Spiritual Monarchs: The Nonjuring Movement and the Development of Separation of Church from State within the Church of England, 1691-1775

Spiritual Monarchs: The Nonjuring Movement and the Development of Separation of Church from State within the Church of England, 1691-1775

by

J.C. Parks

Presented to the Graduate and Research
Committee of Lehigh University
in Candidacy for the
Degree of Doctor of
Philosophy

in

History

Lehigh University

May 2025

Dissertation is accepted and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the PhD in the History Department

John C. Parks

Date Approved: 3/5/2025

Dr. William J. Bulman
Dr. John Savage
Dr. Scott Gordon
Dr. Robert Ingram
Dr. Jessica Roney

Table of Contents

Abstract

After the Glorious Revolution, where the new king William sacked clergy who would not swear a new oath of loyalty, Nonjurors broke with the conforming Church of England. For these separatists, the Church of England spiritually autonomous society under bishops who were spiritual sovereigns. If the state infringed on the church, then there should be separation of church from state. These radical ideas called into question the establishment of religion and a national church, at the same moment that Enlightened theorists sought for a deeper basis for the establishment of society. The ideas of the Nonjurors not only influenced their sect, but churchmen who conformed to the post-revolutionary Church of England, who advocated for a complete divorce between spiritual and civil authority so they may remain untouched by secular powers, even as they claimed great, but unused, spiritual powers. Similarly, Nonjuring separatism also provoked a reaction from those who sought to establish a Protestant civil religion through godly state. These notions of separation of church from state spread across the Atlantic in North America. In planting the Church of England in English colonies, Nonjuror ideas influenced clergy who advocated for their own spiritual privileges against royal government and laity, pushing for a self-regulating, wholly spiritual, church. Similarly, in the bishop controversy of the 1760s, these rival visions of church and state relation flared, with supporters of a colonial bishop desiring an entirely detached, wholly spiritual, church within a British empire that was broadly tolerant, even to non-Protestants. These Anglicans pursued a form of religious liberty that mapped onto the denominationalism that prevailed throughout the future United States.

Introduction

In 1774, the New England-born convert to the Church of England, Thomas Bradbury Chandler, hoped to bring a bishop to the North American colonies. An opponent of the Stamp Act, Chandler was not acquiescent to all metropolitan demands. As a churchman, however, it was paramount that the Church of England have the office which made it the best of all churches. Against opponents both Anglican and not, for over two decades, Chandler argued for the settlement of a bishop that, unlike England, had no political powers whatsoever. In Chandler's view of episcopal office, clergy had only spiritual powers, the right to regulate the conscience and stand as a mediator between God and man. Civil powers were only ever incidental and often negative baggage. The true bishop had no connection to political power and favored "religious liberty" or at least "a willingness that men should think and act for themselves in matters of religion, without any desire of compelling them to conform to the national establishment."[1] Spiritual and civil powers were entirely disconnected in a polity that allowed religious liberty to worship as one saw fit.

For anyone (today or in Chandler's day) with passing knowledge of the sixteenth or seventeenth century, especially England's Civil Wars, this claim is bewildering. How could a member of the Church of England deny bishops a role in a confessional state that imposed outward conformity? Was Chandler simply deceived or deceiving, completely oblivious to the history of the Church of England? Chandler represents part of a larger ecclesiastical change within the Church of England, a product of two centuries of redefining the office of bishop in light of a flagging confessional state. It was because some churchmen believed that clergy were

[1] Thomas Bradbury Chandler, *A Free Examination of the Critical Commentary on Archbishop Secker's Letter to Mr Walpole* (New York City: 1774), 90.

sacerdotal priests, purveyors of a power to bring Heaven and Earth together, that they should separate from the authority of the state. Rather than always tying notions of religious liberty and separation of church and state to liberal (or proto-liberal) theology, Chandler stood for a sacred clergy in an increasingly secular society. The clergy had a right to regulate the souls of the laity as mighty rulers of spirit, but that power was entirely separate from the life of the body in political society. This project analyzes the course of this development, of how radicalized churchmen within the late seventeenth century Church of England embraced religious separation to better defend their priestly privileges. Church was a spiritual parallel society that was never, and could never, be permanently intertwined with the state.

The first chapter of this project begins with the Nonjurors, a breakaway movement from the Church of England that claimed to be its true remnant. The new king of England had received the throne in 1689 after driving out James II at the behest of grateful Lords and Commons. But these Nonjurors, who refused to swear oaths to William, were not concerned with royal politics so much as the king's interference with the clergy. Still haunted by the legacy of the Civil Wars, where the Church of England was legally annulled and its bishops sent into exile, these churchmen were adamant to resist any royal involvement in church affairs. The Church of England was defined by its bishops, which possessed legitimate title going back to the Apostles of Jesus Christ, not the king. When William decided to remove all clergy that failed to swear an oath to him in 1691, replacing them with loyal ministers, the Nonjurors revolted. The problem was strictly a collapse of powers, where the Church of England was a spiritual society that was independent of all political control. If this arrangement meant that the state renounced all religious claims for clerical independence, preferring a non-involved Catholic or pagan before a grasping Protestant, then so be it. Reconstructing a history for the universal church, where

independent bishops were a sign of true Christianity, these Nonjurors rejected conforming clergy as heretics and traitors. This list of apostates included High Churchmen, a new party born of concern for both sacred clerical power and submission to the king. This list also included Low Churchmen, those who severely curtailed, if not rejected, unique clerical powers over the laity in spiritual affairs. The Nonjurors radically reconceptualized the Church of England over the 1690s as an independent spiritual society, ejecting royal supremacy in the name of purity. Instead of an exhausted ecclesiastical view from a prior waning era, the Nonjurors offered a novel and revitalized churchmanship that threatened the legitimacy of the Church of England after the Glorious Revolution.

The second chapter of this project turns to the aftermath of this initial surge of Nonjuring. High Churchmen were not comfortable with or confident about the Church of England under godly monarchs with a sacerdotal clergy. Despite the succession of Queen Anne, a warm advocate for the Church of England and its clergy, High Churchmen were still worried. The threat of Deists, who rejected all clerical pretensions of spiritual authority for a Christianity of lay virtuous living, was growing. Rather than posture as radicals, Deists claimed the mantle of true Protestants, fulfilling the Reformation by empowering godly monarchs to subordinate clergy. The only ones who seemed to offer an adequate response were Nonjurors, who alone seemed to embrace the horns of the dilemma and eject royal supremacy for an independent spiritual society. Nonjurors themselves were unsure of the future, with their separation continuing and internal debates over possible reconciliation with conformists. This moment of instability was further galvanized when Benjamin Hoadly, a critic of sacerdotal clerical powers, began a full-throated attack on Nonjurors. With the Hanoverian succession and the promotion of Hoadly, High Churchmen and Nonjurors believed Deism had now been enthroned in the heart of

England. This chapter recontextualizes the Bangorian Controversy as a reunification of High Churchmen and Nonjurors that took place over a decade. Royal supremacy had fallen into the hands of Deism, and the sacred powers of the clergy could only find protection in the Church of England as an independent spiritual society. This acceptance did not mean abandonment of the conforming Church of England, but a redefinition of its office. The result was a freeze, where official silence meant, tacitly, an acceptance of sacerdotal powers that were implicit to the Church of England. Spiritual authority had been redefined to not only be separate from the state, but impotent to change or alter it. Royal abuses were no reason to break the civil peace, because the king never could truly affect the spiritual powers of the clergy, even if they were barred from their own altars. This radical distinction between spiritual and civil power meant the Church of England could persist in an obedient, yet imagined separate, form into the eighteenth century.

The third chapter examines how these conflicts within the Church of England spread abroad through the North American colonies. Clergy there in churches that were unestablished and undeveloped replayed the same battles over definition. Royal headship against spiritual independence marked the battle over establishing the Church of England in South Carolina. Similarly, frustration over colonial government in the Mid Atlantic colonies led towards greater clerical independence, even seeking an independent and redefined episcopate that had no civil powers. Critics of an American bishop, both inside and outside the Church of England, saw this turn as a novel development and mostly unwelcome. In a third case, the growth of the Church of England in New England, particularly Massachusetts, led to a conflict with the overwhelmingly Congregationalist colonial authority. In reimagining the place of the Church of England in the British Empire, Anglicans promoted religious liberty and a more vaguely religious political society to defend their own interests. Clergy were further defined as entirely spiritual monarchs,

with powers over the conscience but with no influence over the body. In these three cases, Nonjuror ideas, texts, and even offices were deployed in the North American colonies to advance a vision of the Church of England as an independent spiritual society. This vision received opposition externally and internally, reflecting the same debates over the relationship between spiritual and civil powers.

In the final chapter, with a focus on the Bishop Controversy that rocked British North America through the 1760s and 1770s, this vision for the Church of England as an independent spiritual society clashed with a different vision for religion in the British Empire. Advocates for a colonial bishop, drawing on similar arguments deployed by Nonjurors and later High Church advocates of an independent spiritual society, divorced spiritual authority from all civil power. The Church of England in the colonies had no influence or impact on civil government, it had no power in the state. An American bishop, therefore, was no threat to colonial governments. Instead, with a vision of a general religious society where many churches competed for membership, churches were entirely parallel to the state and had no influence. Opponents of the bishop were not simply against expansion of the Church of England. Rather, they conceived of a different, more broadly Protestant, religious politics. Both inside and outside the Church of England, these advocates saw Protestantism as a civil religion with a plurality of establishments. The growth of the Church of England in Congregationalist New England was thus an attack on fraternal unity. While advocates for a colonial bishop were willing to accept a religiously neutral state, enemies were generally not.

This project, therefore, intervenes in several different historiographies of Enlightenment and religion, religious liberty and toleration, civil religion, and the contours of Anglicanism in the eighteenth-century British Empire. First, the desire for separatism and religious liberty, with

an increasingly neutral (if not secular) state, involves questions of the "Enlightenment" throughout the era. According to conventional narratives, it was enemies of "priestcraft" who advanced a secularization of civil politics, not advocates of sacerdotal clericalism.[2] The Enlightenment was a force for progress, towards democratic and egalitarian societies, perhaps best manifest in the theopolitical theory of Benedict Spinoza. However, for partisans of this reified idea of Enlightenment, like Jonathan Israel, it was blinkered by those who were never fully committed the outworking of this spirit. When push to came to shove, Enlighteners had to decide whether they ought to preserve the social institutions that fostered them (the various hierarchies of class, religion, wealth) or tear them down, producing the rift between moderates and radicals. The latter chose the rebirth of all through the divine light of Progress, while the latter made peace with the *Ancien Regime* and reserved illumination for a select few.[3] With a different moral evaluation, Anthony Pagden has argued that the Enlightenment was a future-oriented progressive movement that destroyed all reliance on the past. Enlightenment, unlike predecessors in the Renaissance and Reformation, ripped human society up at the roots to replace it, invoking reason and science against tradition and history to reject all limits on reform or growth. Citing the Marxist Theodor Adorno and ex-Marxist Alasdair MacIntyre, Pagden has argued that Enlightenment's orientation towards progress unleashed a tyranny of reason, ripping everything deemed irrational up at the roots.[4] In both cases, the Enlightenment is a solid Progressive movement, with a clear unified vision, despite many friendly critics and moderates.

[2] J.A.I. Champion, *Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken: The Church of England and its Enemies, 1660-1730* (Cambridge University Press, 1992), 25-29.
[3] Jonathan Israel, *A Revolution of the Mind: Radical Enlightenment and the Intellectual Origins of Modern Democracy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2011), 7-35.
[4] Anthony Pagden, *The Enlightenment: And Why It Still Matters* (Oxford University Press, 2015), 5-14.

This project, in contrast to a hagiography or lapsarian history of progress, contends that the Enlightenment (and its role within this project) must be brought down to the sublunary world of historical contingency. As the late J.G.A. Pocock has well argued, the Enlightenment was a multifaceted moment that could be demarcated by national, or transnational, literary communities of shared interests, thought, and concern. For Pocock, there were simply too many strands, reflecting too many different political communities, to bottle up the Enlightenment into a single narrative of progress against the forces of reaction and *Ancien Regime*, a Whiggish history of liberal agnosticism that loses the particularity of the different ways concern for civil peace could become state policy.[5] The Hobbesian Leviathan, in the English case, was simply one way to regulate and tame these forces, a sinister trope that summoned opponents to subdue and selectively adapt parts of the Hobbist program, whether for republicanism or royalism.[6] This desire for civil peace, and an elite that had a secular viewpoint to remain neutral and above the fray even as individuals were personally committed, could lead to silencing all debate whatsoever, especially on fraught theological questions.[7] This approach was not simply the *avant garde* of a Whiggish or liberal elite that brought about more democracy, equality, and other progressive canards. Rather, this same desire for toleration and civic peace could be equally authoritarian and confessional, even sacerdotal, defending a state sanctioned church-state which imposed peace at the expense of dogmatic uniformity. As William Bulman has argued, the question of Enlightenment was how best this order of elite secularity and civil peace could be brought about, even through royal and priestly means, not a debate about whether it should be or

[5] J.G.A. Pocock, *Barbarism and Religion: Volume 1, The Enlightenments of Edward Gibbon, 1737-1764* (Cambridge University Press, 1999), 4-10.
[6] Jon Parkin, *Taming the Leviathan: The Reception of the Political and Religious Ideas of Thomas Hobbes in England 1640-1700* (Cambridge University Press, 2007), 2-14.
[7] Robert G. Ingram, *Reformation Without End: Religion, politics and the past in post-revolutionary England* (Manchester University Press, 2018), 7-17.

not. One could be equally enlightened in a defense of absolutist monarchy and a spiritual guild of priests that regulate the conscience of the nation.[8]

This project intervenes to add further contour to the options available within England and its North American colonies. If civil peace was necessary and an elite secularity a boon to protect the integrity of the realm, what if this proposal threatened the traditional (real or perceived) powers of clergy to regulate the consciences of the faithful? Rather than a crude dichotomy between reaction and progress, this project demonstrates that Nonjurors, who had a larger diffusive effect than previously believed, offered a kind of churchmanship that allowed a functional separatism to preserve clerical privileges. If the state would not properly defend the Church of England (as these advocates believed), then it would be better for the Church to be an entirely separate, spiritual, society. What that meant in practice was contested between various advocates, but the result was a willingness to accept a secular state. The Church of England could embrace its own divine prerogatives as a priestly caste, while also supporting a religious neutral state that promoted equal competition. The monarchy did not need to enforce liturgical or doctrinal conformity, as official silence could function as a negation of a negative. In other words, since there was no rejection of high clerical pretensions, legally or otherwise, these could flourish in the shadow of the Leviathan. Nonjurors who began as outcasts for their radical views of separatism in turn became the source of new ideas of Anglican churchmanship, spreading even across the Atlantic into Britain's wider empire. When a New England Anglican like Chandler advocated both for a God ordained sacred priesthood and the wide exercise of religious freedom, even for the heterodox and non-Protestant, these did not contradict.

[8] William J. Bulman, *Anglican Enlightenment: Orientalism, Religion and Politics in England and its Empire, 1648-1715* (Cambridge University Press, 2015), xi-xiii, 6-10, 289.

In a similar vein, this project also addresses the conceptual problem of toleration and its different motivations and practices. As Alexandra Walsham has argued for an earlier era, toleration had nothing to do with ecumenism or fuzzy feelings for all beliefs whatsoever. Toleration, a Christian concept that could be dated as far back as Augustine, was "charitable hatred," a willingness to put up with heterodox neighbors as long as they did not threaten the peace and wellbeing of the community. Seemingly liberal policies and politics could coexist with those who held illiberal ideas about society and their fellow man.[9] This model of toleration, however, became more strained as the broad communal basis, even national, was fragmented. Walsham ended her monograph with the Toleration Act of 1689, a failed bridge towards unification, a ceasefire that became a permanent norm in England.[10] What models of toleration could adjust if a national Christendom became increasingly unworkable according to traditional, even Augustinian, means? Teresa Bejan's monograph on varieties of toleration helps explore the range of options that advocates could take. Bejan simplifies these options that faced this broadly European crisis (but more especially Britain as intra-Protestant) through three different models. Hobbes offered a model of "civil silence" where a strong state ended debate and established conformity, whereas Locke offered a model of "civil charity" where the state, directly or indirectly through civil society, imposed rules of decorum and politeness. The third (and Bejan's preferred model) was Roger Williams' "mere civility" of "free speech fundamentalism" that set very few rules that allowed a seemingly endless debate between all participants.[11]

[9] Alexandra Walsham, *Charitable Hatred: Tolerance and intolerance in England, 1500-1700* (Manchester University Press, 2008), 3-5.
[10] Ibid., 267
[11] Teresa M. Bejan, *Mere Civility: Disagreements and the Limits of Toleration* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2017) 11-16.

This project, if it were to follow Bejan's typology, would find an odd alignment, where Roger Williams, the puritan and seeker, found common cause with conformists who believed in a divinely sanctioned priesthood that alone determined the boundaries of God's church. In drawing thick lines between spiritual and temporal authorities, Nonjurors seeming advocated for a "mere civility" of calling their fellow English Christians outside of God's community for failing to follow the tenets of ecclesiastical separatism. Within the North American colonial context, Anglicans too would appear in Roger Williams' camp as advocates for open debate (outside the official Church), even if it led to skepticism of Protestants in the authority of their own churches. In contrast, many Dissenters and low church advocates of a teaching (not sacerdotal) clergy would find themselves with Locke in a desire to temper, through politeness, intra-Protestant debates that would eventually breed mutual charity.[12] Toleration did not require an ecumenical or broad religiosity but could comport with a very narrow and priestly form.

Bejan's typology serves as a useful heuristic to understand how a highly clerical view of Christianity could adopt something like Williams' "mere civility" as part of a strategy of spiritual autonomy. In the case of the Nonjurors and the High Church adaptation of their thought, the desire for a spiritual kingdom, with sacred ministers given divine power, meant a willingness to open up a wider debate, to allow a fuller flowering of religious toleration (especially in the case of acquiring a bishop for the colonies). While these Nonjurors and High Churchmen believed magistrates had the duty to improve religion in general, if they failed to explicitly serve the Church in the way that the above wanted, then it would be better if magistrates were neutral advocates. In other words, it would be better for a neutral, even non-Anglican, magistrate that created a level playing field than an Anglican magistrate who meddled in clerical affairs.

[12] Ibid., 133-135.

Beginning with Nonjurors and carrying through the eighteenth century, the Church of England was effectively reimagined as a sect, a denomination among others, which happened to have the best justifications for its belief and practice. Opponents, again low church Dissenters, instead rejected this level of openness as ruinous to intra-Protestant unity. Literature that damaged the credibility of non-Anglican churches was censored in 1720s Boston. Episcopal government was rejected as invasive and disruptive when it did not exist (and, for bishops like Benjamin Hoadly, was not exercised beyond its teaching function). In the case of the debate over a North American episcopate, both sides claimed religious liberty, toleration, and the church as a voluntary society, but this fact, in practice, meant a variety of differences. Pro-bishop Anglicans, against anti-bishop advocates (outside and inside the Church of England), saw institutional independence as superior to any broader ethos of intra-Protestant unity. Toleration meant the willingness to call into question the legitimacy of other Protestants, to create a competition between institutions instead of charity between the same. A willingness to embrace very ostentatious views of clerical power was in no way inconsistent with desiring broad religious toleration with churches as, functionally, voluntary societies.

This project, therefore, also intervenes into the question of secularism and the separation of church and state. Within the historiography (and hagiography) of the United States, the separation of church and state and liberalism is as old as Thomas Jefferson. In a British context, the work of Steven Pincus has reframed the Glorious Revolution as a fundamentally modern revolution, the first in European history. In a general dichotomy between rival views of modernity, either the Dutch-led tolerant parliamentary liberalism or the authoritarian church-state absolutism of France, England ultimately opted for the first, but not without struggle and conflict. The victory of the Whigs, embracing a parliamentary commercial state against the

Gallican reforms of James Stuart, was a victory for the proto-liberal state that would become synonymous with the Anglophone world. In the realm of religious politics, enemies of clerical power and absolutism sided with James II against the Glorious Revolution Whigs, who advocated ecumenism and broad religious toleration. This division marked Church of England ecclesiastical politics during and after the events of 1688, settling into a compromised but still Whiggish court.[13] Pincus wrote in contrast to the benchmark revisionist work of J.C.D. Clark, who had argued that England had remained as the *Ancien Regime* through 1688 until the Reform Bill of 1832. While Pincus does note some discrepancies between the ideas of King William's most radical and faithful partisans and the courtly settlement under the Whig Junto, Clark had demonstrated that this arrangement was normal for an England that was still very much aristocratic, confessional, hierarchical, and landed. This constellation of authorities, which all operated within, remained stable throughout the eighteenth century, an era that was notably not liberal and not particularly progressive.[14]

This project utilizes both descriptions of the eighteenth-century Church of England to reveal an Anglican High Churchmanship that did not fall from power, that was neither a regnant nor reactionary *Ancien Regime*. Instead, in the case of High Church adaptation of Nonjuring ecclesiology, confessional form could remain stable as it was intentionally not used to preserve the appearance of legitimacy. The purpose of this arrangement, an empowered impotence of a confession-state that did not (and perhaps could not) enforce confessional unity, was to preserve two layers of society. Bishops could claim the power, as successors to the Apostles, to regulate and conform the conscience of the laity, to excommunicate even lords and kings, to standard as

[13] Steven Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2011), 8, 402-416.
[14] J.C.D. Clark, *English Society, 1660-1832: Religion, Ideology and Politics during the Ancien Regime* (Cambridge University Press, 2nd Edition, 2000), 13-25.

spiritual monarchs in the spiritual kingdom of Jesus Christ. Yet, at the same time, this power was not exercised, seeking to win support through other more effective means, so as not to disturb the fabric of civic peace. These churchmen could even ally with a parliamentary state, with a monarch required to work through elected channels, if the potential rights as sacred ministers remained. This view translated well into the North American colonies, where a disestablished Anglican clergy understood themselves in their unique claim to have an episcopal government and formal liturgy. As clergy, they claimed the right to discipline the conscience of the laity through access to the sacraments, the only clear means of God's favor. As subjects, however, they were obedient to civil peace and claimed no unique rights. The old forms could remain, even as their functions had changed drastically for the purposes of retaining civil peace and political order.

Part of this sharp division between spiritual and civil, between religion and state, depended on the *tertium quid* of civil society. As Jurgen Habermas has argued and set the tone for all future discussion (even as timeframe, purposes and agents have changed), civil society was a means of drawing a compromise to "privatize" public life for the purposes of the nascent bourgeoisie. In terms of the Church and spirituality, the "private" realm of spiritual power was a similar meant to draw back churchmanship from the domain of the public, a bourgeois product of the Reformation going forwards.[15] Putting aside the Marxian conspiracy of class interest subversion, this framework still helps to understand why those who believe in the superiority of the Church of England could embrace, tactically, an open sphere of debate and elite secularity in pursuit of civic peace. If the state could not decide for High Churchmen, then the Nonjuror idea of an autonomous spiritual kingdom, could allow them to retain this traditional authority in a

[15] Jurgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society* trans. Thomas Burger (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1991), 178-180, 222-225.

different domain. Clergy may be increasingly powerless within a confessional state, but they could still retain these great and sweeping powers, though ones that only had effect in the afterlife. Colonial Anglicans in North America could similarly embrace this desire for broad religious liberties and no official establishment because they, tactically, believed they would win out through persuasion. It is not to say that some did not genuinely cherish the values of religious toleration and broad freedom for religious practice. However, these ultimately served as means to win converts to the true Church of Christ, as opposed to non-episcopal Protestants who were in a dubious state of being in illegitimate churches with illegitimate ministers and illegitimate means of grace. An increasingly religiously neutral public sphere, under religiously neutral magistrates to keep peace and politeness, served a highly clerical and spiritual vision of the Church of England as a divine society.

In contrast, proponents of a broad Protestant Interest rejected this permanent state of civil society as war by other means for an attempt a different form of national, even imperial, establishment. Benjamin Hoadly first formed this backlash, as a conservator of the Glorious Revolution in both church and state. Nonjurors, for Hoadly, were the enemies because they advanced this strong split, whereas he advocated greater unity. Hoadly's controversial sermon as Bishop of Bangor, provoking the eponymous Bangorian Controversy, was not a naked defense of tolerance for all beliefs whatsoever, no matter how sincere, when he defined Christ alone as king of conscience (seemingly stripping the clergy of their sacred powers). Rather, Hoadly had created a united opposition because he advanced a broader Protestant establishment that was more than the Church of England, an establishment that both clergy and laity had a duty to protect and enforce. This idea was seemingly hateful to the clerical interests of the Church of England, who alone had legitimacy through bishops to confect sacraments and confer God's

grace as legitimate ministers. With a crown that seemed indifferent (if not actively disinterested), a strong separation between civil and spiritual powers, each with their own set of legitimate governments, alone could stand against their collapse in broadly Protestant, but non-sacerdotal, nation. These same reasons galvanized North American Anglicans, who were angered and perplexed that a wholly spiritual bishop was impugned as an attack on other non-episcopal Protestants. For these anti-episcopal forces (both Dissenters and some Anglicans), a bishop was entirely superfluous, creating division in the broad patchwork unity of Protestant churches within a single Protestant Interest. While the Church of England sought a more neutral, vaguely religion in the abstract, civil society, more partisan Protestants sought a civil society as part of a more diffusive Protestant empire.

This project then dovetails well with recent work on the development of non-established, but nevertheless confessional, Protestant establishments. Ashley Walsh has successfully demonstrated how certain interpretations of the Church of England as a civil religion could win over those partisans of a supposed *avant garde* of liberalism. In Walsh's retelling, more republican and Deist inclined figures (on the balance as more radical Whigs) were favorable to a non-sacerdotal Anglican ministry, not anti-clerical in the abstract.[16] Christianity, or at least Protestant Christianity, could form a civil religion to improve the unity and virtue of Englishmen without a rival, spiritual, clerical power. There was no contradiction to desire a godly king in a godly parliament to rule over a godly nation through righteous and benevolent laws while also rejecting any and all clerical privileges as a unique class with privileges in an autonomous spiritual realm of conscience. Therefore, a religious politics for a modern state was possible with a church establishment limited to preaching and performing virtue, or no church establishment

[16] Ashley Walsh, *Civil Religion and the Enlightenment in England, 1707-1800* (Martlesham, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2020), 1-3.

whatsoever. David Sehat has demonstrated, in a broad history of American religious politics, that secularity never really existed in the broad history of the United States. An informal evangelical establishment could still form a political system that enforced confessional norms.[17] America could be that ideal godly republic *sans* clericalism and simultaneously be restrictive and authoritarian in imposing broadly Protestant social norms. This kind of arrangement is what another historian, Sam Haselby, has called religious nationalism that motivated Protestant political unity, despite early America not having any single national establishment.[18] These accounts together demonstrate an alternative to this High Church separatism as a primary antagonist over what exactly the nature of Britain's religious establishment was or should be.

This project, therefore, reveals that separation between church and state, as much as toleration, does not fit any simple narrative of progress or reaction within the long eighteenth-century history of British religious history. This project also explains the seemingly contradictory development of religious denominations, who pride themselves on elaborate mystery and pomp, with clergy who claim supernatural privileges to dispense divine favor, as proponents of religious liberty and toleration. Whether these arrangements were ever true beliefs, or simply pragmatic arrangements, is mostly irrelevant, as if there is any unique virtue in evaluating toleration or liberty as ends in themselves. Instead, the separation of powers could apply to statecraft as much as ecclesiology, where church and state did not (and could not) intersect. Therefore, some of the strongest advocate for elite secularity, civil peace, and a mostly neutral space for debate and conversion came from those who had the strongest views of clerical power and authority. Similarly, in contrast, enemies of clericalism could advance more restrictive civil space out of a desire for a confessional Protestant state with a broad orthodoxy.

[17] David Sehat, *The Myth of American Religious Freedom* (Oxford University Press, 2011), 20-22, 31-32.
[18] Sam Haselby, *The Origins of American Religious Nationalism* (Oxford University Press, 2015), 1-4, 25-26.

Opposition to clerical power and an established church does not, intrinsically, include less or non-confessional politics. In fact, a desire for a more neutral, even secular, civil sphere might be more desirable for those who advocate for their non-political sectarian designs. That was what Anglican advocates for a sacerdotal clergy sought, even if it led to banging heads against fellow Anglicans in opposition to non-clerical (or, as was more the case, insufficiently clerical) establishments. If the choice was between a broad Protestant society (that, intrinsically, depreciated Anglican-ism as a unique confession) and an increasingly neutral society, this tradition of Anglican High Church separatists would choose the latter.

This project, therefore, stands in some contrast with the recent work of Brent Sirota on explaining the development of "Anglican Catholicity" that translated Restoration-era emphasis on charity and benevolence into the voluntary associations of uplift that exploded after the Glorious Revolution. While the old confessional-state was still an ideal unity for Anglicans, the alternative of non-state charity organizations became the norm that formed the basis of Anglicanism's reach throughout the British Empire.[19] In the case of those High Churchmen who relented and participated in this great project, the pre-Constantinian ideal of a patristic church separate from the Roman state gave impetus to remaining detached from the British Empire, organized around episcopal succession than the monarchy. The shocks of state indifference to the Church of England produced a growing desire for ecclesiastical separatism. [20]

This project, instead, emphasizes, first, that the origins of this separatism from the state came from a far more radical source in the Nonjurors, who converted some High Churchmen to their cause, rather than the former being a reactionary hangover from a previous era. Secondly,

[19] Brent Sirota, *The Christian Monitors: The Church of England and the Age of Benevolence, 1680-1730* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2014), 2-11.
[20] Brent Sirota, "'The Manifest Distinction Established By Our Holy Religion': Church, State and the Consecration of Samuel Seabury" in *Religion and American Culture* (Volume 32, Issue 1, Winter 2022), 68-72.

this project has focused more on the role that intra-Protestant polemics drove this forward than merely an overreaching state. High Church Anglican separatists were not distrustful of the state, preferring voluntary associations and soft power as intrinsically superior for a modern benevolent world. Rather, the state was a means to enforce this neutrality to overcome other inferior forms of Protestant churchmanship (Anglican or otherwise) that failed to realize the unique distinctions. What galvanized Protestant churchmen to adopt sacerdotal views of the clergy walled within a separate spiritual kingdom (that should not be touched as much as it could not be touched) was other Protestants who wanted to break down walls to intermingle sacred and secular. What divided English Protestants, both inside and outside of the Church of England, was whether a broad Protestant idea was possible to unite all without a formal establishment. Nonjurors inspired an enlightened reaction, preferring an increasingly secular and religiously neutral state so they may preserve a more narrowly confessional Church of England that was an independent spiritual society without any civil powers. The Nonjurors provided the means to argue that the distinctives of Anglicans (a sacred clerical hierarchy that preserved the episcopal rank) were more important than broader Protestant unity. Since the state failed to defend these particular interests, it would be better to defend separation of church from state and broader religious toleration. In other words, the legacy of the Nonjurors influenced churchmen to choose religious neutrality in statecraft to preserve a narrow Anglican patrimony in priestcraft.

To advance and justify these claims, this project is primarily focused with the intellectual and development of concepts. Focused primarily on written artifacts, especially as they were interlocked in polemical struggle, this history is primarily connected to elite, educated, European men who had some vested interest in the primary institutions of the British Empire. Even as many of the subjects of this study were outsiders and outcasts for their more extreme positions in

church and state, they were still educated and authorized within these power structures. Therefore, this study is primarily focused on a higher rung of society, with many of the less literate and empowered Britons (let alone enslaved blacks and subject indigenous peoples), but nevertheless a crucial study in the develop of political, and ecclesiastical concepts that spread downwards to influence experiences of both the natural and supernatural. According to these beliefs, and the acknowledged powers of the clergy, laity may believe themselves more powerful to stand up against perceived clerical excess. Or, as for many subjects of this study, men with clerical rank, but less social status, may claim prerogatives to command the respect of political elites, even kings.

The focus then is on written texts, primarily publicly circulated letters and published tracts, including sermons, historical studies, and polemical responses. This project focuses less on discovering unknown documents than a reinterpretation of well-read sources. Sensitivity to ideologies of church, what it is and what it does, are often flooded with overreading these as mirrors or, more sinisterly, disguises for politics or social conflict. Instead, this study treats these ideas as worthy of study in themselves, not only to understand differing views of the sacred, but how these impact an understanding of wider non-"religious" modes of life. Whether a civil government had a right to regulate belief and practice is not a given, and the fact that church is sequestered as its own zone of influence, not to infringe on politics or be infringed on, in much of modern Western history is the reason for this study. This belief emerged not only from public agnosticism over confessional questions or an enlightened skepticism towards all religious claims, but also from the strongest believers in the clerical right to direct the conscience. In the eyes of the state, these organizations should be considered voluntary associations, but in the eyes of God, obedience to his sacred minister, capable of confecting sacraments upon the altar, was

paramount. This study thus contributes to how the modern world saw a fragmentation of spiritual and religious questions, for good or ill, from the state.[21]

The influence of the Nonjurors, too often treated as relics of the past, had a long reach over the development of a sacerdotal separatism. The desire to preserve a Christian priesthood, when it failed to regain influence over the court or the majority, meant a retreat to an impenetrable sacred sphere. State interference may be treated as heresy, or a simple lapse of judgement, but it ultimately highlighted the unbridgeable gulf between spiritual authority and civil authority, to the point that the latter was, by definition, neutral. Bishops were spiritual monarchs, but in civil affairs they were mere subjects of the king (or, after American independence, citizens of a republic) There was no contradiction as these realms were, conceptually uncoupled, with a greater emphasis on religious liberty and religious neutrality in politics. What was born from failure and compromise then created the basis of a clericalist defense of religious liberty. It is a strange journey that this project will unfold in the following chapters below.

[21] For this fundamental fracture between religious-economic (private) and political, with the former swallowing up the latter in the crisis of the twentieth century. While the latter is far beyond the scope of this study, the radical separation, which left the state with a contested, if not confused, role in deciding (or not deciding) the scope of the sacred would see a private competition, the so-called marketplace of ideas, take the place of what determined the boundaries of acceptable beliefs. State powers were, thus, deactivated. See Giorgio Agamben, *The Kingdom and the Power: For a Theological Genealogy of Economy and Government* trans. Lorenzo Chiesa (Redwood City, CA: Stanford University Press, 2011).

Chapter One: The Sword of Peter: The Spiritual Independence of the Church of England and the Rejection of Royal Supremacy in Nonjuring Thought, 1691-1697

Jeremy Collier, a priest in the Church of England, was wanted for treason in 1696. In the aftermath of the Glorious Revolution, where William of Orange drove James II from his throne and became co-monarch with his wife (and James' daughter) Mary, not every subject accepted this change of royalty. Some flat out refused loyalty to a usurper and remained loyal to James Stuart, for which they received the name Jacobite. For some fewer still, it was not enough to refuse loyalty to the new king, but he must be actively deposed. A plot to assassinate William in 1696 failed, many of the plotters were apprehended, tried, and sentenced to death. Some of these conspirators, however, had other reasons to oppose the Glorious Revolution.[22]

It was not only that William was a usurper, but he also claimed tyrannical powers over the Church of England. In 1691, William had forced an ultimatum on clergy that still hedged about his royal title. Those clergy who refused to swear an oath that recognized him *de jure* as rightful king of England were deposed and replaced with clergy who did swear. These non-swearers, Nonjurors, were not merely animated by hostility to court intrigue and coups. They were upset with the abuse of the Church of England and the sovereignty its prelates had over affairs of the spirit, of conscience and life after death. It was for this reason that Collier courted public outrage when he (with two other clergymen, William Snatt and Shadrach Cook) prayed the Visitation of the Sick out of the Book of Common Prayer, the canonical prayerbook for the Church of England, for two of the conspirators (John Friend and William Perkins). These prayers absolved these men of their sins and prepared them for Heaven, seemingly removing the stain of

[22] Jane Garrett, *The Triumphs of Providence: The Assassination Plot, 1696* (Cambridge University Press, 1980), 3-5, 141-148, 176, 231-236.

an assassination attempt. Collier rejected accusations of disloyalty or treason, for it was his prerogative, as priest, to pastor his flock. Collier determined that "whereever Death is in view, the Office cannot be unseasonable, nor misapplyed." [23] Collier, as clergy, had a right to determine the scope and exercise of his office, a power that no king possessed.

Collier's intransigence and the assertion of his own rights came from this rejection of William's overreach. Nonjurors like Collier and his fellow priests had radicalized to the point of rejecting any royal restraint or control over the true Church of England, which was the rump of those deposed clergy who refused obedience to William. The Church of England, for these Nonjurors, was a spiritual society that was entirely independent from civil society. Prelates were spiritual monarchs that operated in a parallel society, with parallel authority, to the secular concerns of the throne. This chapter recontextualizes the Nonjuror schism as a radical break with the tradition of royal supremacy within the Church of England. Born from the experiences of the Civil Wars, where the Church of England and its bishops had been legally dissolved, not all churchmen were happy with the conditions of the Restoration that brought the Church of England back into existence. Some clergy, disturbed by the friendly encroachment from the Cavalier parliament that restored the *status quo ante* in 1662, these efforts did not empower clergy sufficiently to rule as sacred mediators between God and man. While efforts against Dissenters, those English Protestants who were ejected from the Church of England for refusing to conform, consumed most attention for these churchmen, frustration still grew.[24] The pressure to keep a united front broke for these churchmen with the Glorious Revolution and William's royal efforts to regulate the affairs of the clergy. The Nonjurors, rather than a mere ghost of the

[23] Jeremy Collier, *A Farther Defence of the Absolution given to Sr. William Perkins, Occasioned By a Paper, Entituled a Declaration of the Archbishops, and Bishops, &c.* (London: 1696), 5-6.
[24] John Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1991), 378-379.

past or a reactionary effort doomed to failure, offered a radical reinterpretation of the Church of England that demanded an entire separation of church from state to defend the interests of an independent spiritual society.

Past historians and theologians, for partisan reasons or misunderstanding, have not understood the significance of Nonjurors for the development of the Church of England. Commonly, Nonjurors have received treatment as part of an Anglo-Catholic theological genealogy, a steppingstone between the Laudian reforms in the 1630s and the Tractarian revolt in the mid-nineteenth century. Often lumped with High Churchmen, a specific historically contingent faction that has been treated as a universal category, Nonjurors were a *tertium quid* between Roman Catholicism and Protestant sectarian, part of a quintessential English characteristic for moderation.[25] In more historicized treatments, the clerical historian Norman Sykes Nonjurors continue the Restoration era High Church tradition of clerical privileges against a grasping state and its Low Church advocates.[26] Fused to Tory politics, G.V. Bennet argued the Nonjurors were reactionary critics, harassing Tory High Churchmen in their conservative readjustment to a post-Revolutionary England.[27] These interpretations rightly acknowledge Nonjuring defense of a sacred clergy against a growing state, but fail to disaggregate them from

---

[25] J. H. Overton, *The Non-Jurors: Their Lives, Principles, and Writings* (London: Smith, Elder, & Co., 1902), 6-8. L.M. Hawkins, *Allegiance in Church and State: The Problem of the Nonjurors in the English Revolution* (London: Routledge, 1928), 49; 53-55; 119-124. J.C. Wand, *The High Church Schism* (London: The Faith Press, 1951), 3-5, 11-12, 16-18. Robert D. Cornwall, *Visible and Apostolic: The Constitution of the Church in High Church Anglican and Non-Juror Thought* (Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 1993), 11-16, 60-77. Kenneth Hylson-Smith, *High Churchmanship in the Church of England: From the Sixteenth Century to the late Twentieth Century* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993), 71-77. Kenneth A. Locke, *The Church in Anglican Theology: A Historical, Theological and Ecumenical Exploration* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2009), 67-71.

[26] Norman Sykes, *From Sheldon to Secker: Aspects of English Church History, 1660-1768* (Cambridge University Press, 1959), 1-5, 22.

[27] G.V. Bennett, "Conflict in the Church", in *Britain after the Glorious Revolution, 1689-1714*, ed. Geoffrey Holmes (Bungay, Suffolk: Macmillan and Co., 1969), 159-160, 165-166. G.V. Bennett, *The Tory Crisis in Church and State, 1688-1730: The career of Francis Atterbury, Bishop of Rochester* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975), vii-viii, 4, 10-13, 20-22. Henry Horwitz gives a broader view of the politics surrounding the Church of England and state in the 1690s that shares Bennett's assessment. Henry Horwitz, *Parliament, Policy and Politics in the reign of William III* (Manchester University Press, 1977), 1-2, 53, 78, 199.

a High Church party that no only emerged later, after the Revolution, but was hostile to Nonjurors.

