an interesting reflection, for it would be difficult to find words more against the practice of letting this world creep in on Christ's Kingdom than Bishop Hoadly's.

Wherever the rewards and punishments are changed from future to present, from the world to come to the world now in possession, there the Kingdom founded by our Saviour is, in the nature of it, so far changed, that it is become, in such a degree, what he professed his Kingdom was not: that is, of this world; of the same sort with other common earthly kingdoms in which the rewards are worldly honour, posts, offices, pomp, attendance, dominion; and the punishments are prisons, fines, banishments, gallies and racks; or something less

1 Norris, The Reconciler, p. 9.

of the same sort.¹

Put against this Norman Sykes' statement, "His elevation to the bench is the gravest offence against ecclesiastical propriety of the century, for in his regard the promotion was the mere reward for political services."² One may say that this statement is overdrawn -- that the defence of the Revolution Settlement was closely tied to his liberal religious principles. But there is the record of Hoadly's absenteeism which shows that either he did not have the interest of the Church at heart, or else he tragically misjudged in which direction that interest lay.³ This much alone can be said for Hoadly: he did not change his principles to court preferment. He was consistently the latitudinarian even when it made him exceedingly unpopular.

Hoadly's writings have been labelled in more recent

1 Hoadly, "The Nature of the Kingdom," Works, II, 407.

2 Norman Sykes, op. cit., p. 362.

3 "Bishops were writing their libraries, when otherwise they might have been travelling round their dioceses. Men were pondering over abstract questions of faith and morality, who else might have been engaged in planning or carrying out plans for the more active propagation of the faith, or a more general improvement in popular morals. The defenders of Christianity were searching out evidences and battling with deistical objections, while they slackened in the fight against the more palpable assaults of the world of the flesh. Pulpits resounded with theological arguments where admonitions were more urgently needed. Above all, reason was called to decide upon questions before which man's reason stands impotent; and imagination and emotion, those great auxiliaries to all deep religious feeling, were bid to stand rebuked in her presence, as hinderers of the rational faculty, and upstart pretenders to rights which were not theirs. 'Enthusiasm' was frowned down, and no small part of the light and fire of religion fell with it." Abbey and Overton, op. cit., I, 5.

times as Erastian. So Overton and Relton say that his ecclesiastical position was purely Erastian,¹ and this comment is taken up in the Encyclopaedia Britannica article "Bangorian Controversy."² That this is a modern evaluation is evident from the fact that the committee of the Lower House charged him with denying the supremacy of the king and the authority of the legislature in ecclesiastical matters.³ Although it is a true statement to a certain degree, it is misleading when charged against Hoadly alone and then applied as such to an interpretation of the Bangorian Controversy. The truth is that it would be exceptionally difficult to find a writer in that controversy who was not an Erastian. The original Erastian position was that in a Christian country (and this at the time there was but one Christian church, it must be remembered), since two autonomous authorities could not be tolerated, the church could not have an independent power of repression. For the church to claim secular power would be to rob Caesar of his due. Therefore, although the church could warn and censure its members, any punitive action had to be performed by the magistrate. But of course he, being a Christian, would place his power at the disposal of the church.⁴

1 Overton and Relton, op. cit., p. 15.

2 14th ed., III, 32.

3 The Report of the Committee, pp. 3f.

4 John Young Evans, "Erastianism," Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, V, 360f.

If this be the understanding of Erastianism, then it can at once be seen, by comparing the statements on establishment, that the Anti-bangorians were the most truly Erastian, since they accepted these propositions fully.¹ The Bangorians, on the other hand, while agreeing that the church could not have secular power, denied that the secular power of the government could be used to enforce spiritual censures of the church. The magistrate could use his power only for the good of the society as such: he could punish the thief as an anti-social menace, but not as a sinner; he could not punish a heretic unless public disturbances had resulted from the heresy.² True religion, for them, was a matter of the heart which external force could not reach effectively.

But since the days of Erastus, Erastianism had come to mean something else in England: that is, the dominion of the government over the church. Although the English kings had always claimed authority over the church in opposition to the Papal claims, Erastianism entered a new phase when King Henry VIII was made supreme head of the church on earth, in England.³ The Independents lodged this power of supremacy in the whole government rather than in the person of the king,⁴ and at the time of the Bangorian Controversy it rested partly with the

1 See pp. 131-137, supra.

2 See pp. 165-169, supra.

3 Evans, op. cit., pp. 364-365.

4 Hutton, The English Church, p. 128.

king, partly with Parliament. The Act of Uniformity was passed by Parliament, not by Convocation, and the Toleration Bill was a governmental, not a church measure. Hoadly seems to have gone along with this situation. But the "Preservative", the writing which most justifies the charge of Erastianism, discloses a slightly different position. The clergy, he admits, hold their offices by government sanction as well as by ecclesiastical ordination, but he questions whether this is right.¹ There is no question of the right of the government to interfere in those cases where actions of clergy lead to civil disorder, for such are civil rather than ecclesiastical concerns. And the Nonjurors, against whom the "Preservative" was directed, and who denied the right of the Revolution government to deprive clergy, still believed in the dominion of the crown over the Church, as Hicke's journey to France for nominations from James II for the bishopric demonstrates. For these reasons, although it is true that Hoadly was Erastian, to say this and no more would misrepresent the controversy on the important matter of the relation of church to state. For the Bangorians, it must be remembered, alone argued against the principle of establishment, although they acquiesced in its practical manifestation.

Perhaps the finest part of the Bangorian Controversy was the argument opening the possibilities of the

1 Hoadly, "A Preservative," Works, I, 570.

existence of the Church Catholic. If the Bangorians never quite convinced their opponents, at least they made known to their world the belief that the true Church embraced differing parties, forms of government, and emphases, but united all Christians under one Lord. "If, instead of endeavouring to impose upon, unchristen, curse, and damn each other, we studied union and reconciliation by Christian methods, and owned each other as Christian brethren," wrote John Jackson,

the consequences we might justly hope for would be to see a speedy end of our animosities and divisions, abundance of peace and mutual forbearance. And if the different measure of light and spiritual understanding, which God hath given, would not suffer us wholly to unite in one visible, constant communion of the church militant on earth; yet reciprocal love and charity, and the same Christian affections, one towards another, would certainly unite us by the bond of the same Spirit from whom these graces flow, in the same invisible communion and fellowship of the saints, and Christ the Head of the Church Triumphant in heaven.¹

But in spite of this broader vision and intellectual activity, the church profitted little from the activity of the controversy. "Religion, whether in the Established Church or out of it, never made less progress than after the cessation of the Bangorian and Salters Hill disputes. Breadth of thought and charity of sentiment increased, but religious activity did not."²

There are two observations drawn from the controversy which are valid for our time. The first concerns

1 Jackson, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

2 Herbert S. Skeats, *History of the Free Churches of England*, 2nd ed. (London: Arthur Miall, 1869), p. 313.

recent efforts towards church union. It is well to consider again that the real unity within the Church Catholic is the one Lord rather than one government. Unless the efforts to realize this unity are based on a mutual respect for varying traditions and are unanimous in the regard paid to the right to dissent, they must fail. In other words, if nothing has been learned from the Church of England's efforts to make itself more and more homogeneous, then the history of the dissenting movements must be repeated. Dissent is bound to come when realities of faith must be spiritually apprehended, and if freedom is not allowed within the church, then dissent will break its way out of the church. It was tragedy for the Church of England to lose men like Bunyan and Fox from its fellowship.

Perhaps in our time the warning would seem to be better directed against too great a comprehensiveness, lest the church be conceived as a vague fellowship of well-wishers. Yet Bishop Hoadly's admonition to compare our demands for order and decency with Christ's holy will is still timely. We perpetually face the question as to whether any man can better interpret a revelation of God than that man to whom God has chosen to reveal himself, "for there are many gifts but one Spirit." It has been noted that eighteenth-century theology was particularly deficient in its doctrine of the Spirit. Had this deficiency not existed, perhaps there could have been greater trust that the Spirit would not lead

devoted men in too diverse paths. The experience of the Society of Friends should be most valuable in this consideration.

The second observation comes from the relation of the controversy to the life of the church as a whole.

The contrast between this literary fury and the aphasia and apathy of the English Church as regards its spiritual duties is striking. The general contempt for the persons and morals of the clergy, found in contemporary literature, is justified by the numerous charges of the bishops, pathetic in their tone of querulous acquiescence and despair. The neglect of parochial work, the spiritual stagnation, nepotism, absenteeism, pluralism, are facts beyond dispute. But when leaders such as Butler were content to combine a bishopric with a deanery and a clerkship of the closet, or (as Secker) a bishopric with a deanery, it is not surprising that the starved and imperfectly educated parochial clergy did well if they reached the standard of Parson Adams.¹

Although the church's intellectual life must be sound, that intellectual life can never substitute for the life of the church as a whole in Christian training and service. The success of the work of the Wesleys and their co-labourers in moulding the religious character of England when intellectualism made little mark upon the life of that day makes its own point. The lesson is that discussions about the church apart from a concern for the individuals who constitute it is dangerously misleading. So must there be constant interaction between thought and its application, or thought can become only

¹ Charles Robertson, England under the Hanoverians, 11th ed. (London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1934), p. 207.

mental exercise, and action only response to the demands of expediency.

"As the Church of Christ is the Kingdom of Christ, he himself is King." Those words contain the real challenge of the Bangorian Controversy, for it is the consideration of the divine calling of the Church that ennobles its purpose, inspires its people, and humbles its leaders.