In a slightly different framework, Nonjurors have also been interpreted as merely mapping onto the political parties that became a permanent fixture after the Glorious Revolution. As High Churchmen and Low Churchmen mapped onto Tory and Whig politics respectively, with Nonjurors as extreme Tories, a fragmentation born from 1688. Nevertheless, these interpretations depend on a simplistic division between forward looking, even proto-liberal, Whigs and reactionary conservative Tories. High Churchmen and Nonjurors, treated as different stripes of reactionary politics, were speaking a "dying, if not quite dead, language" as Mark Goldie succinctly put it.[28] Theology was simply another way of doing politics, in this case a reactionary politics doomed to fail. In a slightly different gloss, Steven Pincus has interpreted the reign of James II as not turning back the clock, but an alternate form of modern politics, with a centralized and bureaucratic state that abstracted beyond the mere person of the monarch. It was not simply loyalty to the person of the king, but the king was the state. James II and William III, politically grouped as Jacobites/Tories and Whigs, had two rival views of modernity in form of the state. Theology, again, was another form of politics, so Nonjurors and High Churchmen reflected their political masters.[29]

Brent Sirota, in contrast to Pincus' breezy conflation of religion as politics by other means, treats Nonjurors as not mere extensions of Jacobitism. Sirota, however, adopts Pincus' dichotomies, seeing the battle between High Churchmen (of which Nonjurors are radically more consistent elements) and Low Churchmen as a battle between conservative and liberal theology.

---

[28] Mark Goldie, "The Nonjurors, Episcopacy, and the Origins of the Convocation Controversy" in *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1759*, ed. Eveline Cruickshanks (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1982), 15, 28-30.
[29] Pincus, *1688*, 402-424.

While High Churchmen and Nonjurors advocated clerical domination, Low Churchmen advanced liberal ideas about freedom of conscience, which became part of the advance of liberal modernism.[30] While Sirota does well to not simply collapse theology into politics, he does not adquately understand the distinction between High Churchmen and Nonjurors, as well as the equally "enlightened" capability of reaction or conservative thought.[31] It was this ability to develop and shatter a constellation of thought that also limits Jacqueline Rose's analysis of royal supremacy. The doctrine was not merely a hangover from the Reformation, but constantly reworked and renovated to justify new religious politics and the establishment for the Church of England. Similarly, the notion of a sacred clergy that had an independent spiritual power, a notion that had a long pedigree in the Church of England, developed for different needs. The experience of the Civil Wars was a rupture that taught an influential minority of clergy that royal supremacy was to be severely criticized, if not abandoned altogether. The Glorious Revolution taught Nonjurors to abandon all pretense to the doctrine altogether, embracing an entirely independent spiritual society that civil authority, including the king, had no power over.[32]

This chapter, in showing the origins and development of Nonjuror thought and how it collided with the conforming Church of England, shows a very different and more radical source of Nonjuring that was anything but dead. Nonjurors were interpreted by contemporaries, both High Churchmen and Low, as a substantial threat to the post-Revolutionary alliance between church and state. I argue Nonjurors did not reform, but to shatter the existent bonds, even if it

---

[30] Sirota, *The Christian Monitors*, 3-4, 24-25, 70-71, 151-153, 188-190. Brent S. Sirota, "The Trinitarian Crisis in Church and State: Religious Controversy and the Making of the Post-revolutionary Church of England, 1687-1702," *Journal of British Studies*, vol. 52, (January 2013), 26, 28-29, 53-54. Brent S. Sirota, "'The Leviathan Is Not Safely to Be Angered': The Convocation Controversy, and Anglican High Churchmanship, 1689-1702" in *Religion and the State: Europe and North America in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, eds. Joshua B. Stein and Sargon G. Donabed (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2012), 44-46, 50.

[31] Bulman, *Anglican Enlightenment*, xi-xiv, 6-11.

[32] Jacqueline Rose, *Godly Kingship in Restoration England, Politics of Royal Supremacy* (Cambridge University Press, 2011), 2-5, 18-19, 130-132.

meant the complete secularization of civil politics. Any semblance of royal supremacy was rejected in order to better defend the passively obedient orthodox, who never submitted the spiritual authorities of the clergy to any lay authority, not king and certainly not Parliament. Nonjuring stood as a radical shock that threatened the very existence of the Church of England, requiring churchmen to either embrace its separatism or repress it throughout the 1690s.

During the English Civil Wars, exiled prelates were in a state of existential crisis. These clergy still claimed to represent the Church of England, though it was no longer legally existent in England. Did the Church of England exist, and if so, how? Did the usurping English Republic, and later the Cromwellian Protectorate, in the 1650s destroy the Church of England? Was that even possible? While some bid their time until the inevitable (they hoped) return of Charles II, others embraced a more radical solution. Herbert Thorndike, a well decorated clergyman of a more extreme Laudian bent, rejected that the Church had any intrinsic relationship to the crown. Thorndike declared, during his exile, that "the Church and civill Societies must needs remain distinct bodies when the Church is ingraffed into the State, and the same Christian members … remain distinct, according to the distinct Societies and qualities of several persons in the same."[33] Other Anglican exiles, like Henry Hammond and Gilbert Sheldon who became prelates after the Restoration of 1660, found Thorndike's ecclesiastical separatism congenial.[34] Therefore, when the Church of England finally returned home, being legally reestablished on generous terms of Laudian orthodoxy in 1662, not every clergyman was happy with the extent of reform. For them, the Church of England was vulnerable to the same statecraft that saw it dissolved in the first place. The clergy's power to discipline and regulate their own numbers and the laity were

[33] Herbert Thorndike, *A Discourse on the Right of the Church in a Christian State* (London: 1649), 40-41.
[34] Jeffrey R. Collins, *Allegiance of Thomas Hobbes*, (Oxford University Press, 2005), 245-255.

insufficient. Diocesan government was unreformed, placing insufficient resources for clergy to prosecute disciplinary offenses. Even worse, the friendly Cavalier parliament gave too much power to itself, and not enough power to clergy-run church courts, to impose reform. While most clergymen were happy with the reforms, "high flyers," or those churchmen of a more extreme temperament, lamented the continued lay captivity of the Church of England.[35]

Thorndike was one of those "high flyers" who was not entirely pleased with the Restoration's efforts. The Church of England erred if it looked to the king for its wellbeing, since the unity of the universal church was "not derived from Constantine, but from our Lord and his Apostles, and the law imposed by them upon all Christians, to maintain communion among themselves."[36] King had constantly overreached their authority to abuse the Church of England, even Henry VIII, who had replaced the tyranny of the pope with his own. The only solution to restrain wicked princes was for the prelates of the Church, as successors of the Apostles, to excommunicate. The Church, as an independent spiritual society, required a means to regulate its boundaries, to remove and discipline offending laity, even kings.[37] Thorndike saw in bishops, as the spiritual rulers of the Church of England, as the only means to resist bad kings, whether they intend well or not. Clergy had to fight to preserve their own spiritual powers by exercising these spiritual powers, no longer relying on a king or parliaments to defend them. The legacy of the ancient and sainted bishop Cyprian, who vigorously asserted episcopal powers in the third century, became an ideal for aspiring prelates and the exercise of their spiritual sovereignty. If

[35] For a partisan, but useful, George Every gives an overview the woes and struggles of clergy seeking greater freedom to govern and discipline. While the views of the clergy did not reflect universal frustration, they do show the inner understandings of many churchmen who would become Nonjurors because spiritual independence was the supreme virtue. George Every, *The High Church Party, 1688-1718* (London: SPCK, 1956), xiii-xiv, 1, 8-10, 72-73, 82-93, 103-104.
[36] Herbert Thorndike, *JUST WEIGHTS AND MEASURES: That is, The present STATE of RELIGION Weighed in the BALANCE* (London: 1662), Intro.
[37] Ibid., 22-27, 34-40.

the legacy of the early church meant an extreme curtailment, if not rejection, of royal supremacy over the Church of England, so be it.[38]

Some younger churchmen, of a similarly "high flyer" temperament, took up the ideal of a spiritually independent Church of England guarded by its bishops. Henry Dodwell wrote a treatise against Roman Catholicism but contained within it veiled criticisms of bad churchmanship. The problem with Rome, and the need for the original Reformation, was the despotism of the pope. To be a Protestant, for Dodwell, was to defend the spiritual autonomy of bishops, which the pope had attempted to usurp and consolidate in his own office. Dodwell was hopeful, however, for various national Catholic churches, such as in France and in the Holy Roman Empire, which still preserved episcopal rights to convene and judge. These bishops, if they had the will, could even overturn the Council of Trent, the Roman Catholic answer to Protestant confessions of faith, and reunite with episcopal Protestant churches like the Church of England. The validity of councils was in the common consent of bishops, and since Trent had not invited Protestant bishops from Sweden or England, let alone Eastern Orthodox bishops from Greece or Russia, it lacked the universal authority to constrain. The "fundamental principle of unity" for the Church was the "unanimous consent of the Catholick church diffusive," exercised through councils of bishops. It was only if bishops were allowed to gather frequently and across national borders that universal discipline and doctrine could be made for the universal church.[39] For Dodwell, therefore, the Church of England would only thrive if it could govern itself through bishops, something that did not rely or depend upon any civil authority, even the king.

---

[38] Jean-Louis Quantin, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity: The Construction of a Confessional Identity in the 17th Century* (Oxford University Press, 2009), 13-22, 327, 370-393. Patristic scholarship advanced from justifying sacred powers for the clergy in the sacraments, but also towards a curtailment of royal supremacy for the primitive rights of bishops. After 1691, however, the model of Cyprian would lead similarly minded clergy towards a total break with royal supremacy. Clergy as spiritual officers over an independent spiritual society were free from the king, who was a purely civil magistrate.

[39] Henry Dodwell, *Two Discourses Against the Romanists* (London: 1676), unnumbered.

It was this episcopal spiritual independence that made the Church of England superior to Rome. Writing to a woman who considered conversion to Catholicism, Dodwell argued that the core error of Rome, more important than prayers to saints or veneration of images, was episcopal tyranny. The Church of England had valid episcopal orders, contrary to Roman Catholic apologetics, that carried back to the Apostles. Submission to the pope did not strengthen or weaken these claims, for bishops in the Church of England had equal validity to "popish" bishops who were enslaved to the pope. Dodwell did not deny validity to Rome because of doctrinal errors, for even the early church recognized "the validity of baptism administered by hereticks."[40] Rome may have veered into severe error, but they had retained tactile succession and that was sufficient for valid orders. English clergy, prior to the Reformation, had fallen into the delusion of Roman obedience, lacking "that kind of grammatical and historical learning which is only fit to qualifie a person to judge of ecclesiastical tradition." The current Church of England, liberated from ignorance, had preserved the ancient and apostolic notion of episcopal independence. Rome, by vesting all power in the pope, had innovated, and therefore conversion was a mistake, a departure from best to corrupt but valid.[41] The superiority of the Church of England, however, did not mean it was immune to corruption. The Reformation may have freed English bishops from the pope, but it threatened to enslave them to the king. Roman Catholic apologists had criticized Henry VIII for illegal reforms, a tyrant who captured the English church. For Dodwell, while Henry Tudor and his parliaments were rough, they imposed nothing without the consent of England's bishops. The Reformation parliaments may have passed laws to reform the Church of England, but they were only valid because bishops met in council to pass

[40] Henry Dodwell, *AN ANSWER TO Six Queries Proposed to a Gentlewoman of the Church of ENGLAND, by an Emissary of the Church of ROME; fitted to a Gentlewomans capacity* (London: 1676), 55-59.
[41] Ibid., 70-76.

them. The seizure of church land was unjust, but it did not jeopardize the Church of England, which was an entirely spiritual society. Land ownership was a civil affair and kings may rescind land grants if they wish. Even if, Dodwell was willing to concede, English clergy slavishly obeyed a tyrant in ecclesiastical reforms, this error did nothing to change the Church of England's constitution.[42] In a circumspect way, in defense to a potential Roman convert, no fault can really be firmly placed on the Church of England. No matter what errors its clergy accept, no matter what abuse it suffers, the Church of England was an independent spiritual society, with ultimate power vested in its bishops. That alone made it the best of all churches.

Dodwell, in arguments against English Dissent, made similar arguments. Like Roman Catholics, Dissents ignorantly believed that the Reformation was a break with the past. Rather than understand the Reformation was the return to the spiritual independence of bishops, Dissenters treated the Reformation as a quest for dogmatic purity, allowing them to separate from the Church of England when it failed to teach good doctrine. Dodwell rejected this idea, as the Reformation was about the institutional unity and purity of bishops meeting in council as spiritual sovereigns. The Reformation was about the preservation of apostolic succession, and their refusal of bishops was "disobedience to the divine government, which by the principles of government is always counted greater than the violation of any particular laws." Dissenters compounded their treason with false authority, "forging covenants in the name of God himself, and of counter feiting the great seals of Heaven for the ratification of such covenants."[43] The Church of England alone preserved the "catholick peace," rejecting papal or royal tyranny and Dissenter anarchy. Like Roman Catholicism, Dissenters created division through demands of

[42] Ibid., 110-120.
[43] Henry Dodwell, *Separation of Churches from Episcopal Government, As practised by the present Non-Conformists, Proved Schismatical* (London: 1679), xii-xiv.

infallible interpretation. The Church of England, in contrast, could only claim probability in doctrine, increasing in truth as more and more bishops met together in council. This arrangement kept the universal church humble without infinite fragmentation of sects, each vying for their own interpretation of the Bible.[44]

Again, the Church of England was not immune to internal corruption. While Dodwell could praise some Dissenters, like the Independents, who did not hand their churches over to civil magistrates, he could not say the same for all clergy in the Church of England. Dodwell lamented those "ill Principled in the Right of Church-Authority" who would make the Church "dependent on the power of the Secular Magistrate (and such a Party there has been among us from the beginning of the Reformation to this very day."[45] Dissenters erred in rejecting God's spiritual government for his church, but these conforming clergy were willing to sell out their birthright for a mess of porridge. Dodwell understood the universal church's government as a covenant, where the clergy, as spiritual magistrates, represented the laity as mediators before God. Deputized by Heaven to give or restrict access to the divine, the clergy could give or withhold the sacrament from the laity, the only sure title to salvation in the afterlife. This power was not "democratical," as clergy were not empowered by the laity to perform their office. Rather, bishops, who were spiritual monarchs, received their office from fellow bishops, with lines that traced back to the Apostles. Bishops alone could impose reforms on the church, even "external solemnities" to add further significance to the "spiritual advantages" in the sacrament.[46] In other words, bishops could add more pomp and ceremony to show the greatness of their spiritual powers. If bishops did not control the means to add or remove clergy, or

[44] Ibid., xviii-xx, 16, 22-35.
[45] Ibid., 35
[46] Ibid., 40-48.

exercise how they granted access to the divine, then it fell to the laity, whether king or assembly. Both would corrupt the church and destroy its government. Thus, bishops alone, who understood themselves as spiritual monarchs, could preserve the Church of England as a spiritual society.

The problem with Dissenters, Dodwell continued into the next decade, was their refusal to recognize the basis of legitimate government. Bishops represented the universal church, as kings represented their respective nations, and had a right to discipline offenses. Clergy, as representative spiritual officers of the universal church, had a right to "oblige men to enter into it, and to submit to its rules of discipline, however the secular state should stand affected." The universal church, including the Church of England, was a spiritual corporation, a "body politick," not "scattered individuals" as he accused Calvinists of believing.[47] The powers of bishops derived from God, who appointed them as his representatives to enforce the laws of his government. Law alone was insufficient for a corporate society, as imposition of law was necessary. Bishops applied God's law in binding and loosing, giving or withholding the sacrament from the laity, applying or rescinding the right of salvation. It was true, as Dissenters complained, that bishops could act badly, as much as kings could act tyrannously. But moral failure and abuse of office was insufficient to scrap the office altogether. God had provided bishops as the means of spiritual authority, as God provided kings as the means of civil authority.[48] Dissenters asking God to miraculously ordain new officers was to reject the normative means that God had provided. In the final judgement, God would punish both wicked bishops and wicked kings, but in this world obedience was necessary. Spiritual and civil sovereigns, as parallel entities, operated according to delegated representative authority. Churches and kingdoms were analogous in function. Therefore, just as kings empower officers to

[47] Ibid., 105-107.
[48] Ibid., 131-137.

distribute civil goods, God ordained bishops to distribute spiritual goods.[49] This logic pertained not just to Christianity, but these were "rules of natural religion as agreed in by the consent of all civilized religious nations" and were the "fundamental principles of government."[50]

It was these principles of government that Dissenters rejected, and were in danger of Hell for doing so. Baptism granted a "legal title" to be saved, which the eucharist, when duly administered, reaffirmed. These were the normal means to receive God's grace.[51] Dissenters, however, had no legitimate representatives to offer these tokens of divine favor. Preaching may speak about grace, and the need to acquire it, but had no power to offer it. Salvation after death was not something primarily felt or believed, but was a legal phenomenon, a deed to a spiritual estate. Dissenter ministers, therefore, tricked their congregations in believing that they could find salvation in their conventicles. Bishops, standing as Jesus Christ, alone could guarantee a legal right to the divine favor that Dissenters so eagerly sought.[52] Dodwell cited the ancient and sainted bishop, Cyprian of Carthage, as proof that each bishop stood as a representative for universal church. These bishops, traced back to the Apostles, received their authority in an unbroken chain, as much as "any sect of philosophers derived their succession from their first founder by keeping up the succession of his chair."[53] Outside of this chain of succession, however, there was "no communicating with Christ, however orthodox a profession they made of him, without a continuance in the orthodox communion." The only alternative for Dissenters was "popish mystical divinity," equating Roman Catholicism with the direct spiritual experiences of sects like the Quakers. [54] Therefore, if "the validity of baptism it self depend on

[49] Ibid., 140-141.
[50] Ibid., 148-149.
[51] Ibid., 156-157.
[52] Ibid., 168-175.
[53] Ibid., 207-208.
[54] Ibid., 254-255.

the authority of him who administers it," and this "authority cannot be had without episcopal ordination," then Dissenters can offer no legal title to salvation.[55]

Dodwell may have embraced a radical historicism, calling the salvation of non-episcopal Protestants into question, but his approach was in line with the Church of England's focus on the earliest centuries of the universal church. The consensus of the earliest centuries was normative, including churches who were independent, even opposed, to the civil authority of the government. [56] For churchmen like Dodwell, this emphasis meant even rejecting royal supremacy over the church for episcopal autonomy. If it did not fit the political mood of the 1670s, it did not matter. The rights of the Church of England, regardless of the monarch or any parliaments, was of supreme importance.

Joining Dodwell in attacks upon the joint threat of popery and Dissenter, George Hickes, chaplain to Charles II, defended bishops as spiritual sovereigns, parallel and analogous to kings. Civil sovereign possessed "supream power, and particularly power of the sword," an arrangement that was preferably as a hereditary monarch. Hickes, however, understood that civil sovereignty could exist in other forms, such as a popular assembly in ancient Athens, when it was delegated. There was no such thing as popular sovereignty, rejecting the idea that "the people are the fountain and foundation of all power and dominion." God alone was the dispenser of sovereign powers, and this power was given through visible and normative means of succession. This power belonged to kings as civil monarchs and to bishops as spiritual monarchs. The Church of England alone stood against the forces of Roman Catholicism and Dissent, which sought to seize the legitimate spiritual monarchy located in bishops and displace it somewhere

[55] Ibid., 354-355.
[56] Quantin, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity*, 342-343, 381-390.

else.[57] The parallel institutions of church and state needed to be scrupulously preserved in their legitimate boundaries against all usurpers and confounders.

While higher placed churchmen fought for the Church of England's episcopal powers in arguments with Dissenters and potential Roman Catholics, other "high flyers" applied the desire for spiritual independence to their particular circumstances. Jeremy Collier, a priest ordained in 1677, had become frustrated with his patron Charles Sackville, the early of Dorset, whom he served as chaplain. Dorset had embraced, at least in Collier's estimation, the libertine cynicism of Charles II's court and had little regard for clerical superiority. Collier had bided his time, but now that the Church of England appeared in danger, with James II's imprisonment of seven bishops for refusing to preach his official dispensation for tolerance, it was time to act.[58] Collier lashed his patron, complaining that the "function of the clergy in general is too often misunderstood, (which in such a skeptical and licentious age we need not wonder at,) those who officiate in private houses lie under particular disadvantages." Collier was not simply a hireling for a temporal lord, but was a "spiritual governour" that ministered to temporal lords. Failing to recognize the great power of priests, was "in effect to challenge divine honours" and "set up" the temporal lord "for a god." A priest like Collier was "in joynt commission with the angels themselves" to govern the universal church, with spiritual powers to bless and restrain laity like the earl of Dorset.[59] Though sounding like the rage of a disgruntled employee, Collier justified his criticism on the basis of belonging to an entirely different order of reality. As a priest, he had

[57] George Hickes, *A discourse of the soveraign power* (London: 1682), 1-4, 19-21.
[58] Tania Boster, "'Better to be alone than in ill company': Jeremy Collier the Younger: Life and Works, 1650-1726" (PhD diss., University of Pittsburgh, 2008), 38-42, 52-53.
[59] Jeremy Collier, *The Office of a Chaplain Equir'd into, and Vindicated from Servility and Contempt* (London: 1688), 4, 11, 21-22.

spiritual power over laity, even very wealthy and powerful laity, to grant access to divine favor. The Church of England was free from civil lords to pursue its own heavenly ends.

Not all prelates in the Church of England, however much they may have resented James II's Catholicism and toleration, were not ready to receive their liberator. William of Orange, landing in the Bay of Torbay, drove James II from his throne and was rapidly received as new monarch with his wife Mary II. It was unclear upon what basis Parliament, gathered in a special session, had the right to confer the crown on William, and so a legal fiction that James had abdicated was the acceptable solution to most parties.[60] As newly elected William III, the new king required oaths of obedience, recognizing his title. Dodwell, a leading voice of many "high flyers" who were uneasy with this breach of legal title, took a subtle approach. It was disturbing that Parliament had declared the throne vacant when the previous king was still alive and exiled in France. Yet, none of these legal problems impacted the Church of England, which was a spiritually independent society. Neither James II nor William III had power to regulate or alter the clergy, therefore good churchmen did not need to debate about the legitimacy of William's claim. Nevertheless, Dodwell feared that the new king would not stop at the limited oaths he required, which simply accepted his rule without adjudicating the legitimacy of his title. William would "never be content with a bare neutrality, but will expect active assistances from his liege subjects, and this by vertue of their Allegiance and their Oaths."[61] But this fact did not mean faithful churchmen needed to oppose the new king, since William was surely reasonable. Given that the old king was still alive, and the clergy had sworn oaths to him, William would not make the clergy commit perjury in forswearing their old sovereign. It was in the new king's "interest"

[60] Richard S. Kay, *The Glorious Revolution and the Continuity of Law* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2014), 1-12.
[61] Henry Dodwell, *Concerning the care of taking the new oath of fealty and allegeiance with a declaration* (London: 1689), 1-3.

to leave the clergy alone, preserved in the "liberty of conscience" that William had promised to protect.[62] Dodwell did not accept William's title, but that did not make him an ardent Jacobite. If William was willing to allow clergy to simply accept his authority, without pressing his title, then peace was possible. It did not matter, as this affair was a civil matter and did not impact the spiritual constitution of the Church of England.

Dodwell was not alone in this circumspect response. George Hickes scolded William's effort to bully the clergy after his just intervention. Hickes praised the seven bishops who refused to obey James II's order to preach his toleration dispensation, honorably suffering jail without counseling rebellion. These same bishops rightly celebrated William's landing, forcing James II to be accountable for his wicked actions. But the seven bishops, who were leading opponents to new oaths for William, never agreed that William's invasion made William into England's new king. The Dutch prince was a check on royal despotism, but not a replacement king. James had never abdicated and now was unjustly forced off his throne, even as James had been wicked in his kingship. Ancient Christians, in their original purity, had always recognized that kings may behave unjustly without losing the right to their thrones. The primitive church was "subject to the most barbarous tyrants, and in the most bloody persecutions, and yet never presum'd to dispense with the fifth [commandment]." Hickes was willing to accept William as a king *de facto*, an unjust tyrant that nevertheless ruled in peace, if he did not require new oaths. He had no right to require perjury and no right to meddle with the clergy. Taking upon the mantle of the sainted Athanasius, a fourth-century bishop who fought heresy even in the imperial court, Hickes declared he would resist the heresy of usurpation in the court as long as it was demanded.[63] Like

[62] Ibid., 9.
[63] George Hickes, *Reflections upon a letter out of the country, to a member of this present Parliament occasioned by a late letter to a member of the House of Commons, concerning the bishops lately in the Tower, and now under suspension* (London: 1689), 2-8.

Dodwell, Hickes was not a Jacobite absolutist. He was willing to peace with William if he refused to impose oaths and respect the clergy's independence. When William refused these demands, only then did division explode.

Collier also attacked William's new oaths as a form of royal overreach into the spiritual autonomy of the Church of England. Collier focused on the liturgical aspect of the oaths, which altered the state prayers in the Book of Common Prayer, requiring prayer for William and Mary by name as legitimate monarchs. Collier was not concerned with usurpation as much as with changes to the prayer book, which no civil magistrate had a right to impose. The new prayers were "civil idolatry" and required the Church of England to praise sin. If the Church of England allowed William to alter their prayers, then the Church must also "invoke Heaven for plague, famine, and conspiracies, and most of those other miseries and sins which we are taught to pray against." Despite this being a great breach of the Church's spiritual independence, Collier expected that evil kings would "by the management of their purses and censures" buy off clergy, who "they have once worked him up to naming." Clergy who accepted these new oaths had betrayed their office, with Collier glossing the Apostle Paul's remark that "*if he pleased men* (Out of Principles of Interest or Servility) *he should not be the Servant of Christ*."[64] The oaths in themselves were not the problem. William's usurpation was tolerable, despite a gross injustice against James II's royal title. The problem was alteration to the Church of England, imposing oaths on clergy, making liturgical changes in public worship, and requiring clergy to betray their consciences. All of these perceived attacks and usurpations drove these Nonjurors forward as opponents of William.

[64] Jeremy Collier, *A Caution against inconsistency, or, The connexion between praying and swearing in relation to the civil powers* (London: 1690), 2-3.

Against these criticisms of William, a fellow "high flyer" but tepid apologist for William's title, William Sherlock, accepted these new oaths and prayers. Sherlock had agreed with Nonjurors up until the final hour, when William threatened to depose all clergy who refused to swear an oath to him and Mary, by name, as rightful *de jure* monarchs of England. Sherlock backed down and swore the oaths, gaining the plush deanery of St Paul's, now eager to justify his seeming acquiescence. 1691 was the break between those who refused to swear the oaths and those conformists who still advocated for clerical powers under royal supremacy. Sherlock represents the birth of a "High Church" party that had previously not existed, an emphasis not on spiritual independence of the clergy to govern themselves. Bishops, for Sherlock, were not analogous to kings as parallel monarchs, but spiritual servants under a godly monarch, with only the latter guaranteeing the former. Unlike the Nonjurors, who jettisoned royal supremacy, High Churchmen, typified by Sherlock, embraced it to justify obedience to the post-Revolutionary government.[65]

Against criticisms that kings never had a right to impose upon the clergy, Sherlock argued that William had every right to deprive clergymen who refused to swear the oath. Quoting a canon from the Convocation of 1603, usurpation was indeed wicked, but that "whenever such changes are made" in civil government, the new authority was "Gods, and must be obeyed." It did not matter if William had usurped the throne, he had now conquered it and had legal right to it. Ancient Judea, under the High Priest Jaddus, was under the Persian Empire before Alexander the Great's conquest. Did Jaddus claim obedience to the Persian shah? No, Sherlocked declaimed, he submitted to the king of Macedonia and swore an oath to him as his new sovereign. From this ancient example, Sherlocked concluded that "princes, who have no

[65] Kenneth Padley, "Rendering unto Caesar in the Age of Revolution: William Sherlock and William of Orange," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. 59, No. 4 (2008), 683-684, 696.

legal right to their thrones, when they are placed there by God, are invested with Gods authority, and must be reverenced and obeyed by all subjects." To refuse this new, divinely given, government was disobedience. To reject conforming clergy as sinning in these new oaths was schism. Sherlock lamented the Nonjurors as "our new dissenters," and rhetorically prayed that God would protect William and Mary from all danger and dissent, invoking the language of the Book of Common Prayer.[66] Whatever ambiguity around William's accession, the matter was settled and all churchmen must conform to the new king's right to regulate the affairs of the clergy, requiring obedience and prayers from them.

Collier blasted Sherlock as a traitor to the cause. Unlike the new dean of St Paul's, Collier confessed he had no "Roman pretences" or ability to perform casuistry to justify the unjustifiable. Sherlock's logic was absurd, for if the Church of England must obey William then it must obey "Captain Tom" as "the most sovereign and divine thing upon the earth" if this nobody drove a king from his throne. Sherlock had basically become a Cromwellian, sanctioning rebellion if it wins and works.[67] In contrast to Sherlock's submission, Collier was the true defender of the Church of England and its spiritual independence. It was not kings, but bishops, who were the legitimate monarchs over the universal church. Bishops were spiritual monarchs and monarchs, whether spiritual or civil, required legitimate succession. Drawing on the example of Cyprian, Collier posed a rhetorical scenario: "let us suppose, according to *St. Cyprian's* Principle, […] that a lawful Bishop is deposed by his People, and another chosen and consecrated by the Presbytery, (who are the Spiritual Estates)." If Sherlocked consented to this arrangement, then he "contradicts the universal church, and destroys the episcopal authority."

[66] William Sherlock, *The Case of the Allegiance due to sovereaign powers, defended, &c.* (London: 1691), 4-8, 28.
[67] Jeremy Collier, *Dr. Sherlock's Case of Allegiance Considered with some remarks upon his Vindication* (London: 1691), 10-11.

Rather than on the power of civil magistrates, the Church of England had a "divine bottom," which never allowed royal tyranny to change its spiritual being. The clergy of the Church of England, as spiritual officers with legitimate succession, alone had the right to alter its own ranks, reform its doctrine, or alter its worship.[68] In the Nonjuring conception of ecclesiastical government, bishops were analogous to kings, spiritual sovereigns that governed a spiritual society in spiritual affairs. Sherlock had confounded these in requiring obedience to a monarch. It was not simply that Collier deigned William as a usurper, it was that he dared to confuse his civil powers with the spiritual monarchy that only bishops possessed.

Hickes also joined in the attack on this form friend, accusing Sherlock of becoming an apologist for tyranny as the price to pay for advancement. If Sherlock justified William as king by his *de facto* conquest, then Sherlock would also logically have to defend Oliver Cromwell as lawful magistrate once he drove Charles Stuart from power. Sherlock justified not only the abolition of the monarchy, but that the English Republic had also abolished the Church of England in dissolving episcopacy. Civil war and usurpation were now Christian virtues for Sherlock. Hickes believed that in praying for William as king, the dean of St Paul's was no longer a Christian, but believed in Thomas Hobbes as his lord and savior. Love of neighbor now meant slavish obedience to power. Sherlock had converted the Church of England into a creature of state, now becoming "the true Son of your Sire Leviathan, who was above all Authority but his own." Against Sherlock's theory of political power, Hickes defended a continuous crown, passed through legal succession, where kingdoms were "as if they had but one immortal, or never dying king." Similarly, bishops had an immortal line through valid succession, leading all the way back to the Apostles. This office had a divine backing, where even if a civil magistrate

[68] Ibid., 16-17.

legally dissolved the Church of England, as had happened during the Civil Wars, it still remained. This understanding of episcopacy as a spiritual monarchy, passed down successively, was necessary to justify the universal church's continued existence. It may be abused by kings, republics, or popes, but it could never be altered or destroyed. Bishops may act unjustly or side with corrupt perversions of the universal church, but the office remained incorrupt. Sherlock, in refusing this principle, had ceased to be a true Christian and embraced the new faith of his usurping patrons. It was better, for Hickes, to suffer as dissidents and even lose conforming laity to the Dissenters than betray the true principles of the Church of England.[69]

Sherlock the High Churchman was joined by Low Church clergy, who eagerly justified the king's deprivations as his right in a Christian realm. Edward Stillingfleet, Bishop of Worcester, joined in the attack on the Nonjurors as a new form of Dissenter. Targeting bishop William Beverige, opposed to royal control of the clergy but unsure if he should still swear the oath or not, Stillingfleet rejected this principled rejection of royal supremacy. The power to fill or empty bishoprics was "an authority which belongs to the imperial crown of England." Beveridge might accept William as king, but that meant he had to accept clerical deprivations. For, as Stillingfleet argued, "if it be unlawful to succeed a deprived bishop, then he is the bishop of the Diocess still; and then the law that deprives him is no law, and consequently the king and parliament, that made that law, no king nor parliament." If the deprived clergy were clergy still, then "the people and clergy of his Diocess are bound to own him and no other […] the clergy, who live in communion with schismatical bishops, are schismaticks themselves; and the whole

[69] George Hickes, *A Vindication of Some among Our Selves Against the False Principles of Dr. Sherlock* (London: 1692), 5, 10-12, 24-25, 42-50.

Church of England now established by law is schismatical."[70] In this simple formula, Stillingfleet could not have done better than Nonjurors to lay out the argument. The values, however, were reversed. It was absurd to claim that the entire Church of England was now in schism because it obeyed the new king, something the Church of England had always done. Fence riders had to decide to become Nonjurors or accept the new king.

Stillingfleet's defense of the Glorious Revolution and attack upon the Nonjurors reflected a long consistent vision of the Church of England that contradicted the "high flyers" and other advocates for a sacred clergy. After the Restoration, Stillingfleet advocated for a charitable establishment for the Church of England, seeking to bring Dissenters back into the fold through wider latitude of belief and practice. All Christian societies required a single church that operated under a godly monarch. Kings did not have unlimited power over churches, but Stillingfleet believed they had "power relative to ecclesiastical affairs," installing or depriving clergy on the basis of merit. The Church of England was not an autonomous spiritual society, but constituted a national assembly, like Parliament, for settling spiritual affairs in the kingdom. All churches, including the Church of England, were beneath their temporal sovereigns. The king of England was the head over the Church, which was an element of a Christian society, not an independent society altogether.[71]

Stillingfleet was not willing to accept permanent toleration for Dissenters, for they were part of a broader national establishment. When any nation accepted Christianity, all churches in

[70] Edward Stillingfleet, *A VINDICATION OF Their Majesties Authority TO FILL The SEES of the Deprived Bishops in a letter out of the country occasioned by Dr. B—'s refusal of the bishoprick of Bath and Wells* (London: 1691), 13-16.
[71] Edward Stillingfleet, *Irenicum; A Weapon Salve for the Church's Wounds; or the Divine Right of Particular Forms of Church Government*, 2nd Ed. (London: 1662), 37-51. John Marshall offers a broader exposition of Stillingfleet's view of the church as part of a broader grouping of Latitudinarians. John Marshall, "The Ecclesiology of the Latitude-men 1660-1689: Stillingfleet, Tillotson, and 'Hobbism'," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. 36, No. 3 (1985), 412-415.

that realm were "incorporated into one Christian society, under the same common ties and rules of order and government."[72] It was simply not possible for Dissenters to remain outside of the Church of England, which was the royal organization of Christianity for all Englishmen, whatever their doctrinal differences. Bishops were not sacred mediators of the divine, but "the king's visitors and commissioners" to ensure good practice and belief throughout his realm. This placed power with the Christian monarchy, who had a right to impose various practices, including the liturgy of the 1662 Book of Common Prayer which Dissenters rejected. Non-conformists had no right to reject the desires of a Christian prince, who convened in Parliament and the Church of England's Convocation, for they ought to submit to the "wisdom of the Whole Nation." Royal supremacy, working through the assemblies of temporal or spiritual lords, held together Christianity within the realm.[73]

Stillingfleet applied this same ecclesiastical vision to the Nonjurors as new Dissenters. Against Beveridge, Stillingfleet explained the need to submit in the same terms that he used against Dissenters. When a nation, such as England, converted to Christianity then "the Church is incorporated into the State, and the Soveraign Power has a Supremacy in all Ecclesiastical Causes." The Reformation restored this power to godly princes, after centuries of papal usurpation, and the requirement of oaths and prayers was an exercise of this power. If Beveridge still wanted to accept William as king, then he also had to accept the king's right to depose

---

[72] Edward Stillingfleet, *The Mischief of Separation: A Sermon Preached at Guild-Hall Chappel, May II. MDCLXXX Being the First Sunday in Easter-Term, Before the Lord Mayor, &c.* (London: 1680), 16.

[73] Edward Stillingfleet, *The Unreasonableness of Separation, or, An impartial account of the history, nature, and pleas of the present separation from the communion of the Church of England to which, several late letters are annexed, of eminent Protestant divines abroad, concerning the nature of our differences, and the way to compose them* (London: 1681), 76-77, 152-155, 220-221, 239-243. Jacqueline Rose demonstrates how Latitudinarian churchmen, during the Restoration, adjusted the royal supremacy to include toleration, but this development was no radical break with the concept. Jacqueline Rose, "'By law established': The Church of England and the royal supremacy" in *The Later Stuart Church, 1660-1714*, ed. Grant Tapsell (Manchester University Press, 2012), 23-26, 32-33.

clergy. To refuse the king this power was to place the Church of England under the authority of "a pope, or a presbytery, or a national synod, above the supream power." Henry VIII had done removed papal clergy to secure the Reformation, sacking all bishops who did not recognize the king as supreme head over the Church of England. Without royal supremacy, Stillingfleet argued, there was no Church of England, and so it was fair to conclude that "the denial of the King's Supremacy in Ecclesiastical Causes, was thought a good Reason to depose Bishops." If Beveridge did not accept this framework, then "the Church must be divided from the state and be independent on [sic] it."[74] Once again, Nonjurors could not put the matter more starkly with reversed evaluation. Stillingfleet had argued for royal supremacy as cause of the Reformation and the means for unity in the Church of England. Bishops were royal commissioners at best, with clergy serving to maintain the unity of a Christian kingdom. If bishops were independent of royal power, then the Church of England was independent of royal power, separated from the state. These claims, in Stillingfleet's use, were to spook Beveridge and others who accepted royal oversight, but this idea was the radical pulse that drove the Nonjurors against the new government.

To further attack and harass the Nonjurors, calling their claim that the Church of England was an independent spiritual society into question, Stillingfleet's chaplain, Humphrey Hody, republished a translation of a thirteenth-century Byzantine ecclesiastical history, labeled "Baroccian MS" in the stacks of the Bodleian. This history narrated the many times where Emperors in Constantinople removed bishops for resisting civil authority over the universal church. In a preface to the translation, the author[75] rejected any sinister motives to republishing

[74] Edward Stillingfleet, *A VINDICATION*, 18-21.
[75] The prefacer's initials, "R.B.", most likely belong to Richard Bentley. A Cambridge trained classicist, Bentley joined Stillingfleet's household in 1683, being a fellow chaplain with Hody. For Bentley's professional

this text, given that it seemed to weigh in on the fight between Nonjurors and conformists. It was simply "singular providence" that this manuscript had been discovered, a means to rebut "unsatisfied persons of the Church of England" that supreme civil magistrates had a right to regulate the clergy. This account utilized the "authorities of Antiquity," a source of authority "which they profess to imitate, and pretend to allege." This medieval chronicle demonstrated that emperors had acted unjustly in depriving bishops, but their right to do it was never questioned and it never provoked schism. Of course, the case of an unjust emperor depriving godly bishops had nothing to do with contemporary affairs. As the prefacer foreswore, "God forbid, that the Case […] should be thought parallel to that of our New Bishops […] as if they needed that kind of defence." It was also clearly not applicable to the good William III, whom the author believed had been a defender of England. However, even if William was unjust in depriving those bishops, the author was willing to concede, he still had a right to do it. Bishops who refused to recognize to recognize the king had, in fact, removed themselves from office. For if clergy "acknowledge no duty to the Civil Magistrate, which protects him; if he shall refuse to act in his Function; if he will not be the Bishop, somebody else must be." [76]

The author of preface was in step with Restoration uses of divine providence to justify acquiescence to the demands of civil government.[77] In this way, conforming churchmanship in the 1690s was no departure from Restoration churchmanship, which had allowed a diversity of

development, and engagement with Byzantine texts, see Kristine Louise Haugen, *Richard Bentley: Poetry and Enlightenment* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011), 56-65, 81-99.

[76] R.B., "Preface", in *The Unreasonable of a Separation from the New Bishops Or, a Treatise out of Ecclesiastical History, Shewing, That although a Bishop was unjustly deprived, neither He nor the Church ever made a Separation; if the Successor was not a Heretic* (London: 1691).