APPENDIX A

THE NICHOLSON DISPUTE

In his second letter to the Bishop of Bangor, Dr. Snape questioned the statement Hoadly had made in his reply to the first letter, that he had consulted no one in the preparation of his sermon, but had preached only what he found in the New Testament.

I pray, recollect yourself, and put these plain questions home to your conscience: whether your absolutely's and properly's, and such like evasive words, were not omitted in your sermon as it was originally composed; whether you did not, before it was preached, shew it to a certain person without such limitations; and whether you were not with difficulty prevailed upon by him to insert them by way of caution. What answer you will make to yourself on these heads must be left to God and your own conscience; but if you think fit to answer the world in the negative, I engage that a person of unquestionable veracity, of as high and sacred a station as your Lordship, will charge himself with the proof of the affirmative.¹

Hoadly published an answer to this charge on June 28 in the Courant.

I did not, before it was preached, show it to any person in the world, either with or without such limitations; and consequently, I could not possibly be persuaded by any person to insert those words.²

He called upon Snape to produce the witness.

The witness turned out to be William Nicholson, the Bishop of Carlisle, who subsequently complained of Bishop Hoadly's misleading the controversy to personal

1 Snape, A Second Letter, pp. 40f.

2 William Nicholson, A Collection of Papers Scattered Lately about the Town, 2nd ed. (London: B. Barker and C. King, 1717), pp. 5f.

issues!¹ The common gossip character of the whole incident is evident from Snape's advertisement in response to Hoadly's challenge:

I hereby declare, that I first received that account from a worthy divine² who assured me, he heard the Right Reverend, the Lord Bishop of Carlisle declare, that he had spoken with the person who advised my Lord of Bangor, upon reading his sermon, to insert such words as absolutely, etc.³

On this basis, Snape secured the Bishop's permission to publish that charge. Since it was made, however, Nicholson said he meant it only for before the sermon was published, not before it was preached.⁴

On June 29 in the Evening Post, Hoadly called on Nicholson to produce his witness.⁵ Nicholson ridiculed Hoadly's denial of the charge,⁶ and finally named Dr. Kennet, Dean of Peterborough. Only, July 3, the Bishop of Carlisle received a letter from Kennet denying the whole business. To this Nicholson replied that it was merely the word of one man against another.⁷ In a second letter, Kennet blamed Nicholson's poor memory in charging the story to him.⁸ He had seen Nicholson only when other witnesses were present who could have substantiated the charge had it been true.

1 Nicholson, op. cit., p. 8.

2 Dr. Hutchinson.

3 Nicholson, op. cit., pp. 9f.

4 Ibid., pp. 10f, 13f.

5 Ibid., p. 12.

6 Ibid., pp. 14f.

7 Ibid., pp. 15-20, passim.

8 Ibid., pp. 33f.

Many charges and counter-charges appeared in the papers by people who were supposed to have witnessed some part of the action. On July 10, Kennet's statement was published in London:

I do hereby declare and avow, in the most serious and solemn manner, that the Lord Bishop of Bangor never did ask or receive any advice of mine in the preaching or publishing that sermon, nor did I ever read or hear any part of it, till the whole was printed and published to the world. And I further declare and protest, that (God so now help me, and hereafter judge me) I never did say or suggest any such thing to any Right Reverend Prelate, or to any man alive.¹

In his reply to La Pillonniere's answer to his second charge in the same letter (see Appendix B), Snape continued the story by saying that some day the mysterious affair would be cleared up. Kennet again defended himself, and said the only way the matter could be cleared up would be for both Snape and Nicholson to admit they were wrong.² Lathbury's judgment is that Nicholson was altogether mistaken. He further reports: "So strongly did Kennet feel on the subject, that he inserted a clause in his will, that he neither 'said nor thought' any such thing."³

The charge was dropped from the third edition of Snape's letter, but no apology was ever made to Hoadly.

1 "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 Public Prints," Hoadly, Works, II, 443.

2 White Kennet, Dr. Snape Instructed in Some Matters especially relating to Convocations and Converts from Popery (London: James Knapton and Timothy Childe, 1718), p. 12.

3 Lathbury, History of the Convocation, p. 459.

APPENDIX B

THE LA PILLONNIERE DISPUTE

Besides charging in his second letter that Hoadly's sermon had been read by a person who advised the insertion of the limiting words, Dr. Snape also accused the Bishop of harbouring a Jesuit.

Before you are so free then, in casting reproaches on others as popishly affected; you would do well to put away the Jesuit whom you entertain in your family, your intimate companion and confidant. A Jesuit he certainly was, and your Lordship is not ignorant of it; and if he hath given you any satisfaction that he hath renounced the Romish errors, he hath given the world none. His putting on the air of a free-thinker, is so far from being a proof of his conversion, that it is to me a sure evidence of the contrary; and gives me the same impression as if I saw him officiating at high mass. I must needs say, your evasive and equivocal way of writing savours very strongly of such communication: and whether the same person may not have helped you to a mental reservation to justify a solemn appeal to God, etc. your Lordship best knows.¹

Denials of this charge were immediately taken up by Hoadly, who called upon Snape to prove his assertion and justify his attacking an innocent person merely because he lived with the Bishop, Snape's opponent, and by La Pillonniere himself who sought to prove his own innocence.

If Snape were to justify his charge, he would have to show: (1) that La Pillonniere was a Jesuit; (2) that he was also a free-thinker, most likely in the worst sense of the term, since it was used to cast odium on the Bishop; (3) that La Pillonniere was Hoadly's intimate companion and confidant; and (4) that La Pillonniere

1 Snape, A Second Letter, pp. 66f.

had helped him to an evasive style of writing.¹ Snape was called upon to produce witnesses.

La Pillonniere, in his defence, freely admits that he was a Jesuit in France. He tells his life story, how he began to discover in his studies the differences between church dogma and the writings of the Fathers. The tension resulting from his discoveries grew to such a degree that he asked for a withdrawal from the order, but subsequently was suspended on the worst of terms.² He still remained a Papist, however, but in defending the position of his church against Protestants, he came to see that his arguments based on the authority of the church would also justify a Moslem remaining a Moslem; in fact, that the whole pretence of infallibility was only a myth.³ His father was eager, of course, to have him return to the one true church, and consequently made arrangements for his confinement in the Bishop of le Man's seminary for his eventual reclamation. Learning of this plan, he fled to Flanders and the Hague where he met Protestant ministers and laymen and eventually joined with the Arminian Church there. The mutual damning and persecuting among the various Protestant groups only made him denounce the more all superstition and persecution.⁴

1 Hoadly, "The Preface to 'An Answer to the Reverend Dr. Snape's Accusation' by Francis de La Pillonniere," Works, II, 590f.

2 Francis de La Pillonniere, An Answer to the Reverend Dr. Snape's Accusation (London: James Knapton and Timothy Childe, 1717), p. 21.

3 Ibid., p. 32.

4 Ibid., p. 46.

No one there or in France ever doubted his sincerity in leaving the Church of Rome.

When he came to England, the Archbishop suspected him, had him investigated, and thereafter was satisfied of his conversion. He taught school for Mr. Mills at Croydon, and left there voluntarily to join the Bishop's family as tutor for the children.¹ His action in trying to reclaim Popish recusants showed his Protestant beliefs. The refugee French Protestants, however, who were Calvinists, would have nothing to do with him because of his connection with the Arminians in Holland.

The last part of this defence is given over to a discussion of the right of private judgment. Those who deny infallibility to themselves cannot consistently persecute others. That an entire church would ever judge anything it enjoined on its members as repugnant to God's Word is nonsense. Therefore the right of judgment must lie with individuals if the church is to have any critique at all. And if unity is to be "most strictly pressed" as Snape argues, then the Papist has the best of the argument. As for vicegerents commissioned by Christ, on that High Church claim, how can the Pope's authority be invalidated? The unity necessary to the church is that of hearts and hopes. External peace in the church is always subject to disturbance by true reformers.² At the close is La Pillonniere's solemn renunciation of

1 La Pillonniere, An Answer, p. 50.

2 Ibid., pp. 53-67.

Popery, followed by a collection of letters relative to his leaving the Jesuits.

Whatever were the merits of the original cause which Snape sought to defend, his action in these two personal disputes which he himself originated presents him in the worst light possible. He made his first charge on Hoadly without knowing even the name of the man who was to bear witness for it. This second charge was made on the basis of a passing word in a casual conversation. In neither case had Snape investigated the evidence before making his charges public. He immediately followed La Pillonniere's defence with a "vindication" in which he makes further charges: (1) La Pillonniere's solemn renunciation of the errors of Popery did not conform to the form prescribed by a law then before Convocation, hence it meant nothing; (2) La Pillonniere wore the gown of the Church of England in spite of the Archbishop's denying him that privilege; (3) he has joined with no Protestant communion; (4) he intimates that all churches are equally corrupt because they have all been guilty of persecution; (5) Hoadly has done whatever was within his power to prevent the French Protestants from testifying against La Pillonniere; (6) all La Pillonniere's foreign testimony is from Jesuits who will stoop to anything and against whom he has not spoken one word; (7) as to his action at Croydon, there he argued against the Church of England and scripture, tried to unsettle the children, spoke against the

Articles, detested going to church and read some book when he did go, and never partook of the sacrament.¹ These charges are based upon the testimony of Mr. Mills, Mr. Rouire, his present French tutor who had said he would deny everything if quoted, and some unnamed boys of the school. Snape asserts that the very fact that La Pillonniere could use his conception of church authority to justify the Papists proves the supposed convert is still a Jesuit.² Rather than defend his own principles, Snape defends the Church of England, as though that had been the object of attack of both Hoadly and La Pillonniere. The Vindication closes with a sham letter to the French Jesuits signed Father de La Pillonniere, in which he is purported to be advocating new methods of conquering Britain: to convince men that private judgment is superior to the authority of the church and consequently again to bring about the confusion of Babel.

The same Vindication was used to make slurs of Hoadly's sermon. (1) Hoadly's conception of loving God as being equivalent to obeying his commandments Snape equates with the Jesuit teaching that a man is in no danger of hell-fire so long as he does not hate God.³ (2) The sermon teaching about prayer as not requiring dis-

1 Snape, A Vindication of a Passage in Dr. Snape's Second Letter to the Lord Bishop of Bangor relating to Mr. Pillonniere (London: J. Bowyer, 1717), pp. 32-41.

2 Ibid., p. 55.

3 Ibid., p. 26.

turbed emotions but rather a "calm and undisturbed address to God" is made the same as praying without attention and without reverence, even entertaining wicked thoughts.¹

Besides these personal affronts, Snape called on the Dissenters, and Mr. Peirce in particular, to defend Calvin from La Pillonniere's charge of Protestant persecution.² He also denied that the case of the Dissenters and the Church of England was anything like the original separation from Rome, since the Dissenters never pretended that the terms of communion of the Church of England were sinful.³ Peirce answered this directly, contending that the terms of communion are sinful and are sinfully imposed, and that the Church of England was guilty of persecution so long as it held the power. Snape is reminded that Calvin was never held to be infallible by the Dissenters, and that they can admit his faults as well as appreciate his incomparable leadership in the Reformation. The great difference of the Dissenters from Calvin lies in the fact that the former do not countenance religious persecution.⁴

Several anonymous pamphlets were issued on both sides of the question. One, since attributed to White

1 Snape, A Vindication, p. 70.

2 Ibid., p. 50.

3 Ibid., p. 53.

4 Peirce, The Dissenters Reasons for not Writing in behalf of Persecution. Designed for the Satisfaction of Dr. Snape, 2nd ed. (London: John Clark, 1718), pp. 28-31.

Kennet, sought to defend La Pillonniere from several charges. (1) La Pillonniere could hardly be expected to give his renunciation of Popery in a form not yet approved by Convocation. Much less did the 1603 Canons regarding backsliding pertain to his case.¹ (2) The letter of the Bishop of London to which Snape alludes for proof of his charge that La Pillonniere wore the gown without permission says nothing of the sort, but only that the Bishop did not recall what evidence La Pillonniere had submitted, nor whether or not he had granted permission for wearing the gown.² Furthermore, it is more akin to Jesuit intrigue to defame all those who have left that order than to become active Protestants.³

By this time in the dispute, several interesting facts had come to light. One was that when Snape first charged La Pillonniere with being a Jesuit, he did not even know the man, but picked up the charge from what a woman had said in a casual conversation. This was Mrs. Mills. When Hoadly learned of it, he wrote Mr. Mills, asking if he ~~were~~ going to be Snape's second. This man in a letter to the Bishop denied it, said he had made no statement, did not want to become involved personally, and if finally pushed would enter on the side of truth. This was, however, after he had privately agreed to

1 Kennet, Dr. Snape Instructed, pp. 25ff.

2 Ibid., p. 27.

3 Ibid., pp. 3ff.

stand by Snape. Mr. Dubourdieu, a refugee French clergyman quoted by Snape, sent a letter to Hoadly through the hands of another bishop, saying that Snape had not only published a private conversation without leave, but had been to his house searching for a personal letter to him from Hoadly.¹

La Pillonniere brought out a direct answer to Snape's charges. (1) He could not be expected to use a form for his renunciation which had not been approved, especially since not one of the clergy, including the Bishop of London and the late Archbishop, ever asked for it.² (2) He had actually worn the gown at his first interview with the Bishop of London, and that Prelate had entered no objections.³ (3) Since he came to England, he has communicated with the Church of England and with no other.⁴ As for his not casting more aspersions on the Jesuits in his book, he was not then attacking the Jesuits, but defending himself. He did, however, represent the contemptibility of their learning, although as in any group, sincere men are there to be found.⁵

But the situation at Croydon is not so simple to answer. When La Pillonniere first went there, he found

1 Hoadly, "Preface to 'A Reply to Dr. Snape's Vindication' by Francis de La Pillonniere," Works, II, 609.

2 La Pillonniere, A Reply to Dr. Snape's Vindication of a Passage in his Second Letter to the Bishop of Bangor (London: James Knapton and Timothy Childe, 1718), p. 14.

3 Ibid., p. 16.

4 Ibid., p. 15.

5 Ibid., pp. 21f.

a hot-bed of Jacobitism with the scholars' mocking King George at the encouragement of Mr. Mills, an arbitrary and unjust master who boasted that he had "excommunicated" three hundred people from his church.¹ The late Archbishop of Canterbury, hearing rumours of his affection to Popery (a rather natural inference, at that time, from involvement in the Jacobite cause), wrote Mills asking if it were true that he had employed a Jesuit. Mills did not mention this to La Pillonniere (who did not conceal the fact that he had been a Jesuit), but wrote the Archbishop that he was a "sober, inoffensive man."² The Archbishop subsequently ordered an investigation of La Pillonniere, which was conducted by a Mr. Warren. This man's testimony, completely clearing La Pillonniere, can be found in the collection of certificates at the close of his first defence, and again in the third. *

In the school, La Pillonniere had spoken only against the extreme positions propounded by the Nonjurors. He had not ridiculed the Articles, but had only maintained to Mills that they were not meant to be taught to children, but that the catechism had been prepared for this purpose.³ As to attending church, La Pillonniere objected only to minding the boys on Sunday, a duty not in his original agreement of employment. He had not only

1 La Pillonniere, A Reply, pp. 25f.

2 Ibid., p. 19.

3 Ibid., p. 34.

read no other book during the service, but had shared a folio prayer book with Mr. Mills, depending on him to find the proper place because of his own difficulty with English.¹ He had never received the sacrament at Croydon, because he was in London during that time of the year when it was observed.²

In addition, it appears that Mills' character was not above reproach. He had been deceitful in the first financial agreements with La Pillonniere.³ His failure to pay his debt to Mr. De Cize, the former French master, made that man complain to the Archbishop.⁴ He sold, to his own profit, trees which were cut for timbers to repair the school buildings.⁵ He so beat one boy that the mother had to remove her son from the school.⁶ He tried to trick Mr. Rouire, his present French master, into testifying against Mr. La Pillonniere, and then with Snape charged that Rouire had been "bought off" when the scheme failed.⁷

All this met an inevitable reply from both Snape and Mills. Snape stormed that all would come to light "when some influences and dependencies shall cease, some mouths that are padlocked be set at liberty, and when time, the great discoverer of truth, shall have

1 La Pillonniere, A Reply, pp. 38f.

2 Ibid., p. 39.

3 Ibid., pp. 25f.

4 Ibid., p. 54.

5 La Pillonniere, A Third Defence (London: James Knapton and Timothy Childe, 1718), pp. 3ff.

6 La Pillonniere, A Reply, pp. 25f.

7 Ibid., pp. 45ff.

made open the whole scene of management."¹ That Dubourdieu's letter came to Hoadly through the hands of another prelate proves it is no better than hearsay, he said. "I cannot believe him [Dubourdieu] so weak a wretch as to do such dirty work for nothing."² Hoadly had suppressed Dubourdieu's promised book which would have explained the whole situation.³

Mills' own defence is chiefly a complaint about Hoadly's great power and his own weakness.⁴ The testimonies La Pillonniere had cited against him are only from a "few ill-natured Dissenters."⁵ He charges that La Pillonniere is still a Jesuit,⁶ although he was kept in Mills' employ until he voluntarily left for the Bishop's household. All this is accompanied with testimonies to the effect that Mills paid his grocer promptly, taught his boys honesty, was a mild man who loved to play musical instruments. The more relevant of these testimonies, however, are signed by crosses and not names.

About this time, Dubourdieu's supposedly suppressed book was published. It is mostly an answer to the

1 Snape, A Letter from Dr. Snape to the Lord Bishop of Bangor (preface to Mills, A Full Answer to Mr. Pillonniere's Reply), p. 3.

2 Ibid., p. 17.

3 Ibid., pp. 23ff.

4 H. Mills, A Full Answer to Mr. Pillonniere's Reply to Dr. Snape and to the Bishop of Bangor's Preface so far as it relates to Mr. Mills (London: J. Bowyer, 1718), pp. 62ff.

5 Ibid., p. 6.

6 Ibid., p. 26.

charge that the funds set aside by Parliament for the relief of French Protestant refugees had been wrongly administered. But although Hoadly is defended, La Pillonniere is severely censured for writing against the refugees, and for propounding heretical doctrines, chiefly Arminianism, which is equated with Popery.¹

In answer to these, La Pillonniere published a third defence, with a preface by Hoadly, summing up the whole situation from the beginning, showing how freely charges had been made without any proof to substantiate them.² La Pillonniere points out that Mills simply ignored the refutation of his earlier charges and still has failed to support them. By tracing letter dates, and by checking testimony against sworn statements, he shows that Mr. Rouire's alleged facts now against La Pillonniere are false.³ (Rouire had changed sides when La Pillonniere refused to pay him for his testimony.) Mr. Dubourdieu's evidence against La Pillonniere came from Mr. Lyon who had personally approved all his works before their publication.⁴ He did not attack the whole body of refugees: only those who insisted on their own infallibility in practice.⁵

1 John-Armand Dubourdieu, An Appeal to the English Nation (London: J. Roberts, 1718), see pp. 191-216.

2 Hoadly, "Short Remarks upon the Reverend Dr. Snape's Letter prefix'd to Mr. Mills' Book," (preface to La Pillonniere's Third Defence), Works, II, 625-632.