[77] Providence was a useful tactic, theological or rhetorical, to justify William's reign. It was, as Tony Claydon has argued, part of a broader flowering of Protestant piety in the 1690s. It was also especially, in Rachel Weil's analysis, important in shoring up a government that was highly anxious about its own legitimacy. Tony Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution* (Cambridge University Press, 1996), 106. Rachel Weil, *A Plague of Informers: Conspiracy and Political Trust in William III's England* (New Haven, CT.: Yale University Press, 2013), 250-253.

views to persist under royal supremacy. Stillingfleet did not ask Beveridge to give up his sacred views of the clergy, who had a power to give access to divine favor through the sacraments. Rather, Stillingfleet asked Beveridge to accept royal supremacy, that William had a right to appoint and remove clergy based on loyalty to the government. If Beveridge did not accept Stillingfleet's account, then the either-or led Beveridge to embrace the full ideas of Nonjuring, where an independent spiritual society was now cut adrift from the vast majority of the nation. The core issue, for Sherlock, Stillingfleet, and Stillingfleet's allies on one side and Nonjurors on the other, was whether the Church of England was an independent spiritual society or under the king. There was no longer, conceptually, room for compromise.

Nonjurors equally embraced this either-or, condemning clergy who swore the oath as heretics. Nathaniel Bisbie, another Nonjuring priest, attacked Hody's prefacer and his interpretation of this medieval chronicle. The antiquity of the universal church pertained to the first few centuries, not the thirteenth century, which was a corrupt age for Christianity. In contrast, Bisbie cited the third century Council of Carthage, overseen by the sainted Cyprian, that determined bishops alone had the power to remove wayward clergy. Synods of gathered bishops were the necessary precondition to remove a corrupt bishop from his see and settle his replacement. This episcopal authority in council had been normative for the universal church, as "neither did emperors by becoming Christians alter the case."[78] Bisbie's citation of Cyprian was not an arbitrary choice posed against medieval exempla. Rather, Bisbie, along with other Nonjurors, had embraced a normative definition for the first few centuries of the universal church. These eras were not mere history, but necessary for the interpretation of Christian

[78] Nathaniel Bisbie, *Unity of Priesthood Necessary to the Unity of Communion in a Church, With some Reflections on the Oxford Manuscript and the Preface annexed. Also Collections of Canons, part of the said Manuscript, faithfully translated into English from the Original, but concealed by Mr. Hody, and his Prefacer* (London: 1692), 21-27

doctrine. Therefore, the Council of Carthage had authority in a way that medieval Byzantine history did not, as the earliest centuries were proximate to the age of the Apostles.

Therefore, it was this early age, prior to Christian kings, that determined the Church of England as an independent spiritual society. According to Bisbie, it was Convocation that officially separated the Church of England from Rome, part of a broader Reformation to ensure episcopal supremacy. The Reformation did not establish royal supremacy, rejecting both popes and kings as heads of the church. It belonged to clergy alone to "handle and define such things which belong to faith in the sacraments, and discipline ecclesiastical, hath hitherto ever belonged, and only ought to belong to the pastor of the church, whom the Holy Spirit hath placed in the church, and not unto lay-men.". Referencing a tenth century story of King Edgar of England and the Archbishop of Canterbury, an age when Bisbie believed the English church was still pure and free, the prince meekly confessed that "[I] wear the sword of Constantine, and you of St Peter." Bishops wielded the spiritual sword and kings wielded the temporal sword, interpreted as radical separation and non-involvement.[79] When Byzantine history demonstrated an intermixture, this fact was proof that the chronicle was from "the middle and corrupt age of the church; and therefore of little or not force against the practice of the more primitive and purer age of the church."[80] The Nonjurors alone, then, preserved the witness of the early church and its practice of spiritual independence. Clergy alone had the right to govern their own affairs, with no interference from the civil arm of royalty.

Dodwell also attacked Hody and the author of the preface as abusers of history and radically misunderstanding how a proper churchman ought to understand the primitive church. Hody was either in bad faith or ignorant to pick a text from the thirteenth century, as if anything

[79] Ibid., 44-45.
[80] Ibid., 58.

from the past whatsoever was sufficient to justify good practice. It was not enough to cite mere history, as Dodwell cautioned that "if matters of fact so nakedly mentioned must be urged for precedents […] how easie were it for an historian, by this way of reasoning, to justifie, as our brethren do, the wickedest things that can be!" Annals from the medieval Byzantine church "cannot pretend to argue the sense of the catholic church, nor of those ages which are most to be regarded, not onely for their antiquity, but their integrity also." Hody's sly effort to win the debate through church history was simply irrelevant. The third century, the age of Cyprian, was far preferable to establish doctrine. In that era, when the Roman Empire was pagan and persecuted Christians, only episcopal synods could fully regulate the affairs of clergy, their removal and replacement. Given the normative nature of this era, Dodwell concluded that "this lay-deprivation […] is, in the principles of the catholic church of St Cyprian's age, a perfect nullity, and consequently that, in regard to conscience at least, our present bishops are still bishops." The age of Cyprian was the standard because "we have withal in him the most distinct account of the sense of the church in his age of such facts, and of the principles on which they proceeded." Cyprian applied meant understanding that the essence of the universal church, including the Church of England, in the "common interest of all the bishops." Episcopal dioceses were a "multitude of absolute and independent societies."[81] By the standards of the earliest and purest history, the Church of England was under the authority of bishops and no layman, not even the king, may interfere.

Cyprian also applied meant that William had overstepped his authority as king (whether as legitimate ruler or usurper) and perverted the doctrine of the Church of England. Bishops

[81] Henry Dodwell, *A Vindication of the deprived Bishops, asserting their spiritual rights against a lay deprivation, against the charge of schism, as managed by the late editors of an anonymous Baroccian ms in two parts…to which is subjoined the latter end of the said ms. omitted by the editors, making against them and the cause espoused by them, in Greek and English* (London: 1692), 11-22.

alone had a right to remove one of their own and any clergy who supported the idea that kings may remove prelates had departed from the Church of England. Astonishingly, for Dodwell, this fact meant that the conforming Church of England, the vast majority of clergy and laity, had committed schism and became a sect. Hody and the author of the preface, as well as their patron Stillingfleet, departed from the truth faith of Cyprian and embraced "Latitudinarian opinions." This perennial corruption always weakened and dissolved "the obligation in conscience to maintain the church as a society in a time of persecution from the civil magistrate." These clergy were not only in error, they had committed heresy. Dodwell defined heresy as that which "sets up or abets a communion opposite to that of the church, on account of opinions."[82]

The example of Cyprian was entirely opposed to this novel interpretation of a church subordinated to kings. The spiritual independence of the Church of England, however, did not meant it did not seek friendship and partnership with civil society. Dodwell believed the universal church and various civil governments ought to support one another in their missions, the salvation of souls and this worldly peace respectively. However, when kings grasped after spiritual authority and their clerical allies abetted them, it was time to resist "in defence of which our holy fathers have incurred this deprivation." But this overreach not only threatened the universal church, it damaged the state. To deprive for new oaths, oaths that violated the conscience, weakened the power of oaths. Since oaths oblige subjects to serve the civil magistrate, it was clear that "the state cannot subsist without obligations of conscience and sacredness of oaths."[83] In other words, not respecting the spiritual independence of the Church of England was not only a moral evil, deprivations over new oaths were also self-defeating for William's efforts. All civil societies depended upon spiritual societies, which preserved and

[82] Ibid., 26-27.
[83] Ibid., 102.

regulated the realm of the conscience. It was not simply that William broke a compact with an independent society, he jeopardized all civil society with his attempt to use oaths for his own political ends.

Collier also attacked the lay deprivations, moving to a broader account of what the Church of England was and what independence its ministers possessed. The Church of England had power because it was a spiritual society established by Jesus Christ. Its power did not lay in "merely secular estates, their civil privileges and jurisdictions […] of which they may be legally (though not always equitably) disseized, whenever the legislative authority of a kingdom shall think fit to do it."[84] Rather, spiritual power resided in the clergy's ability to perform the sacraments, which made the grace of God available to the laity. The eucharist had already become a core element to Restoration piety.[85] Now, with Collier, it was utilized to demonstrate spiritual independence for the Church of England. The sacrament had validity because it came from legitimate ministers. If there was no clear title, traced back to the original Apostles, then recipients of the sacrament would have "no pretence to the covenant of grace, no title to the assistance of God's Spirit; nor any assurance of a blessed immortality." The sacraments of baptism and eucharist were "both necessary to make us members of the church, and to convey the advantages of Christianity." An exclusive clerical power to make these sacraments, to have "the sole right of admitting into a society, or excluding from it," was necessary for the sacraments to be effective. Given this chain of reasoning, the clergy were "the proper and only governors of that society; and can have no dependance upon any other."[86] Kings, out of their

[84] Jeremy Collier, *A Brief Essay concerning the Independency of Church-Power* (London: 1692), 2-4
[85] John Spurr has demonstrated the importance of celebrating the Eucharist for the Restoration Church of England, demonstrating that piety still had a strong place in the era of the Merry Monarch. Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England*, 345-350.
[86] Collier, *Independency of Church-Power*, 3-4.

own self-interest as laymen seeking salvation, should then never meddle in the hierarchy of clergy.

Nevertheless, kings did meddle and often suffered disastrous result. Citing the biblical example of Korah, who had rebelled against Moses, and Uzziah, a king of Judah whose hand withered when he usurped the duties of the Levitical priesthood, Collier warned that any king, even King William, would suffer for trespassing into the sacred. But this royal desecration was to be expected, as Collier interpreted the words of Jesus Christ to mean that "all the princes of the world would disbelieve, and many of them persecute his doctrine for several ages together; and therefore, would be very improper persons to have been trusted with the sovereign administration of ecclesiastical affairs." Conversion to Christianity did not lessen this dire prophecy for kings. Godly princes should be praised if they protect the rights of the universal church and advance its mission. But princes, even confessing Christian princes, should be reviled if they were to "alter the seat of ecclesiastical government, put a period to the Apostolic succession, and dissolve the church into the state." A Christian prince gained no new powers in church affairs; he was still a mere layman. If, as was claimed, that baptism granted Christian kings power over the clergy, then this sacrament gave power to all laity. "Every Christian," even women and children, "would have an equal share in this privilege."[87] Thus, as mere laymen, kings should submit to the spiritual commands of clergy in the exercise of their apostolic office.

To justify the spiritual independence of the Church of England, Collier appealed to the learning of Dodwell. As the Nonjuring don had argued against Hody and his translated medieval chronicle, Collier believed that "the catholic church maintained the right of canonical bishops, both against secular magistrates, and schismatical intruders." Bishops were spiritual monarchs,

[87] Ibid., 4-7.

entirely sovereign in the exercise of their office. Similarly, kings had a unique sovereignty in civil affairs that did not pertain to clergy, who were mere subjects. It was "no more in the power of the state to deprive the church governors of their purely spiritual authority, than it is in the power of the church to remove the magistracy, or disincorporate the state." Defenders of William and his deprivations had perverted the balance of powers. These clergy had "subjected the power of the keys," that ability to include or exclude from the spiritual society of the universal church, "to the civil supremacy." In so doing, these clergy had "given up, as much as in them lies, the fundamental rights of the church." It was not the Nonjurors who were schismatic Dissenters, but their accusers, for the "charge of schism and separation must lie at their own doors." Nonjurors alone, like the age of Cyprian, defended the claim that all spiritual power was "from the bishops" and this power "can be subordinate, or related, to no other head of jurisdiction."[88] Collier, as priest of the Church of England, was entirely independent in spiritual matters to perform his office. He, not the king, had power over the conscience and the power to regulate the ranks of those who granted access to the divine favor of Heaven.

Collier, in light of this spiritual independence, put his claims to the test. Performing the Visitation of the Sick for the condemned, Collier courted public outrage as he seemingly questioned the guilt of Jacobite plotters. According to the 1662 Book of Common Prayer, Collier and his fellow Nonjuring priests, William Snatt and Shadrach Cook, would have prayed, audibly in front of a crowd, "Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to his church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in him, of his great mercy forgive thee thine offences: and by his authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins."[89] This prayer, which placed the accent on the "I" in the power to absolve, had been criticized in the failed attempt to revise

[88] Ibid., 8-12.
[89] *The Book of Common Prayer* (1662; repr. Cambridge University Press, 2003), 317, 322.

the Book of Common Prayer in the 1690s. For clergy seeking comprehension, hoping to win back Dissenters, a revision to a passive role for the minister, announcing "I pronounce thee absolved" instead of "I absolve thee," ultimately failed.[90] Nevertheless, Collier's use of this sacerdotal power, to claim to have the power to forgive sins according to his office of priest, was applied to enemies of William's government. Collier had claimed the right to remove the guilt of men who, seemingly, had not repented of their attempted coup.

In an official response, a group of lead conforming bishops in the Church of England condemned Collier, Cook, and Snatt, the three Nonjuring priests, for "pretending to absolve the said criminals at their execution." The problem was not with the Visitation of the Sick, but the three priests' decision to perform this office publicly. The liturgical prayers were a private comfort for the dying, allowing them to repent and receive forgiveness. But one of the plotters, John Friend, had no intention of repenting of his assassination attempt. According to the bishops, Friend left behind papers that confirmed his continued loyalty to James II. Similarly, William Perkins, the other executed conspirator, did not visibly appear sorry for his role in the plot. Since neither man was contrite for his sins, neither deserved the Visitation for the Sick, either in public or in private. The condemned had not only participated in "the horrid design of assassination," but had also acted with a foreign army of "French papists, for the ruine of their country, and the extirpation of that religion which they themselves do profess." The Nonjurors had "no authority, nor no pretence for the absolving these persons." Added that it was public, the priests should have made it clear that the condemned were repentant for their sin of treason, yet none of the

[90] The battle over reforming the Book of Common Prayer was the final, though failed, effort at comprehension after the Glorious Revolution. Whether it was ever capable of success, or doomed from the beginning, has been debated. Every, *The High Church Party*, 56-59. Ed. Mark Goldie, *The entring book of Roger Morrice, 1677-1691, I: Roger Morrice and the Puritan Whigs* (Martlesham, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2007), 240. John Spurr, "The Church of England, Comprehension, and the Toleration Act of 1689," *The English Historical Review*, Vol. 54, Issue 413 (1989), 927-946.

priests requested "at that time to make a special confession of their sins." The whole affair was "altogether irregular" and the ambiguities around the performance of this office appeared to make the conspirators into martyrs.[91] The bishops who signed this condemnation were across the ecclesiastical spectrum. Low Churchmen Edward Fowler and Simon Patrick signed alongside reputed High Churchmen Henry Compton and Thomas Tenison. Even Richard Cumberland, who had served on James II's ecclesiastical commission and held crypto-Jacobite sympathies, also signed.[92] Nonjurors like Collier were not simply expressing post-Revolutionary politics by another means. Their defense of the spiritual independence of the Church of England, including the clergy's right to exercise their spiritual power to relieve the condemned, motivated their resistance. Their fight was against royal supremacy, whether it took a Whig or Tory or even Jacobite form.

Collier defended himself from the accusations of treason and abuse of office. Collier had served as a pastor, and his efforts were entirely apolitical. Pleading rhetorically, Collier asked whether "all people [were] damned that are cast in a capital indictment?" If that was that case, Collier inquired, why "are they exhorted to repentance, and resignation, why should the church refuse them her pardon on Earth, when she believes tis passed in Heaven?" Obviously for Collier, the prayers and pastoring of the Church of England testified against the idea that men like Perkins and Friend were automatically condemned to Hell for their crimes. Pardon was available for the penitent, and Perkins had demonstrated his penance in seeking a priest to absolve him. If Perkins thought himself innocent, why seek absolution? If Collier had turned Perkins down, then he would have "failed in [his] duty, and gone against the authority both of

[91] *A Declaration of the Sense of the Archbishops, and Bishops, Now in and about London, upon the Occasion of their Attendance in Parliament, Concerning the Irregular and Scandalous Proceedings of certain Clergiemen, at the Execution of Sir JOHN FRIEND and Sir WILLIAM PARKINS* (London: 1696), 3-7.
[92] Ibid., 7.

the ancient, and English church." Collier had not wanted to make a public spectacle, but he was retrained from private ministry by the guards of Newgate prison. It was his right as a priest to perform the Visitation of the Sick publicly if he could not do it privately, for Perkins must "either receive it publickly from me, or not at all."[93]

Further, Collier defended his competency, as a priest, to determine when and how he performed his office. His conforming critics were right that his decision was irregular, but priests had a right to circumvent custom if it comforts the repentant sinner. One example was Collier's decision to lay his hands on Perkins as he absolved him. This choice was not arbitrary but derived from the customs of the church during the age of Cyprian. The third century Council of Carthage determined that the laying on of hands for absolution was valid at the moment of death. While the Church of England's canons did not recognize this practice, Cyprian's example was sufficient to justify its use. Collier claimed that the Church of England has "always professed a regard for the patterns of antiquity: we can't do her a greater honour, than by conforming to the solemnities of the purest ages."[94] Collier not only claimed the right to apply his clerical office in the ways he saw fit, he also claimed the right to reinterpret the Church of England in light of what he saw as a more pure practice. Cyprian was the guiding light for reform, a recognition that the Church of England was an independent spiritual society that did not concern itself with worldly civil affairs. Any limitation on this reality needed change, even if it meant changing the canons of the Church of England in the name of the universal church's true constitution.

In response to his self-defense, Hody attacked Collier as a derelict clergy that defied the standards of the Church of England. There were clear standards for how the Visitation of the

---

[93] Jeremy Collier, *A Defence of the Absolution given to Sr. William Perkins, At the Place of Execution. April the 3d., With a Farther Vindication thereof, Occasioned by a Paper, Entituled a Declaration of the Sense of Arch-Bishops and Bishops, &c.* (London: 1696), 2.
[94] Ibid., 5-6, 9-10.

Sick was to be performed. It was not fit for Collier to adapt alien standards, such as those of the ancient church of Carthage, for English pastoring. The norms for the Church of England were not found in hoary tradition, left to individual clergy to recover and use, but in positive statute from Parliament or Convocation. But these criticisms were mild compared to Hody's accusation that Collier abetted treason. It was clear that these Nonjuring priests, in "pronouncing the absolution, they look upon the fact [of the assassination attempt] as no sin." Collier was not merely inventing new traditions for the Church of England, he was using his office to advance enemies of the realm. Hody rhetorically asked whether there was "not law, nor canon to punish such confessaries, as absolve those that imbrue their hands in the blood of princes, and that dye without declaring any particular repentance for what they stand condemned for, and a repentance as open and notorious as their crime?"[95] The issue was treason, and Collier's claims for his own spiritual independence to perform his office jeopardized the entire kingdom.

Collier responded by, again, emphasizing his rights as priest. He was not inventing new customs or canons, for the Church of England always depended on the witness of the ancient church. Cyprian was part of the "practice general" for the Church of England as a pure and apostolic church. It was this legacy that Collier, as a priest, had a right to use as he saw fit. "Every priest," Collier declared, "is here left to his liberty, both as to office and gesture, to substance and ceremony." Since Perkins was near death and Collier had adequately applied Cyprian's conciliar ruling, there should not be any scandal with what he did. If he had acted irregularly or improperly (let alone treasonously), Collier appealed to "both the antient, and our own church, in my defence." If Perkins was unrepentant, as Hody claimed, Collier knew

[95] Humphrey Hody, *Animadversions on two pamphlets lately publish'd by Mr. Collier the one call'd, A defence of the absolution given to Sir William Parkins at the place of execution, April 3d, the other, A vindication thereof, occasion'd by a paper entituled, A declaration of the sense of the achbishops* [sic] *and bishops, &c.: shewing the nature of the late absolution, both as to church and state: in a letter to a friend.* (London: 1696), 7-8, 23-26.

differently. Perkins had privately before his execution confessed to Collier his sorrow for his role in the plot. The priest had not revealed this fact because "the canon obliged me not to reveal." In twisting the accusation around, Collier declared that if he had exposed Perkins' confession then he would have been "pronounced irregular." Now that Collier is being condemned, the condition was sufficient to reveal the truth. Perkins had confessed, the guards would not let Collier return, so he publicly performed the Visitation of the Sick. If Hody, or other conformists, were upset that he had performed his duty so publicly, with language that the crowd could hear, then he was simply being a good Protestant. Collier snorted that his critics were "for prayers in an unknown language," since otherwise it was impossible to do his duty.[96]

The King's Bench, however, did not see things Collier's way. He, along with Cook and Snatt, were charged with a High Misdemeanor in 1696. The choice of court reflected the government's decision to see these Nonjurors as part of a wider Jacobite plot. In response, Collier went briefly into hiding to evade arrest, refusing to show up for his trial.[97] Collier, once again, rejected the accusation that he aided or abetted treason. The Visitation of the Sick was "by parity of reason" a valid thing to perform for "the case of persons to be executed, who are to be consider'd as dying men." If this office was not used, pastoring clergy would be forced to use "the liberty of extemporary effusions, which rather become a Calvinistical elder, than a presbyter of the Church of England." First, his critics wanted Collier to pray unintelligibly like a Roman Catholic. Now, his critics blamed him for not praying idiosyncratically like a Dissenter. The whole trial was a farce because the King's Bench had no right to try spiritual offenses. Civil courts had no power to determine the sufficient repentance of a confessing sinner. Only the

[96] Jeremy Collier, *An Answer to the Animadversions on two Pamphlets Lately Publish'd By Mr. Collier, &c.* (London: 1696), 9-12, 21-22.
[97] Boster, "Better to be alone," 79-80.

absolving priest was "to rest satisfied with an account of the general repentance of the person to be absolved." Collier was satisfied and thus the matter was concluded. Plus, if the court wanted Collier to have performed the Visitation of the Sick privately with an explicit list of sins, then the court was really asking for "auricular confession, as 'tis taught and practiced in the church of Rome."[98]

Unsurprisingly, Collier's refusal of the court's jurisdiction and his implied accusation of popery did not win him any sympathy. However, his insignificance did nothing to warrant any further prosecution or harassment. Collier, after a brief life in hiding, reappeared in London in 1697 and continued his ministry to Nonjuror separatists. He was never arraigned or acquitted for his role in absolving William Perkins and John Friend.[99] Nevertheless, Collier's intransigence did not abate and reflected a desire for a spiritually independent Church of England. He was a vocal and involved Nonjurors who had radicalized to the point of rejecting royal supremacy and separating from the Church of England. And he was not alone in his opposition. As this chapter has demonstrated, the Nonjurors took contradictions and frustrations from the Restoration and applied them towards complete separation. They were not merely a more consistent form of churchman, part of a perennial "High Church" idea for a sacerdotal clergy that mediated between God and man. There was a "High Church" party, but it was one that was formed in distinct opposition to the Nonjurors. More like Low Church or Latitude churchmen, High Church defended royal supremacy as a core doctrine to the Church of England, when Nonjurors developed their criticism of this idea into full rejection. There were two radically separated societies with two radically separated sets of powers. Earthly and heavenly societies may

[98] Jeremy Collier, *The Case of the Two Absolvers that were Tryed at the Kings-Bench-Bar at Westminster, on Thursday the 2d of July 1696 For giving Absolution at the place of Execution to Sir John Friend and Sir William Parkens*, (London: 1696), 2-3.
[99] Sirota, *The Christian Monitors*, 163.

overlap, or even offer mutual support, but they were entirely different. The legacy of Cyprian became a means to attack royal supremacy, even casting a shadow over the Reformation and the origins of the Church of England. The Nonjurors represented an explosive development, not specter from the past, that threatened to delegitimize the established and conforming Church of England. They stood for a very different churchmanship against their critics across the political and ecclesiastical spectrum.

Chapter Two: The Ghost of Laud? Separation of Church from State in the High Church Realignment, 1701-1719

The Bangorian Controversy in 1717 ended in a stalemate, where the Church of England's synodical body, Convocation, was prorogued by King George I (despite the continued complaints from its lower house) and not called for over a hundred years. Seemingly all doctrinal strife was institutionally foreclosed, no longer capable of being debated in the only clerical body that could discern orthodoxy from heresy. Benjamin Hoadly, Bishop of Bangor and eponymous instigator of the crisis, avoided condemnation, but his rejection of a spiritually independent clergy also dissipated. Conforming High Churchmen and separated Nonjurors had joined forces to attack Hoadly and his anti-sacerdotal ecclesiastical views. This alliance, rather than an obvious one, had serious problems. While now High Churchmen and Nonjurors united around the Church of England as an independent spiritual society under the authority of the clergy, they had not always agreed on this arrangement. As the previous chapter demonstrated, High Churchmen and Nonjurors had recriminated each other throughout the 1690s, opening a rift about the fundamental nature of the Church of England. The former accused the latter of sectarian treason, effectively a new form of Dissent, while the latter denounced the former as creatures of state and no different than Roman Catholics. However, by the late 1710s, the two had joined together in opposition to the threat of Hoadly and his allies.

This realignment, which resulted in a not quite victory of foreclosure, prevented Hoadly from vindication. This chapter reinterprets the 1700s and 1710s as an ecclesiastical realignment. While Hoadly took a radical step towards rejecting all claims that the Church of England was an independent spiritual society, High Churchmen stepped towards the Nonjurors in embracing the

idea and radically curtailing royal supremacy over the Church of England. While a disinterested or uninvolved monarch could do little to govern the Church of England well, it could comport with the notion that the Church was a spiritually independent body. This chapter explores how clergy in a legally established church could see themselves as belonging to a parallel, and entirely separate, society.

This chapter intervenes in discussions about the changing nature of religion and the Church of England into and through the eighteenth century. In the work of J.C.D. Clark, the eighteenth century was the persistence of the *Ancien Regime*, an England that retained a stratified, hierarchical, and aristocratic society. The constellation of ideas that had defined England earlier in the seventeenth century remained, with the Glorious Revolution doing little to alter the basis upon which English society subsisted. In Clark's revisionist work, the Church of England continued to uphold this old order, part of a confessional-state that was alien to all liberal notions of religious plurality or liberty.[100] In contrast to this conservative interpretation of the eighteenth century, Steven Pincus has argued that the Glorious Revolution was the first modern "revolution," a conflict over two rival visions of constructing a modern state for a modern society. A commercial people with a growing public sphere of debate, governed by a centralized and bureaucratic permanent state with an effective and regular means of taxation, England decided towards a more liberal, rather than absolutist, version of modernity. Theological debates reflected this more general debate, between churchmen in favor of liberal society and those in favor of an absolutist one.[101]

This collapse of theology into another form of politics or social formation is inadequate, a lack that Brent Sirota, operating in Pincus' general framework, attempted to correct. For Sirota,

[100] Clark, *English Society*, 2-28.
[101] Pincus, *1688*, 6-10, 415.

the core debate between churchmen was the birth of civil society, an indirect *tertium quid* that stood between political statecraft and private conscience. The Church of England transformed from confessional politics towards involvement in civil society, a means to influence through charity work and voluntary societies. This effort was not private or individual, but it was also not a turn back to the confessional enforcement of the Restoration. The Church of England, according to Sirota, pursued a new direction, against reactionaries seeking to reimplement a coercive confessional state, towards benevolence and toleration.[102]

This chapter affirms Clark's conservative account of the eighteenth century, with the qualifier that *Ancien Regime* was not intrinsically opposed to modernization while retaining an outward form of stability. Nonjurors were not, as Mark Goldie has described, speaking a "dying, yet not quite dead, language" that fizzled out over the eighteenth century. [103] Rather, as this chapter argues, the Nonjurors offered a new way forward to their former enemies. High Churchmen and Nonjurors had not been the same, in different shades of consistency and reaction. Rather, the Nonjurors, who had broken with the Church of England's orthodoxy around royal supremacy, offered a way for High Churchmen to remain within the established Church of England under a seemingly derelict or disinterested monarch. The Church of England was an independent spiritual society that just happened to coincide with civil government through a temporary, purely accidental, legal establishment. The Church of England had a sacred clergy that were beyond the influence of the civil magistrate, but they obeyed his request, whether in or outside Parliament, out of a desire to maintain civil peace. This chapter shows how High Churchmen silently adapted Nonjuring ideas as Nonjurors proved capable of defeating their shared enemies, both in and outside the Church of England, which rejected any notion of an

[102]Sirota, *The Christian Monitors*, 2-12.
[103] Mark Goldie, "The Nonjurors, Episcopacy, and the Origins of the Convocation Controversy," 15, 27-30.

independent spiritual authority for clergy. The Bangorian Controversy of 1717 was thus a strange victory, for the silence of the monarch meant clergy could act, or at least could imagine to act, according to their right as officers of an autonomous spiritual kingdom.

This chapter continues from the earlier focus around the Glorious Revolution and its post-Revolution 1690s into the 1700s and 1710s. Nonjurors, who had separated out of principle to preserve the spiritual independence of the Church of England, condemning all conformists, even High Churchmen proponents of a sacerdotal clergy, as heretics. They had proven able critics of Quakers and Deists, both of whom continued as threats to any claim that the clergy had unique spiritual powers to mediate between God and man. While some High Churchmen began to admire Nonjuring ecclesiology, some Nonjurors admired the fact that the High Churchmen had an empirical church. This partnership was not, as earlier accounts have argued, a natural and inevitable fit between two discrete groups often treated as one.[104] But the threat of Hoadly, as a critic of the Nonjurors that advanced a non-sacerdotal view of the clergy, provided a means for realignment. If royal supremacy was useless to defend the rights of a spiritual clergy, then the Church of England as an independent spiritual society was a preferable alternative, especially when royalty did not actively appear to intervene. As Robert Ingram has demonstrated, the effects of intra-church debate led to state-imposed silence. Leviathan put an end to a Reformation without end. [105] However, modifying Ingram's claim slightly, this silence could be a benefit to churchmen who believed themselves immune to damage. If the Church of England was a spiritual society, entirely parallel to civil government, it was immune to royal overreach.

---

[104] Henry Broxap, *The Later Nonjurors* (Cambridge University Press, 1928), 292-293. Gordon E. Rupp, *Religion in England, 1688-1791* (Oxford University Press, 1987), 5-9. Clark also treats these two groups as ultimately identical in their churchmanship. Clark, *English Society*, 85-86, 101-105.

[105] Ingram grasps this with a subtle recognition that, if a spiritual autonomy of a sacred visible institution was to function, it either required the papacy or accepted silence beneath a parliamentary state. Ingram, *Reformation Without End*, 1-10.

The king was incapable of altering the spiritual constitution of the Church of England. If he would not serve the clergy, then the clergy would find other means, even indirect moral suasion. The powers of the clergy remained always, even if they were inoperative.

This defense stood in marked contrast to the alternative vision of Hoadly, which this chapter also recontextualizes. Hoadly was not a precursor to Lockean liberalism in advocating religion of the heart and voluntary association.[106] Rather, Hoadly advanced a broad Protestantism under the authority of Parliament. Praising the Glorious Revolution and the Hanoverian succession as the reign of godly monarchs, Hoadly advocated for a reworking of a confessional state that could embrace a wide definition of Protestantism in an alliance against Roman Catholicism. [107] Hoadly's vision could coincide even with Deists, who had embraced a Protestant civil religion of virtuous living against all claims of a clerical caste. [108] This chapter, besides reconstructing the rapproachement between High Churchmen and Nonjurors, also shows the particular antithesis Hoadly posed. If High Churchmen were willing to abandon ideas of royal supremacy for a spiritually independent clergy, then Low Church figures like Hoadly reembraced a confessional state in a novel application. The closure of Convocation did not vindicate Hoadly, and his brand of churchmanship dissipated. Instead, official silence and High

[106] William Gibson, *Enlightenment Prelate: Benjamin Hoadly, 1676-1761* (London: James Clark & Co, 2004) 101-103. Additionally, Jeffrey Collins has tried to demarcate the distinction between a civil vs a prophetic church, the former acting as a bulwark for the state and the latter as critical and distant from society. Despite the dubiousness of this dichotomy (whether conceptually or in concrete), Hoadly clearly advanced the civil religion that Collins saw Locke as attacking. Jeffrey R. Collins, *In the Shadow of Leviathan: John Locke and the Politics of Conscience* (Oxford University Press, 2020) 55-72.

[107] Hannah Smith has demonstrated that the Hanoverians inspired fervent devotion from anti-clerical Protestants that advocated royal supremacy against grasping prelates. Hannah Smith, *Georgian Monarchy: Politics and Culture, 1714-1760* (Cambridge University Press, 2006), 37-58.

[108] Ashley Walsh has shown how the Church of England was not intrinsically an enemy to the heterodox, but could be, and was in some clergy, a great ally to a godly and anti-clerical empire. Walsh, *Civil Religion and the Enlightenment in England*, 11-16.

Church pretensions allowed the sacerdotal clergy as an independent spiritual society to persist under different conditions into a new century.

The Nonjuror schism within the Church of England was not so much about swearing new oaths, but the king's power to alter the hierarchy of the Church. Failing to swear new oaths to William and Mary as legitimate monarchs, the king deprived Nonjuring churchmen in 1691, provoking a rejection of not only the new government but the conforming and juring Church of England. As the previous chapter has demonstrated, the Glorious Revolution was a crisis for the Nonjurors, who believed themselves the true Church of England. Conformists had embraced the worst heresy of royal enslavement of spiritual powers. High Churchmen, who rejected the Nonjurors for their rejection of royal supremacy and redefining the Church of England as an entirely spiritually independent society, were in a difficult place. They believed in a sacred clergy under royal headship, but William did not respect them that many of them desired. The efforts of Convocation in 1697, which High Church Francis Atterbury attempted to define as a spiritual parliament with the same rights as the body in Westminster, failed and resolved no clerical issues.[109] New ideas, or at least a new government to impose the old idea, rankled High Churchmen going into the 1700s. There was a possibility of unity among Nonjurors and High Churchmen in light of disgruntlement with William's government.

Charles Leslie, Nonjuring priest and partisan, was pleased to see Atterbury moving closer to the Nonjuring position, advocating a firmer spiritual independence for the Church of England. According to Leslie, Atterbury now knew that William was no defender of clergy, having abandoned his alliance with "unmanly" advocates for the Dutch usurper. But Atterbury had a far

[109] G.V. Bennett, *The Tory Crisis in Church and State,* vii-viii, 4, 10-13, 20-22. Sirota, "'The Leviathan Is Not Safely to Be Angered,'" 44-46, 50.

way to go, as he was not yet able to give up royal supremacy. Leslie hoped to further convince him to abandon the king's prerogatives over the clergy.[110] Atterbury was wrong to believe that the king had a right to regulate diocese and control clerical appointments, even if this power went back to the English Reformation. The Henrician Act of Submission, which placed the clergy under royal headship, was like a son demanding headship over his father. This request was absurd. In spiritual affairs, clergy were spiritual fathers over their lay sons, even kings. The Church was always a spiritually independent society, since its start with Jesus Christ, and no king had a right to alter the superiority of clergy over laymen in spiritual affairs.[111]

Leslie rejected any abstraction of spiritual or clerical power, as if it was entirely invisible or in the mind. Rather, the spiritual diocese of a bishop was a geographic affair, for there was no such thing as a bishop without a diocese. If civil magistrates did have the right to reorganize dioceses, then Parliament during the Civil Wars had effectively abolished the Church of England. If Atterbury was right about the Act of Settlement, which legally established the Church of England and placed it under supreme royal governorship, then the same civil authorities could unmake the Church. This claim was blasphemous, as if bishops in the Church of England no longer had apostolic succession because a civil government dissolved their office for a time. The current government was no better and the piecemeal efforts to protect the faith of the Church of England were ineffective. The Test Act, which was to preserve civil offices for those men who conformed to the Church of England, was openly defied by Dissenters. Their partial conformity, attending Church of England services to meet the bare criteria to serve in

---

[110] Charles Leslie, *The Case of the Regale and the Pontificat stated. In a conference concerning the independency of the Church, upon any Power on Earth, in the Exercise of her Purely Spiritual Power and Authority* (London: 1701), i-xx. As Linda Colley noticed, Tory partisans were uneasy with Nonjuror arguments about clergy as spiritual representatives for an independent society, though she too often equates High Churchmanship as an adjunct to Tory politics. Linda Colley, *In Defiance of Oligarchy: The Tory Party, 1714-1760* (Cambridge University Press, 1982), 23-29.

[111] Leslie, *The Case of the Regale and the Pontificat*, xxx-xxxv.

government, was subversion. If the monarch had a right to govern or regulate the clergy, the Church of England would be a mere creature of state. Leslie did recognize that the universal Church had temporary partnerships with various states over the centuries, but they did not alter the fundamental right of clergy to regulate their own affairs. The Church of England, with its apostolic ministers, had no friend in civil government and needed to reassert its own spiritual independence. Only the Nonjurors preserved this power and Atterbury should join them.[112]

This parallel power was not to create a rival force with civil government, as High Churchmen had claimed, because spiritual power pertained to an entirely different aspect of Human life. The Church of England taught passive obedience because all clergy were, in civil affairs, subjects to the king as supreme magistrate. But that did not mean kings had rights in spiritual affairs. The Church of England had permitted "incorporation" with English monarchs to further each separate end, opposed to Roman Catholicism which conflated all power under the pope. Sadly, kings have behaved no better than popes, seeking to consolidate all spiritual power under them. Faithful clergy should refuse these efforts to control them and subordinate them to the crown. Even worse, Leslie claimed that Deists, those terrible heretics that plagued England and proliferated under William's government, embraced this tyranny. Deists, if able, would subordinate all the clergy under the king, rejecting all pretensions to spiritual power. If Atterbury did not reject royal supremacy, then the Deists would win, making "the Gentry, Deists; and the Common People, Dissenters," as the Church became a mere creature of royalty.[113]

It was out of this radical division between spiritual and civil powers that led Leslie to praise the Church of Sweden as being superior to the Church of England. Episcopal and Protestant, Leslie believed the Church of Sweden operated as truly autonomous in spiritual

[112] Ibid., 11-15.
[113] Ibid., 17-25.

affairs, established in law with protections from royal overreach. In the Church of Sweden's liturgy, the priest prayed first for the clergy and then the king, recognizing that kings were beneath the clergy in power, subservient beneath the divinely empowered ministers of God.[114] If English kings did not recognize this arrangement, then they would meet the end of the biblical Uzziah, a king who had dared to seize priestly offices and suffered a divine curse of a withered hand for doing so. Kings must submit to bishops for "the word bishop, like that of king, is a word of government and relation: And as there cannot be a king without people; so neither a bishop without a flock."[115] Even if the Church of Sweden was preferable, not everything had been bad in the Church of England's history. Leslie praised early English reformers, like Thomas Cromwell and Thomas Cranmer, who preserved the episcopal right to excommunicate kings. Queen Elizabeth's alteration of her own title, from head to supreme governor, signaled to Leslie that the English reformers understood that kings had no power over clergy as spiritual officers. Even the Book of Homilies, an authoritative set of sermons for the Church of England, had preserved the right of bishops to excommunicate publicly wicked kings.[116]

If the clergy of the Church of England understood their role, they would bring William to his knees and require repentance for his tyranny. William was primarily a sinner for his heresy, creating rival altars in the Church of England that disrupted its unity and harmony.[117] The king had followed the path of many medieval popes and kings, seeking to steel the divine powers of the episcopate and consolidate them in themselves. William was also like sinning Protestant princes on the Continent, who imitated their forebearers in stealing the spiritual power of the clergy. Leslie lamented that this crime had convinced some Protestants, equating this royal

[114] Ibid., 28-33.
[115] Ibid., 39-44.
[116] Ibid., 62-69.
[117] Ibid., 75.

power with the Protestant faith, to convert to Catholicism to preserve priestly power.[118] If the Church of England was to reverse this tide, then it had to be rigorous about its own history. The Tudors were not to be defended when they erred and threatened to alter the unalterable constitution of the universal church. The Church of England came from Heaven, not parliamentary statute.[119] This divine power was manifest in the bishops, who gathered as a spiritual college and governed their own affairs. This collegiality promoted "commerce of the nations," whether it was between kingdoms or dioceses, both being analogous for this twin set of powers.[120] With the true Church of England free from "inquisition on the one hand, or Premunire on the other," true peace could grow among spiritual sovereigns, each in his own domain. A gathering of bishops without royal control would lead to not only unity among Protestants, but also be a means to reunite with Roman Catholic bishops who could escape papal domination.[121]

The Nonjuring battle was thus extremely important for Leslie, a restatement of first principles to purify the Church of England of royal supremacy. Bishops were not creatures of state, but spiritual sovereigns, mediators between God and man. God granted legitimate right to bishops as spiritual monarchs as God granted legitimate right to kings as civil monarchs. The two offices were analogous and parallel. Bishops had the power to confect the sacraments, granting access to salvation in baptism or confirming this spiritual right to a good afterlife in the eucharist. Clergy were not mere teachers of virtue, a mistake too many clergy in the Church of England made, but God's ministers on Earth. If clergy were mere teachers of virtue, then the Dissenters were justified in continuing a separate existence. Their chapels were valid because there were many talented teachers among them. Thus, Leslie was indifferent to government

[118] Ibid., 96-100.
[119] Ibid., 116-121.
[120] Ibid., 152-154.
[121] Ibid., 161-168.

licensing for preaching. It was irrelevant, let the Dissenters preach, it did not make them real priests of God. The Church of England alone had valid apostolic succession, creating legitimate bishops who had a legal right to grant salvation through the sacraments.[122] The failure to understand this spiritual independence made wealthy laity abusive, thinking they could buy clergy as "part of his equipage" rather than submitting to them as spiritual princes. Leslie lamented that the divine authority of clergy was "thus blown away by burghers." If these gentlemen could abuse priests, it was obvious kings would enslave the clergy as well.[123] James II, for all his faults as a Catholic, at least understood the spiritual independence of the clergy. Unlike William or his older brother Charles II, James recognized Scottish episcopalians had a right to self-government. [124] Leslie's support for the Stuarts was thus, according to his argument, out of legitimate succession and the spiritual independence of the clergy. Leslie was even willing to tolerate Dissenter preaching, which was no concern to him. All that mattered was the spiritual rights of clergy as operating in as a parallel society to purely civil kingship.