3 La Pillonniere, Third Defence, pp. 36ff.

4 Ibid., p. 99.

5 Ibid., p. 107.

It is difficult to discover when this phase of the controversy ended. Bishop Fleetwood anonymously published two satirical works purporting to be defences of Snape's position.¹ Nicholas Amhurst wrote a piece of doggerel poetry in the same vein.² Bishop Hoadly certainly wrote no more, since by this time his own justification and that of La Pillonniere from the charge of being a Jesuit was apparent.

In the third edition of his second letter to the Bishop of Bangor, Snape dropped the charge that Hoadly had been helped in his equivocal way of writing by the Jesuit living in his house, but he never retracted the charge that La Pillonniere had not renounced Popery, in spite of the fact that that man, in his reply to Dr. Snape's Vindication, had used the words and form directed by Snape for a thorough-going renunciation, and that he was a regular communicant of the Church of England. But as a result of the notoriety issuing from involvement in the Bangorian Controversy, La Pillonniere himself was engaged in another controversy with the French clergy in England, which saw pamphlet after pamphlet in the tedious cycle of "charge, defence, and vindication."

1 William Fleetwood, A Letter to the Reverend Dr. Snape; wherein the Authority of the Christian Priesthood is Maintained, 3rd ed. (London: J. Roberts, 1718); and The Curate of Wilts, His Second Letter to the Reverend Dr. Snape, 3rd ed. (London: J. Roberts, 1719).

2 Nicholas Amhurst, A Congratulatory Epistle from His Holiness the Pope, to the Reverend Dr. Snape (London: E. Curll, 1718).

APPENDIX C

DEAN SHERLOCK'S SIDE DISPUTE WITH BISHOP HOADLY
OVER HIS REFERENCE TO THE EXAMPLE OF CHRIST

At the close of his defence of the committee's report, Sherlock charged that Hoadly would let nothing stand in the way of his argument, not even the example of Christ. Lifting a sentence from Hoadly's "Answer to Dr. Atterbury," "The example of our Lord is much more peculiarly fit to be urged to slaves than to subjects,"¹ he remarked: "a doctrine that will make the ears of a Christian to tingle; and ought to make him read with caution a writer so fond of his own notions as to take such steps to defend them."²

This, Hoadly answered, was a gross misrepresentation of his thought.

He has, as he owns, been searching into a former long controversy of mine upon quite another subject; and after all his searches, he has found out a sentence which he has a mind should be a mark of infamy upon me. And this sentence he would not trust to the reader accompanied with the occasion or grounds of it, or the interpretation of it expressed and explained in the whole paragraph around it. Nay, he would not venture to trust the commonest reader with the whole sentence, separated from the rest of the paragraph, but leaves out two parts of this little sentence itself, purposely and closely annexed to the words he quotes, in order to prevent all misinterpretations.³

1 In the original edition, p. 65; but found in Hoadly, Works, II, 317.

2 Sherlock, A Vindication, p. 116.

3 Hoadly, "An Answer to a Calumny cast upon the Bishop of Bangor by the Reverend Dr. Sherlock, Dean of Chichester," Works, II, 633f.

The situation to which it originally applied was this. Atterbury had urged St. Peter's exhortation to suffer like Christ as a fitting example for subjects mistreated by their government; in other words, as a support for the doctrines of passive obedience and non-resistance. Hoadly, on the other hand, said it applied rather to slaves who had no recourse to any counter-action but revolt. Subjects of a nation are not slaves of the government. Nor were Christians ever meant to be so, as the example of St. Paul's claiming his rights as a Roman citizen shows. Christ, in his example of humility, acted the part of a slave, but this example was never meant to discourage all efforts to obtain justice in a Christian state.¹ The example of suffering wrongfully

is not to be so urged to civil subjects, considered as subjects, invested with civil rights and privileges, so to make them in the state of slaves, or to submit to the greatest of evils voluntarily because our blessed Lord, agreeably to his own design, did so.²

At the close the Bishop speaks directly to Sherlock:

It is not a difference in doctrine, or any particular opinion, either seriously expressed, or accidentally mentioned, in our disputes, but such a cruel behaviour of Christians and divines which is most likely to make the ears, not only of a Christian, but of every honest heathen who hears of it, to tingle.³

In the three volume edition of Hoadly's Works, following the "Answer to a Calumny" there was printed, at the Bishop's request, a letter from Bishop Fleetwood

1 Hoadly, "An Answer to a Calumny," Works, II, 635-638.

2 Ibid., II, 638.

3 Ibid., II, 640.

of Ely, first published in the Flying Post January 18, 1719.¹ It appeared unsolicited, before Hoadly's "Answer," and points out Sherlock's obvious misrepresentation. The purpose of that, said Fleetwood, was not argument, but to cast ill-will on the Bishop of Bangor.

Dean Sherlock's reply was not an apology, but a "vindication" of Christ's example. He quoted, he declares, Hoadly's complete proposition. The Bishop, he asserts, says the example of Christ is fit only for slaves, whereas it is "equally fit for kings, subjects, and slaves, when they suffer wrongfully."² Now that statement is a sheer lie, for Hoadly said he did not deny "that the example of Christ is proper to be urged to all Christians suffering wrongfully, as well as to slaves."³ Sherlock's own character needed more vindication than Christ's example. However that may be, the Dean notes with great delight that Christ was not bought and sold at auction on a slave market. The example of humility is not to be urged because Christ suffered as a slave, but because he was Lord and Master.⁴ The question is not how St. Peter urged the example (as Fleetwood understood it), but rather the nature of

1 Hoadly, Works, II, 640-642.

2 Sherlock, The Condition and Example of our Blessed Saviour Vindicated: in Answer to the Bishop of Bangor's Charge of Calumny against the Dean of Chester (London: J. Pemberton, 1718), p. 14.

3 Hoadly, "Answer to Dr. Atterbury," Works, II, 320.

4 Sherlock, The Condition and Example, p. 32.

Christ's example itself.¹ He raised the issue to show how in fighting a wrong, Hoadly will run into an extreme position.² As to answering the original complaints against him, the Dean would first have the Bishop answer Mr. Law.³

The Bishop of Bangor's answer soon followed. He finds it interesting that Sherlock objects to his translating *οἰκέτης* as slave, when Atterbury, whom the Dean has not seen fit to criticize, gave it the same meaning.⁴ But Sherlock has confused the whole issue: St. Peter applies Christ's example to slaves because he is addressing slaves; he does not say it is fit only for them.⁵ Christ's example is for those who are suffering as Christians, not as civil subjects considered as such.⁶ Although Christ was neither bought nor sold, his humiliation is well described as that of a slave. "I must answer," he writes,

that I never could once imagine in my heart, much less affirm in words, that one not a slave might not suffer in the same manner with our blessed Lord; because I affirmed him himself, who thus suffered, not to have been a slave: that I never once thought that he either was a slave or was taken for a slave, and therefore could never argue from his trial, or from anything else, a matter which I never admitted into my thoughts: that I

1 Sherlock, The Condition and Example, pp. 53f.

2 Ibid., pp. 55f.

3 Ibid., p. 62.

4 Hoadly, "An Answer to a Late Book, written by the Reverend Dr. Sherlock, Dean of Chichester, intituled, The Condition and Example of our Blessed Saviour Vindicated, etc.," Works, II, 652.

5 Ibid., II, 653.

6 Ibid., II, 659.

never affirmed or imagined that Christ's business at his trial was to represent a slave; or that he did not pretend to be a king; or, which is all along this place laid upon me, that every part of his behaviour bore resemblance in every respect to the condition of a slave: and lastly, that I never once said, or imagined, that his trial was all very like the trial of a slave. It is a hard case to be thus represented in a book offered to the world as a vindication of our blessed Lord's condition and example when I never once, I say never once, thus spoke either of his condition, or his example.¹

Sherlock has yet to prove that his extremes are wrong.²

Early in the original controversy Sherlock anonymously published an insolent abuse of Hoadly. By twisting words of the Bishop's writings he makes Hoadly appear as a libler of Convocation, a denouncer of the clergy as lacking both "conscience and common sense," a would-be scholar whose acquaintance with the Church Fathers was as slight as his knowledge of his own diocese.³ An anonymous reply raised the question of Sherlock's 1712 sermon which Sykes later exploited.⁴ Sykes considered the Dean's conduct and reached the conclusion that he was a flighty individual. When Hoadly pointed out Sherlock's self-contradictions, the Dean went off to a defence of the Corporation and Test Acts. When he was called upon to explain their present neces-

1 Hoadly, "An Answer to a Late Book," Works, II 666.

2 Ibid., II, 691.

3 Sherlock, Remarks upon the Lord Bishop of Bangor's Treatment of the Clergy and Convocation (London: E. Smith, 1717), pp. 7, 18f, 23, 27f.

4 Anon., A Reply to the Remarks upon the Lord Bishop of Bangor's Treatment of the Clergy and Convocation. Said to be written by Dr. Sherlock (London: S. Baker, 1717), pp. 35ff.

sity, he went off to a vindication of our Saviour.¹ But the Dean's scholarship, Sykes writes, is extremely poor as his attempts to make *δουλος* mean something else than slave indicate.² As for Hoadly's exaggerations, they are mostly products of Sherlock's imagination and resourceful ability to misquote.³

Sherlock published a reply to Hoadly in which he insists that if Christ is to be an example to slaves, he must be a slave himself.⁴ With equal logic, he declares that if Hoadly owns that Christ's condition was only figuratively that of a slave, then he must hold that the Incarnation was only figurative.⁵ Christ's example is held up to slaves, not as slaves, but because they suffered wrongfully. Paul pled his rights only to avoid unnecessary suffering, not because he thought it right to resist civil authorities.⁶ But Sherlock never got to the real question: whether civil subjects must submit to what is not only in their power, but in their right to oppose, as against a slave who has no rights.

The last voice in this side dispute was that of Sykes who pointed out that Sherlock had never answered to the charge of calumny, that he had never retracted

1 Sykes, The Dean of Chichester's Conduct Considered (London: James Knapton and Timothy Childe, 1718), p. 15.

2 Ibid., pp. 26ff.

3 Ibid., pp. 35ff.

4 Sherlock, The Lord Bishop of Bangor's Defence of his Assertion Considered (London: J. Pemberton, 1718), pp. 1-10.

5 Ibid., p. 27.

6 Ibid., pp. 23-25.

his libel that Hoadly would allow nothing, not even the example of Christ, to stand in his way in an argument.¹ Sykes enumerates Sherlock's misquotations, not only of his opponents in controversy, but even of the Greek lexicons whose support he needed.² Sherlock has not cleared himself from agreement with the Bishop of Bangor in his 1712 sermon, he has never answered Sykes' replies, he has not answered what Hoadly has said about the extremes charged to him, he is still charged with the calumny of saying that Hoadly "wrote down" the religion of oaths, he has not acknowledged the abuses proved against him, and he has refused to heed what Hoadly has said in his last book.³

This side dispute has been discussed, not for the light it might have but does not shed upon St. Peter's words or Christ's example, but for the glimpse it provides into the way the controversy was carried on, and into the character of one of the Churchmen who wrote against Hoadly to "defend" the faith. And it serves to show how, to avoid the heresy of wrong belief, one may become guilty of the "heresy" of unchristian conduct and action.

1 Sykes, A Fourth Letter to the Reverend Dr. Sherlock (London: James Knapton and Timothy Childé, 1718), pp. 6ff.

2 Ibid., pp. 19f, 27f, 57, 77ff.

3 Ibid., pp. 94ff.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS CONSULTED IN THE
PREPARATION OF THIS PAPER

Section 1. Original Sources.*

- Amhurst, Nicholas. A Congratulatory Epistle from His Holiness the Pope to the Reverend Dr. Snape. London: E. Curll, 1718. [under the pseudonym "Philaletthes"].
- A Letter to the Reverend Mr. Law, Council for the Committee of Convocation and the two Famous Universities, in a Cause depending between them and the Bishop of Bangor. London: J. Roberts, 1719. [Anon.]
- Anon. An Answer to a Letter to the Bishop of Bangor: Written by one Andrew Snap, D.D. London: T. Warner, 1717.
- Anon. An Answer to the five important Queries contained in Mr. Prolocutor's Postscript to his Answer to a Letter, with some fresh Queries humbly offered to the Reverend Prolocutor himself, relating to the Lord Bishop of Bangor, and the Committee. London: J. Morpew, 1718.
- Anon. A Brief Consideration of two Passages in the Bishop of Bangor's Answer to the Committee. London: J. Morpew, 1718.
- Anon. The Church and State Vindicated; and the Bishop of Bangor's Preservative Defended, against several late Answers to it. London: J. Darby, J. Harrison, A. Dodd, 1717.
- Anon. The Convocation Anatomized, being a brief Examination of the Proceedings against the Lord Bishop of Bangor's Writings by the Lower House of Convocation. London: T. Warner, 1717.
- Anon. Dr. Sherlock's Vindication of the Test Act Examined, and the False Foundations of it exposed. In Answer to so much of his book against the Bishop of Bangor as relates to Protestant Dissenters. London: S. Popping, J. Harrison, A. Dodd, 1718.

* Because of the constant intertwining of the various strands of the controversy, it has been deemed best to arrange these in alphabetical order. The works of each author have been arranged chronologically.

- Anon. An Exposition of the XXXIV Article of Religion, of the Traditions of the Church; referred to in the Report. London: J. Roberts, 1718.
- Anon. High Church Doctrine proved to be Popish and Inconsistent; or, Reflections on Mr. Trapp's Sermon. London: J. Roberts, 1717.
- Anon. A Layman's Thoughts on the Late Treatment of the Bishop of Bangor, in the Charge made against Him by Dr. Snape, and Undertaken to be proved by the Bishop of Carlile (sic). In a Letter to the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Carlile. London: R. Burleigh, 1717.
- Anon. A Letter from the Jesuits to Father de La Pillonniere, in Answer to the Letter sent to them by that Father, and published by Dr. Snape in his Vindication. London: T. Warner, 1718.
- Anon. A Letter to Andrew Snape, occasioned by the Strife that Lately Appeared among the People called Clergymen. London: T. Warner, 1717.
- Anon. A Letter to Dr. Sherlock, concerning the Wickedness and Injustice of Making any Addition to a Divine Institution, by Humane Authority, a Term of Religious Communion, and a Qualification to a Civil Employ. London: S. Baker, 1718.
- Anon. A Letter to Dr. Snape, occasioned by his Letter to the Bishop of Bangor. Wherein the Doctor is Answered and Exposed, Paragraph by Paragraph. London: J. Roberts, 1717.
- Anon. A Letter to the Scholars of Eaton (sic): Occasioned by their Master Dr. Snape's Letter to the Bishop of Bangor. London: J. Roberts, 1717.
- Anon. A Modest Enquiry into the Bishop of Bangor's Preservative against the Nonjurors. London: C. Rivington, 1717.
- Anon. The Necessity of a Divine Call or Mission in those who take upon them to Preach the Gospel of Christ. Being a Sermon on Rom. x. 15. London: W. Taylor, 1717.
- Anon. Observations on a Letter said to be written by the Lord Bishop of Bangor. London: R. Burleigh, 1717.

- Anon. A Preservative against the Bishop of Bangor's Sermon: or, the Church of England Defended, in opposition to the pernicious Doctrines and Designs lately advanc'd against her. London: J. Morphew, 1717.
- Anon. A Reply to Francis de La Pillonniere, the Bishop of Bangor's reputed Jesuit's, Answer to Dr. Snape's Accusation. With some remarks on the preface and postscript annexed thereunto, by the Rt. Rev. Pre-late. London: S. Baker, 1717.
- Anon. A Reply to the Remarks upon the Lord Bishop of Bangor's Treatment of the Clergy and Convocation. Said to be Written by Dr. Sherlock. London: S. Baker, 1717.
- Anon. A Rod for the Eaton (sic) Schoolmaster's Back: or, a Letter from a Country School-boy to Dr. Snape, occasion'd by one from him to the Bishop of Bangor. London: J. Roberts, 1717.
- Anon. A Scourge for Mr. Trapp: being an Answer to the wild Calumnies dispersed thro' his Sermon. London: T. Warner, 1717.
- Anon. Short Remarks on a Letter from the Reverend the Prolocutor of the Lower House of Convocation, &c. to a Reverend Member of the Late Committee. London: Timothy Childe, 1718.
- Anon. A True State of the Controversy between the Bishop of Bangor and the Reverend Dr. Snape. London: J. Sackfield and T. Warner, 1717.
- Anon. The Uninterrupted Succession of the Ecclesiastical Mission Asserted, and the Appeal to the Consciences and Common Sense of the Christian Laity Discussed. London: J. Morphew, 1717.
- Anon. A Vindication of the Honour and Prerogative of Christ's Church: as it is laid down by the Right Reverend, the Ld. Bishop of Bangor, in his Sermon Preached before the King, on the 31st of March last. Being an Answer to the Cavils of Dr. Snape. 2nd ed., corrected. London: T. Warner, 1717.
- Anon. A Vindication of the Reverend Dr. Snape. London: J. Morphew, 1717.
- Anon. The Vulgar Prepossessions in favour of the Bishop of Bangor, candidly and impartially consider'd. London: J. Morphew, 1718.

Balguy, John. Silvius's Examination of Certain Doctrines lately taught and defended by the Reverend Mr. Stebbing. London: J. Roberts, 1718. [Anon.]

---- Silvius's Letter to the Reverend Dr. Sherlock. London: J. Roberts, 1719. [Anon.]

Barrington, John Shute. The Layman's Letter to the Bishop of Bangor, &c. London: J. Roberts, J. Graves, A. Dodd, 1716. [Anon.]

---- 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: J. Roberts, J. Graves, A. Dodd, 1717. [Anon.]

Bennet, Thomas. The Non-Jurors Separation from the Public Assemblies (sic) of the Church of England examined and proved to be Schismatical, upon their own Principles. 2nd ed. London: W. Innys, 1716.

Bradford, Samuel. The Nature of Christian Union, and the Method of restoring it. A Sermon preached before the King, Jan. 19, 1717-18. London: J. Wyat, 1718.

Burnet, Gilbert. A Letter to the Reverend Mr. Trapp, occasion'd by his Sermon on the Real Nature of the Church or Kingdom of Christ. London: Timothy Childe, 1717.

---- An Answer to Mr. Law's Letter to the Lord Bishop of Bangor. London: Timothy Childe, 1717.

---- A Full Examination of several important Points relating to Church-Authority, the Christian Priesthood, the Positive Institutions of the Christian Religion, and Church-Communion. In Answer to the Notions and Principles contained in Mr. Law's second Letter to the Bishop of Bangor. In a second Letter to Mr. Law: with a Postscript, wherein his evasive Answers to former Objections are considered. London: Timothy Childe, 1718.