Atterbury did not respond to Leslie. As High Churchmen everywhere hoped, the new Queen offered them hope that their time had come. Anne was a warm advocate for the Church of England, not a foreigner like the Dutch William. Queen Anne would preserve the Church of England from the dangers of the Whigs, believed by many High Churchmen to be hidden Deists and republicans. Nevertheless, Anne's reign proved a disappointment to many High Churchmen, insufficiently promoting the powers of the clergy as their royal head. While Anne had set aside funds to improve damaged churches and fund ministers, these did not sufficiently recognize the right of the clergy to organize and govern themselves. Many High Churchmen organized as part

[122] Ibid., 172-177.
[123] Ibid., 199-200.
[124] Ibid., 229-232.

of a Country party of Tories who rejected the corruption and supposedly anti-clerical sentiments of the court, including Tories whom Anne had invited to govern.[125]

Nonjurors, too, were faced with challenges in the 1700s. The original Nonjuror bishops were nearly all gone. Should new Nonjuror bishops be ordained, and the separation continue? For George Hickes, an original partisan and prelate, the answer was yes, for the conforming Church of England had not understood its error or changed its way, leaving the door open to Deism. The great threat of Deism was that it rejected the spiritual powers of the clergy, which was, in effect, to reject the existence of the Church. It was no surprise, for Hickes, that Deists were all closeted republicans, because they rejected the spiritual monarchy of bishops for the same reason, they rejected the civil monarchy of kings.[126] Focused on Matthew Tindal, who had defended royal supremacy over the clergy in *The Rights of the Christian Church*, published in 1706, and, in Hickes' summary, attacked all clerical pretensions as priestcraft that sought to enslave men's souls. The Nonjuring prelate eagerly embraced these accusations. Hickes was a purveyor of priestcraft, who enslaved men's souls to keep them from ultimate destruction. Tindal's heterodox Christianity was not as old as creation, but Hickes' priestcraft was. This battle between Deism and the Nonjurors, in Hickes' estimation, was the ultimate clash between God and Satan. If Tindal was right, then all priests should be purged; but if Hickes was right, then Tindal should be condemned utterly, though in the "gentlest manner." [127] The challenge was either-or: Deism or Nonjuroring, with nothing in between.

[125]High Church disappointment in Anne was rampant, part, but not equal, to the division between court Tories and the backbench Country Tories. Bennett, *The Tory Crisis in Church and State*, 48-70.
[126] George Hickes, *Two Treatises, one of the Christian priesthood, the other of the dignity of the episcopal order* (London: 1707), preface without pagination.
[127] Ibid., xvi-xviii.

Attacking Tindal's account of ancient history, a sacred clergy who governed an independent spiritual kingdom possessed "antiquity, universality, and consent" of all previous ages.[128] The Church of England's practice of the eucharist was indeed like a pagan ritual, a bloodless sacrifice offered to God and receiving divine presence. Like ancient pagan mysteries and the Roman Catholic mass, Christian sacraments communicated an inward grace through an outward sign of sacrifice.[129] While Tindal saw this practice as proof that paganism had corrupted Christianity, Hickes argued that if such a metric was adopted then Deists should throw out the whole Bible. Had not Scripture commanded to sacrifice, to build altars, to ordain a priesthood, and to conduct ceremonial pomp? Rather, in contrast, the Bible was in line with ancient history, including pagans, which "our English Cyprian," Archbishop William Laud, had recognized in converting many simple tables into ornate altars for the sacrament. The Christian priest conducted a divine sacrifice, bringing together God and man through ritual performance. If this arrangement was priestcraft, as Tindal accused, then all royal monarchy was "kingcraft," for kings united the people together through ceremony in a similar manner.[130] Nonjurors alone could "compleat our Reformation" by restoring clerical spiritual autonomy by rejecting royal supremacy. [131] In criticizing Tindal's defense of royal supremacy, Hickes had outlined that the Church of England had spiritual independence not only as a Christian church, but as all religious institutions, even Pagan ones, had in antiquity. Priestcraft, be it Protestant or otherwise, was how a sacred clergy remained independent of civil powers over affairs of God and the afterlife. Without this clerical power, Tindal not only attacked God's Church, but the very concept of the sacred that has existed since the beginnings of civilization.

[128] Ibid., xi-xii.
[129] Ibid., xxxiii-xlv.
[130] Ibid., liv-lxiii
[131] Ibid., lxxxi-lxxxii

Therefore, in Hickes' framework, clergy and kings had entirely separate and parallel sets of power. The Church could excommunicate, a spiritual judgement for a spiritual offense, but had no right to punish the body or seize property. Similarly, kings had a right to corporate punishment, property seizure, and execution, but not power to the judge the conscience, no right to tell a Christian whether he was Heaven or Hell bound. Kings and bishops had mutually supported one another in their roles, but never did they usurp the powers therein.[132] Hence, the clergy could only ever punish members of their own flock. Church of England clergy could only punish members of the Church of England, not those outside of it.[133] However, the Church of England was not a voluntary society or a mere product of the state. It was a spiritual kingdom, established by Jesus Christ, who appointed representatives to govern in his name. This arrangement was no different than a king who granted officers to govern for him. These commissions were not infallible or omnipotent. Clergy did not have unlimited power any more than a royal minister had unlimited power to act for the king. It was true that clergy had sometimes submitted to the civil government of the king for the sake of temporal peace. But that was not the same as claiming that the king had a right to regulate or govern the clergy. Both temporal and spiritual powers had limits to their exercise, seeking cooperation when possible. Tindal, however, had confused everything, no different than Roman Catholics, in trying to give kings the tyranny of power over spiritual affairs.[134] Hickes was willing even to praise Presbyterians, who had defective orders but understood the independence of clergy.[135] To be a true Protestant, for Hickes, was to defend the spiritual independence of bishops as monarchs of a parallel society.

[132] Ibid., xciv-xcix.
[133] Ibid., cxxiii-cxxvi.
[134] Ibid., clxii-clxxi.
[135] Ibid., cxcv-cxcix.

While Hickes admitted that Tindal was right that the New Testament did not explicitly endorse a clergy with unique spiritual powers, it did not reject it either. The Old Testament required a sacred priesthood from the tribe of Levi that was outside of royal control. Ancient pagans, both Greek and Germanic, had guilds of sacred priests that operated independently of the state. There was, in Hickes' reading, a universal history of priestcraft, an independent caste of men who had unique powers to mediate between Heaven and Earth. The New Testament may not have been explicit, but it in no way signaled a departure from this testimony to natural religion. Therefore, Hickes declared that "bishops and presbyters are, truly and properly speaking, sacerdotal ministers of God and their offices of a sacerdotal nature." These flowed from "the common notion of a priest, and priesthood, as I have explained it out of the Scriptures, and in which, as in the notion of temple, and sacrifice, both Jews, and Heathens did agree."[136] The Christian sacraments bore witness to this priestly power, with the clergy as "priests upon Earth" who offered "the symbols of [Christ's] body and blood" and received divine favor for the laity in return.[137] Even ancient pagans understood the mediatorial power of the priest, as the Homeric Chryses alone could ward off a plague from Apollo because Chryses was his priest.[138] Deists "secularize" priesthood, reducing ministers to those "well-powdered" worldlings who cared nothing for the divine, only civil advancement. [139]

Therefore, if ancient history testified to a sacred class of men who mediated between Heaven and Earth, they should remain as a separate independent society to preserve their purity. Bishops were "spiritual princes" in diocesan "spiritual principalities," where the exercised their sovereign spiritual powers. These claims had a long pedigree in Christian history, with the third

[136] Ibid., 1-19.
[137] Ibid., 58-70.
[138] Ibid., 77-78.
[139] Ibid., 123-134.

century Origen referring to bishop as “princes of the Church” and the fourth century Gregory Nazianzen who praised the “unbloody dignity” of bishops who ruled with the word.[140] Hickes triumphantly proclaimed that “the Church hath an empire, and is a principality, as well as the state, of which the bishops are archons, or princes, under Christ Jesus, as the Apostles were.”[141] Like civil magistrates, bishops ruled through “spiritual coercion” in the rite of excommunication, the spiritual equivalent of fines, imprisonment, and execution. There was a perfect and parallel analogy, for “as kings are bishops of the state, so bishops are as kings in the Church.”[142]

This view of the church, according to Hickes, was concurrent with the English Reformation, for the Church of England recognized, from the beginning, “two Powers, Spiritual and Temporal, Ecclesiastical and Regal” that never intersected.[143] In contrast, the Deists made the king into the source of spiritual power, as he had the sovereign right to appoint and remove all clergy, as much as he had the sovereign right to appoint all civil ministers. For Hickes, Deists made the king into the high priest of the Church.[144] The struggle, for Hickes, was existential. There was either a sacerdotal clergy in an independent spiritual corporation, which the Bible and all civilization attested, or the king had unlimited tyrannical powers. To avoid the latter, the former must be vocally embraced. For Hickes, Nonjuring alone preserved these ideas, the only alternative to Deist royal supremacy.

But what if the High Churchmen could be converted? What if the conforming Church of England was not lost forever? Henry Dodwell, who had been a Nonjuror since 1691, believed the time for reunification had come. The last of the original Nonjuring bishops, Thomas Ken, had

[140] Ibid., 177-180, 184-185.
[141] Ibid., 187.
[142] Ibid., 195, 201.
[143] Ibid 227-229.
[144] Ibid., 239-240.

died in 1711. Now was the time to repair the constitution of the Church of England as a spiritually independent society. Contrary to Hickes, his primary interlocutor, the conforming Church of England had not been permanently stained when its clergy accepted William's deprivations. They erred, but they had not explicitly ratified what William had done as doctrine or altered the core constitution of the universal church. Now that the deposed bishops were dead, the schism was over and Nonjurors should reunify with clergy who were willing to accept their principles. The idea of a permanent separation, where a small sect of Nonjurors alone was the true Church of England, would promote skepticism and atheism among the simple. Given that the Nonjurors had no visible presence, in altars or diocesan office, Dodwell feared that the average laity will think spiritual power was imaginary, despite the contrary being true.[145] Physical manifestation, however, was important epistemically to justify a legitimacy that had a very historical form. Eternal life and salvation depended on the legitimate spiritual powers that clergy claimed in their office.[146] This visible ceremony helped the simple understand the real force behind the "spiritual coertion" of excommunication. A visible diocese helped understand the nature of what it meant to be removed from the spiritual kingdom of the Church of England.[147] These visible dioceses served the same purpose as episcopal rolls, with a historic record of English bishops tracing their succession back to the Apostles. The rolls did not create spiritual authority but were witnesses to it for the sake of doubters and skeptics. These lists also served to recognize legitimate bishops from "criminal bishops" created by royal despotism.

---

[145] Henry Dodwell, *The Case in View, Now in Fact, Proving, That the Continuance of a Separate Communion, Without Substitutes in Any of the Late Invalidity Deprived Sees, Since the Death of William late Lord Bishop of Norwich, is schismatical* (London: 1711), 1-8.

[146] Dodwell's consistency and emphasis on visible lines of succession meant, by implication, that non-episcopal Protestants were never Christians and having bishops was part of salvation. Jean-Louis Quantin, "Anglican Scholarship Gone Mad?: Henry Dodwell (1641-1711) and Christian Antiquity" in *History of Scholarship: A Selection of Papers from the Seminar on the History of Scholarship Held Annually at the Warburg Institute* eds. C.R. Ligota & J-L Quantin (Oxford University Press, 2006), 305-356.

[147] Dodwell, *The Case in View*, 57-57.

These tangible markers, which the conforming Church of England alone possessed, aided understanding that clerical office was "beyond the power of the subjects either to give or limit it."[148] For the sake of regaining this visible support, it was paramount for Dodwell that the Nonjurors rejoin the Church of England and restore the unity of the ancient constitution.

Forgiveness of these errors did not make Dodwell blind to the fact that many clergy were still docile and servile in accepting the original deprivations. Nevertheless, the Church of England still had its "sense of bishops" as spiritual monarchs, as the Nonjurors also believed, even if most of its clergy no longer believed it.[149] Like a drunk who condemned drunkenness, the Church of England still believed itself, at the level of its original divine constitution, an independent spiritual corporation under a sacred clergy that alone could govern. The Church of England never rejected the idea that its clergy had sacred powers and the Church was an independent society. Dodwell lamented that the Church of England failed to meet regularly in Convocation, where these clerical privileges could be expressed and defended through clear affirmations and denunciations. Similarly, Dodwell praised the Greek Orthodox church, which continued to govern through councils of bishops, and hoped that the Church of England would soon wake up from its stupor. Nevertheless, conforming clergy still accepted the foundations of the Church of England and that was sufficient for reunion.[150]

In an appendix, intensifying his criticisms of remaining separate, Dodwell complained that ordaining new Nonjuring bishops was a betrayal of the original Nonjurors, a turn from faithfulness to schism. There were no more usurpers or usurped, the grave claiming all of them

[148] Ibid., 70-79, 82-85.
[149] Ibid., 93-101.
[150] Ibid., 115-128.

and settling the issue.[151] It was not possible for separation "grounded on an injury" to "last longer than the injury on which it is grounded."[152] If Nonjuror bishops continued as bishops without any bounded diocesan jurisdiction then they claimed universal powers that were equivalent to the pope.[153] The origins of episcopal were equivalent to the "state of nature," where individuals formed contracts and social bonds to mutually improve life. Explicitly contrasting his theory to Hobbes, Dodwell rejected the idea that society derived from fear of a "common enemy" in a war of all against all. Rather, societies were formed for the "happiness of each individual," which was guaranteed through "positive laws made by the governors of the bodies for the good of all members."[154] Bishops, like these individuals in a state of nature, formed bonds of alliance for mutual prosperity. To create new altars, as new Nonjuror bishops would do, was to declare a "state of war" and constitute a breakdown of these social bonds. The problem was not Nonjurors creating new dioceses but creating new ones where they already existed. Given that Archbishop William Sancroft of Canterbury had died, an office that all bishops recognized as superior to any mere bishopric in England, there was no longer a contest over the rightful archbishop. No Nonjuring bishop had a similar right to regulate the rest of the Church of England, and therefore continued separation was schismatic and wrong.[155] In this defense of his own return, Dodwell in no way repudiated the original Nonjuror ideas that the Church of England was spiritually autonomous under a spiritually independent clergy who could govern themselves. Rather, since the conforming Church of England never officially repudiated these

[151] Henry Dodwell, *Appendix, proving that our late Invalidly-deprived Fathers had no Right to Substitute Successors* (London: 1711), 1-2, 11-14.
[152] Ibid., 17.
[153] Ibid., 26-27.
[154] Ibid., 28-30. As Jon Parkin has argued, many Restoration and post-Revolution theorists adopted elements of Hobbes' theory, including the state of nature and social contract, to refute the large Hobbist vision. Dodwell acted in a similar way. Parkin, *Taming the Leviathan*, 2-14.
[155] Dodwell, *Appendix*, 42-47.

principles, reunification could take place on the basis of Nonjuring principles of spiritual independence. Whatever compromises or failures at an individual level, the Church of England could still be understood on Nonjuring terms.

Atterbury, despite Leslie's earlier condemnation in the 1700s, dropped defense of royal supremacy to join the attack on Tindal's earlier tract. Tindal was correct that clergy were subordinate to the monarchy in a "civil political way," but in spiritual affairs they were entirely independent. Jesus Christ gave the Apostles the "keys" – that power to pardon or affirm the guilt of sinners, opening or locking Heaven to the laity. Posed rhetorically, did Jesus Christ give these powers "to the supreme civil magistrate as such" or "did Christ originally give these keys to his Apostles and their successors?" The answer was, for Atterbury, obviously the latter, since if civil magistrates had this right Pagan, as much as Christian, kings would have the right to regulate the clergy.[156] That was why James II was never a threat to the Church of England, despite his being Roman Catholic.[157] No king ever had power over the clergy, an error that made Deists like Tindal closer to Roman Catholicism. Tindal, in effect, made "our kings and queens as popes to the church, devourer of her inherent spiritual rights." Bishops were spiritual kings who had power "not only in his own diocese, but also thro the whole catholic church."[158] Without referencing Hickes' attack on Tindal, Atterbury sounded nearly identical in defending a fully spiritual Church of England that gave no power to the monarch over clergy as spiritual officers. This position was a significant departure from his claim that Convocation, as a spiritual parliament, was under royal headship. [159] Now kings had no right to regulate the clergy, a seeming capitulation to the Nonjuring rejection of royal supremacy.

---

[156] Francis Atterbury, *The Mitre and the Crown; or, a real distinction between them* (London: 1711), 3-9.
[157] Ibid., 15-16.
[158] Ibid., 21-25.
[159] Bennett, *Tory Crisis in Church and State*, 48-57, 69-70.

In a sequel work, clarifying his claims in the original, Atterbury described in what ways the Church of England was an independent society. Like a kingdom, which had a hierarchy of governing officials that ascended to a sovereign that presided for the wellbeing of its subjects, the Church had clergy that derived their power from God. It was a spiritual society, and spiritual societies differed from civil societies in their "original, in their nature and constitution, in the ends they aim at, and in the different means by which they pursue their several ends." The distinction between Church and kingdom were like "like two parallel lines that can never meet to cross each other," entirely separate. Membership in the Church and membership in a kingdom could overlap, just as much as an English subject could also be shareholder in the East India Company or South Seas Company, the same person with different roles in different social bodies. As a kingdom and the Church overlapped, they offered each other mutual support, with kings giving temporal benefits to clergy and clergy preaching obedience to the king. While royalty may bless bishops with civil title, kings never claimed authority over the clergy on spiritual affairs. For Deists like Tindal to accuse "high flyers" of popery was not only false, it was the same trick that radical parliamentarians used to execute Archbishop Laud during the Civil Wars.[160] Rather, it was Roman Catholics who had, like Tindal, confused civil and spiritual power. Directly quoting George Hickes, Atterbury argued the Council of Trent ratified placing all temporal power in the pope, as much as Deists hope to place all spiritual power in kings. Even the Henrician Act of Supremacy, which made the king the head of the Church, still recognized the difference between civil and spiritual power, since the king had no power to determine whether clergy met for a synod.[161] With quotation of Hickes, Atterbury had embraced the notion of the Church of England as an independent spiritual society, which stood in danger of Deist

[160] Francis Atterbury, *A Continuation of the Mitre and the Crown* (London: 1712), 28-29, 37-38.
[161] Ibid., 42-43, 49-53.

attacks that reduced it to a royal creature. The independence of the clergy as purveyors of sacerdotal power was supremely important, the center of English Protestantism, not royal supremacy, which had become the doctrine of the heterodox.

High Church Tories, like Atterbury, were not the only ones drawn to the Church of England as an independence spiritual society. Some Whig High Churchmen, who were no less advocates for clerical spiritual powers but accepted the king's supremacy worked through Parliament, adopted similar arguments as Atterbury. John Potter, a rising priest and future Archbishop of Canterbury, also attacked Tindal for confounding spiritual and temporal power in the king. The civil monarch never had spiritual authority, but always defended the spiritual independence of the Church as God's universal society.[162] Against Deists and Dissenters, who treated the Church as a voluntary debate club for philosophy, the Church of England stood as the spiritual society that brought salvation to Humanity. To leave the Church was to leave God's ordained society for salvation; to leave the Church was to forsake salvation.[163] Even though the membership of a kingdom overlapped with the Church, they were parallel societies, where neither one could infringe upon the other, each equally a visible society towards different ends.[164] The powers of clergy, as governors of a spiritual society, only pertained to "the next world." The clergy alone had the right to baptize, confect the eucharist, ordain additional ministers, as well as compose canon law and form diocesan jurisdiction, and these powers only impacted the future state of the soul.[165] Excommunication was the most important spiritual power because it alone could regulate the membership of a spiritual corporation. If clergy did not

[162] John Potter, *A Discourse on Church Government: Wherein the rights of the church and the supremacy of Christian princes, are vindicated and adjusted* (London: 2nd Ed., 1711), 2-3.
[163] Ibid., 5-12, 17-18.
[164] Ibid., 22-24.
[165] Ibid., 210-221.

have the power to excommunicate, then clergy were powerless. No society, civil or spiritual, could exist without the threat of exile.[166] Even Pagan priests, in their own spiritual corporations, had this right, with ministers of the Eleusinian mysteries able to eject wayward acolytes.[167] All spiritual corporations, Christian or Pagan, had this right to expel, but this penalty was entirely spiritual and carried no civil effect.[168]

Potter believed that the clergy were an independent spiritual society, with bishop as their highest office, the equivalent of king in the civil realm. Episcopal power did not map onto civil boundaries, with bishops from various civil societies gathering to act as a single spiritual society, enforcing discipline and deciding doctrine. Nevertheless, bishops did not want to offend civil authorities or disrupt civil peace, often creating dioceses to reflect preexistent civil jurisdictions. This cooperation had, in the past, allowed an overlap between the Church of England and English monarchs, granting kings "the power of appointing bishops and church-officers to exercise their functions in particular districts." These arrangements reflected "the times and other circumstances [that] would best bear." However, this arrangement never robbed bishops of their original sovereign power to govern and regulate the Church of England, with royal or lay powers to influence clerical government as ever only on loan.[169] In this arrangement, Potter offered a subtle, though not entirely coherent, defense of an independent spiritual corporation with a sacred clergy that had loaned, temporarily, these powers to civil authority. Bishops could in theory reclaim these spiritual powers, they could excommunicate wicked kings, and erect dioceses for their own purposes. But bishops were also promoters of civil peace, allowing civil governments the initiative. Kings may behave tyrannically over the clergy, but these acts had no

[166] Ibid., 382-385.
[167] Ibid., 382-385.
[168] Ibid., 426-427.
[169] Ibid., 454-455.

ultimate effect. Spiritual power pertained to the afterlife and spiritual office came through Apostolic succession, something kings could never truly touch. Potter rejected Deist arguments without fully embracing the demands of separatism that the Nonjurors taught. The Church of England was an entirely parallel and separate society no matter what kings or parliaments did. As long as civil government did not explicitly reject the spiritual independence of the Church of England, the tacit arrangement persisted. Spiritual independence could coexist as a tacit reality in the mind of the clergy, something the laity accepted if they did not vocally reject it.

High Church agitation, and greater movement towards Nonjuror ideas, only intensified with the Hanoverian succession and failed Jacobite invasion. With Queen Anne childless, the distant and foreign Elector of Hanover, George I, became king of England in 1714. Hoping that widespread unpopularity would turn Britons against their new king, James "the Pretender" invaded and rallied supporters in a failed bid for the throne. With general support for the Protestant Hanoverians, Whigs painted Tories as complicit and silent collaborators, gaining a majority in Parliament in 1716. High Churchmen were even more concerned about the current monarch, a recently converted Lutheran who seemed willing to turn government over to members of Parliament that rejected High Church arguments for clerical privilege. With continued heterodoxy in the Church of England, Convocation could become the means to reassert clerical privilege as an independent spiritual society against criticism and detractors.[170]

This criticism was rapidly coalescing in the person of Benjamin Hoadly, a rapidly rising clergyman that vigorously defended the Glorious Revolution and attacked the Nonjurors. Hoadly was dangerous precisely because he conformed to the Church of England and had defended its superiority against Dissenters. Arguing with Presbyterian Edward Calamy's defense of continued

[170] On the Whig's succession painting of Tories as crypto-Jacobites in 1716, Linda Colley remains a standard account. Colley, *In Defiance of Oligarchy*, 85-117.

non-conformity in the early 1700s, Hoadly defended the Protestant credentials of an episcopal church. Bishops were a *jure Humano* institution, but they were an ancient form of government. The Apostles appointed bishops as successors, not as sacerdotal mediators of the divine but as paragons of virtue. The antiquity of bishops made them normative, but not necessary for valid orders. Continental Protestants were not less for failing to gain control of bishoprics, but that did not make them opposed to bishops as a corruption of the Reformation. Presbyterians who refused to enter a fully Protestant national church were, unlike their Continental peers, guilty of schism.[171] To claim, as Dissenters did, that the Church of England was insufficiently Protestant was an error. Hoadly argued that the Book of Common Prayer was thoroughly Protestant, prescribing the sign of the cross in baptism (a practice that many Dissenters disdained as popery) as a "symbol" to remind the congregation of their faith. The sign of the cross was a demonstration that "the infant, as a Christian, is obliged to confess and worship a crucifi'd savior manfully and constantly." [172] These practices, even if not commanded in the Bible, in no way detracted from the Church of England's Protestant credentials.

Hoadly celebrated Dissenters for their attack on Roman Catholicism, but not everything that Protestants shared with Roman Catholics was intrinsically suspicious. Catholicism did promote "vanity, indecency, or number of things prescribed," but abuse was not intrinsic to any ritual whatsoever, especially if it benefited the laity. Kneeling to receive the Lord's Supper taught the communicant that he received "a favor, a pledge of [God's] love," not unlike how men knelt to receive honors from a king.[173] Even if this reasoning was not convincing, priests were not slaves of the Church, they only obeyed "in all lawful and honest things" and nothing more.

[171] Benjamin Hoadly, *The Reasonableness of Conformity to the Church of England* (London: 1703), 4-10, 28-29.
[172] Ibid., 45-50, 62-65.
[173] Ibid., 83-84, 94.

Dissenters should return and work out their scruples within a diocese, not outside and opposed to it.[174] While this apologetic was too little too late for many Dissenters, it did signal Hoadly's support for the Church of England as the center of an international Protestant Interest. The accession of William to the throne not only protected English Protestants for Hoadly but opened a united front. The revolution allowed the Church of England to regain the initiative in galvanizing Continental Protestants in a league against Roman Catholicism and absolutism (seen as one in the same by them).[175] Adiaphora, such as the sign of the cross in baptism or kneeling for the Lord's Supper, were not worth dividing over. The unity of Protestants was more important.

It was the same belief that motivated Hoadly's vocal defense of the Glorious Revolution. Preaching on the definition of civil obedience, before the Mayor of London and during the reign of Queen Anne in 1705, Hoadly argued that God made governments to defend the happiness and peace of a people, not for slavish obedience. If governments failed to "truly answer to the end of their institution" then they were no longer acting as governments and were not to be obeyed. Passive obedience to tyrants was a sin and "common sense, and the powerful law of self-preservation," which God had imbued in nature, counseled resistance. That was what English Protestants had done in 1688, rejecting James II's despotic reign according to "the laws of nature and reason" to secure "the publick interest." But, Hoadly further argued, resistance to tyrants was not for the masses. Only magistrates, particularly those who had a "deep sense of religion," had a right to use their office to resist an unjust king in the name of law and peace.[176] The Glorious

[174] Ibid., 142-159.
[175] Tony Claydon has demonstrated the growth of a broader and more united notion of Protestantism after the Glorious Revolution, in England and across the Continent, as a renewed bulwark against Roman Catholicism. Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution*, 1-12.
[176] Benjamin Hoadly, *A Sermon Preach'd Before the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor* (London: 1705), 6-14.

Revolution, for Hoadly, was thus a demonstration of godly politics, of thoroughly Protestant rulers who overcame a tyrant.[177]

This desire to fully defend the Protestant Interest led Hoadly into attacking prelates who failed to defend the Glorious Revolution adequately. The Tory Bishop of Exeter, Ofspring Blackall, had preached in 1709 a defense of passive obedience, that Christians must submit to unjust, even tyrannical, kings as part of their civil duty. Christians never had a right to resist, a claim that drew scoffs from Hoadly. Kings only had power through an original contract with their subjects, "the foundation of civil authority," which made royalty responsible to Parliament. If the king broke his oath, overstepping his rights, then Parliament could defend itself. The Lords and the Common may be beneath the dignity of a king, but they were not slaves of the king. Similarly, laity and ministers had an unequal covenanted relationship. Laymen had a right to reject their pastors if they overstepped their biblical authority. Even children, in relation to their fathers, had a right to defend themselves if they felt their life threatened. All authorities, whether political, pastoral, or parental, had limits, formed by God for the mutual benefit of both. Passive obedience not only infringed on conscience, commanding men to obey what they cannot believe on pains of damnation, it also could in no way justify the Glorious Revolution. If passive obedience was sacrosanct than 1688 was worse than 1649, the year of the regicide, for the latter only involved a few dozen conspirators but the former brought "all ranks and orders of men" to resist the king. Blackall not only betrayed the current royal establishment, which had come to power through a rejection of passive obedience, but also the Church of England. Unlike Roman

[177] As Young has argued, the use of explicitly biblical and Protestant claims to justify what was considered heterodox led to suspicion of heresy. Hoadly, who was friendly with rationalists and Newtonians, fell under accusations of Socinian subversion. B.W. Young, *Religion and Enlightenment in Eighteenth Century England: Theological debate from Locke to Burke* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 19-20, 44. Ingram, *Reformation Without End*, 83-89.

Catholicism, which had empowered priests to restrain the conscience of the laity, Protestant laymen had a right to reject spiritual corruption. God alone was king of conscience, and therefore passive obedience was a grievous error.[178] For Hoadly, the cause of Protestantism and the Glorious Revolution were one and the same.

Bewildered by this vocal denunciation from a lowly priest, Blackall balked at this unprovoked and irrational attack upon him. Hoadly had no idea what he was discussing, for if he were correct, then all monarchy and all hierarchy was dissolved. It was just common sense that the current, post-Revolutionary, monarch was the monarch, the supreme authority over "all persons, and in all causes."[179] The bishop had no reason to defend himself because he adhered to what everyone already believed, with Hoadly acting as a Whiggish contrarian to cause a tempest in a teapot. There was no contract between king and people, the monarchy was always hereditary and never elected. That was simply the way it was.[180] As a mild patriarchalist, where kings had their authority from their paternal rights as fathers over their people, no father ever had his authority because his children granted it. The same logic applied to kings.[181] Hoadly was misguided at best, if not insane and evil, for contemplating scenarios where sons killed unjust fathers. No right of resistance ever existed, never for children and never for subjects.[182]

Against Blackall's appeal to common sense and consensus, Hoadly blasted back that it was not untoward to contemplate subjects resisting their king, for that was exactly what had happened in 1688.[183] Rather than passive obedience, William of Orange landing in the Bay of

---

[178] Benjamin Hoadly, *Some Considerations humbly offered to the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Exeter* (London: 1709), 7-16.
[179] Ofspring Blackall, *The Lord Bishop of Exter's Answer to the Letter of Mr. Hoadly* (London: 1709), 14.
[180] Ibid., 25-27.
[181] Ibid., 31-33.
[182] Ibid., 54-55.
[183] Benjamin Hoadly, *An Humble Reply to the Right Revered the Lord Bishop of Exeter's Answer* (London: 1709), 10-12.

Torbay was a call for godly and rational magistrates to hold their king accountable to his oath. If priests and bishops could be held accountable for failures in morals and dogma, being publicly censured and criminally convicted, then the same applied to all civil magistrates, even the monarch. For Hoadly, the power of "censure and punishment, inseparable from resistance, may, in some cases, remain to the governed society, by virtue of that right to self-preservation, which God Almighty doth by no means take away."[184] The divine command to honor father and mother did not mean limitless obedience to a king, a wooden misreading that was akin to Roman Catholics taking the words of Jesus, saying "this is my body," as proof of transubstantiation. True obedience to government meant resistance when government became tyrannical. [185]

In contrast to Blackall's patriarchalism, Hoadly rejected the idea that kings and fathers were equivalent. Paternal and political power operated in two different ways, with kings receiving power from varied households contracting to form a government. If the governing broke their contract with the governed, it simply "cannot be God's Will that he should be kept in possession of power." For this doctrine of royal covenant, Hoadly cited not John Locke, but the "judicious" Richard Hooker, an unimpeachable divine in the Church of England.[186] If Hoadly was wrong, and Blackall right, then the bishop should support "national repentance" for the "national injustice" of the revolution. [187]

Hoadly's early career, then, was marked with a fully Protestant defense of the Glorious Revolution as a rebuke to tyranny in church and state. A fully Protestant Church of England

[184] Ibid., 33-36.
[185] Ibid., 44-45.
[186] Ibid., 49-59. *Pace* William Gibson, who believed Hoadly drew his political ideas from the liberalizing contract theory of John Locke. Similarly, the further backdating of liberalism in C.B. Macpherson failed to understand the full nature of an earlier republican tradition that prioritized the estates of the realm, not individual possession, that motivated England's revolutions, particularly in 1688. Gibson, *Enlightenment Prelate*, 51. CB Macpherson *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism: Hobbes to Locke* (Oxford University Press, 2011), 3-4.
[187] Ibid., 65-66.

never regarded its clergy as having the power to restrain or restrict the conscience. A good priest taught the Bible and exhibited virtue, allowing laity to scrutinize and judge for themselves. Similarly, a good magistrate governed according to the law, willing to defy even a superior magistrate, even the king, if he became despotic. This reasoning seemed to give power to both laity and subjects to overthrow their legitimate monarchs. Mere defactoist reasoning, when civil monarchs did nothing to uplift the estate of the clergy, meant that the Church of England was still in danger.[188] Hoadly's high praise of William and godly kingship was not good obedience, but no different than Deist embrace of royal supremacy. Hoadly, like Deists, was claiming to complete the Reformation in further subjecting the clergy to royal power.[189]Hoadly's arguments not only supported William's usurpation and deprivations, they also justified the parliamentarian arguments to wage war against Charles I during the Civil Wars, leading to the ultimate destruction of the Church of England. Hoadly appeared as the antithesis to the spiritual independency of the Church of England.

Writing his final work against Deists and all critics of spiritual independence, George Hickes once again outlined the first principles of Nonjuring ecclesiology. The Church of England had failed to fully embrace the Nonjuring cause, therefore, contrary to Dodwell, the separation must continue. Written as series of pastoral letters to a sergeant-at-arms in 1714-15, *The Constitution of the Catholick Church* rejected Dodwell's return as sinful and did nothing to fight the Deist rot in the Church of England. Only the Nonjurors preserved the true Church of England by rejecting the sin of rebellion, as the rest of the Church of England made public prayers for a

[188] However, *Pace* Colley, High Churchmen had a more creative relationship with Nonjurors, who found common cause as "The Church in Danger" remained unsatisfied, in their estimation, during Anne's reign. Colley, *In Defiance of Oligarchy*, 85-117.
[189] Justin Champion has recovered Deists as not precursors to secularism, but anti-clerical theologians who sought to perfect the Protestant Reformation. Champion, *The Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken*, 23-24.

usurper.[190] Remaining apart from the conforming Church of England was akin to separation from Roman Catholicism. Hickes equated prayers to saints as similar to prayers for a usurper, both a ritual perversion of true Christianity. Both these acts contaminated the worship of God and should be shunned. Even if a parishioner privately rejected the royal claims of the Hanoverians, he tacitly accepted them if he sat silently through a liturgy that promoted them. Even worse, to pray for a usurper was like ancient Christians who offered incense to Caesar as a god, a betrayal of the faith for slavish conformity. Prayers for George of Hanover as king of Great Britain converted the Church of England into a pagan temple, the erection of civil idolatry in the house of God.[191] This threat, of worshiping the king as a spiritual power, had remained a threat to the Church of England since the Reformation. While Roman Catholics made the pope the source of all civil and spiritual power, Protestants had given these powers to the king. This error continued "within these Three Kingdoms and other Reform'd Countries."[192] If kings had power over the clergy, if they were the supreme governors of spiritual affairs, then kings could change the doctrine of the Church of England from orthodoxy into heresy, even into atheism. Royal supremacy meant the Church was a creature of the state. Therefore, the conforming Church of England must be abandoned as incorrigibly corrupt.[193]

In contrast to the degraded conforming Church of England, the Nonjurors understood the true Church of England was an independent spiritual kingdom under bishops as its spiritual aristocracy. As civil kings appointed a peerage, so too did Christ appoint bishops as spiritual peers, governing all laity whether they were princes or peasants. The clergy stood as mediators to

[190] George Hickes, *The Constitution of the Church Catholick, and the nature and consequences of schism* (London: 1716), iii-xvi.
[191] Ibid., 8-12.
[192] Ibid., 25-28
[193] Ibid., 37.

grant the laity access to eternal life. Never once in the whole of Christian history, according to Hickes, did kings have a power to regulate the clergy, to promote or remove them. There may have been times when the universal church took royal preference into account, but they never allowed him that power. Spiritual monarchs may have joined with civil monarchs for mutual support, but only if kings recognized themselves as spiritual subjects of the clergy. If kings violated this agreement, and it was usually kings who overreached, then they became spiritual usurpers and provoked schism, driving both the civil and spiritual realms into anarchy and division.[194]

If there was no true distinction between the civil and the spiritual, then ordination was a useless rite, granting something that did not exist. Roman Catholics and Presbyterians understood this point, something that the conforming Church of England had failed to understand. Even if the pope was a spiritual tyrant, he still had a spiritual office as Bishop of Rome, a far better title than a mere king claiming power over bishops. Presbyterians erred in the rejection of bishops, but they were right to jealously guard clerical privileges from kings. For Hickes, it was better to have a legitimate tyranny or republic than an illegitimate monarch, who could only create anarch through his usurpation.[195] The conforming Church accepted this despotism, allowing a spiritual commoner to seize the spiritual throne, forcing the true Church of England to enter exile. Contrary to Dodwell's claim that a tangible diocesan jurisdiction improved the claims of bishops, true clergy needed no physical altar to assert his true right as a successor to the Apostles.[196] Churchmen like Dodwell should know better, as the true Church of England, though a minority, had entered a similar exile under Charles II against the

[194] Ibid., 62-101.
[195] Ibid., 128.
[196] Ibid., 156-157, 166-167.

Commonwealth. If the civil power could dissolve episcopacy, as it had during the interregnum, then the bishops in exile were really laymen. But access to a diocese or an altar was irrelevant to legitimacy, a bishop was a bishop wherever at home or in exile.[197] Like the ancient Christians in pagan Rome under persecuting civil magistrates, the Nonjuring bishops would persevere, even if in hiding.[198]

Thus, for Hickes, the issue was the tyrannous threats of a civil magistrate leading Christians astray, but he could never truly remove the powers of the bishop. The clergy could never, truly, be damaged or harmed by a mere prince, who was nothing more than a spiritual commoner. These spiritual powers remained even if they could not be used, as much as an exiled king could not exercise his civil powers. Passive obedience, which Hickes praised as dogma, was true in both civil affairs and spiritual affairs, even if the king and bishops were exiled in a foreign land. Passive obedience, against "sinful latitude and comprehension," respected the independence of spiritual and civil powers.[199] Dodwell,"addicted to nostrums," was the only one blind to the reality that Hickes saw, in effect abandoning Nonjurirng to accept surrender to heresy, obeying a usurper as king by the mere fact that he claimed the right.[200] The Church of England was either an entirely spiritual polity, segregated from all civil power when civil authority was unjust, or it was a creature of state. Dodwell had compromised along with the conforming Church of England. Nonjurors alone preserved the truth in England and must continue.

Hickes proved to be the foil Hoadly needed to reject all accounts of the Church of England as an independent spiritual society. Hoadly agreed with Hickes about his assessment. If

[197] Ibid., 204-205.
[198] Ibid., 220-225.
[199] Ibid., 233-24.
[200] Ibid., 242-268.

the Church of England was an independent spiritual corporation under spiritual monarchs that required absolute passive obedience, then the Glorious Revolution must be rejected. However, if the clergy did not have this spiritual power, then laymen had a right to resist this unjust tyranny, as much as English subjects resisted the tyranny of James II. If Hickes was right, then the conforming Church of England really was heretical. Protestants had to decide who was right, Hoadly or Hickes, William or James, and adjust their views accordingly.[201] But Hoadly believed himself correct and advised that godly Christians had a right to resist "subjection to a race of princes" and were "obliged, upon pain of damnation" to not accept any royal heir if it meant the destruction of the realm. Hickes had rejected this Protestant doctrine, along with the Protestant ideas about "justification, faith, antichrist, musick in churches, and ceremonies too." It was therefore no surprise that Hickes also advanced the novelty of "their scheme of church-authority, sacerdotal powers, regulat successions, authoritative benedictions, and absolutions." Hickes was not the defender of a Protestant Church of England but sought to return it to Roman Catholicism.[202] Nonjurors like Hickes believed in absolutism, whether in church and state. According to Nonjuror principles, Hoadly argued that they would have to meek accepted the exile of saintly bishops, like John Chrysostom in the fourth century, as a "hazard of the publick" since this process was a civil act.[203] For Hoadly, tyranny was tyranny, and the effort to demarcate civil or spiritual powers was part of simple acquiescence to a legitimate, though lawless, despot.