Cannon, Robert. A Vindication of the Proceedings of the Lower House of Convocation, with regard to the King's Supremacy: And some Thoughts concerning Religion; with the occasion of their being made publick (sic). And a Postscript to the Lord Bishop of Bangor. London: Jos. Fox, B. Barker, C. King, 1717.

Chubb, Thomas. Several Enquiries Concerning Justification, &c. London: James Knapton, 1718.

Cockburn, John. A Short and Impartial Review of the Lord Bishop of Bangor's Sermon . . . now after the several Defences of his Lordship. London: J. Morphew, 1718.

Collins, Charles. Howell and Hoadly; or, the Church of England Crucified between two -----. 2nd ed. London: S. Baker, 1717.

Cumming, John. The Conspiracies of Evil Designing Men against the Real Interests of Christ's Kingdom, etc., and their Disappointments. London: A. Well, 1717.

Dawson, Thomas. Suspiria Sacra: or the Church of England's Memorial: With an Admonition to Jesuits and their Patrons extracted out of the Statute Law. London: C. Rivington, 1718.

---- An Introduction to the Bishop of Bangor's intended Collection of Authorities: With a Letter from Sion-College, A.D. 1645. Recommended in a Prefatory Epistle to the Consideration of his Lordship, Mr. Pillonniere, and Mr. Toland. London: J. Bowyer, 1718. [Anon.]

Defoe, Daniel. A Friendly Rebuke to one Parson Benjamin; particularly relating to his Quarrelling with his own Church, and Vindicating the Dissenters. London: E. Moore, 1719. [Anon.]

Dubourdieu, John-Armand. An Appeal to the English Nation. London: J. Roberts, 1718.

Earbery, Mathias. The Old English Constitution Vindicated and Set in a True Light. London: n.p., 1717.

---- A Review of the Bishop of Bangor's Sermon, and his Answer to the Representation of the Lower House of Convocation. London: J. Bettenham, 1718. 2 vv.

Fleetwood, William. A Letter to the Reverend Dr. Snape; Wherein the Authority of the Christian Priesthood is maintained; the uninterrupted Succession of Bishops from the Apostle's Days is lineally deduced, and the Cavils of Hereticks (sic) and Fanaticks (sic) are answered. 3rd ed. London: J. Roberts, 1718. [Anon.]

- The Curate of Wilts. His Second Letter to the Reverend Dr. Snape -- Wherein the divine Authority of our Church Establishment, and the Necessity of continuing Penalties on all Dissenters from it, are demonstratively proved. 3rd ed. London: J. Roberts, 1719. [Anon.]
- Fuller, P. A Letter to the Reverend Mr. Pyle, occasioned by his Exceptions against Mr. Law's first Letter to the Bishop of Bangor. London: J. Bettenham, 1718. [Anon.]
- Gordon, Thomas. A Letter to the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury. Proving that His Grace cannot be the Author of the Letter to an eminent Presbyterian Clergyman in Swisserland (sic), in which the present State of Religion in England is blackened and exposed, and the present Ministry are misrepresented and traduced. 3rd ed. London: J. Roberts, 1719. [Anon.]
- *A Modest Apology for Parson Alberoni, Governor to King Philip, a Minor; and Universal Curate of the whole Spanish Monarchy: the whole being a short, but unanswerable Defence of Priestcraft, and a new Confutation of the Bishop of Bangor. 8th ed. London: J. Roberts, 1719. [Anon.]
- Gray, James. Reasons for Abrogating the Corporation and Test Acts, being some Reflections on several Passages in a Book, entituled, A Vindication of the Corporation and Test Acts, &c., written by Dr. Sherlock; in a Letter to the Doctor. London: R. Robinson, 1718.
- Hare, Francis. Church Authority Vindicated, in a Sermon preached at Putney, May 5, 1719, at a Visitation of the Peculiars of the Archbishop of Canterbury. 4th ed., corrected. London: J. Roberts, 1720.
- A New Defence of the Lord Bishop of Bangor's Sermon. 2nd ed., corrected. London: J. Bowyer, 1720. [Anon.]
- Scripture Vindicated from the Misinterpretations of the Lord Bishop of Bangor: in his Answer to the Dean of Worcester's Visitation Sermon concerning Church Authority. London: J. Bowyer, 1721.

* Also attributed to Philip Horneck.

- Herne, Thomas. The false Notion of a Christian Priesthood, and the Pretences to Sacerdotal Oblation, Intercession, Benediction, and Authoritative Absolution examined and confuted: Being an Answer to Mr. Law's second Letter to the Bishop of Bangor. 2nd ed. London: James Knapton, 1718. [under the pseudonym "Phileleutherus Cantabrigiensis".]
- A Letter to the Reverend the Prolocutor: being an Answer to . . . a Letter from the Prolocutor to the Reverend Dr. Edward Tenison, Arch-Deacon of Carmarthen. London: J. Roberts, 1718. [Anon.]
- An Essay on imposing and subscribing Articles of Religion, with a Postscript relating to the French Clergy. In a Letter to Phileleutherus Oxoniensis. London: James Knapton, 1719. [under the pseudonym "Phileleutherus Cantabrigiensis".]
- A Short Vindication of the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury from the Imputation of being the Author of a Letter lately printed at Zurich, concerning the State of Religion in England. London: J. Roberts, 1719. [Anon.]
- 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. With Occasional Observations on Them. [1719, under the pseudonym "Phileleutherus Cantabrigiensis". Published in Hoadly's Works, II, 381-399.]
- A Continuation of An Account of All the considerable Pamphlets that have been published on either Side, in the Bangorian Controversy, to the End of the Year MDCCXIX. With Occasional Observations. [1720. Published in Hoadly's Works, I, 689-701.]
- Hickes, George. The Constitution of the Catholick (sic) Church, and the Nature and Consequences of Schism. [location and name of publisher unknown], 1716.
- Hoadly, Benjamin. The Works of Benjamin Hoadly, D.D. ed. by John Hoadly. London: John Hoadly, 1773. 3 vv.
- Innes, Alexander. The Absolute Authority of the Church in Matters relating to Conscience, and Men's Right of judging for themselves reconciled: After some Misunderstanding occasioned by the Bishop of B---'s Preservative and Sermon: In Two Discourses, on June the 2nd and 16th. London: J. Morphew, 1717. 2 vv.

- Jackson, John. The Grounds of Civil and Ecclesiastical Government briefly considered, and an Answer to Mr. Law's Letter to the Bishop of Bangor. 2nd ed. London: James Knapton, 1718.
- Kennet, White. A Letter to the Lord Bishop of Carlisle, concerning one of his Predecessors Bishop Merks. 3rd ed. London: S. Buckley, 1713.
- A Second Letter to the Lord Bishop of Carlisle upon the Subject of Bishop Merks. London: S. Buckley, 1716.
- A Third Letter to the Lord Bishop of Carlisle, Lord Almoner to his Majesty, upon the Subject of Bishop Merks, wherein the Nomination -- and Depri- vation of English Prelates are shewed to have been originally constituted and governed by the Sover- eign Power of Kings and their Parliaments: Against the Pretensions of our New Fanaticks, &c. London: S. Buckley, 1717.
- Convocation-Craft: or, a brief History of the Intrigues, and Insolence of English Convocations under the Papacy, till Restrained by King Henry VIII. London: S. Baker, 1717. [Anon.]
- Dr. Snape Instructed in some Matters especially relating to Convocations and Converts from Popery. London: James Knapton and Timothy Childe, 1718. [Anon.]
- La Pillonniere, Francis de. An Answer to Dr. Snape's Accusation . . . With a Preface by the Lord Bishop of Bangor. London: James Knapton and Timothy Childe, [1717].
- A Reply to Dr. Snape's Vindication of a Passage in his second Letter to the Bishop of Bangor, relating to Mr. Pillonniere. Wherein a full Answer is also given to Mr. Mills, and all his other Evidences. . . . To which is prefixed a Letter to Dr. Snape, by the Lord Bishop of Bangor. London: James Knap- ton and Timothy Childe, 1718.
- A Third Defence, containing, I. A Reply to Dr. Snape's and Mr. Mills's new Calumnies, in their late Book. II. A Faithful Account of Mr. Rouire's whole Conduct; and a Demonstration of the Falsity of his Oath, and other present Declarations; supported by large Extracts out of his own Letters, and by his ample Testimony to the Truth written in French him- self, with a Design of publishing it. III. A Post- Script in Answer to Mr. Armand Dubourdieu's Calum- nies. . . . To which are prefixed some few Remarks on Dr. Snape's Letter before Mr. Mills's Book, by the Bishop of Bangor. London: James Knapton and Timothy Childe, 1718.

Law, William. The Bishop of Bangor's Late Sermon and his Letter to Dr. Snape in defence of it Answered, and the dangerous Nature of some Doctrines in his Preservative set forth. In a Letter to his Lordship. London: W. Innys, 1717.

---- A Second Letter to the Bishop of Bangor, wherein his Lordship's Notions of Benediction, Absolution, and Church-Communion are proved to be destructive of every Institution of the Christian Religion. With a Postscript in Answer to the Objections that have been made against his former Letter. London: W. Innys, 1717.

---- A Reply to the Bishop of Bangor's Answer to the Representation of the Committee of Convocation, addressed to his Lordship. London: W. and J. Innys, 1719.

Legh, George. A Letter from Edinburgh to Dr. Sherlock, rectifying the Committee's Notion of Sincerity, defending the whole of the Bishop of Bangor's Doctrine, and maintaining that Religion, not a Profession of it, is Religion; that the Gospel, not a Corruption of it, is the Gospel; that Christ, not the Church, is Christ. 2nd ed., corrected. London: J. Roberts, A. Dodd, J. Fox, 1718. [under the pseudonym "Gilbert Dalrymple".]

---- A Letter to the Reverend Mr. Stebbing; being remarks upon his late Book relating to Sincerity, with a Postscript concerning the Authority of the Church. London: J. Roberts, 1718. [under the pseudonym "Philo-Christianus".]

---- The Case of an Erroneous Conscience represented in a new Light, being an Enquiry, 1. Whether following an Erroneous Conscience is Sin. 2. Whether doing an Act wherein one follows it is Sin. In Answer to a Part of Mr. Stebbing's Defence of the Nonjurors, &c. In a Second Letter to the Reverend Mr. Stebbing. London: J. Roberts, 1719. [Anon.]

Lowman, Moses. The Principles of an Occasional Conformist, stated and defended. With a Preface in Answer to Dr. Sherlock's Reflections on Occasional Conformity in his Vindication of the Corporation and Test Acts. London: John Clark, 1718. [Anon.]

---- A Defence of the Protestant Dissenters; in Answer to the Misrepresentations of Dr. Sherlock in his Vindication of the Corporation and Test Acts. London: John Clark, 1718.

- Remarks on Dr. Sherlock's Answer to the Lord Bishop of Bangor's Late Book, &c. In further Vindication of the true Meaning of the Corporation and Test Acts. London: John Clark, 1719.
- Marsden, Robert. Remarks upon the Lord Bishop of Bangor's Sermon: entituled, the Nature of the Kingdom or Church of Christ. 3rd ed. London: W. and J. Innys, 1718.
- Marshall, Nathaniel. A Defence of our Constitution in Church and State: or, an Answer to the late Charge of the Non-Jurors accusing us of Heresy and Schism, Perjury and Treason. London: W. Taylor and H. Clements, 1717.
- Merks, Thomas. The Late Bishop of Carlisle's Speech against the Deposition of Kings and in Vindication of Hereditary Right, and the Lineal Succession to the Crown of these Realms. London: J. Morphew, 1714.
- Mills, Henry. A Full Answer to Mr. Pillonniere's Reply to Dr. Snape and to the Bishop of Bangor's Preface, so far as it relates to Mr. Mills. In which the Evidences given to Dr. Snape are justified, the Bishop of Bangor's Objections answered, Mr. Pillonniere's pretended Facts disproved, and base Forgery is detected. . . . To which is prefixed a Letter to his Lordship, by Dr. Snape. London: J. Bowyer, 1718.
- Mosse, Robert. The Report Vindicated from Misreports. Being a Defence of my Lords the Bishops as well as the Clergy of the Lower House of Convocation. London: J. Morphew, 1717. [Anon.]
- Neal, Daniel. A Letter to the Reverend Dr. Francis Hare, Dean of Worcester, occasioned by his Reflections on the Dissenters in his late Visitation Sermon and Postscript. London: John Clark, 1720.
- Nicholson, William. A Collection of Papers Scatter'd lately about the Town in the Daily Courant, St. James's Post, &c., with some Remarks on them. In a letter from the Bishop of Carlisle to the Bishop of Bangor. 2nd ed. London: B. Barker and C. King, 1717.
- Norris, Charles. A Dialogue between Dr. Sherlock, Dean of Chichester; and Dr. Sherlock, Master of the Temple. London: J. Roberts, 1718.

- The Reconciler, or the Bangorian Controversy abridged, made familiar, and brought to a final Period, by a full Discovery of its being only mere Battology. London: W. Boreham, 1718.
- Peirce, James. A Letter to Dr. Bennet, Occasioned by his late Treatise concerning the Nonjurors Separation, &c. London: John Clark, 1717.
- The Interest of the Whigs with Relation to the Test Act. London: R. Burleigh, 1718. [Anon.]
- The Dissenters Reasons for not Writing in Behalf of Persecution. Designed for the Satisfaction of Dr. Snape in a Letter to Him. 2nd ed. London: John Clark, 1718.
- Some Reflections upon Dean Sherlock's Vindication of the Corporation and Test Acts. London: John Clark, 1718.
- The Charge of Misrepresentations maintained against Dean Sherlock's Preface to his Answer to the Lord Bishop of Bangor's Late Book, entitled, The Common Rights of Subjects Defended, &c. London: John Clark, 1719.
- Place, Conyers. Some Free Thoughts, by way of Censure and Character of the Right Reverend the Bishop of Bangor's Answer to the Representation made against him by the Committee of the Lower House of Convocation. London: E. Curll, 1718.
- Potter, John. The Bishop of Oxford's Charge to the Clergy of his Diocese, at his Triennial Visitation, in July 1719. London: George Mortlock, 1720.
- A Defence of the late Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Oxford, July, 1719. In a Letter to the said Clergy. London: George Mortlock, 1720.
- Prat, Daniel. An Answer to the Reverend Dr. Snape's Second Letter to the Lord Bishop of Bangor: With occasional Observations on three other the most celebrated Treatises against his Lordship, viz. Dr. Sherlock's, Mr. Law's, and the Remarks. London: Timothy Childe, 1717.
- Remarks on the Reverend Dr. Snape's Second Letter to the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Bangor. With some Reflections on Dr. Sherlock's Answer to a Letter, &c. London: Timothy Childe, 1717. [Anon.]

- Farther Remarks on the Reverend Dr. Snape's Second Letter to the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Bangor . . . with an Appendix, in Answer to Mr. Law's Letter. London: Timothy Childe, 1717. [Anon.]
- The Necessity of Believing in a Future State, in order to the being truly Religious. In Answer to Part of Dr. Cannon's Thoughts concerning Religion: And to so much of Dr. Sherlock's Vindication of the Corporation and Test Acts, as relates to this Subject. London: Timothy Childe, 1718. [Anon.]
- A Review of the Most Considerable Writers in the Great Controversy with the Bishop of Bangor. London: Timothy Childe, 1719.
- Pyle, Thomas. A Vindication of the Bishop of Bangor, wherein is considered the true Notion of Religious Sincerity, &c. In answer to the Exceptions of Mr. Law. 2nd ed. London: J. Wyat, 1718.
- A Second Vindication of the Lord Bishop of Bangor, in Answer to Mr. Law's second Letter, wherein his Notions of Benediction, Absolution, and Church-Communion are proved to be destructive of the whole Christian Religion and Contrary to Common Sense, &c. London: J. Wyat, 1718.
- An Answer to Mr. Stebbing's Remarks concerning Religious Sincerity and Church Authority. Being a further Vindication of the Lord Bishop of Bangor. With a Preface in Answer to that of the Reverend the Dean of Chichester. London: J. Wyat, 1719.
- An Answer to Mr. Stebbing's Miscellaneous Observations upon some Passages in the Bishop of Bangor's Answer to the Representation. London: J. Wyat, 1719.
- A Report of the Committee of the Lower House of Convocation, &c. concerning several dangerous Positions and Doctrines contained in the Bishop of Bangor's Preservative, and his Sermon. Read in the Lower House, May 10, 1717. 2nd ed. London: J. Morphew, 1717.
- Rogers, John. A Discourse of the Visible and Invisible Church of Christ. In which it is shewn, that the Powers claimed by the Officers of the Visible Church are not inconsistent with the Supremacy of Christ as Head; or with the Rights and Liberties of Christians as Members of the Invisible Church. 3rd ed., corrected. London: T. Woodward, 1720.
- Rundle, Thomas. God the Rewarder of them that diligently seek Him. A Sermon preached at St. James's Church on Nov. 5, 1717. London: J. Knapton, 1718.

Sherlock, Thomas. A Sermon Preached before the Right Honorable the Lord-Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of London, at the Cathedral Church of St. Paul, on November the 5th, 1712. London: J. Pemberton, 1717.

---- An Answer to a Letter sent to Dr. Sherlock, relating to his Sermon Preached before the Lord-Mayor, Nov. 5, 1712. To which are added some Observations upon the Account the Bishop of Bangor has given of his intended Answer to the Representation. London: J. Pemberton, 1717.

---- Remarks upon the Lord Bishop of Bangor's Treatment of the Clergy and Convocation. London: E. Smith, 1717. [Anon.]

---- Some Considerations occasioned by a Postscript from the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Bangor to the Dean of Chichester, offered to his Lordship. 2nd ed. London: J. Pemberton, 1717.

---- A Vindication of the Corporation and Test Acts: In Answer to the Bishop of Bangor's Reasons for the Repeal of them: To which is added a second Part, concerning the Religion of Oaths. London: J. Pemberton, 1718.

---- The Condition and Example of our Blessed Saviour Vindicated: In Answer to the Bishop of Bangor's Charge of Calumny against the Dean of Chichester. London: J. Pemberton, 1718.

---- The Lord Bishop of Bangor's Defence of his Assertion Considered. London: J. Pemberton, 1718.

---- An Answer to the Lord Bishop of Bangor's Late Book: intituled, The Common Rights of Subjects Defended, &c. London: J. Pemberton, 1719.

Smith, Joseph. A Modest Review of the Lord Bishop of Bangor's Answer to the Reverend Dr. Snape; or, the Charge of Misrepresentation Impartially Considered. London: C. Rivington and J. Morphew, 1717.

Snape, Andrew. A Letter to the Bishop of Bangor occasioned by his Lordship's Sermon preached before the King at St. James's, March 31st, 1717. London: Jonah Bowyer, 1717.

---- A Second Letter to the Lord Bishop of Bangor, in Vindication of the Former. London: Jonah Bowyer, 1717.