The Church of England was not under prelates, and it was not an independent spiritual society under a sacerdotal clergy. Rather, the clergy were preachers of the gospel and godly ministers who provided examples of virtue to the laity. They had no unique powers as mediators.

[201] Benjamin Hoadly, *A Preservative Against the Principles and Practices of the Nonjurors* (London: 1716), 6-8.
[202] Ibid., 15-16.
[203] Ibid., 38-52.

Nonjurors, like Roman Catholics, created a rival society that was an *imperio in imperium*, a rival kingdom that vied for control of the civil government. By teaching that clergy were spiritual monarchs, the Nonjurors "extinguish'd the very light of the gospel, and put in its place, nothing but what is calculated to support its own exorbitant pretensions." Civil powers restraining clergy who believed in sacerdotal powers were not unjust, but righteous to overthrow a tyranny over lay consciences. Hoadly went even further, claiming an unjust king was preferable to an unjust prelate because at least kings had legitimate rights according to their coronation oath.[204]

This Nonjuring tyranny was manifest in the works of Dodwell, who threatened to unchurch Dissenters and question their salvation. It was wrong for Dissenters to stay outside the Church of England, which was the national Protestant church and a godly one at that. But if Dodwell wanted to win back Dissenters, Hoadly believed he went about it in the worst possible way. Asking laity to muddle through episcopal rolls, to struggle with historical records that were always in contest, was to invite cynicism and doubt. In contrast, Hoadly believed "sincerity" was sufficient, an effort to obey what was God's word according to conscience. Hoadly did not deny the Christianity of Nonjurors, despite their error, for they acted according to their beliefs. But that did not stop Nonjurors from claiming the power to determine saint from sinner, especially through absolution. Hoadly denounced the clerical pretension to free the conscience from guilt, given that Nonjuring clergy had no way of really knowing whether a repentant sinner was sincere. Nonjurors were simply bigots with liturgical schemes to "excommunicate, unchurch, unchristian, those, whose church-government, or worship, differ from their own." The result of Nonjuring was atheism and Roman Catholicism, not the Protestant faith of the Church of

[204] Ibid., 56-59.

England.[205] Hoadly, as a bishop of the Church of England, had rejected all claims to sacerdotal power whatsoever. His core concern was a truly Protestant nation and church, one that could comprehend unity despite institution divisions. Nonjurors not only claimed false powers for the clergy, which Hoadly believed as spiritual tyranny, they also stripped civil power of the ability to promote the true faith. Hoadly offered a total rejection of the Nonjurors from within the Church of England.

In reversing the use of foil, Leslie attacked Hoadly's denunciation as the antithesis of the Church of England. If Hoadly was right, there was no Church of England. He failed to understand the complete separation of powers between civil and spiritual societies, which had only ever been united in the biblical Adam and the patriarchs. Since the days of Moses, God had separated civil and spiritual powers into different societies. Nonjurors preserved this ancient truth, while Hoadly threatened to confound them through royal tyranny.[206] While Leslie learned his theory from the Bible and the universal church, Hoadly took his novel theory from "his friend Mr Lock" who taught an "independent state of nature" like their teacher, Thomas Hobbes. If the biblical patriarch Isaac shared Hoadly's views, and "had been born a Whigg," then he would have never received the paternal blessing from Abraham. Isaac would have "held up magna charta against the old man, and pleaded original contract, and the independent state of nature" against any prerogative for fathers to bless or withhold blessing.[207] Leslie, instead, upheld inalienable sovereignty that could operate through a variety of governments. In England's civil

[205] Ibid., 77-78, 90-100; Nonjurors, as much as Hoadly, departed from traditional use of Renaissance historicism towards epistemic doubt and need for foundational principles, marking a stronger departure from Dodwell's earlier historicism. Dmitri Levitin, *Ancient Wisdom in the Age of the New Science: Histories of Philosophy in England, 1640-1700* (Cambridge University Press, 2015) 516-522.
[206] Charles Leslie, *The Finishing Stroke Being a vindication of the patriarchal scheme of government* (London: 1716), 2-3.
[207] Ibid., 18-19; 30; 56. The accusation of being Lockean was part of a wider strategy to tar all Whigs with the brush of republicanism and Hobbism, through the appeal to a state of nature not out of actual reliance on his thought. Collins, *In the Shadow of Leviathan*, 217-229.

government, the sovereignty existed in a hereditary crown while government was distributed to Parliament. If, as Leslie accused Hoadly of believing, "the original power be in the people, it is democrasy, tho' there be one called king upon the throne." Hoadly converted kings into "ministers of the people, accoutanble to them, and deposeable by them."[208] Analogously, if spiritual sovereignty resided in the laity, even if the layman was the king, then clergy were disposable by the laity. The sovereignty of bishops and kings were in jeopardy from the dissolving ideas of Hoadly.[209]

Hoadly, however, continued his total rejection of any sacerdotal clergy in an independent spiritual society. Preaching in his diocese, in a widely printed and infamous sermon, Hoadly saw clerical pretensions as part of an illicit use of emotion in preaching. The "law of reason" would determine fact from fiction, and therefore calm sobriety was necessary from the pulpit. In interpreting his sermon text (John 18:36: "My kingdom is not of this world"), Hoadly denied any connection between Christ's kingdom and the visible institutions of the universal church. No clergy had power over the conscience, which was invisible and belonged to God alone. Advocates of a sacred clergy denied this truth, inventing powers to grant access to divine favor so as to control the conscience. Jesus ruled directly in the hearts of the faithful, who alone had the power of final judgement. No clergy had the right to impose "unity of confession," which did not produce truth but "stupidity and sleep" in slavish and ignorance obedience. Pretensions to govern the conscience were built upon "ruines of sincerity and common honesty." As Hoadly declared, "if Christ be our king; let us shew our selves subjects to him alone in, in the great affair of conscience and eternal savaltion." The meaning of a "king, whose kingdom is not of this

[208] Leslie, *A Finishing Stroke*, 63-65
[209] Ibid., 100-105. Jon Parkin has shown how a variety of figures adopted Hobbist ideas, but insufficiently in Tories and Jacobites who used similar arguments to defend royal absolutism, even as they accused their opponents of doing the same. Parkin, *Taming the Leviathan*, 14, 358-361.

world" was a rejection of all sacerdotal clergy. The universal church, including the Church of England, was a temporal arrangement to preach this truth, but nothing more. Clergy were mere teachers of gospel and virtue, not mediators or a separate society.[210]

After Hoadly's rejection of all sacred powers of the clergy provoked an uproar, George I convened Convocation at the behest of these agitated churchmen to settle the controversy. The leading voice against Hoadly was William Law, a recent Nonjuror in response to the Hanoverian succession, who blasted the Bishop of Bangor for collapsing all spiritual power into civil authority. The clergy had authority because they had their authority from the Apostles, who appointed bishops as copies that succeeded through the centuries.[211] Christ was indeed king of a spiritual kingdom, but he did not rule alone. Christ had deputized the clergy to speak on his behalf, issuing judgements and pardoning offenses. This power was "bestowed on persons according to his order, and in obedience to his authority," granting them authority but not unlimited authority. Bishops, like kings, were still subject to God in the exercise of their authority, even as that power was not absolute.[212] They had a right to restrain the conscience as an officer who "presides over us in things relating to religion and the service of God." This power was analogous to a king who "presides over us in things relating to civil life."[213] Hoadly had denied all spiritual power, ignorant of the Church of England's mystical powers. He was like someone who treated the effects of baptism by analyzing the chemical composition of water. The sacraments were not mere social rights but impacted the future state of the soul before the eyes of God.[214] Spiritual power was entirely independent of civil authority, though that spiritual

[210] Benjamin Hoadly, *The Nature of the Kingdom, or Church, of Christ* (London: 1717), no pagination.
[211] William Law, *Three Letters to the Bishop of Bangor* (London: 8th ed., 1721), 41-42.
[212] Ibid., 50-61.
[213] Ibid., 120.
[214] Ibid., 143-147.

power in no way conflicted with civil power. The spiritual authority of the clergy pertained to the afterlife, with civil magistrates commissioned to protect the exercise of this great office.[215] Law's restatement of clerical powers was akin to both Hickes and Potter, a spiritual power that was entirely separated from civil authority. Royal supremacy was diminished to the point of insignificance, two parallel powers that did not intersect in their exercise.[216]

Hoadly's supporters, however, rejected the independent spiritual powers of the clergy as absurd. In a parody of Nonjurors and their supports, the Whig polemicists John Trenchard and Thomas Gordon lisped a defense of the spiritual independence of the Church of England. This independence would be in danger until the prophecies of the recently deceased Charles Leslie came true. Only when "holy lechery" was secure, only when "men bow before clergy and lick the dust from their feet" would the Church of England ever be safe. True and godly churchmen would never both with divine things, and instead focus on better pursuits like horse racing and being dominated by their wives. The ideal defender of sacerdotal clergy was "drunk and orthodox." However they were beset by an evil alliance of Hanoverian monarchs, Whigs, and the weather (a storm had kept the Pretender from landing in England because rich Whigs had bribed the clouds). The leader of this band was the Bishop of Bangor, who marched at the head of wicked things like "truth, reason, scripture, and sincerity." He would destroy the Church of England because he believed in "liberty and the gospel" and did not promote the kind of ignorant laity that would attempt to murder King George out of a rumor that he was a cannibal. The Church of England was, quoting Leslie, crushed between the "upper and nether milstones" of king and commons. The only hope was to support the fictious claims of spiritual independence,

[215] Ibid., 150-151, 181-184.
[216] Clark argued that Nonjurors were only theoretical advocates of independence, but this misses the polemical use of this program, shifting from a more radical moment of crisis to a novel development that allowed ecclesiastical independents to have everything they want and more. Clark, *English Society*, 101-105.

from a fabricated succession of bishops, and suppress the fact that the king had always elected bishops to the Church of England. If this dangerous information was not suppressed then laity would realize how ugly and naked the ignorant High Church clergy were and repair to a better faith.[217] The mockery of Trenchard and Gordon was not in defense of secularity or removing faith from politics. Rather, they offered their support for Hoadly because he established true religion in both the church and state. Their criticisms of High Churchmen were similar to attacks on Quakers, confusing an imaginary invisible power for the life of virtue. If the Church of England was to promote the true gospel, then its authority must be imbedded within the godly monarchy of the Hanoverians.[218]

Ultimately, the lower house of Convocation found Hoadly guilty of heresy in 1718, condemning his *Preservative* as a blasphemous attack on the spiritual authority of clergy. Hoadly rejected this accusation because it was only as defender of clergy as preachers of virtue that their role was established. Only a virtuous ministry under a godly prince was capable of advancing the Church of England. Kings had every right to govern, regulate, and restrain the clergy when they were "injurious to the members of civil society." Kings had a right to restrain clergy who delegitimated other Protestants, seeking to destroy through "mutual differences in religion and worship." Kings could not command the conscience, but no earthly authority, church or state, had that right. All subjects had a right to a conscience "entirely free to judge and chuse; without which judgement and choice, what they profess, and embrace, is not religion." If clergy claimed this right as mediators, they impose "religious injuries, defamations, and abuses" that threaten

[217] John Trenchard and Thomas Gordon, *An Apology for the Danger of the Church* (London: 1719), 6-31. As Hoadlian sympathizers that genuinely cared for the well-being of a fully reformed and virtuous Church of England, not simply as Dissenters or anti-establishmentarians. Ashley Walsh has demonstrated that they pursued an anti-clerical civil religion. Walsh, *Civil Religion and the Enlightenment in England*, 59-79.
[218] Andrew Starkie has provided a general overview of the Bangorian Controversy, particularly the role of more radical Hoadly supporters. Andrew Starkie, *The Church of England and the Bangorian Controversy, 1716-1721* (Martlesham, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2007), 6-7, 14-15, 147-153, 173-176.

the "civil rights" of a civil magistrate's subjects. Therefore, the civil magistrate had a right to protect his subjects "equally in that freedom, with which God and Christ have made them free."[219] To prove his orthodoxy, Hoadly claimed that everything he wrote could be found in Richard Hooker, an authoritative apologist for the Church of England.[220]

Against Nonjuror analogies between kings and bishops, Hoadly rejected any comparison. Ministers of the Church of England "must not frame our ideas, from the kingdoms of this world, to what ought to be, in a visible and sensible manner, in Christ's kingdom." There was no compare between spiritual affairs to temporal ones, the former belonged to God alone. Hoadly only wrote to defend the "happiness of Human life here, and hereafter," where a free conscience promoted the "dignity and well-being of Man" for "the honour and service of almighty God himself."[221] Hoadly's defense of conscience was not absent political authority, but only a duly constituted civil authority, which limited itself to governing the bodies of men, had authority. Spiritual authority existed, but only as a divine interaction with man. There was no sacerdotal clergy and there was no spiritually independent Church of England. Rather, clergy were under the authority of a king who had a duty to promote outward worship and virtuous living. Spiritual independence was entirely denied, justifying the High Church convergence to emphasize this doctrine against Hoadly's defense of royal supremacy over the Church of England.

Despite the lower house's condemnation, Convocation never settled the matter and fell silent. Hoadly was neither condoned nor condemned, leaving an ambiguity about clergy and church. The clergy could be sacred ministers of a spiritually independent church, the matter was foreclosed without resolution. Indirect efforts, such as the High Church Whig Edmund Gibson,

---

[219] Benjamin Hoadly, *An Answer to the Representation Drawn up by the Committee of the Lower House of Convocation* in *Collected Works of Hoadly* (London: 1718), 518.
[220] Ibid., 520-521.
[221] Ibid., 576-582.

as Bishop of London, were pursued through the House of Lords. Despite a partnership with Robert Walpole, political efforts to failed.[222] Nevertheless, the pretensions of a sacerdotal clergy in a spiritually independent church, one that claimed a right to regulate its own membership despite royal overreach, persisted. Since spiritual authority was entirely separated from civil government, where kings could never really remove bishops from their spiritual office, High Churchmen imagine themselves immune. Spiritual independence was compatible with establishment, without reliance on royal supremacy to advance the interests of the Church of England.

It was in this way that the Bangorian Controversy was an odd victory for High Churchmen and their adaptation of Nonjuring spiritual independence. They even advanced, as John Potter did in 1737, to the archbishopric of Canterbury. The sacred priesthood had sovereign powers to impact the afterlife, but were not exercised for the sake of civil peace. In an age of silence, other indirect means, such as moral suasion, could defend the interests of the Church of England. It was not that bishops could not convene in Convocation and assert their rights, they could but only chose not to use this power. Kings may have power to select episcopal successors, but this power was on loan and belonged to the spiritual monarchs. Hoadly's rejection of a sacerdotal clergy did not win out, with High Churchmen persisting in the same claims of spiritual independence. The ghost of Laud was enthroned upon the grave of the Stuarts, an ambiguous settlement that would, nevertheless, work within the increasingly commercial and secular world

[222] Gibson's early attraction to Nonjuring and his rejection of the same, as Norman Sykes has documented, comports well with other Church Whigs, like John Potter, who found peace in such a separate ecclesiastical structure that even civil bullying were simply immaterial. One was a bishop whether one had a diocese or not, one was a spiritual monarch whether the crown or Parliament recognized them or not. See Norman Sykes, *Edmund Gibson: Bishop of London, 1669-1748* (Oxford University Press, 1926), 8-69.

of the eighteenth-century British Empire. The spiritual independence of the Church of England could thus expand as it saw fit by other means.

Chapter Three: Church of England against Empire? Separation of Church and State in the Expansion of the Church of England in North America, 1701-1725

At the dawn of the long eighteenth century, the Church of England abroad was in disrepair. Throughout the North American colonies, the Church suffered a dearth of ministers, Bibles, prayer books, and the funds necessary to rectify these deprivations. To meet these needs, concerned churchmen formed the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (SPG) to ameliorate the problem. As Thomas Bray, founder of the new order, noted after a tour of North America, these colonies were "to be considered as almost so many heathen nations."[223] Thus a new effort to evangelize began, involving both colonial governments, activist laity, and zealous clergy, to stir up faith in the Church of England and its doctrines. But these same efforts to instill zeal and piety in British colonists also created strong divisions within a nascent, and quite fractious, religious community. The main issue, as this chapter will example, was the organization of the Church of England abroad. What was the relationship between the clergy and laity? Did the priests of the American Church of England have a spiritual authority to reprimand misbehaving clergy? Confronted with rival Protestants (whether in Congregationalist New England or the Quaker Mid-Atlantic), French Catholics in Quebec, as well as non-Christian and non-European potential converts, Anglicans also faced one another over perceived abuses of authority, over the growth of either an Erastian lay captivity or popish priestcraft, that threatened the unity of the Church. Like England, Anglicans in North America were severely divided over the very constitution of their church.

[223] Thomas Bray, *A Memorial, Representing the Present State of Religion, on the continent of North America*, (London: 1701), 11.

For some churchmen in the North American colonies, the Church of England was an autonomous spiritual society, which organized its religious affairs (pertaining to the conscience and the life to come) on its own terms, without necessitating consultation with lay authorities in the civil government. Other churchmen advocated for a strong lay guidance over the colonial Church of England, either in the form of local vestries that could regulate parish ministry, or in the form of an establishment that mirrored the relationship between the Church and crown back in England. For the former, efforts to bridle, regulate, and restrain clergy were anathema, tantamount to heresy, and demanded the sternest action, even, for some, requiring a colonial episcopate to restrain lay power. For the latter, any insubordination was effectively rebellion or treason, denying the crown's appointed ministers or duly elected governing authorities. Rather than treating the colonial Church of England as a generally unified entity, in conflict with American Dissenters who resisted and resented metropolitan control over their affairs, this chapter argues that Anglican internal divisions reveal a more complex form of religious establishment in colonial North America. These controversies were not localized to the far side of the Atlantic, but, rather, reflected a dynamic interrelation, by all, in a trans-Atlantic exchange of ideas. Agitated colonial churchmen, seeking their own spiritual independence, were intertwined with debates back in England over the nature of the church authority. Additionally, by primarily focusing on Anglicans, who had advocates, unique among Protestants, that emphasized a sacerdotal notion of clerical authority, this chapter demonstrates that separation of church from state could emerge from those who appeared most reactionary. It was not from proto-liberals or radical Protestants that a desire to remove state power from church life, but from men who believed clergy had a unique right, as God's ambassadors, to mold the conscience of their congregations, opening the gates of Heaven or slamming them shut. A unique argument to

build a wall separating the Church of England from the colonial government emerged from the Church's most vocal clericalists.

In a fairly thin historiographic field, most histories about the Church of England, specifically, operate either as chronicles, detailing the lives and acts of early Anglican advocates, providing a trove of raw material but often under theorized or explicated,[224] or treat the Church as a mostly unified institution. In terms of a unified colonial Church of England, Anglicans operate as a united bloc bring about a shared imperial policy. James Bell has argued that the "King's Church" operated as a beachhead for the expansion of Anglican/metropolitan policy that sought greater integration of the colonies into English politico-religious culture. The narrative is one of simple expansion outwards, rebuffed by Americanized Dissenters who prioritized their own self-governance at the expense of parliamentary authority. Colonists who converted to the Church of England sought greater ties, reflecting an elite trying to impose greater royal control over North America. Whether lay vestries, royal governors, or clergy controlled the colonial Church of England, these were all extensions of metropolitan control in London.[225] This approach is entirely inadequate to deal with substantive divisions with the Church, treating them as squabbles between personalities within an institution that possessed a shared vision and united government, when these divisions precisely reveal that there was no shared vision or united government. The Church of England was not just the king's church, but the clergy's church, the

[224] As an exemplar of this approach see John Woolverton's history of Anglicanism in North America from a practicing Episcopalian. The book remains the only comprehensive account of the colonial Church of England but does not sufficiently understand the nature of the conflicts he details. John Frederick Woolverton, *Colonial Anglicanism in North America* (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1984).
[225] James B Bell, *The Imperial Origins of the King's Church in Early America* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 18-26.

lay vestry's church, each adhering to a different constitution and mission for the Church of England. [226]

Other, more recent, accounts have emphasized the division within the Church of England against contested visions elsewhere. Rowan Strong has demonstrated that the SPG worked in concert with the British Empire, expanding both British dominion and commerce with religious justification, finding strife over the role of commerce within the British Empire.[227] The Church of England also has been treated by Travis Glasson in its trans-Atlantic capacity to rationalize and expand, if in the spirit of amelioration, African slavery throughout the British Empire. Strong, however, does not adequately explore inner divisions within the SPG as to what the Church of England was and what authority its clergy possessed.[228] Both demonstrate divisions of vision among Anglicans about the role of the Church, but only about more incidental issues, such as the British Empire, commerce, and slavery, not the very constitution of the Church itself and the role of clergy therein. This account focuses on the internal divisions at the very heart of the colonial Church of England, which impacted how churchmen then considered issues ranging from the moral influence of trade upon Anglican laity, the conversion of non-Europeans, the relationship between English culture and non-European converts, and the existence of race-based chattel slavery. Focused on both Anglican interaction with non-Anglicans (real and imagined), as well as internal disputes, this chapter will show how some churchmen, believing in a spiritual independence for the clergy, will advocate for an effective separation between the government of

[226] As Jacqueline Rose has demonstrated, churchmen divided over how integral the state was to the Church of England, with Nonjurors going as far as to argue for an independent spiritual society, though she underplays how these were novel developments that broke with the paradigms of the Reformation. Rose, *Godly Kingship in Restoration England*, 2-5, 18-19, 130-132.
[227] Rowan Strong, *Anglicanism and the British Empire, c. 1700-1850* (Oxford University Press, 2007), 32, 70-71.
[228] Travis Glasson, *Mastering Christianity: Missionary Anglicanism and Slavery in the Atlantic World* (Oxford University Press, 2017), 3-13, 75-110.

the Church and the government of royal colonies, in spiritual and civil affairs respectively, to defend their own interests.

In relationship to wider religious literature about the development or decay of Protestant Christianity within North America, this chapter takes a both-and approach. Following the work of Patricia Bonomi, who has argued that Protestants across the ecclesiastical spectrum expanded their faith throughout the North American colonies, this chapter argues that Anglican missions and desire for clerical reform reflected a wider and consistent drive of expanding Protestant Christianity across the British Empire. The division among Anglicans over the nature of the Church and the authority of its clergy reflected growth and vitality.[229] However, utilizing the work of Jon Butler, this expansion dovetailed with a fear (especially among the clergy) of growing infidelity and apostasy. Lacking a "priesthood of the state" that could impose confessional norms, British colonists in North America had more freedom to lapse from church authorities and pursue their own religious (or areligious) interests.[230] Contrary to Butler, however, non-clerical religion was not necessarily irreligious, and, as Lauren Winner has argued about the establishment of the Church of England in Virginia, a cool and comfortable faith was not a disguise for disinterest in religious affairs.[231] There was no single form of colonial religion or churchmanship, especially among Anglicans, who divided over clerical powers and the relationship of the nascent Church of England to royal colonial governments. The desire for an independent Church of England, an entirely spiritual body that granted no rights to any civil establishment (especially when it sought to regulate ordained ministers), was part of a wider

[229] Patricia U. Bonomi, *Under the Cope of Heaven: Religion, Society, and Politics in Colonial America* (Oxford University Press, updated edition, 2003), 6-9, 40-41.
[230] Jon Butler, *Awash in a Sea of Faith: Christianizing the American People* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992), 5-11.
[231] Lauren F. Winner, *A Cheerful and Comfortable Faith: Anglican Religious Practice in the Elite Households of Eighteenth-Century Virginia* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2010), 1-8, 18-23.

Protestant expansion of faith, but one that fought against lay-dominant churchmanship and political establishment. There was no single vision for the Church of England in the North American colonies, any more than was any single vision back in England.

This chapter will focus on three case studies that demonstrate these internal divisions, leading towards a demand for spiritual independence, covering the geographic and cultural expanse of British North America. In the case of Edward Marston, an SPG missionary in South Carolina during the 1690s into the 1710s, his one-man crusade against the colony's elite subjects reflected a greater rift in what an established Church of England would look like. Against efforts to subject the Church to either lay vestries or to the royal government, Marston pursued separation, in the name of his clerical office, to protect the Church's autonomy, even when it led him to ally with Dissenters whom he detested. In the second case, John Talbot, an SPG missionary in the Mid-Atlantic, grew increasingly agitated over the state of irreligion and weakness of the Church of England in the colonies. From the 1700s into the 1720s, Talbot would butt heads with royal governors and clergy, Anglicans all, in his effort to gain an American bishop for an entirely spiritual and independent Church of England. In the third case, John Checkley, a New England convert, printer, and layman, who was arrested and tried before the General Court of Massachusetts in the early 1720s. In defense of minority Anglicans in a Congregationalist colony, having an informal but effective religious establishment, Checkley advocated the separation of church from state to protect the rights of his co-religionists, even as not all Anglicans, even in New England, agreed with Checkley's strategy or vision. In all three cases, the colonial Church of England divided over the nature of clerical authority and its status with civil government. In all three cases, a movement (though mostly unsuccessful) formed to reject civil power and carve out an independent, spiritual, power for the church that the state

could not regulate or restrain. For these English subjects, the success and independence of the Church of England, and its ministers, meant pushing away the government of the Empire, not drawing it closer. The sacred authority of the priests was more important than commercial success or British expansion, a Church of England shorn of its civil status if it could protect its spiritual claims. If the state wanted to influence the Church, then so much worse for the state.

I.

In 1699, Edward Marston washed up on the shores of Charles Town in the newly settled colony of Carolina, an SPG missionary appointed as minister for the parish of St Phillip's. More akin to the world of the Caribbean, Charles Town was the urban center for a growing class of planters and merchants, many of whom were Marston's parishioners. Marston, who had come to combat heathenism among the English and convert American Indians, lamented that Carolinians had no respect for decency or learning. In skirmishes with the Spanish in the Floridas, the English soldiers had torched the libraries of St Augustine in a fit of excess. It was no surprise, for Marston, that if the soldiers were wanton then so were the colonial elite in Carolinian assembly, full as it was with libertine Dissenters and Huguenots who had come to chase wealth. But all was not lost, for Marston praised a French Roman Catholic priest who had recently converted to the Protestant Church of England, coming to Carolina in holy orders to pastor and evangelize. The colonists were suspicious of his background, but Marston rejoiced in another faithful minister who would carry on the work of the Church of England. [232] The work was on the fringe of empire and far away from positions of preferment, but perhaps that was what appealed to the

[232] Edward Marston to Thomas Bray, February 2, 1703 in ed. George W. Williams *Letters from the Clergy of the Anglican Church in South Carolina, c. 1696-1775* (Charleston, SC: University of Charleston Special Collections, 2008), 27-28.

new vicar. Marston was focused on the work of the Church, with little regard for social prestige or wealth accumulation.

It was this stern focus on mission and virtue that led Marston into his first conflict in the colony. Samuel Thomas, another minister from the SPG, arrived in Charles Town in 1702, as vicar for the parish of St James, Goose Greek. But Thomas flouted the terms of his mission moving into the estate of Governor Nathaniel Johnson instead of preaching to the Yamasee nation. Robert Stephens, a member of the Goose Creek men, a group of frontier merchants that traded with the Yamasee, complained to the Society that Thomas had abandoned his duty.[233] Evangelizing the Yamasee, Stephens believed, would strengthen the bonds between them and the English, making the latter a preferred trading partner over the Spanish. In a rash move that would define Marston's mission, Stephens reported that the new clergyman had personally confronted Thomas and rebuked him for abandoning his call. Instead of preaching to the American Indians, Marston accused Thomas of choosing the comfort of the governor's mansion.[234] While the Goose Creek men had their own motives, namely trade with the Yamasee, they had dovetailed with Marston's zeal to evangelize. In a letter to the SPG, Marston lamented that his conflict with Thomas had not led to repentance but disapproval. But that was par for the course, as Marston recounted that laity in his own parish had attacked him in the street with a whip for challenging their wickedness. Like this corrupt colony, Thomas needed to be recalled so he could be reeducated in "the principles and government of the Church of England established by law." Instead of submitting to the duties of his clerical office, Thomas had turned the governor against

[233] The Goose Creek men, who were in the main Anglicans, were also concerned by the rise of Dissent in South Carolina but found Governor Johnson's efforts to establish the Church of England as a failed power grab. See Robert M. Weir, *Colonial South Carolina: A History* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1997), 64-79.
[234] Robert Stephens to SPG, n.d., 1703, in Williams, 29.

Marston, who now claimed the right to cut all colonial funding to Marston, leaving the minister's wife and three children destitute. Marston's crime, he supposed, was that he denied that Carolina's assembly had "any ecclesiastical jurisdiction over him."[235] Within a few short years, Marston had asserted his own clerical authority and had gained enemies in the proprietary governor, the colonial assembly, and the SPG.

Despite his early alienation, however, Marston continued to attract allies due to his uncompromising zeal. Another Goose Creek man, Thomas Nairne, praised Marston, writing to Marston to show his support. While other SPG ministers shirked their duty to evangelize Indians, particularly the Yamasee, whom these incompetent ministers insulted by not only irregularly teaching them but failing to bring them gifts, Marston was faithful to his call. Nairne recounted that Thomas had attempted to defend his retreat from the frontier as choosing to evangelize the unconverted slaves on Governor Johnson's estate. But "all Carolina laughs at that untruth," trusting Marston to carry out the work that Thomas ought to be doing.[236] The shift in ministry reflected a broader transformation within South Carolina to establish the Church of England in the colony. Governor Johnson saw himself as the royal vicar, an ardent Tory who sought the benefits of Queen Anne's Bounty for the churches in his colonies, a fund set aside for construction of churches and installment of ministers.[237] Therefore Johnson attempted to shepherd through the colonial assembly an Act of Establishment, a bill which would legally establish the Church of England and grant governance over the church to the royal governor.

---

[235] Marston to [SPG minister], May 3, 1705, in [Daniel Defoe], *Case of Protestant Dissenters in Carolina, Shewing How a Law to prevent Occasional Conformity There, has ended in the Total Subversion of the Constitution in Church and State* (London: 1706), 57-61.

[236] Thomas Nairne to Edward Marston, August 20, 1705, in Williams, 34.

[237] David Parrish has rightly noted that Johnson's efforts carried over the "rage of party" that dominated England during the same period, bringing High Tory politics to bear on efforts to reform South Carolina. However, Parrish mistook Johnson's anti-Nonjuring sentiments as self-covering, rather than fully consistent with a High Church Tory politics bordering on Jacobitism. David Parrish, *Jacobitism and Anti-Jacobitism in the British Atlantic, 1688-1727* (Martlesham, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2017), 41-42.

According to the proposed law, South Carolina would divide into several parishes, each with an elected vestry that the right to hire or fire its ministers, controlling the exercise of their services and pay. Virginia was the first to implement a version of this law, under the ecclesiastical commissioner for the Bishop of London, James Blair, creating the wider Anglican religious culture of the colony.[238] Marston, however, saw this law as colonial Erastianism, a submission of church to state, that would lead to greater immorality. Informing the SPG of his displeasure, Stephens lamented that St Philip's had ejected Marston and replaced him with a new minister, his name graciously left off, who baptized a bear before a crowd as a joke.[239] Johnson's plan, as his critics saw it, was not to improve the piety of South Carolina, but to place the Church of England's control in his grasping hands. Marston resisted this colonial Erastianism as a product of colonial immorality, the governor's protestations to the contrary.

Thomas, however, did not see criticism of Johnson, let alone himself, in the same way, writing an apology to the SPG. The Yamasee had "neither leisure nor disposition to attend Christian instructions." These heathens were simply uninterested, but the enslaved blacks and white servants on Johnson's estate "were in a spiritual sense almost famished for want of the word & Sacraments." It was a blatant lie from Marson that Thomas' "connivance at vice and ignorance in the Canons & Constitutions of the Church of England were the things which most recommended me to the favour of the Government." Rather, Marston made these criticisms because he was a "fast friend of King James," covering his own disreputable behavior, having "refused to take the oath as himselfe hath acknowledged to me shewed so great a violence against the government." Not only was Marston a Jacobite, but he "continued a Non juror for many years" before returning to the Church of England and taking oaths to William and Mary.

[238] Woolverton, *Colonial Anglicanism*, 164-165.
[239] Robert Stephens to SPG, February 26, 1706, in Williams, 39-40.

But these were spurious pledges of loyalty, as spurious as his criticisms of Thomas. Marston made "use of a crucifix and by his justification of the papist custom of crossing themselves," as well as his "frequent practice for many years has been almost every Lord's day to preach against the Dissenters whom he treated with so much roughness and severity that they had wholly deserted the Church." Even though "the Dissenters are of late become Mf Marston's friends and advocates," Thomas was convinced that Marston remained a Jacobite and a crypto-Catholic, hostile to the Protestant Interest of Great Britain. Thomas concluded that "the true character of Mr Marston is, that in his judgement he is a violent Jacobite and great enemy to the Government in Church and State as settled under King William." [240]

Besides offering a justification for his own actions, and deflecting criticisms to Marston's treasonous associations, Thomas could not hold back his confusion that marked this conflict. On the one hand, Marston was irrationally abusive towards Dissenters, which befit his highflying ecclesiology, believing non-episcopal Protestants were defective at best. On the other hand, Dissenters joined with Marston to attack Johnson's settlement plan, opposed to any civil establishment for the Church of England. In this, Marston offered a very different vision for the Church of England, one that prioritized its own spiritual autonomy at the expense of furthering the church-state within the colonies. What Marston shared with Dissenters, even if it was an alliance strictly of convenience, was a concern that church powers, including the right to regulate their own clergy and the clerical power to expel members, were under threat. Priestly prerogative took priority over state recognition, Erastianism a far more damnable sin than Dissenting.

As part of this joint front, two leading Dissenter ministers in South Carolina, Archibald Stobo (Presbyterian) and William Screven (Baptist), wrote a criticism of the Act of

[240] Samuel Thomas to SPG, June 21, 1706, in Williams, 41-49.

Establishment and a defense of Edward Marston. The Anglican minister was not an enemy of government but had become a martyr to overreach. While they disagreed about ecclesiology, Marston shared with them a desire for spiritual principle, declaring that "we (Ministers of the Gospel) do not arrogate too much to ourselves, nor take too much upon us, when we affirm, That we are superior to the People, and have an Authority over them in Things Spiritual, and appertaining to God."[241] Clerical privilege in things spiritual (left strictly undefined) united both Anglicans and Dissenters against Johnson's plan. Across the Atlantic, Daniel Defoe (a Tory and Dissenter) joined in the defense of Marston. Writing in response to Johnson's Test Act (1704), which, like the English statute, required yearly reception of the eucharist in the Church of England, Defoe lamented this law as persecution. Dissenters did not "disturb the public peace" or attack the Church of England, unlike Roman Catholics, but had nobly born the burdens of the shared Protestant interest like an "ass." Toleration had converted the Netherlands, a "perfect bog," into a rich commercial society, with Dissenters participating to the broad uplift of South Carolina. As proof, Defoe quoted Marston, who "little favouring Dissenters" still recognized that they were "the soberest most numerous and richest people of this province." If a highflyer like Marston can recognize the general boon that Dissenters contributed, then it was wrong to lock them out with tests and disenfranchisement. It was not Dissenters that emptied Anglican parishes, but Governor Johnson, motivated by "mere faction," who had perverted the faith of the Church of England into a political scheme. Marston was targeted by the government for rejecting this idea, having been harassed for his belief that "clergy had a divine right to a Maintenance," something Dissenting ministers believed as well. Defoe hoped Queen Anne would soon put an end to the "heavy yoke of persecution and slavery" that Johnson sought to enact.[242]

[241] [Defoe], *Case of Protestant Dissenters in Carolina*, 55-56.
[242] Ibid., 7-9, 13-25.

Against these darts against this plan to establish the Church of England, Johnson wrote to the SPG, requesting their support before the Queen. Marston was still at large and an annoyance, having been ejected from St Philip's, but now taking residence at Christ Church, still operating as a "pest of the church." The Act of Establishment would alone allow Johnson to crack down on this rogue priest, allowing lay vestries to have total control over funding for clergy, lessening the burden on the SPG.[243] Johnson also wrote to Henry Compton, Bishop of London and staunch Tory, for support the Act of Establishment, as Marston remained at large, though having been removed from Christ Church. If the law were passed then Marston would be permanently shut out from influence.[244] Johnson's efforts were further hamstrung with the death of Thomas in late 1707, with the governor's estate needing a replacement from the SPG.[245] Marston, retreating from Charles Town, took up in the parish of Bermudas Town, where he found himself, according to fellow SPG minister, Francis Le Jau, welcomed as a "ingenious preacher and sober person," but provoked outrage when a female boarder he took in died suddenly, sparking rumors he had murdered her to take her property.[246] Johnson's report conflated events, as Christ Church's vestry later wrote to the SPG to tell them that Marston had not been ejected but turned down the offer to be minister for the parish, thought they were glad he had, given his temper.[247] Nevertheless, the confusion of who had authority, priest or laymen, over the ministry of the Church continued to divide South Carolina. Johnson's effort to mimic England's ecclesiastical structure for South Carolina provoked a backlash from some clergy who bristled against being

[243] Governor Johnson and Council of South Carolina to SPG, September 19, 1707, in Williams, 63-64.
[244] 'Act of Establishment' in [Defoe], *Case of Protestant Dissenters in Carolina*, 48-49.
[245] Thomas Hassell to SPG, November 30, 1707, in Williams, 66.
[246] Francis Le Jau to SPG, March 19, 1708, Williams, 70-72.
[247] Vestrymen of Christ Church parish to SPG, September 21, 1711, in Williams, 169.

placed under a civil state. For those like Marston, the Church of England's spiritual independence was in jeopardy.

Despite Johnson's struggle to get the Act of Establishment passed, he gained a new ally in the SPG commissioner, Gideon Johnston, who threw his weight behind getting the law passed. Writing to Bishop Gilbert Burnet, Johnston believed the act would solve the lack of good ministers throughout the colony. It was not only Marston who had caused problems, but also the lay vestry's who seemed resistant to good order and instruction. St Philip's had hired Thomas Marsden, man with an occluded background who had abruptly left Maryland for unknown reasons. Now in South Carolina, Marsden retained his office, despite Johnston's belief that he was incompetent, with the vestry protecting their choice. The Act of Establishment would put more power in the colonial laity, but the needs of the Church of England had "no effect upon the headstrong and giddy populace." Marston, Marsden, the whole colony was rotten, filled with "the vilest race of men upon the Earth they have neither honour, nor honesty nor religion enough to entitle them to any tolerable character, being a perfect medley or hotch potch made up of bank[r]upts, pirates, decayed libertines, sectaries and enthusiasts of all sorts […] and are the most factious and seditious people in the whole world." Only Governor Johnson's efforts could curb the immorality and irreligion of the colony. It was true, admitting to a Whiggish clergyman, that "the Church party went too great a length upon this occasion," but Dissenters were relentless in their criticisms, joined by highflyers like Marston, who was of "one or two half faced churchmen, who in reality are Dissenters, and who sometimes come to church that they may be able to do us more mischief." The divide in South Carolina was "not between high and low Churchmen; but between the dissenters and the Church."[248] All those who rejected a civil

[248] Gideon Johnston to Bishop of Sarum, September 20, 1708, in Williams, 79-85.

establishment, whether of high or low clerical persuasions, were now simply Dissent for Johnston. Marston's high churchmanship had now, for some, turned into full blown sectarianism. The debate was not between those who had high views of the clergy or low, but between those who wanted an establishment and those who did not.