- A Vindication of a Passage in Dr. Snape's Second Letter to the Lord Bishop of Bangor, relating to Mr. Pillonniere. London: Jonah Bowyer, 1717.
- Somerville. Reasons against Repealing the Occasional and Test Acts, and Admitting the Dissenters to Places of Trust and Power. London: J. Morpew, 1718. [Anon.]
- Stanhope, George. The Prolocutor's Answer to a Letter from a Member of the Lower House of Convocation, entitled, The Report Vindicated from Misreports. London: R. Sare, 1718.
- A Letter from the Prolocutor to the Reverend Dr. Edward Tenison, Archdeacon of Carmarthen. London: J. Morpew and R. Sare, 1718.
- Stebbing, Henry. A Defence of the First Head of the Charge of the Committee of the Lower House of Convocation against the Right Reverend, the Lord Bishop of Bangor. London: H. Clements, 1718. [Anon.]
- Remarks upon a Position of the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Bangor concerning Religious Sincerity . . . To which is prefixed a Preface by the Dean of Chichester. 2nd ed. London: H. Clements, 1718.
- Miscellaneous Observations: or, Remarks upon Some Scattered Passages in the Bishop of Bangor's Answer to the Representation: Being the Conclusion of the Defence of the first Head of the Charge of the Committee. London: H. Clements, 1718.
- Sykes, Arthur Ashley. The Innocency of Error Asserted and Vindicated. 2nd ed., corrected. London: J. Wyat, 1715. [under the pseudonym "Eugenius Philalethes".]
- An Answer to the Nonjurors Charge of Schism upon the Church of England. London: James Knapton, 1716. [Anon.]
- The Difference between the Kingdom of Christ, and the Kingdoms of this World. Set forth in a Sermon preached at the Archdeacon's Visitation in St. Michael's Church in Cambridge, December 13, 1716. London: James Knapton, 1717.
- Some Remarks on Mr. Marshall's Defence of our Constitution in Church and State. London: James Knapton, 1717.

- A Letter to the Reverend Dr. Sherlock, one of the Committee of Convocation, comparing the dangerous Positions and Doctrines contained in the Doctor's Sermon preached Nov. 5, 1712, with those charged upon the Bishop of Bangor in the late Report. London: R. Burleigh, 1717. [Anon.]
- A Second Letter to the Reverend Dr. Sherlock, being a Reply to his Answer, proving the Doctrines maintained in his Sermon to be the same with those charged upon the Bishop of Bangor. . . . To which is added a Postscript to the Reverend Dr. Sherlock, Dean of Chichester. By Benjamin, Lord Bishop of Bangor. 2nd ed. London: James Knapton and Timothy Childe, [1717].
- A Third Letter to the Reverend Dr. Sherlock, being an Answer to his Considerations offered to the Bishop of Bangor. London: James Knapton and Timothy Childe, 1717.
- Remarks upon Dr. Sherlock's Answer to Mr. Sykes. London: R. Burleigh, 1718. [Anon.]
- Remarks upon Dr. Sherlock's Considerations offered to the Lord Bishop of Bangor. London: R. Burleigh, 1718. [Anon.]
- The Dean of Chichester's Conduct Considered, in his Remarks; his Vindication of the Corporation and Test Acts; and the Condition and Example of our Blessed Lord Vindicated. London: James Knapton and Timothy Childe, 1718.
- A Fourth Letter to the Reverend Dr. Sherlock, being an Answer to his late Book, entitled, The Lord Bishop of Bangor's Defence of his Assertion Considered. London: James Knapton and Timothy Childe, 1718.
- A Vindication of the Innocency of Error, &c. from the Misrepresentations of the Lord Bishop of Oxford in his late Charge, and the Defence of it. London: James Knapton, 1720.
- The Authority of the Clergy and the Liberties of the Laity Stated and Vindicated. In Answer to Mr. Rogers's Discourse of the Visible and Invisible Church of Christ. London: James Knapton, 1720.
- Tenison, Edward. A Protestation made on the 14th Day of February, 1717/18, in Behalf of the King's Supremacy and the Protestant Doctrines asserted and maintained in the Lord Bishop of Bangor's Sermon. London: J. Wyat, 1718.

Trapp, Joseph. The Real Nature of the Church or Kingdom of Christ. A Sermon preached May 19, 1717. In Answer to the Bishop of Bangor's Sermon on the same Text. With a Postscript in Answer to his Lordship's Letter to Dr. Snape. London: H. Clements, 1717.

Wake, William. A Vindication of the Realm and Church of England, from the Charge of Perjury, Rebellion, and Schism unjustly laid upon them by the Nonjurors. London: J. Morphew, 1716. [Anon.]

Werenfels, Samuel. Three Discourses: One, A Defence of Private Judgment; Second, Against the Authority of the Magistrate over Conscience; Third, Some Considerations Concerning the Reuniting of Protestants. trans. by Phileleutherus Cantabrigiensis [Thomas Herne]. London: James Knapton, 1718.

Whitby, Daniel. An Answer to the Reverend Dr. Snape's Second Letter to the Right Reverend Father in God, Benjamin Lord Bishop of Bangor. 2nd ed. London: W. Churchill, 1717.

---- A Defence of the Propositions Contained in the Lord Bishop of Bangor's Sermon, from pag. 11, to pag. 17. And also of what is said in his Preservative concerning Real Sincerity, and our Title to the Favour of God. London: James Knapton, 1718.

Section 2. Secondary Sources.

Abbey, Charles J. The English Church and Its Bishops 1700-1800. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1887. 2 vv.

Abbey, Charles J. and Overton, John H. The English Church in the 18th Century. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1878. 2 vv.

Adiney, W. F. "Nonconformity". Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. ed. by James Hastings. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1937. IX, 381-393.

Burnet, Gilbert. History of His Own Time. a new edition. London: Reeves and Turner, 1883.

Cardwell, Edward. Synodalia. Oxford: The University Press, 1842. 2 vv.

"Thomas Sherlock." The Encyclopaedia Britannica. 11th ed. Cambridge: The University Press, 1911. XXIV, 850.

- "Bangorian Controversy". The Encyclopaedia Britannica. 14th ed. London: The Encyclopaedia Britannica Co., 1929. III, 32.
- "Test Act". The Encyclopaedia Britannica. 14th ed. XXI, 976-977.
- Evans, John Young. "Erastianism". Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. V, 358-366.
- Halkett, Samuel and Laing, John. Dictionary of Anonymous and Pseudonymous English Literature. new and enlarged edition by James Kennedy, W. A. Smith, and A. F. Johnson. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1932. 7 vv.
- Hallam, Henry. The Constitutional History of England. 7th ed. London: John Murray, 1854. 3 vv.
- Hobhouse, Stephen. William Law and Eighteenth Century Quakerism. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1927.
- Hunt, John. Religious Thought in England from the Reformation to the End of Last Century. London: Strahan and Co., 1870-1873. 3 vv.
- Hutton, William Holden. "Thomas Sherlock". Dictionary of National Biography. ed. by Sidney Lee. London: Smith, Elder, and Co., 1897. LII, 93-95.
- The English Church from the Accession of Charles I to the Death of Anne (1625-1714). London: Mac-Millan and Co., 1903.
- Lathbury, Thomas. A History of the Convocation of the Church of England from the Earliest Period to the Year 1742. 2nd ed. London: J. Leslie, 1853. [1st ed., 1842.]
- A History of the Nonjurors. London: William Pickering, 1845.
- Lecky, William Edward Hartpole. A History of England in the 18th Century. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1878. 8 vv. Vol. I.
- Lodge, Richard. The History of England from the Restoration to the Death of William III (1660-1702). London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1910.
- "Benjamin Hoadly". The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge. ed.-in-chief, Samuel Macaulay Jackson. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1909. V, 301.

Overton, John H. William Law, Nonjuror and Mystic.
London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1881.

Overton, John H. and Relton, Frederic. The English Church from the Accession of George I to the End of the Eighteenth Century (1714-1800). London: MacMillan and Co., 1906.

Patterson, M. W. A History of the Church of England.
London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1909.

Perry, George G. The History of the Church of England.
London: Saunders, Otley, and Co., 1864. 3 vv.
Vol. III.

---- "Benjamin Hoadly". Dictionary of National Biography. XXVII, 16-21.

Pollock, John. "The Policy of Charles II and James II".
The Age of Louis XIV. "The Cambridge Modern History."
Vol. V. ed. by A. W. Ward, G. W. Prothero, and
Stanley Leathes. Cambridge: The University Press,
1908. Chapter IX.

Robertson, Sir Charles Grant. England under the Han-
overians. 11th ed. London: Methuen and Co., 1934.

Skeats, Herbert S. History of the Free Churches of
England. 2nd ed. London: Arthur Miall, 1869.

Stephen, Leslie. History of English Thought in the
Eighteenth Century. 2nd ed. London: Smith, Elder,
and Co., 1881. 2 vv.

---- "William Law". Dictionary of National Biography.
XXXII, 236-240.

Stoughton, John. Ecclesiastical History of England:
The Church of the Revolution. London: Hodder and
Stoughton, 1874.

---- Religion in England under Queen Anne and the
Georges. 1702-1800. London: Hodder and Stoughton,
1878. 2 vv.

Sykes, Norman. Church and State in England in the
XVIIIth Century. Cambridge: The University Press,
1934.

Temperley, H. W. V. "The Revolution and the Revolution
Settlement in Great Britain (1) England." The
Age of Louis XIV. "The Cambridge Modern History."
Vol. V, Chapter X.

Trevelyan, George Macauley. Blenheim. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1930.

Whiston, William. Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Mr. William Whiston. London: printed for the author, 1749.

Wright, Thomas. England under the House of Hanover. 2nd ed. London: Richard Bentley, 1848. 2 vv.