However, despite the hostility of the governor and the SPG commissioner, Marston continued his crusade. Le Jau informed the SPG them that Marston had acquired a license to practice law, after having turned down Christ Church parish, though Le Jau had tried to dissuade him from this course of action, but "in vain."[249] As an acting attorney, Marston had "arrested several persons" and "abused one Col. Gibbs that sat as chief justice," which led to the South Carolina council to seek the arrest Marston. Governor Johnson had died earlier the previous year, with the colony awaiting a new royal representative, but that turn of events did little to cool the temperature. Le Jau reported that Marston refused to return to Charles Town to meet with the new governor, Edward Tynte, remaining in "the remotest of our parishes near the Yamousee Indians."[250]

Johnston confirmed this turn to civil law and outlaw status, after Johnston had been disposed for months with illness. Marston, a criminal for stealing a third of the books from the provincial library and refusing to give an account of his possessions, had been turned out of Christ Church for his "rough and magisterial way," had turned to civil law to sue former parishioners for "depriving him of his ffreehold [sic] or benefice in this place, but always with ill success." Marston disdained the ignorance of the colony's clergy, for not having been educated at Oxford or Cambridge, as well as the "revolution clergy whom he considered a "parcel of schismaticks and intruders." The rogue priest even scandalously considered Henry Compton, the

[249] Francis Le Jau to SPG, August 5, 1709, in Williams, 94-96.
[250] Francis Le Jau to SPG, February 19, 1710, in Williams, 103.

bishop of London, as a "murderer and perjur'd person" for his revolutionary participation. Marston had moved to St Bartholomew's parish, the southernmost church in the colony, to be close to Indians. Johnston had received Marston's requests to excommunicate two former parishioners, but Johnston had no intention to pursue this course. [251] For failing these requests, Johnston later reported that Marston now considered Johnston as an "Irish raparree" and "schismatick." Marston continued to abuse the Bishop of London and all the clergy of South Carolina, except Le Jau, "for what reason he know best." Johnston was tired of Marston and hoped to see him forced to leave the colony sooner than later.[252] Marston likely received Le Jau, if it may be conjectured, because the French minister had received his ordination from the Church of Ireland. Given this source of succession, Le Jau was not tainted with William's deprivation of Nonjuring clergy in 1691. By canonical standards, the Church of Ireland had never entered the same schism that the Church of England had.

The result of both Marston's crusade and Johnson's Act of Establishment was joint failure. While the latter died through the Queen's refusal to assent to it, Marston eventually gave up his efforts to attack his former parishioners, and formally apologized to the bishop of London for having "so barbarously reflected" on him. But that apology came far too late, with Marston barred from any parish in South Carolina by episcopal order.[253] Marston attempted to continue his mission, leaving South Carolina to preach in the Bahamas. However, soon after leaving for the island, Marston succumbed to "pestilential fever" and perished in 1718. [254] If anyone had won the conflict between Marston and Johnson, it was the lay vestries, who continued to exercise authority over the hiring and firing of clergy for their parishes. While Marston remained

[251] Gideon Johnston to SPG, July 5, 1710, in Williams, 120.
[252] Gideon Johnston to SPG, January 27, 1711, in Williams, 145.
[253] Gideon Johnston to SPG, April 20, 1711, in Williams, 156.
[254] William Tredwell Bull to SPG, November 24, 1718, in Williams, 317.

eccentric within South Carolina's planter society, he demonstrated how a separatist vision could emerge from within the Church of England. There was no single idea of what establishment looked like, even with its most English form receiving death by neglect from the crown. Marston represented a pathway of separation of church from state through a highflying clericalism that, when pressured, chose independence over a church-state partnership.

II.

John Talbot, a missionary priest from the SPG, travelled to Pennsylvania to combat Quakerism. Alongside the former Quaker and first SPG missionary George Keith, Talbot was concerned to combat a heresy that depreciated Christian orthodoxy and church hierarchy. But this mission floundered. Keith requested from Henry Compton, Bishop of London, £200 to build a new church in Burlington, New Jersey, as well as for an additional "3 or 4 pious ministers" to staff the parishes in the new colonies.[255] Keith would soon retire from ministry in the Mid-Atlantic, but Talbot would take up his mantle to establish the Church of England in Penn's Holy Experiment. Writing to Richard Gillingham, Talbot considered himself deep in enemy territory, with William Penn as "a greater Antichrist than Julian the Apostate." The only way to combat Penn's Quakerism was a vibrant Anglican ministry, but that was precisely what was lacking, with one parish seeking a New England Congregationalist to staff the church. Talbot believed the lack of hierarchy was the greatest temptation to the non-ministerial Quaker church, and thus only duly ordained ministers, educated in the faith, could overcome this problem.[256] The solution was obvious: the ordination of an American bishop. The colonies had a "great need" for a bishop,

[255] George Keith to Bishop of London, February 26, 1703, in ed. George Morgan Hills, *History of the Church in Burlington, New Jersey: Comprising the Facts and Incidents of Nearly Two Hundred Years, From Original, Contemporaneous Sources* (Trenton, NJ: 2nd Edition, W.S. Sharp Printing Company, 1885), 29-31.
[256] John Talbot to Richard Gillingham, April 10, 1703, in Hills, 32-35.

who would "bless all" throughout North America.[257] This cry for a bishop, the office that had sole right to ordain additional clergy, would define Talbot's missionary career. It would mark Talbot's increasing frustration and radicalism towards the Church of England, eventually flirting with and embracing Nonjuring as a solution to his problems. The spiritual hierarchy alone, for Talbot, could combat Quakers and establish an orthodox Christian faith in the Mid-Atlantic, regardless of social stability or civil magistrates.

In the early years, however, Talbot was optimistic about success. New parish churches appeared throughout the Mid-Atlantic, particularly Talbot was sanguine about St Mary's in Chester. Talbot had been using Thomas Bray's work against Quakers, but he believed something more "authentick" was needed, something that attacked the roots. Therefore Talbot requested Gillingham to send him copies of the Book of Common Prayer and Charles Leslie's *A Short and Easie Method With the Deists*.[258] The need for prayer books was to put the Church of England's formal and rote liturgy against Quaker silence, but Leslie's work offered a more radical criticism of all Dissenters who departed from the Church's episcopal government. Published in 1697, Leslie, an Irish Nonjuror and partisan for the deposed King James, attacked not only Deists but Quakers for lacking an apostolic priesthood. As much as kings required valid succession through heredity, so too did ministers need a line to the Apostles, both requiring a historic bond that established the legitimacy of its truth claims and authority.[259] Leslie may have suspect ecclesiastical and political loyalties, the work established the basis of Anglican superiority on its spiritual hierarchy. The clergy were a necessary part of the faith, the only basis upon which Christianity stood as a legitimate power to alter the conscience and determine eternal destinies. If

[257] John Talbot to Richard Gillingham, November 24, 1702, in Hills, 26-29.
[258] John Talbot to Richard Gillingham, May 3, 1703, in Hills, 35-39.
[259] Charles Leslie, *A Short and Easie Method with the Deists* (London: 1697), 48-50.

Protestant Anglicans were to succeed against those who attacked the church, or attacked all hierarchy like the Quakers, then Leslie's stronger medicine was necessary. Therefore, it was clear that if the Church of England would succeed, it would need a steady stream of clergy from the hands of a bishop. Only an American bishop could defeat Quakerism.

Writing to the SPG, Talbot made these complaints clear to his supporters. Building new parishes was useless if there were no ministers and reliance on the Bishop of London, who had nominal jurisdiction over North America, was unreliable, for his authority extended over such a large geographic space that he could not regularly manage the colonial churches. Talbot asked the SPG to petition the Bishop of London to appoint a suffragan bishop, an *ad hoc* subordinate outside normal diocesan boundaries, who could handle issues in North America. The lack of apostolic clergy was damaging the Church of England's mission, with Talbot complaining that "the poor church of America is worse off in this respect than any of her adversaries."[260] Talbot had been requested by the parish of St Mary's in Burlington New Jersey to be their minister. He not only taught "true orthodox doctrine," but would "bring many over from the Quakers" through his preaching.[261] However, to accomplish this mission, Talbot believed an American bishop was necessary. Leading clergy from across the Mid Atlantic, Talbot led a petition to the metropolitan Church of England to appoint a suffragan for the colonies. The episcopate was the source of spiritual unity, authoritative teaching, and discipline for the Church of England, a guarantee of both spiritual vitality and civil obedience. Being "deprived of the advantages that might have been received of some Presbyterian and Independents," who were open to ordination in the Church of England, but were not able to receive it since no bishop was available. If North America did not have a bishop, then Anglicans would be replaced by Presbyterians, who were

[260] John Talbot to Secretary [of the SPG], September 1, 1703, in Hills, 40-43.
[261] Petition from Churchmen of Burlington, April 2, 1704, in Hills, 52-53.

"tainted by republican principles," which would subvert not only churches but also the state. Without a bishop, there would be no king. [262] Additionally, sending a similar request to the Bishop of London, the minsters intended to petition Queen Anne, but wanted to consult his judgement before they proceeded. [263] Talbot had found himself as a rising star at the center of colonial clergy that desired a bishop to combat heresy and establish the Church of England on a firm, if clerical, faith.

However, an American bishop would not only contend against Quakerism, but also the corruption and laicizing that threatened to take hold of the Church of England in the colonies. Writing to George Keith, Talbot reported the case of a Mr. Urquhart, an SPG missionary sent to Jamaica, where he was forced to contend against "whigs and fanatics" who rejected all clerical pretensions, refusing to "pay Mr. Urquhart what is allowed by law." The laity, that seemed to Talbot on the verge of deconversion, refused to submit to clerical authority.[264] The need, for Talbot, was great, and so after years of inaction, Talbot himself returned to England in 1705 to request a bishop, believing he could gain a suffragan from the aged Compton. Writing about Talbot's mission, Thorowgood Moore, an Anglican missionary in the colonies, had faith in Talbot's mission, a man whom he believed had "zeal and industry for the glory of God, and the good of his church" and would succeed.[265] But that was not to be. Talbot complained bitterly from London to the SPG that the Bishop of London simply refused. Talbot informed the Society that he would return to the colonies and continue his labor, and continue his petitions, until the Church of England received a bishop in North America. [266] But it would take some time, as

[262] Clergy Petition of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania Ministers at Burlington November 2, 1705, in Hills, 61-62.
[263] Burlington Meeting of Clergy to Bishop of London, November 2, 1705, in Hills, 63.
[264] John Talbot to George Keith, October 20, 1705, in Hills, 55-60.
[265] Thorowgood Moore to Mr. Hodges, November 14, 1705, in Hills, 64.
[266] John Talbot to SPG, March 14, 1706, in Hills, 64-65.

Talbot lamented that Satan himself had been "raising lies and slanders in my way," detaining Talbot for over a year from returning to Burlington.[267] While Talbot did not specify the nature of these accusations, it is not a leap to suggest his hotheaded clericalism and interest in Leslie's polemic smacked of Nonjuring. The cry of a colonial "Church in Danger" due to the lack of a bishop was not unlike the metropolitan cry, which smelled of crypto-Jacobitism to Whigs and Low Churchmen, even to revolutionary Tories like Henry Compton.[268] The quest for a bishop now offended the powers that be in the metropole, and Talbot walked away frustrated that his own mission against Quakers was hamstrung by the very hierarchy of the Church of England.

Nevertheless, Talbot eventually returned to New Jersey, immediately sparking more trouble for himself. Moore wrote the SPG to inform them that the royal governor of New York, Edward Hyde, Viscount Cornbury, had arrested Talbot at his parish of St Mary's. A High Churchman and zealous partisan for Queen Anne (to the point of being accused of crossdressing like her in public[269]), Cornbury was not in any way anticlerical or republican, yet he labeled Talbot, as well as Moore who was writing to the SPG, as a "preacher rebellion" and suspended them from conducting the liturgy. Having failed to heed the warnings, since these clergy believed only the Bishop of London, not a royal governor, had the right to suspend worship, Talbot and Moore continued until they were apprehended and brought to New York. Moore suspected Cornbury was consolidating his own power, suspicious of clergy who celebrated the sacrament too frequently for the governor's tastes. Moore was optimistic that Queen Anne would soon intercede for the jailed clergy and recall Cornbury for his misrule.[270] Responding to these

[267] Talbot to Secretary, August 27, 1707, in Hills, 65-66.
[268] Parrish had noted such was the case in South Carolina, but the Rage of Party spread also into the Mid Atlantic colonies. Parrish, *Jacobitism and Anti-Jacobitism in the British Atlantic*, 41-42.
[269] Mr. Neau to Secretary, February 27, 1709, in Hills, 87-89.
[270] Mr. Moore to Secretary, August 27, 1707, in Hills, 66-74.

criticisms, Cornbury accused Talbot and Moore of falsely believing in the Church of England's spiritual independence, that only bishops had a right to regulate the "affairs of the Church." They were also disobedient to royal authority and, compounding their crimes, escaped their confinement in Ft Anne, with a third clerical prisoner, John Brookes, fleeing to Burlington.[271] Like Johnson, Cornbury combined his High Churchman and Tory loyalties to imagine that the monarch's supreme governance over the Church of England mirrored the colonies. As a vicar of the crown, the royal governor had a right to regulate the ministry of the Church established by law, offending the sensibilities of clergy like Talbot and Moore who denied the civil authority such powers. This incident was further proof that civil power threatened the life of the Church's spiritual independence. Civil authorities now joined with Quakers and unmoved hierarchy in obstructing the mission of the Church of England. Talbot and his allies, in their estimation, stood alone against an Erastian collapse of the Church into civil authority.

The only solution to these depredations was a colonial bishop. Writing to the SPG after Cornbury's arrests, Talbot argued that good government in state meant no civil magistrates, like Cornbury, who could arrest lowly clergy, such as Moore and Brooke. These lower clergy had few means to contend against a royal governor. Only a bishop had the majesty and authority to contest a crooked governor and intercede, as a strictly spiritual authority, for the rights of the Church against grasping magistrates.[272] Writing again, Talbot requested an American bishop immediately, a bulwark for the "good government in Church and State," lest impious governors like Cornbury continued their despotism over the clergy.[273] But the Governor of New York was not the only one who had become frustrated with the denunciations of clergy like Talbot.

[271] Lord Cornbury to Secretary, November 29, 1707, in Hills, 75-77.
[272] John Talbot to Secretary, August 20, 1707, in Hills, 83-84.
[273] John Talbot to Secretary, January 10, 1708, in Hills, 77-88.

Lieutenant Governor Richard Ingoldsby, placed over both New York and New Jersey, had resented Moore for having refused to give him the Eucharist. Having previously confessed to the priest that he was unwilling to forgive his enemies who had personally insulted him, Moore had decided that Ingoldsby was insufficiently conformed to the faith of the Church to receive its sacrament. During a Sunday morning liturgy, Moore publicly withheld the eucharistic elements, leading Ingoldsby to storm out of the parish with his family, intending to punish this troublesome priest.[274]

This experience, Talbot lamented, had pushed both Moore and Brookes to leave the colonies, returning to England out of concern for their health, not believing they could suffer another run in with the royal government. But Talbot blamed not only Ingoldsby for this incident, but also the SPG who had done nothing to promote an American bishop which alone could restrain bad behavior among magistrates. Without a bishop, not only were priests the potential victims of vindictive governors, but there would be fewer and fewer priests as ordinations dried up. It was absurd, Talbot complained, to build more parish churches if there was no regular ministry to staff them. A regular ordained ministry was what made the Church of England superior to Quakerism. Without a hierarchy, it would be no surprise if the Mid-Atlantic fully converted to the heterodox faith. Therefore, Talbot instructed the SPG that if they would not get a bishop for the colonies, they could, at the least, petition Queen Anne to appoint moral royal governors, even "if not of religion," not of the Church of England, who would not seek power grabs. [275] Remarkably, Talbot was, in this letter, willing to tolerate non-Anglican royal governors if they would leave him and his ministry alone. The Church of England's future was, for Talbot, less tethered to imperial and royal government but to the self-maintenance of the

[274] Colonel Quary to Bishop of London, January 20, 1708, in Hills, 78-80.
[275] John Talbot to Secretary, August 24, 1708, in Hills, 84-86.

Church of England among its ministers. Magistrates had little to do, for Talbot, with the success of the Church.

Inaction from higher ups did not prevent Talbot from preparing for the coming of an American bishop. He informed the SPG that he had acquired an estate in Burlington that could serve as a diocesan residence.[276] Additionally, Cornbury had been recalled back to England, replaced with Robert Hunter, who was in consultation with the Society about an American bishop.[277] Even more, Queen Anne issued a patent that formally recognized Talbot as rector for St Mary's, further improving his legitimacy as an Anglican minister in the colonies. [278] Events seemed to be improving for Talbot, whose momentum for a colonial bishop had attracted further support. One of the laity from St Mary's, Jeremiah Bass, had petitioned the SPG for "accelerating the coming of a Bishop amongst us," who would provide clerical and spiritual unity for the Church of England across the colonies. [279] However, the campaign attracted criticism from erstwhile ally, Governor Hunter, who admired Talbot's character and work, but feared he was too much of a hot head to minister well.[280] Hunter further complained that unnamed Anglican clergy had circulated a rumor that he was a Dissenter, requesting proof of his conformity to the Church of England. Even worse, a visiting priest at St Mary's, Jacob. Henderson, agitated the congregation for failing to pray for Queen Anne by name, not recognizing her victory against France in the War of Spanish Successions. This near treason was not Henderson's fault, but he had fallen under Talbot's influence, who remained popular despite his "scruples."[281] While, at this point, there was no reason to think Talbot had converted to

[276] John Talbot to Secretary, June 30, 1709, in Hills, 90-92.
[277] SPG Report, n.d., 1710, in Hills, 100-101.
[278] Letter of Patent, n.d., 1710, in Hills, 97-100.
[279] Jeremiah Bass to Secretary, December 17, 1711, in Hills, 101.
[280] Governor Hunter to Secretary, May 7, 1711, in Hills, 101.
[281] Governor Hunter to Secretary, February 25, 1712, in Hills, 103-104.

Jacobitism, but his vague loyalties to the throne reflected his attraction to Nonjuring. The Church had no right to determine legitimate authority in state, which divided Charles Leslie who Talbot had eagerly read from conforming churchmen that accepted the Glorious Revolution, as much as state had no right to determine the Church's hierarchy. Mixing with those loyal to King James and Queen Anne imaged his sharp division between church and state, between spiritual and civil authorities, that did not overlap.

To further push the issue of an American bishop, Talbot convened a gathering of clergy from the Mid-Atlantic colonies, on their own authority as priests, to petition Queen Anne. Flattering her as "nursing mother" for the Church, a biblical prophecy commonly applied to monarchs as civil guardians of Christianity, they asked the queen to grant a bishop so he could "preserve the order and authority of the Church to punish the prophane with ecclesiastical censures to protect the Clergy."[282] Talbot led with his signature. But no bishop was forthcoming, and conflict with the Quakers intensified. Talbot complained to the SPG that a group of Quakers had broken into an Anglican church and stolen books and plate, believing that if Anglicans had a bishop then no such crimes would ever occur.[283] How Talbot knew these were Quakers, since none (to his knowledge) had been arrested, suggests a conflation of infidelity with a lack of clergy. Quakerism was the default position, inward and individual, if a clerical hierarchy did not instruct lay people in the basics of Christianity. It was an all or nothing gambit.

But through all these requests, petitions, and letters, asking for a bishop, had never put forward who would staff this office. The parish of St Mary's supplied that need, asking that the SPG appoint none other than Talbot himself to be the colonial bishop. Praised as having an "apostolick person," with adequate ability and zeal to combat infidelity, only an American

[282] Burlington Vestry and Wardens to Queen Anne, n.d., [1712], in Hills, 116-119.
[283] John Talbot to Secretary, August 6, 1713, in Hills, 109-110.

bishop of his make could combat the growing Quakerism in the colonies. Now that the New Jersey assembly had just passed a law to allow solemn affirmations in lieu of oaths, Quakers could easily slip into the civil government and bring persecution against the Church of England. Only a bishop, with his moral suasion and impressive office, could restrain these policies from being implemented.[284] Talbot also sought out other allies, writing to ardent churchman and formerly royal governor of Virginia, Francis Nicholson, for support. Now governor of Nova Scotia, Talbot informed Nicholson that only "the speedy sending a Bishop into these parts to protect us and stand in the Gap against any person who may encourage or countenance any lawless designs against the Church."[285] But these requests ended in inaction.

Talbot became melancholic, as affairs in Burlington took a turn for the worse. Lamenting to the SPG, Talbot proclaimed that his missionary efforts had failed, that the colonies all had "iniquitie established by law," and he would like to return to England. Even worse, disease afflicted his parish, forcing Talbot to bury many of his parishioners, a number larger in 1714 than in the past ten years combined. Sick himself, Talbot asked the SPG, these failures notwithstanding, to send more missionaries, more prayer books, and an American bishop who alone could save the drowning mission.[286] But, rather than give up, Talbot redoubled his efforts, even breaking faith with former allies. Governor Hunter fumed to the Society that Talbot had dipped his feet in trason. Having purged the attorney general of New Jersey, Alexander Griffifth, who had been "an impudent tool of Lord Clarendon [Edward Hyde]" and exposed Jacobite, after the failed rebellion in 1715. [287] With the death of Queen Anne and the succession passing to the distant Hanoverian electorate, the son of James II, James, also called the Pretender, had

[284] Churchwardens and Vestry of Burlington to Secretary, March 25, 1714, in Hills, 111-113.
[285] Clergy of New Jersey and Pennsylvania to Governor Nicholson, n.d., [1714], in Hills, 121-123.
[286] John Talbot to Secretary, October 28, 1714, in Hills 125-126.
[287] Governor Hunter to Secretary Popple, April 9, 1715, in Hills, 139-140.

summoned an army to reclaim what he believed was his birthright. A few Tories, frustrated with the failures of Queen Anne, threw in with the Stuarts, allowing zealous Whigs to paint all Tories with the brush of disloyalty. The failure of James' invasion, and the success of the Hanoverian George I and his Whig allies, meant a purge of all those insufficiently loyal, with Toryism smeared as tyrannical and papist.[288] Griffifth was a Tory who had allied with the failed putsch, and thus he fled. Where did this turncoat find shelter? In St Mary's parish, where Talbot had, effectively, "incorporated the Jacobites in the Jerseys under the Name of a Church, in order to sanctify his Sedition and Insolence to the Government." If the SPG did not discipline this wayward priest soon, then he and others like him would "destroy all government and good manners."[289]

Rejecting these accusations of treason and disloyalty of their patron, Bass wrote to the SPG as one who was "extremely amazed" at such a claim, equating zeal against Quakers as Jacobitism.[290] Joining him, the church wardens of St Mary's wrote a joint letter to the SPG, defending Talbot as a "truly pious and apostolic person," not politically partisan for the deposed Stuarts. [291] Talbot himself wrote to the new Bishop of London, John Robison, professing that he had been a "Williamite from the beginning." [292] Writing also to the SPG, Talbot furiously reversed the charges, accusing Governor Hunter of having betrayed the Church of England, equivalent to the biblical Haman, who had sought to persecute and exterminate the Jews of Babylon. Hunter did little to promote Christian education, and his failure was absolute irrefutable proof that the colonies needed a bishop, who would not only support the Church but face down

[288] Linda Colley provides standard account for what the failed Jacobite invasion of 1715 did to English politics, particularly for Tories. Some of the aftermath spilled over into the North American colonies. Colley, *In Defiance of Oligarchy*, 21-29.
[289] Governor Hunter to Secretary Popple, April 9, 1715, in Hills, 139-140.
[290] Jeremiah Bass to Secretary, October 6, 1715, in Hills, 140-141.
[291] Church Wardens of Burlington to SPG, October 28, 1715, in Hills, 143-144.
[292] John Talbot to Bishop of London, October 21, 1715, in Hills, 141-142.

evil magistrates. Only a bishop could adequately defend the Church from attacks upon its clergy.[293]

If Talbot was innocent of Jacobitism, then what provoked Governor Hunter's outburst? Talbot's friendliness with Jacobites, such as Griffifth, did him no favors, especially as cordiality with treason was, not unreasonably, considered crypto-treason. With a new claimant on the throne, with a shaky hereditary claim and little experience with England, George I and his Whig allies were on unstable ground. Unsure of their own legitimacy and unsure of a legitimate Jacobite threat, there was a feeling (real or imagined) that all former Tories were Jacobites in waiting, on the verge of toppling the throne and the parliamentary privileges that Whigs prized. Not only the British Isles, but the American colonies, were filled with suspect hidden Jacobites that required suppression.[294] Talbot's fixation on church issues, his willingness to befriend men who shared his clericalist vision, and his impatience with civil authorities all operated as marks against his good intentions. While the Jacobite invasion of 1715 had more closely wound church and state as intertwined, Talbot had refused to close the unbridgeable gap between spiritual and civil authorities.

Despite this growing clericalism, the Society offered no support. Writing to Talbot, the SPG informed him that Charles Gookin, lieutenant governor of Pennsylvania, had also lodged a complaint of his Jacobitism. Talbot had not imposed oaths of loyalty to George I on St Mary's. This willful inaction was tantamount to treason and Talbot should comply immediately.[295] Either tonedeaf or uninterested, Talbot wrote back to the Society that the real threat to the Church of England was not Jacobitism, but an absent bishop in the colonies. No Anglican minister would

[293] John Talbot to Secretary, November 1, 1715, in Hills, 144-145.
[294] Parrish, *Jacobitism and Anti-Jacobitism in the British Atlantic*, 1-7.
[295] Secretary to John Talbot, August 2, 1717, in Hills, 152.

take a post in Pennsylvania or New Jersey because there was little support or protection, preferring to settle in Maryland, where there was a church establishment, as easier and more profitable.[296] Talbot also scratched off a letter addressed to the entire bench of bishops in the Church of England, requesting a colonial episcopate immediately.[297] However, despite cooling pressures from the failed rebellion, which forced Talbot to keep his head down, his demand for a bishop went unanswered.

Talbot quieted for a while after these accusations, but they soon flared up once more. John Urmston, a recently deposed rector of Christ Church, Philadelphia, bitterly complained to the SPG that Talbot remained a traitorous Jacobite. It was not for being a bad minister, but Talbot's malign influence, that had led Christ Church to drive Urmston from his office. Talbot's influence, according to Urmston, was found in Christ Church's refusal to name the monarch in the state prayers, a general, rather than specific, prayer for the wellbeing of Great Britain's monarch. Additionally, the parish believed they had the right to eject an unworthy minister, not requiring the Bishop of London's permission (who had sent Urmston to Philadelphia). According to the deposed minister, the parish believed that the Bishop of London was as distant and legitimate over the affairs of the colonial church as Rome was. Additionally, the congregation unfairly expected their minister to preach twice on Sundays, provide morning and evening prayer services every day, and to also preach on feast days. These were "rebellious principles" that Talbot had taught this erring congregation, with Urmston demanding his immediate reinstatement. Even though Governor William Burnet of New Jersey, and son of the Whiggish prelate, had banned Talbot from his ministry at St Mary's, his influenced continued unabated.[298]

[296] Talbot to Secretary, May 3, 1718, in Hills, 154.
[297] Petition to the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church of England, June 2, 1718, in Hills, 154-156.
[298] Letter of John Urmstron, June n.d., 1724, in Hills, 177-180

It is not hard to see how Urmston had twisted standard duties for the clergy and the prudent decision to not include a monarch's name due to time delay between Great Britain and its colonies. However, Talbot had become a whipping post for subversive clerical behavior, or, in this case, a parish ejecting their minister.

Against these claims, a gathering of Anglican clergy from the Mid-Atlantic wrote a letter to reject Urmston, a man who had been deposed for being non-resident for a year.[299] Talbot also wrote to the SPG, glad that Christ Church had "starved out" Urmston. But even so, Talbot was frustrated that Governor Burnet had taken the Burlington residence that Talbot had reserved for a future bishop as his own, further proof of civic disinterest in church affairs.[300] The cause for a bishop had not ceased, as clergyman, William Vesey, wrote to the Bishop of London, requesting him to appoint a suffragan in Burlington for the regulation of the Church. Only a bishop could restrain the bad behavior of clergy, as well as inspiring good behavior in others.[301] But these concerns were secondary compared to the criticism Urmston had begun. William Keith, lieutenant governor of Pennsylvania, complained to the Bishop of London that Christ Church still would not pray for the king by name and, even worse, he had heard rumors that some Anglican clergy claimed ordinations from a Nonjuror bishop. If they were true, Keith promised that he would prosecute these erring priests.[302] Governor Burnet confirmed these rumors with a twist: the Nonjuring bishop who had ordained them was none other than John Talbot, having received an illicit ordination when he last visited England in 1722. He was now guilty of spiritual Jacobitism, denying the regular hierarchy of the Church of England. [303]Henderson, the SPG

[299] Letter of the Clergy, n.d., [1724], in Hills, 175-176.
[300] Talbot to Secretary, December 9, 1723, in Hills, 176-177.
[301] William Vesey to Bishop of London August 10, 1724, in Hills, 188.
[302] William Keith to Bishop of London, July 24, 1724, in Hills, 186.
[303] Governor Burnet to Bishop of London, August 3, 1724, in Hills, 188.

missionary who had failed to pray for the Queen before, confirmed these attacks on Talbot. While the laity of Christ Church were wary of Talbot's embrace of Nonjuring, they had become open to this position because of his tireless work on their behalf, having ministered there since Urmston's ejection. Hender offered a new twist on the common refrain: if the colonies did not have a bishop soon, then Talbot would become a Nonjuring one to fill the void. [304]

Had Talbot, in fact, become a Nonjuror? Only conjecture and rumor surfaced, though Talbot never rebutted the charge. It was not inconsistent for Talbot, who had proclaimed himself a Williamite, had radicalized in the face of what he perceived as incompetence and failure. Nonjuring was a solution to the absent colonial bishops, allowing Talbot to acquire ordination to this clerical rank outside the normative government in both church and state. Talbot rebutted accusations of treason, professing he had never deviated from the liturgy in the Book of Common Prayer, remaining vague in state prayers because there was a time lag between the colonies and the metropole. This way would preserve the truth of prayers from the turns of royal fortune. Tellingly, Talbot passed over accusations of Nonjurings and instead focused on the new house he purchased in Burlington to serve as his parsonage. Talbot was only considered to battle infidelity, whether from Quakers or others. [305] Was this property to serve as a replacement diocesan residence? Other critics, such as Lieutenant Governor Keith, criticized that Talbot's proteges in Christ Church believed themselves "wholly independent" from the Bishop of London, rejecting the idea of needing a license to preach. The congregation teemed with Jacobitism to the point that no one could openly praise George I and the royal family without being driven out.[306] Whether because they believed his protestations insincere or the validity of

[304] Rev. Jacob Henderson to Bishop of London, August 16, 1724, in Hills, 188-189.
[305] John Talbot to Secretary, September 7, 1724, in Hills, 189-190.
[306] William Keith to Secretary, May 13, 1725, in Hills, 191-192.

his critics, the SPG removed funding from Talbot as a Society missionary. Complaining bitterly to the Bishop of London, Talbot had no character defect to bar him from ministry, unlike men such as Urmston. If there was a colonial bishop in the North American colonies, then someone would be able to testify to the SPG and see him reinstated. [307] Unsurprisingly, Talbot received no response.

Suffering these major setbacks, Talbot submitted to the censure and ceased ministering in Burlington. This resignation received parish lament, with one lay member of St Mary's, Rowland Ellis, writing to the SPG about the lack of worship. Since Talbot had been pressured to resign, there had not been preaching in the congregation for five or six months.[308] Additionally, the wardens of St Mary's petitioned Governor Burnet to restore Talbot, for without him the doors to the parish had effectively closed. [309] But despite Talbot's official retreat, Nonjurors continued to circulate in the Mid-Atlantic. Keith wrote to the Bishop of London that Richard Welton, a Nonjuring priest, had come to Philadelphia possessing an episcopal seal, a clear claim that an episcopate was being established in the colonies. The Privy Council, having heard of this affair, recalled Welton back to England, but the rogue priest instead fled to Portugal. [310] SPG commissioner Wilkinson complained that Nonjurors were cropping up in Maryland, though they divided over whether to cooperate with conforming churchmen. However, the commissary believed that Talbot remained quiet and submissive throughout these travails.[311] This posture of humility won the praise of even Talbot's enemies. Archibald Cummings, an Anglican minister in Pennsylvania, found it hard to purge all Nonjuring influence from Christ Church because Talbot

[307] John Talbot to Bishop of London, July 2, 1725, in Hills, 192-193.
[308] Mr. Ellis to Secretary, September 21, 1725, in Hills, 203.
[309] Churchwardens of Burlington to Governor, April 8, 1726, in Hills, 203.
[310] William Keith to Bishop of London, April 8, 1726, in Hills, 204-205.
[311] Commissary Wilkinson to Bishop of London, June 15, 1726, in Hills, 205-206.

was "universall beloved." However, Talbot had promised Cummings to stay out of Christ Church's affairs, receiving some begrudged respect from the clergyman.[312] Letters of support poured into the Society, with the parishes of St James, New Bristol, along with St Mary's and Christ Church, asking for Talbot's reinstatement, whatever his antipathy to the Hanoverians. [313] Nathaniel Horwood, another Anglican missionary, also requested that the Society reinstate Talbot in St Mary's, as the parish not only lacked a minister but also copies of the Book of Common Prayer and the Book of Homilies, normative texts for the faith and piety of the Church of England.[314] But these requests went unheeded.

Whether the SPG or the Bishop of London would ever change their minds about Talbot, they never had the chance, as Talbot died in November of 1727, still living in Burlington until the end. Talbot's mortal departure was "much lamented" by St Mary's, who left a tribute to the man who had so ardently served them. [315] After his death, an episcopal seal was discovered in the possession of Talbot, sparking later debate among Anglicans over whether Talbot was technically the first American bishop for the Church of England.[316] Regardless if this seal meant Talbot was really a bishop or not, it explains his sudden silence in pursuing an American episcopate, since in his own estimation, he had finally achieved on his own what the SPG had never provided. A fully independent Church of England, with a spiritual episcopate detached from civil authority, now took the form of Nonjuring orders.

Talbot's unrelenting crusade to gain an American episcopate saw him tear apart relationships not only with colonial governors, many of whom subscribed to the Church of

---

[312] Archibald Cummings to Bishop of London, October 19, 1726, in Hills, 207-208.
[313] Memorial to SPG, n.d., [1726], in Hills, 208-209.
[314] Nathaniel Horwood to SPG, April 28, 1727, in Hills, 210-211.
[315] *American Weekly Mercury*, November 30, 1727.
[316] For an argument that Talbot had indeed been ordained by Nonjurors as a bishop, based on rumors and an episcopal seal found among his belongings, see George Morgan Hills, "John Talbot, the First Bishop in North America" in *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* (Vol 3, No 1, 1879), 32-55

England, but also fellow Anglican ministers. The battle to establish the Church of England in British North America was not merely a war between conformists and dissenters, let alone orthodox Protestants against heterodox Quakers, but between churchmen with rival views of what the Church of England was. Against some, whether High Churchmen or otherwise, who had believed in greater civil controls over the Church (at least when it conflicted with social harmony), Talbot touted the Church's spiritual autonomy and independence when it came to conducting worship and regulating clergy. The answer to Talbot's vision was the constant refrain for a bishop, unceasingly frustrated through disinterest and hostile criticism. For Talbot and his allies, the Church of England was an entirely spiritual society, radically separated from civil society, and required a bishop to fully govern itself as such. If civil authorities, even fellow Anglicans, stood in the way of this vision, Talbot opposed them and asserted his rights as a priest. If the Church's spiritual independence conflicted with civil law, so much worse for civil law.

III.

John Checkley was a native son to New England, born in 1680 in the colony of Massachusetts, but he became a public enemy for his "apostasy" to the Church of England. Sent to study abroad in England in the late 1710s, Checkley became convinced that the apostolic succession of bishops was necessary for Christ's church, converting from New England Congregationalism to Anglicanism. Checkley returned to Boston and established a printing press, forming a circle of likeminded New England Anglicans who pursued a vigorous defense of the episcopal Church of England against Congregationalist dissent. Checkley's new faith came, seemingly, with ambiguity about the new Hanoverian dynasty in England. When the Massachusetts General Court, the highest governing body in the colony, required new oaths for

George I, Checkley dragged his feet and found himself, in 1720, fined for disobedience. Released on bond, Checkley soon swore the new oaths, but it did not mean he had given up his attacks upon the New England establishment.[317]

Checkley's career began at a time when great instability gripped Massachusetts, and New England more widely. The experiment in godly republicanism had failed with the restoration of the Stuarts. While the Glorious Revolution in 1688 had provoked wide support, especially as it overturned the rule of James II who had imposed the hate New England Dominion, that had swept away the charters of the northern colonies, its result was mixed. The new royal charter had taken away the old charters, and not a few New England elite had abandoned the old ways for participation in a widely tolerant, Protestant, monarchical empire. Efforts to shore up Congregationalism saw a turn towards clericalism and royalism, which could encourage a further move into the Church of England. The growth of Anglicanism was not merely an alternate Protestant church, it was a direct repudiation of New England's foundations and perhaps the first step towards the destruction of Congregationalism.[318] Therefore, when Checkley lamented, after his trial in 1720, that New Englanders were willing to "crucifie afresh" Jesus by their refusal to celebrate Christmas, this disposition was not mere humbug as Checkley believed.[319] It was an effort to preserve New England against the sense that the end was nigh. Similarly, when New

---

[317] Edmund F. Slafter, *John Checkley; or, The evolution of religious tolerance in Massachusetts bay. Including Mr. Checkley's controversial writings; his letters and other papers*, Vol. I (Boston, MA: The Prince Society, 1897), 32-39.

[318] Michael P. Winship, *Godly Republicanism: Puritans, Pilgrims and a City on a Hill* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012), 248-249. Contrary to Owen Stanwood's account, there was more ambiguity in Massachusetts' relationship with the metropole, anxious over the new protections for the Church of England. The Standing Order had to find a cautious way to maintain its own order against the threat of replacement. Peter Field had included a demonstration of how the Standing Order attempted an indirect way to preserve its influence. Owen Stanwood, *The Empire Reformed: English America in the Age of the Glorious Revolution* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011), 135-146. Peter S. Field, *The Crisis of the Standing Order: Clerical Intellectuals and Cultural Authority in Massachusetts, 1780-1833* (Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1999), 17-18.

[319] John Checkley to John Read, December 24, 1720, in Slafter Vol II, 147-149.

Englanders accused Checkley of being "worse than a papist, or even the devil himself" for closing his shop on January 30th, the Church of England's memorial for Charles I as a martyr, he had kicked the hornet's nest.[320] While Checkley believed himself the besieged minority, a faithful member of apostolic Christianity against republicans and sectarians, not a few New England Congregationalists saw themselves under similar siege conditions.

Nevertheless, Checkley was ready to go on the attack, republishing his own apology for the Church of England, *A Modest Proof*, in 1723 after the "Yale Apostasy" of the previous year. When Timothy Cutler, rector of Yale, casually inserted a line from the Book of Common Prayer to conclude his address, he left Congregationalists stunned. Their own seminary in Connecticut, second after Harvard, now was in enemy hands. After criticism, Cutler revealed his conversion to the Church of England, joining with several other Congregationalist clergymen and seminarians, creating an even more apocalyptic fear of imminent doom.[321] Checkley's apology, which was a standard apology for the Church of England, functioned as a bombshell. Bishops were the only legitimate successors to the Apostles, the "true ministers of the Gospel" who subsequently created the lesser orders of priests and deacons. This threefold ministry was not *jure humano*, but had been created by Jesus Christ, God in the flesh, and placed upon his apostles and revealed in the sacred pages of the New Testament. Primitive Christian history, pure and untainted as later years would be, preserved this idea of apostolic succession and the necessity of bishops. Through laying on of hands, which Congregationalists did not practice, the bishop created new ministers and thus became the source of church unity and legitimacy. The purpose of this defense, Checkley counseled, was to establish the true church on legitimate grounds, one that was historical and empirical through the rolling of the centuries, fortifying the significance

[320] John Checkley to John Read, January 30, 1721, in Slafter Vol II, 149-151.
[321] Woolverton, *Colonial Anglicanism*, 128-129.

of ministerial office and sacraments. Laymen had a responsibility to examine which church has the best claim to having been founded by Jesus Christ and commune with it. The Church of England, with its order of bishops that can be traced back to the Apostles, clearly had the best claim and the surest means of salvation. [322] The implication was that Congregationalists churches were no churches, its ministers and sacraments were illegitimate, and all Christians had no valid profession of faith, given that they had no church. A defense of bishops was received as an attack upon Congregationalism as a fraud, the destruction of the godly republican ideal.

Checkley, however, was advancing quite a different vision than the anti-puritan church of King Charles and Archbishop Laud in the mid seventeenth century. Against accusations that the Church of England was not fully reformed according to the Reformation, Checkley proclaimed that a truly "Reformed" church was one that had an independent episcopal clergy, with their "primitive purity and liberty" restored to them after papal captivity. Additionally, the Reformation restored the doctrines of passive obedience and nonresistance, which preserved the wholly spiritual and non-civil aspect of the Church, doctrines that the Church of England possessed as its "surest foundation" for both spiritual purity and civil peace. The crown did not control the Church of England, let alone create it. The spiritual and civil realms were two radically distinct societies whose members occasionally overlapped in the main, often partnering for mutual benefit and support. As civil society promoted itself through a variety of offices, some higher and others lower, so too did the Church have spiritual offices that dispensed spiritual powers. Citing both the sainted John Chrysostom and the Reformer John Calvin, Checkley argued that episcopacy was a "spiritual consulship," an elective monarchy that oversaw a spiritual senate of priests. This spiritual monarch had the power to preach, perform the

[322] John Checkley, *A Modest Proof* (Boston, MA: 1723), ii-v.

sacraments, ordain, discern orthodoxy from heresy, establish public worship, and excommunicate.[323] These powers were strictly spiritual and had no overlap with civil authority, fulfilling Jesus' teaching that his Apostles would not be like worldly rulers. However, this spiritual monarchy had certain powers that did not belong to the priesthood, such as ordination, which belonged "not solely, yet chiefly to bishops." While this qualification did no unchurch Continental Presbyterians, it did call non-episcopal English Protestants into question. Dissenters had no excuse and should return to the Church of England immediately as a fully spiritual, independent, episcopal body that promoted toleration and civil peace.[324]

The backlash was quick and from the highest echelons of New England theology. Edward Wigglesworth, Harvard's first professor of divinity, blasted Checkley's clerisy as a betrayal of Protestantism. Presbyterianism, which applied to Congregationalism as rule by a plurality of ministers, was never explicitly condemned in the early Church. While Anglicans like Checkley were quick to seize upon Jerome's early criticism of the heresiarch Aerius in the fourth century, they undermine themselves. Jerome condemned Aerius not only for equating the office of bishop with presbyter, but also for rejecting prayers for the dead, a practice that many Anglicans avoided. Jerome could not be taken in bits and pieces, but this procedure was irrelevant anyway, since the same church father had accepted that the early church practiced Presbyterianism. Jerome was not alone, as he was joined by many early Christian doctors (including John Chrysostom, Ambrose, and Augustine), as well as England's early reformers, including "that excellent and holy martyr" Thomas Cranmer, the first Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury and compiler of the Church of England's liturgy. But church history was a red herring, since church fathers contradicted and could be difficult to understand. The core source of doctrine was the

[323] Ibid., 31-35
[324] Ibid., 57-60.

Bible alone, and the New Testament, according to Wigglesworth, drew no differences between bishops and priests, both having the same "apostolic power and authority" to minister. There was only one office in the church, that of the ordained minister.[325]

This office did not depend on Apostolic succession, as if everything the Apostles did passed onto the later church. If Apostles were superior to the ministers they appointed, that it no way transferred to bishops. To make this claim, as Checkley had, was a sleight of hand, for did bishops also have universal jurisdiction to minister or the power to confect miracles? Could Anglican bishops speak in tongues, exorcise demons, perform divine healings like the Apostles? Wigglesworth dismissed these arguments as misunderstanding that Apostolic succession did not exist. But while it did not serve the Protestant position, Checkley's arguments did appear to validate Roman Catholicism, which had a pope with a universal jurisdiction and charismatic authority to create new binding doctrines.[326] Since the minister's power to ordain did not come from the Apostles, all Protestants (episcopal and presbyterian) should unite in recognizing the unity of the single ministerial office.[327] Citing Henry Dodwell, an Anglo-Irish Nonjuror and chief authority for defending episcopacy, Wigglesworth argued that the early church was like the ancient synagogue, a plurality of ministers who governed over the congregation. Anglicans and Congregationalists ought to respect one another, each having legitimate orders as fellow Protestants who could unite against Catholicism and infidelity.[328] Rather than condemn the Church of England as corrupt or popish, Wigglesworth emphasized Protestant unity across institutional divisions. Conformists and Dissenters could stand united, despite their differences

[325] Edward Wigglesworth, *Sober Remarks on a book lately reprinted at Boston, entituled, A modest proof of the order and government settled by Christ* (Boston, MA: 1724), 4-10, 19-23.
[326] Ibid., 36-43, 56-61.
[327] Ibid., 73-84.
[328] Ibid., 109-122.

over church government, to create a front against their common enemies. Checkley's incitement was an attack upon any shared Protestant interest.

In response, with the mask of detached inquiry slipping, Checkley blasted Wigglesworth as a deranged schismatic. Dissenter refusal to rejoin the Church of England was a sin so grave that it was equivalent to the "forbidden pleasures of the animal life," with Wigglesworth an insane "enthusiast" who promoted a form of church government that had only been normative during the "anarchy" of the regicide and Commonwealth. Episcopacy was, in contrast to New England Congregationalists, normative. Even the hotheaded Scots had "super intendants" in their church, a bishop in all but name. Restating his claims, the threefold distinction of offices, with bishops superior to priests, went back to the Apostles, with Paul ordaining the biblical Timothy and Titus as bishops with an office to teach and discipline lesser clergy. These were "proper acts of prelatical government" in the New Testament church, which the Church of England retained. Against Wigglesworth, who tried to steal episcopal authority through claims of ministerial equality, only a bishop could restrain "the Hydra of Heresies which ought to be beat down by the Crozier" which Dissenters unleashed.[329]

However, Checkley qualified the office of bishop as strictly spiritual, with no temporal or civil powers. Episcopacy also had no intrinsic diocesan jurisdiction, with Checkley foreswearing to "measure the Episcopal Power of Ordination by the extent Jurisdiction." Geographic dioceses were a civil matter that belonged to civil magistrates, but bishops still retained the right to ordain and excommunicate. While England's bishops were barons and sat in the House of Lords, this status was simply "the munificence of princes, as the rewards of the bishop's piety and services," royalty blessing prelates with civil office to advance the good of the realm. But this civil power,

[329] John Checkley, *A Defence of a Book Lately re-printed at Boston entituled, A Modest Proof* (Boston, MA: 1724) in Slafter Vol II, 51-57, 60-75.

as well as further distinctions between archbishops and bishops, were merely civil additions to the original office. All bishops, not matter how lowly or small their diocese, were "equally Christ's bishops," even if "they were no lords, and had no lands." The authority of bishops over priests pertained to the original spiritual distinction, which varied church fathers (as well as Calvin) had essentially admitted. The threefold hierarchy was in "every way of a divine original," and therefore Dissenters ignored this governmental structure at their peril.[330] Checkley thus vacated episcopacy of any intrinsic temporal dimensions. Bishops could have no titles, no estates, and perhaps not even a regular diocese. They may be over a handful of faithful parishioners or over a large population, all were equal because the office operated as spiritual monarchy, equivalent to a king as sovereign over his domain. Spirituality was entirely evacuated from temporal life, except as much as temporal authority invited it in.

However, this book war soon took on legal dimensions, as the Massachusetts General Court had Checkley arrested on charges of sedition. For republishing Charles Leslie's *A Short and Easie Method With the Deists* in 1723, the court treated the Irish Nonjurors words as Checkley's. This work primarily targeted Deism and Quakerism through an appeal to the sacred hierarchy of the Church of England, however it could, by extension, read as an attack on all non-episcopal Protestants. Leslie was also a rabid Jacobite, rejecting the succession of William and Mary as well as the later Hanoverian settlement. Though Leslie was popular as a critic of Deism and heterodoxy, going through several reprints, Checkley republishing this text was, for the court, tantamount to endorsing Nonjuring and Jacobitism, a direct attack upon the royal government. Considering his earlier indiscretions and ambiguous loyalties, as well as daring to "represent even the Church of Rome as a true and mother church," Checkley was charged with

[330] Ibid., 77-90.

libel for the following claims in Leslie's book: Rome was the current mother church for Western Christianity, Congregationalists were equivalent to Quakers and Deists for denying apostolic succession, non-episcopacy was equivalent to rebellion, non-episcopal government was an invention of Rome, King William was never a legitimate monarch, Dissenters were equivalent to nonbelieving Jews, and, finally, that all Dissenters imitated the antichrist and their ministers were, at all times, committing blasphemy and rebellion. For republishing these inflammatory lies, Checkley was as guilty as Leslie for these words.[331]

Before the judges, Checkley pled not guilty. In his defense, he argued that he had never denied George I's title to the throne, he never scandalized "ministers of the gospel by law established in this province," and never created any division among subjects of the crown.[332] The language was intentionally slippery, as Checkley would go on to demonstrate. On the first point, Checkley simply denied that there was any other who had a better right to the throne of Great Britain than George of Hanover. The passage in Leslie used to prove Checkley's treason was strictly hypothetical. According to Checkley, Leslie was not explicitly denying William, or, by extension, George, a rightful claim to the throne. Rather, Leslie was demonstrating a lesson in passive obedience. Christians must submit to lawful authorities, despite whatever abuses they suffered. Checkley pleaded that such was no apology for the House of Stuarts. In fact, turning the accusation around, if anyone was guilty of disloyalty, it was the Congregationalists. Had they not read James the Pretender into this passage? They had exposed themselves as believing James had any credible claim to the throne, a thought that had never even occurred to Checkley, the obedient servant of George I.[333] The absurdity of this rhetorical gamble is manifest, attempting to

[331] Presentment of Mr. John Checkley for Libel, n.d., 1724, in Slafter Vol II, 1-7.
[332] The Speech of Mr. John Checkley upon his Tryal at Boston, n.d., 1724, republished 1730, in Slafter Vol II, 11-12.
[333] Ibid, 12-14.

convince the General Court that they were cryptically Jacobite for suspecting Checkley was a Jacobite. However, at the very least, Checkley publicly denied Jacobitism, which comported with his strict concern for the Church of England as an independent spiritual society.

On the charge that Checkley sowed division among British subjects, he denied the accusation entirely. Calling men to obedience could in no way be considered as disobedient, as Leslie's text had only made a case for the apostolic origins, and necessity, of an episcopal order. It was no treason to show the strength of a better claim against the weakness of a worse claim, as bishops could trace their office to the Apostles while Congregationalist clergy could not. Ambiguity about how to apply this strong claim, such as leaving the Congregationalist churches for the Church of England, was beside the point, or so Checkley thought. It was Congregationalists, by not promoting clear hierarchical legitimacy, that created confusion among British subjects. Once again, it was men like those sitting on the General Court, who were guilty of the charges placed against Checkley. Instead, Checkley's reprint was, as much as in church as in state, a defense of monarchy. A refusal of a spiritual monarch was tantamount to rejecting a civil monarch, a refusal that created the rank heresy of Deism. Thus, Checkley went on to argue that republicanism was rejected in Aristotle's classical theory of government, it was rejected in the works of John Locke, who was in fact an apologist for social inequality and hierarchy, it was also rejected in a basic history of ancient Israel, Greece, and Rome. However, before Checkley could give a demonstration from Classical Athens, the Court silenced him, for "the Court can't spend their time in hearing you talk about the Greeks and Romans." Appealing to Magna Carta as demonstrating the validity of using historical example, the Court let Checkley continue his defense with appeals to Babylon. Checkley concluded with the claim that any defense of episcopacy as the stronger legitimate claim was a defense of monarchy, no matter the society,

ancient or modern, temporal or spiritual.[334] Was this defense another eccentric rhetorical gamble? No, for Checkley's arguments derived from Leslie's ecclesiology, that priestcraft had grounds on ancient history, even from pagans. It was a natural order that existed for all peoples, whether Christian or not.[335]

Finally, against the charge of scandalizing ministers of the gospel, Checkley rejected this comparison. Even the divines of the Westminster Assembly, which Congregationalists respected, acknowledged apostolic succession. If the General Court thought Checkley had accused them of having illegitimate orders then it was that their own guilty consciences had gotten the better of them. Even if the General Court rejected these arguments as Presbyterian, and not applying to them, London's provincial assembly of Independents in 1654 published *Jus Divini Ministerii Evangelici*, which claimed Congregationalists ministers had apostolic succession through presbyters. In failing to accept these arguments, the General Court had departed from their own origins. Nevertheless, Checkley then warned the judges that they were on shaky legal ground. According to the laws of England and the colony, there was no religious settlement in Massachusetts. Since it was "repugnant to the laws of England" to have contradictions and given that Parliament had established the Church of England, either Massachusetts had no establishment (which meant the Church of England was free to proliferate) or the Church of England was established. Congregationalism only existed "of general terms," and had no legal protections or privileges. Checkley foreswore that he was trying to establish the Church of England, but the General Court should not presume to infringe upon his rights of open discussion. If the judges would not decide the matter, Checkley advised that a court in England

[334] Ibid., 15-21.
[335] Nonjurors maintained, and developed, these natural "enlightened" arguments to defend a sacred clergy that William Bulman has demonstrated among Restoration churchmen that continued into the 1690s. Bulman, *Anglican Enlightenment*, 279-298.

should settle the matter.[336] Checkley rested his defense on this point, which was likely to win no favor among the judges of the General Court. However, this raised the specter of open competition and the possibility that the informal Congregationalist settlement would be outcompeted by missionaries from the Church of England.

Pending a final decision, the General Court issued a provisional judgement: if Leslie's book did, in fact, teach what the charges said it taught, then Checkley was guilty of libel for republishing. Thus, theoretically, Checkley may not be guilty if the General Court misread Leslie's book. But if the book had not been misread, then Checkley, and by extension the Nonjuring of Leslie, was guilty. Waiting a final verdict, Checkley was grim, but remained somewhat optimistic. It was still possible that the General Court would drop the charges out of fear that a metropolitan authority would put pressure on the Bay colony. But that kind of pressure was only possible if Checkley could write to England, which he feared he could no longer do, with the Massachusetts government preventing his mail from being sent. The trial was, for Checkley, a farce and a reenactment of the "fury of these righteous Root and Branch Reformers" who had attempted to destroy the Church of England once, and now were trying to do so again in New England. But the Congregationalists were not alone, as they received help from an Anglican minister, Henry Harris, the rector of King's Chapel. It was not Dissenters who alerted the General Court about Checkley's reprint of Leslie, but rather Harris who was "at the bottom of this whole affair."[337]

In a subsequent letter, Checkley lamented that Harris, and other unnamed Anglican ministers, betrayed him to the Congregationalists, as much as Caesar had been betrayed by his

[336] Speech of Mr. John Checkley, 24-36.
[337] John Checkley to Rev. John Berriman, June 1, 1724, in Slafter Vol II, 158-161.

former friends in the Senate.[338] It was unclear what exactly Harris had against Checkley. He had arrived in Boston in 1709 with a letter of recommendation from the Bishop of London, quickly becoming an assistant rector at King's Chapel. Although not involved in any open scandal, the parish disliked Harris, never permitting him to become more than an assistant rector. Even more damning, King's Chapel refused to offer money for Harris' burial when the minister died years later in 1728.[339] Given Checkley's rank hostility to Congregationalism, rather than defending broader Protestant unity, it is possible that Harris sympathized with Congregationalism and had little interest in antagonizing them. But whatever the reasons for Checkley's suspicions, it did signal that even in New England, where Anglicans were a small minority, division existed within the colonial Church of England. Not all accepted Checkley's high views of episcopal power as a spiritual monarch over the Church, retooling Nonjuring views of the Church for a colonial context. Checkley was not a mere vanguard for greater metropolitan control over the New England colonies and means to further integrate them into the British Empire. Even among adherents of the King's church there was division over the nature of the king's authority.[340]

Brought once more to the General Court to hear its decision in light of its provisional judgement, Checkley had his lawyer and fellow Anglican, John Read, to improve his defense. Read rejected any claim that republishing a book could count as libel, especially when based upon quotes that were pulled from different editions of the work. The version of Leslie that Checkley reprinted was not identical with all other editions of the work. Additionally, Leslie's work was entirely theoretical and did not make any explicit claims for Massachusetts, and so the

[338] John Checkley to Rev. Dr. Thomas Bennett, June 25, 1724, in Slafter Vol II, 166-168.
[339] Francis William Pitt Greenwood, *A History of King's Chapel in Boston: The First Episcopal Church in New England: Comprising Notices of the Introduction of Episcopacy Into the Northern Colonies* (Boston, MA: Carter, Hendee, 1833), 69, 90-92.
[340] Contrary to James Bell's interpretations, Checkley was primarily interested in the expansion of the Church of England, whether that included metropolitan authority or not. Bell, *Imperial Origins of the King's Church*, 26, 75, 142.

General Court could not convict mere "innuendo" in a text.[341] Checkley then spoke in his own defense, claiming that this case was really whether he had intended, by "imagining and contriving, by the Subtilty of Arguments, to traduce the Title of His present Majesty." But Checkley was innocent of this crime, for he had already sworn an oath to George I. The real reason for this prosecution was persecution, a bad conscience derived from fear that Leslie was right and Congregationalist churches were not churches. Only if Congregationalists were sectarians, and the General Court certainly did not, would they fall under Leslie's criticism.[342]

Though clever, the General Court did not accept these arguments, finding Checkley guilty of libel, fined £50 for the crime, and an additional £50 as collateral, a surety of "good Behaviour for six Months," as well as paying court and procedural costs.[343] But these problems did not silence Checkley, who immediately went about disobeying the General Court's order by writing to friends with the hope that these unjust charges would soon be reversed. But the Congregationalist order continued to stir. Checkley had gotten word that Cotton Mather had attempted to summon a general synod in Massachusetts to deal with the Anglican menace. However, the Bishop of London shutdown these efforts, claiming his metropolitan authority as overseer over the churches of all British colonies, even Congregationalists. Mather, against Anglican growth, had hoped to produce "something like the Solemn League and Covenant to prejudice the rising Generation against the Church." Therefore, Checkley believed that the North American colonies needed their own episcopate, as the Bishop of London was too far away. Bishops were "principle of unity" that would provide a spiritual monarch to resist Dissent, in

[341] The Argument of John Read Esq. in Arrest of Judgement In the Case of Mr. John Checkley, Before the Supreme Court in Boston, November 3, 1724, in Slafter Vol II, 39-44.
[342] A Pleas in Arrest of Judgement by Mr. John Checkley, [November] n.d., 1[724], in Slafter Vol II, 45-48.
[343] The Sentence of Court, November 27, 1724, in Slafter Vol II, 50.

both state and church, furthering growth and spiritual renewal.[344] Additionally, Checkley hoped the Bishop of London would intercede on his behalf, forcing the General Court to issue a *noli prosequi*, leaving Checkley legally convicted but absolved of paying the fines. But whatever the outcome, Checkley would remain defiant, continuing to defend the Church of England, even "by stealth," even if he lost his surety for good behavior. Optimistic about the growth of the Church of England across New England, with new parishes built in Rhode Island and Connecticut, Checkley had hope for eventual vindication.[345] As an Anglican partisan, and now advocate for an American bishop, Checkley believed the only future for Anglican growth was preventing the state from interfering. If the Church of England's spiritual authority was in danger, better to have no established religion than the wrong kind.

Checkley thus plunged himself into ministry. As a lay evangelist, Checkley attempted to win over the Penoscot, an American Indian nation in New England, hoping to convince them to abandon Roman Catholicism and its French priests for the Church of England. He feared that if the "Independents" found out about Checkley's efforts, they would prohibit the meeting, preferring the Indians stay papists before becoming Anglican.[346] Checkley's efforts reflected internecine missionary competitions, dividing over whether culture or creed came first in civilizing the Indians.[347] Thus Checkley feared the influence of Dissenters on evangelizing, with magistrates who would act the part of a "Scotch Cameronian," imposing Presbyterianism on the colony and its native inhabitants. [348] However, Independents and Presbyterians were not the only

[344] John Checkley to Rev. Dr. Thomas Bennet, June 15, 1725, in Slafter Vol II, 173-177.
[345] John Checkley to Rev. Dr. Zacharay Grey June 21, 1725, in Slafter Vol II, 169-171.
[346] John Checkley to Rev. Dr. Zachary Grey December 10, 1725, in Slafter Vol II, 180-182.
[347] As Laura Stevens has argued, Checkley as a member of the SPG likely saw Indians as an emotive source of pity, both unifying Britons in their culture and faith, as well as disparaging their own moral failures. Laura M. Stevens, *The Poor Indians: British Missionaries, Native Americans and Colonial Sensibility* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 85-110.
[348] John Checkley to Sir Francis Nicholson, December 11, 1725, in Slafter Vol II, 182-183.

ones Checkley feared. Henry Harris, also, was a problem, threatening to take over King's Church, the first and most prestigious parish in Massachusetts. Harris, rather than promote the cause of the Church of England, would ally with Congregationalists, further wrecking missionary efforts to join the Church of England in particular, rather than becoming a Protestant in general.[349] Harris did not get the position, but nothing allayed Checkley's suspicion that the Dissenter establishment would drive out faithful churchmen. Writing to Edmund Gibson, new Bishop of London, Checkley lamented that Congregationalists, in violation of English law, sought to oppress the Church of England. Another New England convert, like Checkley, faced jail three time for writing defenses of the Church of England.[350]

Eventually Checkley put his hand to the till, seeking holy orders for himself, though this required him to keep his mouth shut. He was under suspicion in England of being a Jacobite and Nonjuror, but after ten years of waiting, he was finally trusted and ordained a priest in 1738. Checkley maintained an Anglican reading network throughout New England, attracting the attention and visit of philosopher-bishop George Berkeley, who was interested in establish an American seminary for Anglican missionaries. Becoming a recipient of SPG funds, Checkley reported on his early successes, baptizing twenty-six people in 1740 and catechizing several American Indians and enslaved Africans into the faith.[351] Checkley represented an earl foray into a defense of the Church as an institution entirely set apart from civil government. It was irrelevant if the Church of England had official recognition or legal establishment, for it was primarily a spiritual institution in competition with other Protestants, as well as Roman Catholics, for conversion. The spiritual offices, especially the bishop, provided the basis for the

[349] John Checkley to Rev. Mr. Black, December 27, 1725, in Slafter Vol II, 185-188.
[350] John Checkley to Rt. Rev. Edmund Gibson, March 27, 1728, in Slafter Vol II 188-192.
[351] John Checkley to SPG, November 6, 1740, in Slafter Vol II, 192-195.

Church as the most legitimate, and therefore most trustworthy, among the churches. Evangelism, as Checkley took up the cause, was, effectively, interdenominational competition.

IV.

In each of these three cases, the Church of England was internally conflicted as to its mission and relation with civil society. Like the metropolitan church, Anglican divided on the authority and role of the clergy, the difference between civil and spiritual authority, and the role a royal governor or lay elite had in the government of the Church. Churchmen like Marston, Talbot, and Checkley offered a radical, even separatist, vision of what the Church of England was, a spiritually autonomous organization with a sacred hierarchy that controlled the conscience, tangentially involved in civil affairs at best. The Church of England was not simply an extension of imperial authority over unruly colonies. Rather, for these churchmen and their allies, the Church of England might be in an antagonistic relationship even with fellow Anglicans, even with royal governors. Therefore, colonial governments must, if they will not refrain, be entirely divorced from the spiritual affairs of the Church. Frustration with the failures of missionary effort, the lack of resources, and the irreligion many churchmen saw in laity, led to a more radical solution. An episcopal church could only survive if colonial government left them alone, and they were allowed to pursue their own ends, including the appointment of their own clergy. If the colonial or royal government stood in the way of these efforts, they were to be criticized, if not resisted.

This chapter has demonstrated that separation of church from state did not necessarily emerge from the precursors to liberalism, from radical sectarians and heterodox movements. Rather, in these three colonial cases, the push for separation came from within the heart of the Church established by law. At best, the Empire provided the context for missions and expansion

to occur peacefully. But if royal governors or elite laity infringed upon the rights of the clergy, if they claimed rights over what these highflyers considered spiritual, they were to be opposed as enemies of the Church. The British Empire did not have a single vision of an imperial church that would conform, whether legally or culturally, the North American colonies into a homogenized British society. Rather, these churchmen show divisions within the Church of England over not only what the Church was, but the responsibility of civic government to leave Anglican ministers free to pursue their own end. If push came to shove, for these churchmen, it was better to separate church from state than to be established on imperfect terms.

Chapter Four: Sacerdotal Religious Liberty and the Separation of Church and State in the Colonial Bishop Controversy, 1761-1775

From the very founding of England's colonies in the Americas, the Church of England intended to establish a bishop on a foreign shore. How this was to be done, at what time, and the relation between the colonial churches to the mother church was unclear. As the colonial churches expanded, gaining establishment status in many of the southern and Caribbean colonies, their jurisdiction was placed under the authority of the Bishop of London. However, logistical problems began to rapidly emerge. American would-be clergy had to travel across the Atlantic to receive valid holy orders. Ministers behaving badly were often beyond clerical censure. In southern colonies, particularly Virginia, lay governance dominated the life of Anglican ministers. Resistant to clerical demands or evangelical fervor, gentle and genteel religion produced a "comfortable" faith, where lay vestries ruled over their parish churches.[352] In the northern colonies, however, Anglicans, those raised in the faith and especially converts, found this arrangement frustrating. The fullness of the church, they believed, came through an episcopate, but this was glaringly missing from colonial life. In the 1760s, there began a push from a vocal minority on both sides of the Atlantic to establish a colonial see for the Church of England abroad, provoking a conflict that would divide, as this chapter argues, two rival visions of what it meant for the British Empire to be a Protestant power.

The bishop controversy of the 1760s and 70s was not, as Carl Bridenbaugh had argued and given it one of the fullest treatments, a dress rehearsal for the American Revolution, where metropolitan Anglicans clashed pens with republican "puritan" Dissenters. While many

[352] Lauren Winner's analysis shows a sympathetic view of Virginian Anglicanism: a predictably stable, yet living, faith under a gentlemanly lay elite. Winner, *A Cheerful and Comfortable Faith*, 1-8.

Dissenters did believe in the British empire as a Protestant confederation, it had little to do with a growing colonial sense of autonomy against imperial reforms.[353] Similarly, James Bell has argued that the growth of the Church of England reflected metropolitan integration, reforms bringing colonial government further in line with Westminster, operating as beachhead as the "king's church" to unify royal government.[354] But these accounts do not stand up under scrutiny, where opposition to the Stamp Act proponents of a bishop with opponents, with both those in favor of a bishop and those opposed praising the parliamentary monarchy of the Hanoverian dynasty. Not all Anglicans sought a bishop, and some Dissenters worried an American bishop would create divisions within the empire. These accounts simply roll the Bishop Controversy as part of the struggle between imperial reformers and colonial reactionaries, failing to distinguish the strictly religious nature of the division over what it meant for the British Empire to be a Protestant power.

Contrary to surface reading of claims that these Anglicans wanted to destroy Dissenters, Anglicans disavowed all persecution and disclaimed any role for bishops in civil government. For Katherine Carté, this irenic disposition reflected an imperial Protestant scaffolding, operating as the interconnection between imperial governments that contained divisive denominations. The bishop controversy, in this light, becomes a tempest in a teapot, reflecting frustration, but still within a shared framework of Protestant empire.[355] In a very different light, Brent Sirota considered the push for a colonial bishop as part of an "Anglican catholicity," that wanted an independent spiritual kingdom that not quite a voluntary society and not quite a church

[353] Carl Bridenbaugh, *Mitre and Scepter: Transatlantic Faith, Ideas, Personalities, and Politics 1689-1775* (Oxford University Press, 1962), xii-xiv, 14-20.
[354] Bell, *Imperial Origins of the King's Church*, xi-xv, 18-21, 142, 166-186.
[355] Katherine Carté, *Religion and the American Revolution: An Imperial History* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2021), 2-14, 104-114.

established by law.[356] But these examinations muddle the bifocal vision many of these Anglicans had. Before God, the Church of England in the colonies was the legitimate catholic church from the Apostles of Jesus Christ. To leave was to apostatize from the true faith and court damnation. However, in the eyes of civil authorities, the Church of England was a voluntary society that members chose to join or leave, to submit to its sacred clergy or to depart (mistakenly for these partisans) for other churches. This split vision formed Anglicans into advocates of something like a proto-denominational zone of competition under a vaguely religious civil government that allowed the best churches to thrive. As opposed to those advocates of a Protestant Interest, who sought mutual respect among rooted Protestant churches (whether they were formally or legally established or not), colonial Anglicans in support of a bishop were less prone to think in terms of Protestant unity. In part, it was because the Church of England was guarded for its own success. But it was also in terms of broader evaluations of government, where non-episcopal Protestants had, objectively, worse claims on being a church than Moravians, even Catholics, who had bishops. The goal for these pro-bishop Anglican partisans was simultaneously to defend their sacred notions of clergy with a widely tolerant civil regime. Both sides of this conflict rejected clergy in civil government, but those opposed to bishops were united in strict toleration for Protestants, whereas Anglicans were willing to extend this privilege to religion in general. Here, with attention to this bifocal vision, Anglicans could be both proto-liberal in religious liberty and highly restrictive about the spiritual authority necessary for salvation.

In contrast to these past treatments, this chapter argues that the Bishop Controversy pit two different views of what a Protestant nation was to be. David Sehat demonstrated in a later period that a "Christian Republican" tradition formed in early America, seeking a religious

[356] Sirota, "'The Manifest Distinction Established By Our Holy Religion,'" 68-72.

politics in civil affairs without a formally established church. This chapter shows how this tradition goes back earlier into the colonial period, where hostility to bishops was driven by a desire for an irenic and plural Protestant informal establishment, without any one church receiving legal privileges over another. This idea predated America as an independent republic and operated within a vision of the British Empire as a royal confederation of many semi-autonomous parliamentary assemblies united under one constitutionally limited king.[357] This chapter also draws on the work of Sam Haselby, who has demonstrated a Protestant religious nationalism that stretched throughout American history, uniting various Protestant denominations into a broader Evangelical coalition against the forces of Roman Catholicism and infidelity. [358] This history dates back to the colonial period for America, where an irenic Protestant nationalism formed the basis of patriotism for the British Empire as the premier power in service of the Protestant interest. Against this idea of an institutionally diverse and fragmented, but spiritually united, Protestant front, partisans for the Church of England (particularly in the northern colonies of America) fought for their own unique status as the most legitimate and most traditional Protestant church. Rather than emphasize unity, these Anglicans advocated for division and competition, preferring civil governments that recognize no shared Protestant ethos if it meant not prioritizing the Church of England. Strict neutrality, even for Catholics and Quakers, was preferable to broad Protestant chauvinism.

The question of an Anglican bishop for the American colonies exposed the rifts between these two rival ideas of Protestant empire. By advocating for strict difference between spiritual and civil government, these pro-bishop partisans were willing to endorse a widely ecumenical religious politics, where civil society promoted religion in the abstract, not Protestantism

[357] Sehat, *The Myth of American Religious Freedom*, 4-12, 20-32.
[358] Haselby, *The Origins of American Religious Nationalism*, 1-4, 25-27.

particularly, that would allow a competition among all denominations. Religious liberty did not mean privileges for Protestants and restrictions on non-Protestants, but a general toleration for all sects that did not disturb the affairs of civil government. Religious questions were strictly spiritual and handled by clergymen alone. Rather than the comingling of civil and spiritual authorities through a religious politics, where laymen enacted policies to regulate religious practice and belief, Anglicans sought strict division of powers. A bishop was, therefore, no threat as he would only, by definition, have power over the spiritual lives of those who chose to be members of the Church of England. In rejecting any sense that civil governments, metropolitan or colonial, had any right to infringe on bishops, and those bishops only had a limited authority over Anglicans, these partisans advanced denominationalism, where Christian sects were allowed free range to convert new members and govern themselves as voluntary societies. Broad Protestant unity across denominations, where all Protestant churches were basically the same, was rejected for inter-denominational competition. For these Anglicans, the Church of England was best and Congregationalists and Presbyterians, as well as Quakers, Moravians, and Catholics, were all on the same spectrum of alternate religions competing in the spiritual marketplace. Even worse, these partisans considered Moravians and Catholics as superior to Presbyterians and Congregationalists for having legitimately ordained bishops.

The Bishop Controversy, in this reading, marked the difference between a uniquely Protestant religious politics of empire against a generally religious civil authority that ceded spiritual authority over the conscience to churches competing for membership. A confessionally tinged lay authority in both church and state, advancing the Protestant Interest, even a Protestant religious nationalism or a Christian republicanism compatible with a form of British Empire, competed against a highly clerical view of spiritual authority. These clergy, far from the days of

Laud, sought total separation from civil government. While critics of an American bishop believed all clerical office threatened some sort of involvement (and bishops would introduce surrogate royal authority unattached to Parliament), pro-bishop partisans rejected this idea in total. Churches were entirely separate from civil government; clergy were separate and parallel from civil magistrates. The former had power over the conscience, while the latter regulated the body. Civic magistrates had no alignment besides religion in the abstract, allowing various denominations and sects to compete without any distinctly confessional civil establishment (even if it was informal and institutionally plural). These two rival visions of how the British Empire was a Protestant Empire clashed in the appointment of a colonial bishop.

Long before the fear of an Anglican bishop rocked the whole of British North America, metropolitan High Churchmen had, recurrently, sought a bishop. Edmund Gibson, bishop of London from 1723-1748 and considered the pope informal for Robert Walpole's ecclesiastical management. Gibson was a Church Whig, reconciled to a parliamentary monarchy with high views of clerical powers, who had been part of refitting a fully spiritual church with an unused ecclesiastical prerogative in civil affairs. In other terms, Gibson and other Church Whigs, sought an empower impotence, a church power subordinated that claimed autonomy in spiritual affairs. Therefore, despite his desire for a bishop, Gibson dropped the issue when the court was disinterested in pursuing it. For the sake of social stability, and not seeking a conflict over who had jurisdiction over the Church, sleeping dogs were better left lying.[359] In the colonies too, more pressing matters consumed Anglican interest away from ecclesiology. In the southern colonies, a functional church-state settlement took away impetus for further reform or agitation. In the northern colonies, early clashes over the unchurching of Dissenters, such as John Checkley

[359] Norman Sykes offers a general, though somewhat uncritical, biography of the London prelate that worked consistently with Whigs in Parliament under Robert Walpole. Sykes, *Edmund Gibson: Bishop of London*, 350-371.

before the Massachusetts General Court, gave way to adjacent concerns. Episcopacy threatened the civil balance, but debates over predestination and freewill, which involved questions of civil polity and church authority in a less confrontational way, persisted.[360] By the late 1730s, however, the arrival of George Whitfield and the unleashing of the Great Awakening, realigned priorities. Anglican reaction towards Whitfield and his brand of emotive preaching was primarily negative. Many other Protestant churches, however, severely divided over accepting this new form of piety or rejecting it as aberrant and destructive of established hierarchies. By the end of the 1750s, the Church of England had become a haven for those colonists seeking a more stable polity, with its rote liturgy and formulaic prayers. The growth of conversions compounded the need for ecclesiastical reforms and additional ministers to handle the expanding mission.[361]

If the Awakenings were a temporary pause on episcopal reform, the nearing victory over France in the Seven Years War increased a desire to further improve the state of the Church of England abroad. Under the newly crowned George III, Richard Holcombe, Bishop of Llandaff and contributor to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, preached that it was time for Anglican renewal. New missions were needed, as there were still "infidel" Englishmen who needed conversion, many "Irish Papists" in the colony of Nova Scotia, and the "Latitudinarian error of the times" threatened missionary efforts.[362] This third complaint linked Holcombe to the High Churchmen criticism of watering down Anglican distinctives towards a broader Protestant

[360] Woolverton offers a general overview of what gripped the Church of England in the New England colonies, without depth of intellectual history. Woolverton, *Colonial Anglicanism*, 152-153, 178-188.
[361] John Woolverton offers a general overview with a focus on the Church of England. Mark Noll gives a benchmark account of how the Great Awakening was pivotal for the development of Evangelicalism within both North America and England. Doug Winiarski shows the darker side of this legacy and the destruction it left for the Congregational establishment in New England. Woolverton, *Colonial Anglicanism*, 189-194. Mark Noll, *The Rise of Evangelicalism: The Age of Edwards, Whitefield and the Wesleys* (Lisle, IL: Intervarsity Press Academic, 2010), 59-76, 108-138, 188-204. Doug L. Winiarski, *Darkness Falls on the Land of Light: Experiencing Religious Awakenings in Eighteenth-Century New England* (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2017), 449-455.
[362] Richard Holcombe, *A Sermon Preached before Incorporated Society for the Propagation of the Gospel* (London: 1761), 13-19, 35-38, 45-46.

coalition. It was not enough to target those who had fallen away from faith or Catholic subjects, but those who were too close to embracing "Latitude," the error of downplaying clerical privileges which dated back to the late Restoration era.[363] SPG missionaries now needed to focus on those churchmen and laity who did not treat the hierarchy with sufficient respect and distanced their patrimony from the defective church governments of other Protestants.

The SPG found an eager ally in East Apthorp. As a New England convert and minister, Apthorp reflected the small vocal community of Anglicans who persisted in a Congregationalist stronghold. Legally, none of the New England colonies had a formal church establishment, though each town had a right to covenant its own church with its own minister to receive mandatory tithes. The existence of Congregationalism received a shock in the "Yale Apostasy" in 1722, when several prominent clergymen and seminarians, including the rector of Yale Timothy Cutler, converted to the Church of England.[364] Apthorp was one of those young men attracted to the superiority of the Church of England among the Protestant churches, understanding church membership as a boon that granted "membership in a common stock, a joint interest and association for mutual advantage." Society was a "mercantile term" and one that required any potential member to weigh which organization was most secure in its legitimacy and title. If "stock" in the Church of England was most likely connected to God's blessings, as its ministers had the clearest and most legitimate succession from the Apostles that Jesus Christ commissioned. The purpose of the church as a society was to offer these privileges to potential converts. It was not to be imposed upon a people with "civil penalties," which

[363] Samuel Fornecker offers a polemical account of how Latitude or Armianism were internal criticisms within the Church of England. Though in an earlier period, they reflect clerical accusations in a slightly later era. Samuel D. Fornecker, *Bisschop's Bench: Contours of Arminian Conformity in the Church of England, c. 1674-1742* (Oxford University Press, 2022), 3-4, 16.
[364] Woolverton, *Colonial Anglicanism*, 128-129.

"would perhaps destroy the whole power of religion" if utilized to protect or support the Church of England when it was under attack.[365]

To advance the Church of England in New England, Apthorp wrote to the SPG to commend its efforts in evangelizing New England. The SPG's choice to only fund Anglican churches and Anglican missions was in no way a blow against "liberty of conscience," since New Englanders had every right to join a church of their own desire. No longer were the sons of the Puritans forced to attend "savage and gloomy" Calvinist churches, but they now had, through SPG largesse, access to the "beauty of holiness" in the Church of England.[366] SPG missions, for Apthorp, were not to defend a broad Protestant Interest that could unite Protestants wherever they were settled in whichever form of church of government. Rather, the SPG was to fuel the growth of the Church of England at the expense of the Congregationalist churches. Religious liberty allowed New Englanders to simply vote with their feet and find a better society to join.

This rejection of broad Protestant cooperation, which New England's Congregationalist establishment had pursued after the Glorious Revolution, rankled New Englanders. Jonathan Mayhew, hardly a dogmatic or orthodox Calvinist, yet a fervent Congregationalist, took up his pen in defense of Congregationalism.[367] Mayhew had previously won his spurs in attacking Anglicanism through a rejection of passive obedience, the doctrine that required subjects to never resist a civil authority, even if he acted unjustly. Mayhew had attacked Charles Stuart as a tyrant who brought French politics and religion to England, and that Puritans had had a right to

[365] East Apthorp, *The Constitution of a Christian Church* (Boston, MA: 1761), 8-13. Rowan Strong has demonstrated how important commercial metaphors were for the SPG as a means of moral uplift and reform. Strong, *Anglicanism and the British Empire*, 62, 70-71.
[366] East Apthorp, *Considerations on the Institution and Conduct of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts* (Boston, MA: 1763), 8-14, 17.
[367] Patrick Mullins gives an intellectual biography of Mayhew as a doctrinally heterodox and rationalist theologian but a defender of New England's Congregationalist establishment. Patrick Mullins, *Father of Liberty: Jonathan Mayhew and the Principles of the American Revolution* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2017), 1-18.

resist him. Since the Church of England revered his "saintship and martyrdom" because he was a good "churchman," loved "hierarchy," and a friend to "[priest]craft," Anglicans must not be permitted to trample the rights of Dissenters in New England.[368] As a talented and trusted defender of the New England way from Anglican critics, Mayhew further defended against Anglican missions among Congregationalists. There was no need for the SPG in an area that was already heavily Christianized. The Society would be better suited to preach among unconverted American Indians and enslaved Africans, who had little knowledge of the gospel. In failing to reach these peoples, the SPG was wasting funds and personnel on rank partisanship between Protestants.[369]

Mayhew had no problem with the Church of England, who had many godly pastors and ministers in its ranks, but the division with Congregationalists. The SPG had a charter that was "catholic in the highest degree" among Protestants to resist "popish priests and Jesuits" in North America. Apthorp, in seeking to set up Anglican missions in New England, had equated Congregationalist churches with Islamic mosques.[370] The so called "beauty of holiness" that Apthorp praised only created hypocrites who had a "zeal for rites and ceremonies, for external modes and forms; especially uninstituted ones, the inventions of men, while the zealots are comparatively negligent of the weightier matters of the law and gospel." These were not men being brought to a richer faith but recreating the old persecuting spirit of the seventeenth century, breeding men who yearned to "shoot dissenters as freely as they might shoot pigeons."[371]

---

[368] Jonathan Mayhew, *A Discourse Concerning Unlimited Submission and Non-Resistance to Higher Power* (Boston, MA: 1750) in ed. Bernard Bailyn, *Pamphlets of the American Revolution, Vol I* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University, 1965), 238-242, 245-246.
[369] Jonathan Mayhew, *Observations on the Charter and Conduct of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts […] with Remarks on the Mistakes of East Apthorp* (Boston, MA: 1763), 5-13; 18-19. Laura Stevens has demonstrated how the plight of Indians was used for inter-church criticism. Stevens, *The Poor Indians*, 85-86, 109-110.
[370] Mayhew, *Observations*, 73-74, 78-80.
[371] Ibid., 93-96.

Anglican missions would only create hatred among Protestants instead of brotherhood and did little to advance true Christianity, as Mayhew understood it, in North America.

If SPG missions in New England did not improve virtue, but only created lukewarm churchmen who liked ceremony and bigotry, what was the real purpose of these missions? The goal was to "episcopize" Congregationalists, as well as all other non-episcopal Protestants throughout North America. By focusing on fellow Protestants, not only did men like Apthorp cede unconverted natives to French Catholicism, but shattered Protestant unity in the pursuit of one church over another in competition with others.[372] It was simply partisanship, the same kind that "wheedled and duped" Charles I to impose Anglican worship on the Scots Presbyterians in the precursor to the Civil Wars. Apthorp, and SPG churchmen like him, dishonored the "moderate Christian spirit of the English bishops since the revolution."[373] If Protestants cooperated then "God would unite all the Societies for the propagation of True Religion, whether in England, Scotland, or America." [374] The policy of the British Empire, for Dissenters like Mayhew, was to promote a wide and broad Protestant Interest against French Catholics. Since the Glorious Revolution in 1688, intensified through the Protestant Hanoverian succession in 1714, a wide irenic Protestant confederation stood united against French efforts to dominate Europe and the world. Intra-Protestant toleration was necessary, under a godly monarchy and a free elected government, for the British Empire to thrive.[375]

Against Mayhew's criticisms of Anglican missions in New England, Henry Caner, another New England Anglican, attacked Mayhew for misunderstanding the purpose of SPG

---

[372] Ibid., 106-112, 119-122.
[373] Ibid., 157-168.
[374] Ibid., 176.
[375] Brendan McConville has demonstrated how the idea that the Hanoverians were godly defenders of the Protestant Interest was common among many American Dissenters. Problems in the Empire were due to Catholics and Jacobites, not the royal family. Brendan McConville, *The King's Three Faces: The Rise and Fall of Royal America, 1688-1776* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina, 2007) 217-222, 264-266.

missions. The SPG was not tasked to evangelize American Indians, but wayward Englishmen who had lapsed into infidelity. The charter, sanctioned by King William (who had fully conformed to the Church of England), was to promote Anglican missions, not all Protestants in general.[376] Mayhew may dislike these efforts, but he had no ground to stand on. New England had no Protestant establishment, formal or informal; but if there was a legal establishment, it was the Church of England, which was "beyond all controversy established in all his majesty's colonies and plantations."[377] However, the point was not to force Mayhew and his Dissenting brethren to conform, but to demonstrate the superiority of the Anglican way, the "glory of the Reformation," so erring New Englanders would be convinced of their errors.[378] If Mayhew wanted Protestant unity, it was through institutional conformity to a single polity, and the only proper basis of unity was a bishop. Against Dissenting suspicions, bishops were purely spiritual, having no civil powers, but only could discipline clergy, confirm new members, and excommunicate the wicked. Anglican bishops were entirely Protestant, so why was Mayhew so hostile to them? Anglicans were "neither French nor Indians, nor Serpents, nor Dragons." Congregationalists should not throw up walls but face the truth that the Church of England was the superior Protestant church.[379]

Caner had thrown down the gauntlet for Mayhew and other Congregationalists. The broad unity Mayhew imagined, where the SPG operated as part of a broad Protestant Interest, respecting different Protestant settlements where they existed, was rejected. The SPG was a specifically Anglican institution for the promotion of the Church of England, even if this meant

[376] Henry Caner, *A Candid examination of Dr. Mayhew's Observations on the charter and conduct of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel* (Boston, MA: 1763), 5-9, 16-24.
[377] Ibid., 27, 38.
[378] Ibid., 54.
[379] Ibid., 81-93.

missionaries seeking to convert Congregationalists. Therefore, as a specifically Anglican body, the SPG and all its supporters should eagerly seek a bishop, the institutional source of unity for Anglicans. Spiritual unity was only possible through institutional unity, and institutional unity was only possible through a bishop. Therefore, Caner agreed that men like him were trying to "episcopize" the Congregationalist churches, though not through force of law. The promised renewal of Great Britain under the new reign of George III meant the explosive growth of the Church of England, competing with, and overcoming, rival English Protestants. An American bishop was therefore necessary for the Church of England to fulfill its mission.

Against Caner, Mayhew continued to reject this fragmentation of Protestant unity. King William III may have conformed to the Church of England, but he maintained his sympathy for Dutch Calvinists as fellow brethren. [380] The SPG, chartered under William, was therefore a "catholic" organization for all Protestants, not of a "narrow, party design" of Anglicans exclusively. Similarly, Caner was wrong to presume that parliamentary act established the Church of England in all places, for that act to establish the Church pertained only to England as English law. The kings of Great Britain were sovereigns over many different locally governed assemblies, that could establish different Protestant churches, legally distinct but spiritually united.[381] This framework not only applied to the religious politics of each colony, but also the institution of slavery. Was Caner suggesting that Virginia law that permitted black slavery was overthrown by English law that did not? Of course not, as each colonial charter allowed for different laws and different legal establishments, even racialized slavery, within a single imperial

[380] Jonathan Mayhew, *A Defence of the Observation on the Charter and Conduct of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, Against an Anonymous Pamphlet* (Boston, MA: 1763), 3-4.
[381] Ibid., 26-29, 38-43.

union.[382] Therefore, the local rights of New Englanders in "liberty of conscience" about church meant that every town had a right to "legally chuse, settle and support a protestant minister of any denomination, whether Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Congregationalist, Baptist, or Lutheran." Since Congregationalists had been settled throughout New England, these churches were churches by law, which was ratified by the "august visible head of their own church."[383] The problem was not, for Mayhew, bishops in the abstract, as the Church of England currently had bishops "of moderation; lovers of civil and Christian liberty as well as of learning; and encouragers of the latter even among non-conformists." The problem was imposing a church establishment, including bishops, where a Protestant establishment already existed. [384]

In Mayhew's construal, the Church of England was not, intrinsically, the enemy. It was the church settlement for England, where it had its own ironically Protestant episcopal bench, over a Protestant people. The problem was exporting this to colonies where there was already a Protestant establishment. It was not at the colonial level, but at the local level, where Congregationalism existed, and this had, in Mayhew's recounting, received royal sanction. The British Empire had no single Protestant church establishment, but it was committed to Protestants anywhere within its dominions, promoting their mutual welfare. The problem was the idea of Anglicans introducing intra-Protestant competition, wasting energy and resources in dividing Protestants. The fixation over a bishop was not simply rehashing old Puritan polemics against prelacy, for Mayhew accepted that bishops were not intrinsically bad. The issue was an

[382] Ibid., 52-54. Mayhew's notion of a royal confederacy, where each colonial assembly acted as a semi-autonomous parliament under the king, has been more widely described in the work of Eliga Gould on the transformations of the British Empire over the late eighteenth century. For Mayhew's reference to African slavery as an Anglican embarrassment, Travis Glasson has demonstrated ambiguity within the SPG over slavery and efforts to reform it. Eliga H. Gould, *The Persistence of Empire: British Political Culture in the Age of the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina, 2000), 123-136. Glasson, *Mastering Christianity*, 75-110.
[383] Mayhew, *A Defence of the Observation*, 57-64.
[384] Ibid., 91.

attempt to disrupt the spiritual unity of the Protestant Interest through what was effectively denominational competition.

As the Seven Years War concluded, with a victory for Britain over their ancient foe, the empire was strained. Not only had Britain acquired the new colony of Canada with a foreign and Catholic population, but Britain had also, indirectly, acquired dominance over the subcontinent of India after the East India Company's victory at Plassey a few years earlier in 1757. The new burdens of empire, ruling over large foreign populations, and a new youthful king had brought "reformers" to the government. The luxuries of commerce were fruits of victory, but they were also dangers that could corrupt Britain and make incapable of rule. If George III and the "reformers" were to effectively preserve British dominance on land and sea, then belts must be tightened, participation in imperial protection must be mandated, and all subjects, wherever they may be, must contributed to the wellbeing of the empire under an imperial and sovereign Parliament.[385]

It was amid these imperial reforms that controversy over Anglican missions, and an American bishop, continued to roil. In response to Mayhew's attacks on supposed failures of the SPG and delegitimizing of Congregationalist churches, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Secker, responded. A former Dissenter himself, Secker believed bishops were a purely spiritual office, with no civil powers intrinsic to the office (their baronial status in England was a product of civil law but did not pertain to the episcopate).[386] Secker was not trying to call Congregationalists into question, but not every English colonist in North America, even in New

[385] Justin du Rivage has argued a revisionist account of how the Battle of Plassey and victory in the Seven Years War led to a transformation of the British Empire, which many colonists rejected. This view fits the growing hostility from critics of a colonial bishop as part of a wider transformation of the British Empire. Justin du Rivage, *Revolution Against Empire: Taxes, Politics, and the Origins of American Independence* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2017), 77-79.
[386] Thomas Secker, *An Answer to Dr. Mayhew's Observations on the Charter and Conduct of the Society* (London: 1764), 3-5.

England, could conform to the local church. Additionally, the Great Awakening had "wearied out" many Congregationalists and had "induced them to seek a peaceable Refuge in our Communion." Given these conditions, it was more than fair for the SPG to provide ministers to these Anglican converts and have a growing mission in New England where there were several New Englanders seeking to conform to the Church of England.[387] Given these numbers, the SPG was incapable of handling ministry in the colonies and North America required a bishop to impose spiritual discipline and powers over its clergy. According to Secker's plan, there would be two bishops, in compliance with the king's discretion, placed in North America, who could ordain and discipline clergy, as well as confirm new members. American bishops, unlike English bishops, would have no power in civil affairs, having no power to judge civil or marital law cases. If Dissenters in England could tolerate mild bishops with mild civil powers, then surely Dissenters in North America could tolerate pure bishops with only spiritual powers.[388]

Mayhew, however, did not live to counter Secker, dying suddenly in 1764. Charles Chauncy, another Old Light stalwart in Boston and critic of the Great Awakening,[389] took up Mayhew's mantle to defend the Protestant Interest. Prior to clashing with Secker, Chauncy had already demonstrated a firm defense of the New England way, arguing from Scripture and church history for the legitimacy of Congregationalist orders. Bishops were only ever innovated as a product of royal government, with even the original Reformers in the Church of England rejecting episcopacy as a distinct office. Original Church of England Protestants were on "very different foot from that of a jus divinum" and would side with Congregationalists as having

[387] Ibid., 10-11, 19.
[388] Ibid., 48-57.
[389] Marsden has included in his biography of Jonathan Edwards how Mayhew was a critic of the Great Awakening on account of his theological heterodoxy, opposing Edwards' mostly orthodox Calvinism and his support for the revivals. George Marsden, *Jonathan Edwards: A Life* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2004), 269-272.

equally valid orders.[390] Now Chauncy took this same approach in defending Mayhew from his critics. Eulogizing the departed minister as a "friend to liberty both civil and religious," Mayhew always trumpeted "what saith Scripture?" against critics of the New England way. As an "avowed enemy to all human establishments in religion, especially the establishment of meer ceremonial rites as necessary to Christian communion," Mayhew rejected efforts to force a bishop onto America, rebuking that "respectable society at home" which had abused "charity for the propagation of Episcopacy." It was not simply Congregationalists defending themselves that provoked this criticism, but even "some of the Episcopal perswasion" were "with him in his sentiments upon the main point he had in view." [391] Mayhew's legacy was as a firm defender of the Protestant Interest, which cut across different Protestant churches, to prevent competition. The SPG's turn to establishing missions in New England, even a bishop, was fanning the flames of sectarian division. An American bishop was primarily a sign of denominational warfare than distinct, but aligned, Protestant establishments within a shared British Empire.

Against Chauncy's eulogy, Jeremiah Learning, a New Englander and lay Anglican, defended Secker's plan from its critics. The reason why Anglicans grew in New England was because of Congregationalist insufficiency. Anglicans, through their bishops, could claim an uninterrupted chain of ministers back to the Apostles. Could Chauncy say the same for his ordination? Congregationalist ministers claimed a direct ordination from Christ, but that was, for Learning, absurd. In the Bible, the Apostle Paul had requested the Ephesian elders to ordain Timothy as a bishop. Similarly, in his contemporary New England, the lower house of Connecticut could only pass laws if the governor, as royal vicar, gave the king's approval. In both church and state a parallel logic operated through representation, Christ through his bishops

[390] Charles Chauncy, *The Validity of Presbyterian Orders Asserted* (Boston, MA: 1762), 74-76, 83-87.
[391] Charles Chauncy, *A Discourse occasioned by the death of the Reverend Dr. Mayhew* (Boston, MA: 1766), 27-30.

and the king through his royal governors. If Chauncy denied this logic, as he would as a Congregationalist, he was no different than a Quaker, rejecting all ministerial hierarchy.[392]

On the other side of the Atlantic, the cry for an American bishop gained further support. John Ewer, bishop of Llandaff, preached before the SPG that the colonial Church of England required colonial bishops. Analogizing from natural law, all creatures have a right to self-preservation, but Human beings also have a need for higher things (such as religion, art, morality, science) which were from beyond Nature. These needs were not intrinsic but must be taught within any Human society. The Church of England fulfilled these higher needs, with a bishop to produce new clerical teachers to bring these needs to Englishmen in the colonies. Requiring Anglican ordinands to travel across the Atlantic to have their commission was absurd, given that French Catholics had their own bishop in America. Dissenters in the colonies need not worry about the presence of a bishop, which was a purely spiritual office that had no civil powers and claimed no spiritual powers over non-Anglicans. Bishops only had the powers "to ordain ministers, confirm youth, and to visit their own clergy." Bishops in North America were necessary to meet the higher needs of English society, allowing the colonial church to mature into its full mission.[393]

With this metropolitan blessing, Thomas Bradbury Chandler, an Anglican priest operating for the SPG in New Jersey, advocated more forcefully for an American episcopate. A New England Dissenter by birth, Chandler found a kindred spirit in the new Archbishop of Canterbury, to whom he dedicated his apology for a colonial bishop. Chandler wrote this work at the request of Samuel Johnson, another New Englander convert who moved to the Middle

[392] Jeremiah Leaming, *Defence of Episcopal government of the church* (New York City: 1766), 7-16, 19-22.
[393] John Ewer, *Sermon Preached before the Incorporated Society for the Propagation of the Gospel* (London: 1767), 3-8, 14-17.

Colonies, who hoped Chandler would refute all those who were "misrepresenting the matter" of an American see. Chandler was carrying on the battle that had begun back in the 1720s, where John Talbot had been a vigorous partisan for a colonial see. Now was the time, Chandler believed, to fulfill what Talbot had fought for his whole ministry.[394] Like Talbot and Secker, Chandler argued that bishops were a purely spiritual office, having no civil powers, and thus was no threat to the religious liberty of Dissenters. The "real nature" of the episcopal office was not limited to geography or to particular kingdoms, but was only "government, ordination and confirmation" within the membership of the Church of England. Citing the former Archbishop of Canterbury, John Potter, bishops were an entirely spiritual office, but also necessary as successors to the Apostles, the only legitimate source of ordination.[395] While groups of colonial priests had gathered to pragmatically govern the colonial Church of England, these were irregular affairs and tainted with Presbyterianism.[396] If Anglicans were to have regular government over their own affairs as a spiritual body, they needed local bishops to act.

Dissenters, however, failed to understand the true nature of episcopacy. According to Chandler, Dissenters believed the Church of England was a civil institution and would, if given power, seek to control all non-episcopal Protestants. But that was preposterous, Chandler argued, because bishops never had power over non-Anglicans since "religion being a matter of free choice" was always non-coercive. The Church of England was "in the very nature of it a voluntary society." One only was an Anglican if one chose to join or remain in the Church. Having only a "spiritual nature," clergy could only punish through excommunication, barring reception of sacraments, but never had the power to punish the body, which alone belonged to

[394] Thomas Bradbury Chandler, *An Appeal to the Public in Behalf of the Church of England in America* (New York City: 1767), i-ii, ix-x.
[395] Ibid., 2-18.
[396] Ibid., 27-29.

the civil magistrate. Rather than priestcraft, as Dissenters maligned, excommunication was the only means for clergy to preserve good behavior in a voluntary society. If bishops were in the colonies, Chandler believed, Anglicans would behave better and would improve the broader morality of the colonies. Therefore, bishops benefited non-Anglicans through greater moral conformity.[397] Further proof was in the existence of Moravian and Roman Catholic bishops in America, which had never threatened the colonial government or sought to impose their religion on all others. If these churches could have bishops, which were barely Protestant or not at all, then why could Anglicans not have the same privilege?[398] Anglican bishops, like their Moravian counterparts, "shall have no authority but purely of a spiritual and ecclesiastical nature, such as is derived altogether from the church and not from the state."[399]

Dissenters, however, were not living up to their professed principles. If they, as they claimed, believed in "the principles of religious liberty," then Dissenters should support an Anglican bishop. Contrary to accusations that the settlement of an Anglican bishop was concomitant with the Stamp Act, the hated tax that rallied opposition across North America against Parliament's internal trade regulations. Such a claim was a "vile and malicious representation of the case" and the settlement of a colonial bishop had nothing to do with this "unconstitutional oppressive act." Chandler was explicit that a colonial bishop would have "no authority over dissenters, nor indeed to exercise discipline over our people, the clergy excepted."[400] Nevertheless, Dissenters were mad to consider the imposition of tithes as a great fear. Just as Parliament had a right to impose taxes because it represented the people who paid, so too did the clergy represent the laity and had a right to require tithes, according to the "law of

[397] Ibid., 30-34.
[398] Ibid., 41-42.
[399] Ibid., 79.
[400] Ibid., 83-96.

nature," as their due.[401] This analogy fit Chandler's broader division between spiritual and temporal powers. Bishops were spiritual monarchs over a spiritual kingdom as kings were civil monarchs over a civil kingdom. These were not only the best form of government in each respective realm, but they mutually supported one another, teaching obedience to proper authority in proper realm. As Dissenters loved the king, they should also love Anglican bishops, both promoting a proper respect for monarchy, even if they could not, in good conscience, be Anglicans.[402]

Chandler's defense of the Church of England adopted a radical separation between spiritual and civil authority. Even more, spiritual authority was entirely voluntary and had no coercive ability to impose any penalties upon the body or property. Though clergy had a right to claim tithes, enforcement was never through church courts. The Church of England had no intrinsic or fundamental relationship to either the king or to Parliament but was simply an apostolic branch of the church Jesus Christ established, tracing its legitimacy through episcopal successions. Rather than an outpost for greater metropolitan control over the colonies, Chandler had also denounced the Stamp Act as unjust. Instead, the colonial Church of England was one more spiritual organization, constituted of its members alone, that a right to organize itself and spread as it saw fit. Chandler even equivocated Anglican bishops with non-Protestant or quasi-Protestant episcopal denominations, framing this debate primarily about religion in the abstract rather than any common Protestant front. Bishops were simply the governors of entirely spiritual voluntary societies that had no more power than regulating the rolls of its membership.[403]

---

[401] Ibid., 100-106.
[402] Ibid., 115.
[403] James Livesey has demonstrated how civil society was more of a tactical retreat/buffer than an actual *tertium quid* between public politics and private life. In his account, he focuses on Scotland and Ireland, but the same is applicable to analyzing churches as spiritual and voluntary societies. James Livesey, *Civil Society and Empire: Ireland and Scotland in the Eighteenth-Century Atlantic World* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009), 3-23.

However, Dissenters rejected this idea of mutually competing Protestants on a broad religious field of competition. William Livingston, a noted lawyer and politician in the Middle Colonies and fervent Presbyterian, decried the Anglican tendency to treat New England like a mission field. Denouncing the "impudent informer" that had misled the Bishop of Llandaff, Livingston defended New England as a place where "Christianity has not only been supported, but so faithfully preached, and so zealously inculcated, that I will venture to affirm, there is not a more virtuous, no a more religious people upon the face of the earth." These New Englanders, like Presbyterians among the Swiss, Dutch, and Scots, lacked bishops, but were superior in morals to most English Christians.[404] The SPG had misconstrued the state of Protestant faith in New England for its own advantage, seeking to squander its funds and missionaries to convert already converted Protestants. Instead of improving the spiritually dilapidated churches of Maryland and Virginia, which had become immoral and indifferent, the SPG only thought in terms of institutional competition. No SPG minister could compare to New England's own John Eliot, a puritan missionary in the seventeenth century who had translated the Bible into Algonquian and other native languages. Instead of seeking to convert them, the SPG and the Bishop of Llandaff should praise New England Congregationalism, which "justly merits a note of approbation, from the pen of a Christian bishop." [405]

In response to Livingston, Charles Inglis, an Anglican rector in New York City, defended both the need for SPG missions in New England and a colonial bishop. The Bishop of Llandaff's sermon was not to condemn New England Congregationalists, but to signal support for New England Anglicans. Livingston was "fighting with his own shadow" to equate support for

[404] William Livingston, *A Letter to the Right Reverend Father in God, John, Lord Bishop of Landau* (New York City: 1768), 1-4.
[405] Ibid., 10-17.

Anglicans as hostility towards Congregationalists, as the SPG was designed to support Anglicans wherever they may be, just as Congregationalist churches sought their own internal support.[406] If Congregationalists happened to convert to the Church of England on account of its superior worship and ministry, that was not an intentional attack on Congregationalists, only a failure on their part.[407] If, however, Livingston wanted to dredge up the past of New England godliness, he should remember that "New England rum and cyder killed more Indians than ever the New-England ministers truly converted."[408] The SPG, in contrast, had made inroads with the Mohawk, the Moskito, and among west African nations, even having a black Anglican missionary in Philip Quaque. These efforts spurred great labor among other churches to reach the nations, a mutual push to send more missionaries out into the field.[409]

It was for this reason that colonial Anglicans needed a local bishop. Only an American episcopate would provide the order and organize to continue missions, ordaining the necessary number of ministers to evangelize and instruct. Bishops were an entirely spiritual office only for the regulation of its own clergy. Unlike the baronial office that "bishops in England derive from the state," the core powers of the bishop were strictly spiritual. Livingston, failing to parse the difference between spiritual and civil authorities as distinct realms, prejudiced his readers to think a colonial bishop would be identical to a metropolitan bishop. In their essential powers to ordain and discipline bad priests, bishops would never interfere with the "dignity or authority or interest" of colonial government in its role as civil magistrate. Payment for a bishop would be entirely voluntary, taken from free will offerings and SPG collections. Also, Inglis promised, an

[406] [Charles Inglis], *A Vindication of the Bishop of Landaff's Sermon from the Gross Misrepresentations and Abusive Reflections, contained in Mr. William Livingston's Letter to his Lordship* (Boston, MA: 1768), 6-26.
[407] Ibid., 36-37.
[408] Ibid., 43-44.
[409] Ibid., 54-61.

American bishop would not be settled where Dissenters were a majority, which would further relax fears of an Anglican captivity.[410]

Between Livingston and Inglis, sparring over the encroachment of Anglicans into Congregationalist New England, revealed a rival vision of Protestant unity. While Inglis foreswore competition, it was not a problem if Anglicans were successfully evangelizing Congregationalists away from their informal establishment. In fact, the jealousy stirred up would improve outreach among the different nations. For Livingston, not only was the desire for SPG support and an American bishop a slap in the face to the most Christianized region of North American (in his estimation), but these missions also broke apart broader Protestant unity. Religious liberty, for a united front of the Protestant Interest, meant mutual recognition among Protestants against French Catholics, Indian Heathens, and various others outside the irenic umbrella of shared faith. For Anglican partisans of a bishop, in contrast, the churches foreswore all ties with civil government (except as an accident of successful evangelization) in the pursuit to grow its own organization. Conceptualized as a voluntary society, the Church of England had no coercive powers except to discipline its own membership and produce new officers. On the surface, this retreat inward was no threat to other churches who, similarly, provided for themselves. But through a more incisive analysis, this process shattered any sense of mutual Protestant Interest towards competition between various Christian denominations for their own benefit. The SPG was not to uplift all Protestants throughout the British Empire, it was specifically for the Church of England, treated almost as a denomination in a marketplace of competition with other churches, whether Protestant or non-Protestant. Religious liberty, in this

[410] Ibid., 64-67.

framework, was the right to practice religion in general, whether it was specifically Protestant or not.

Chauncy, rejoining the conflict, wrote a longform work against Chandler, arguing against a colonial episcopate. Contrary to the claims that bishops were necessary for the constitution of the Church of England, Chauncy appealed to the Reformers. Like other Protestants, the Reformers believed that bishop and presbyter had the same basic set of powers, with bishops put over priests as royal overseers to maintain good government in the realm.[411] Given that bishops were just royal commissioners, there was no need for colonial Anglicans to have bishops, since their presbyters could ordain new ministers if they needed to replenish their ranks. The only difference between bishop and presbyter, for Chauncy, was that the former had civil powers. Therefore, Chandler's desire for an American bishop must be a desire for greater royal control over the colonies.[412] Chauncy here was not simply exposing Chandler's true intentions, it was also integrated with a growing hostility to "Tories" who diminished the powers of colonial assemblies. After the Stamp Act, these associations, regardless if true, blackened the character of an opponent. To accuse Chandler of wanting greater royal oversight was to trash his entire argument for an American episcopate as tyranny.[413]

Furthermore, bishops were no boon to greater collective morality. Citing Nonjuror Charles Leslie, who had advocated bishops *jure divino* as necessary to the Church of England, the current Church of England was bloated with corrupt clergy, with many of them, in the colonies, as political creatures from the Bishop of London. For Chauncy, given that an American

[411] Charles Chauncy, *The Appeal to the Public Answered* (Boston, MA: 1768), 7-10.
[412] Ibid., 34-36.
[413] The category of "Tory" was still used polemically as a disloyal, crypto-Catholic, authoritarian. Justin du Rivage has demonstrated how it became a term of abuse among self-professed Whigs on both sides of the Atlantic. du Rivage, *Revolution Against Empire*, 1-23.

bishop would be drawn from the same crop of colonial ministers, a colonial episcopate would likely promote corruption and immorality. Chauncy further praised Leslie that, as a critic, he was right that infidels and libertines mocked Christian churches for immoral clergy. Therefore, more clergy, even a bishop, would offer no real solution. Instead, a disciplined and moral laity would be the only force for renewal. England had bishops, but most of the English nobility and gentry were immoral and openly disdainful of clerical censures. If England's bishops could not restrain wicked laity, what hope would an American bishop have, who was even weaker and poorer than his metropolitan brethren. Instead of Chandler's disclaimed that bishops would only discipline clergy, Chauncy advocated that if there was a bishop in America, he must certainly discipline the laity. Anything less was self-sabotage.[414] Additionally, if a bishop would inspire more reverence in the laity, as Chandler claimed, then why was not the omnipresence of God sufficient? If clergy were badly behaved knowing God was watching them, why would they act differently before a handful of bishops scattered across a large continent? The whole scheme of creating more government to impose greater morality was self-defeating.[415] If Chandler was delusional for believing bishops would improve the morality of Englishmen, he was even more delusional if it would improve missionary work among the Indians. It may be true, as Chandler believed, that an Anglican bishop would help convert natives to English cultural norms, but this evangelism would not produce godliness. If anything, converting American Indians to Englishness made them worse. Chauncy pointed at failed efforts in Massachusetts, lamenting his own people's failure to inculcate moral behavior, and instead had depopulated these nations. It was not English

[414] Chauncy, *The Appeal to the Public Answered*, 63-70.
[415] Ibid., 76-79.

civilization, but peaceable conversion through moral living, that could convert natives. A bishop offered nothing to this program. [416]

Instead of looking to government office, one that was still, contrary to Chandler's defense of a spiritual office, dependent on George III, as "supreme head" of the Church of England, Chandler should focus on conversion of the heart.[417] Chandler's scheme was not only a failure, but entirely alien to the constitution of the Church of England, that did not know a bishop without civil powers. If Chandler was convinced about a wholly spiritual non-coercive episcopate, he should work to see that implemented first in England. [418] Therefore, Anglicans should focus on renewing their own people where they were dominant, particularly in Maryland and Virginia. If Anglicans like Chandler were so desperate for a bishop, then they should just appoint one among themselves and get on with their ministry. But they would not, because Chandler was addicted to "high-church tory principles and maxims" that departed from pure Protestant faith.[419] If Chandler were worried about Dissenters being insufficiently loyal to the British king, he should look inward, for it was not Dissenters, but Anglicans, who teemed with "red hot Jacobites."[420] It was Anglicans who saw bishops as "absolute monarchs in church" who were in danger of departing from the "wisely contrived mixture of power" in the British constitution. [421] Rather than separating apart a spiritual from a civil realm of authority, postulating an absolute sovereignty in both, Chauncy had argued for the mixed constitution, which limited the power of ministers in relation to laity (as kings had to consult their subjects). By equating bishops with royal ministers, Chauncy also denied the radical independence of

[416] Ibid., 120-126.
[417] Ibid., 137-138.
[418] Ibid., 144-148.
[419] Ibid. 155-165.
[420] Ibid., 185-188.
[421] Ibid., 199.

church office from state oversight. There was no radically separated spiritual power within a broadly Protestant empire.

Again, Chauncy's criticisms, Chandler once more rejected the notion that bishops meant civil authority. The original office of bishop was wholly spiritual, and as long as colonists desired a broad religious liberty, there would never be civil powers for bishops. It was only fair, based on Britain's policy of religious liberty, to allow Anglicans to have the full exercise of their offices, as much as any other Protestant church had full use of its officers in the colonies.[422] Chauncy had misunderstood the English Reformers, who only understood bishops as royal overseers in their capacity as peers of the realm. They understood, according to Chandler, that bishops were a higher office to presbyter. Contrary to Chuancy, the inequality of office was a distinctly Protestant position, since it was "from popish schoolmen and canonists," who had been "for some Ages endeavoring to destroy the Distinction between the two Orders," that the equality of office emerged.[423] To support this view, that Presbyterianism was closer to Roman Catholicism that episcopacy, Chandler cited "the high-flying Dr. Hickes" as part of his argument.[424] As an early Nonjuror, who had vocally argued for the radical separation between spiritual and civil powers, Chandler saw a fellow ally in the Nonjuring wing of the Church of England, who had advanced these views forcefully and convincingly. It was uniquely Protestant to defend bishops as superior, and this idea of ministerial equality was "revenge for rejecting the Pope's supremacy."[425] Chauncy, not unlike Deist heretics, ended up embracing a kind of royal papacy, giving kings the power to regulate the churches. As much as bishops were monarchs

[422] Thomas Bradbury Chandler, *The Appeal Defended,: or, the proposed American episcopate vindicated* (New York City: 1769), 7-16.
[423] Ibid., 19-25.
[424] Ibid., 30.
[425] Ibid., 48.

with "authority purely ecclesiastical," the king was only the "political father" of the British Empire. Chauncy, like both Deist heretics and Roman Catholics, had granted the king powers that did not belong to him.[426] If the citation of Nonjuror Hickes had tainted Chandler's argument, he was not alone. John Potter and Andrew Snape, High Churchmen and conformists, had also agreed with the same argument that bishops had a unique office from presbyters and were spiritually autonomous from civil power. Loyalty to the House of Hanover was consistent with a view of entirely separated bishops as spiritual monarchs.[427]

However, despite Chauncy allying himself to Roman Catholics and Deists, Chandler still considered him a Protestant Christian. Even if he were ignorant, he still professed faith in Christ. Chauncy was like Quakers who were wrong about the efficacy of sacraments, having rejected all outward ritual, but were sincere in their belief. This toleration based on sincerity had limits, as Muslims and Pagans did not claim to be following the Bible or Apostolic custom. But for Chandler, every church, even if Quaker or Roman Catholic, had a right to toleration, as much as a man may mistakenly act for a king even if he had a faulty commission. In other words, other Protestants may have no legitimate ministry, no legitimate ministers, but they thought they did and that was sufficient. God would be gracious with their erroneous judgement.[428] Chandler, here, struck a severe blow against any broader sense of Protestant unity. It was not a problem, for Chandler as an Anglican, that other Protestants had no legitimate sacraments, no legitimate clergy, and no legitimate churches. They were no different than Quakers who also had no orders, and no different than Roman Catholics who also had mistakenly believed their doctrines. While

[426] Ibid., 49-57. Ashley Walsh has demonstrated how Deists could also advocate royal supremacy under a sacred king, opposed entirely to all independent clerical power. Walsh, *Civil Religion and the Enlightenment in England,* 59-79.
[427] Chandler, *The Appeal Defended*, 62-63.
[428] Ibid., 71-72.

Chandler did not extend this toleration to Muslims and Pagans, it was only because they did not claim to operate within a shared Christian framework. Therefore, religious liberty in the British Empire had no firm Protestant boundaries, but could encompass something approximating religion in the abstract, permitting various churches to freely convert and interact for their own ends.

Bishops, then, were only there to offer spiritual legitimacy over spiritual affairs within the spiritual corporation of the Church of England. Bishops grounded that terrible clerical power of excommunication, which allowed a minister to cut off the wayward and unrepentant from communion with the church. If the excommunicated never restored relationship with the church, his salvation was in jeopardy. Bishops were the ultimate arbiters of this power, who could discipline the lesser clergy when they crossed the line. Dissenters, then, should seek an Anglican bishop for the colonies, since they bad Anglican priests may be defrocked and excommunicated if they overstepped their boundaries or practiced immorality, especially if they harassed non-episcopal Protestants.[429] It was true that the British Parliament upheld the Test Act, which required conformity to the Church of England to hold office, but that was only because Dissenters had, during the Civil Wars, destroyed the kingdom. That was not a problem in the colonies, and all in the past, so Dissenters should simply move on and accept colonial bishops that abjured all civil power.[430] If this account was not convincing, Chandler turned to the natural basis of all political societies. Every polity, according to "natural rights," had a right to determine its spiritual allegiance, "without any distinction of Christian or Pagan Protestant or Papist," by civil statute. Tithes, that Dissenters had to pay in England to the Church of England, were simply

[429] Ibid., 107-111.
[430] Ibid., 139-146.

taxes imposed on those outside the legal establishment of a spiritual corporation.[431] In just and free societies, like Britain, this church order only came with the consent of the people.[432] It was up to the wider society to determine which was the best religion for legal settlement, without confounding civil and spiritual authorities. Religion was thus to be determined through measured decision and natural reason:

> In my Judgement of the Matter, Religion under every Form ought to be regarded, in a greater or less Degree, as perhaps the worst Form of it is better than none at all; and under all Forms it ought to be tolerated, as far as is consistent with the public Safety. But as no Man, nor Society of Men, can be under Obligations to promote or propagate any Religion, which is believed by him or them to be false; so all men are obliged to promote the Interests of what they believe to be the true Religion, and more especially after any signal Interpositions of divine Providence in their Favor.[433]

Therefore, the SPG was, contrary to Chauncy, fulfilling its mission in expanding the broad base of English religious culture. What it meant to be British was a general attachment to pure and natural religion, that improved general morality and education, teaching submission to proper authorities. Therefore, if Chauncy wanted Anglicans, or more particularly the SPG, to convert the natives, then he had to adjust his understanding. According to Chandler, missionaries first made natives culturally British, then they could understand and fully adopt British religion. Ideally this conversion would be to the Church of England, as the best church available, but true conversion was not possible without this cultural immersion first. [434] In other words, Chandler believed that civil society preceded spiritual society, that one understood broad religion in the

[431] Ibid., 148-149.
[432] Ibid., 156-157.
[433] Ibid., 180-181.
[434] Ibid., 186-189.

abstract (which civil governments have a right to promote, even if they cannot create or regulate it) which would lead then to voluntary subscription to a particular church confession. The British Empire was not fundamentally Protestant then, for what it meant to be a just and free empire was to allow a broad base of various religious alignment, according to the conscience, promoting the best (which, as an Anglican, was obviously the Church of England). This arrangement formed not only the organization, and differentiation, between civil and spiritual society, but also how missionary efforts should be arranged.

Chauncy, unlike Chandler, had cofounded these arrangements. When Chauncy had suggested presbyters should simply ordain a bishop for themselves, if they were so desperate, perhaps even asking the Bishop of London's commissioner, Chandler balked. Ecclesiastical commissioners were not spiritual officers, they had civil powers to help the Church of England from the king and Parliament. Only bishops, as spiritual monarchs, had the right to ordain. This power came to bishops successively, dating back to the Apostles and to Jesus Christ. Chauncy, as a Dissenter, did not understand the distinction between civil and spiritual powers, something quite common among New England's Congregationalists, who had cruelly executed Quakers and accused witches for a supposed spiritual offense in the late seventeenth century. Dissenters, manifest in their bouts of persecution, never truly understood the differentiation between spiritual powers (which existed only with spiritual authorities, like bishops) from civil powers, which only pertained to crimes of the body, not belief. Dissenters, Chandler argued, should follow Anglicans, understanding spiritual errors could only be defeated through reasoned argument in a society that promoted religious liberty. The Anglican "clergy of England are in general friends to religious freedom," unlike Congregationalists, and would further preserve the

separation between spiritual and civil powers.[435] Like the kings of England, bishops were spiritual monarchs "regulated by fixed laws," that prevented the tyranny of popery. "Primitive, or Protestant episcopacy" was what the Church of England practiced, and it comported with the Hanoverian mixed constitution against Congregationalist democracy.[436] In Chandler's estimation, separation between spiritual and civil power came from parallel institutions that mutually supported one another. While Dissenters like Chauncy had confused these powers (manifest in witch trials) and insinuated constitutional changes (democratic Congregationalism subtracted from royalty), they ultimately imbued spiritual powers into a civil society that they expected to operate on behalf of a shared Protestant Interest. Religious liberty was, for Chandler, only possible if the powers were separated into different corporations, which they could establish bonds with one another. But there was separation and an order to their enactment, as nature preceded supernature. In Chandler's Anglican vision for the British Empire, a vague religious settlement allowed many churches, even heterodox ones, to compete with one another.

Chauncy once more responded, though he was growing irate with Chandler's romp through scriptural and ancient history to justify bishops. The core issue was a colonial bishop in North America, which had greater powers than Scripture ever allowed. Chauncy accepted "bishop" as referring to the local pastor of a congregation, but it did not mean an inequality in office. Chauncy even accused Chandler of having accepted the arguments of Benjamin Hoadly, a controversial Whig bishop that seemingly dissolved all clerical power to mere teaching and persuasive authority, that the episcopate was a Human invention. If bishops were a convention from the Apostles, not God himself, then they could not be said to be necessary or by "divine

[435] Ibid., 225-226.
[436] Ibid., 255-256.

appointment" which Chandler had seemingly argued for in his books.[437] Listing examples of Medieval ecclesiastical jurists who had accepted the possibility of priests ordaining a new bishop *in extremis*, then Chandler had no reason to demand that an Apostolic bishop was needed to ordain a bishop for the colonies. Republishing Jean Claude, a Huguenot historian of the Reformation, Chauncy quoted favorably:

> Whenever any person is invested into supream power, and the society over which he is placed is independent on other societies, such a person can never be placed in his power if not by them who must after be his subjects, unless by his predecessor, which no society can depend upon for a constant rule of succession.[438]

Therefore, for Chauncy, Chandler's arguments were worthless because sovereignty was not alienable to any individual indefinitely (be it a king or a bishop) but was inalienable to a society as a whole and could be reclaimed when necessary. A gathering of Christians could appoint one of their own as a pastor, as much as a gathering of subjects may select someone to succeed as king. There was no unbroken line of ministers that preserved a spiritual, or civil, body and its legitimacy.

It was this mistaken notion of sovereignty that led Chandler to embrace even Roman Catholics as having valid orders. How, Chauncy wrote with venom, could Chandler consider the "foul, filthy, old, withered harlot, the foulest and filthiest that was ever seen" of Roman Catholicism as having more legitimate clergy than non-episcopal Protestants like Chauncy?[439] If these spiritual powers were lodged entirely in an Apostolic priesthood, regardless of how much error and idolatry it had fallen into, then Chandler should receive episcopal ordination from the

[437] Charles Chauncy, *Dr Chauncy's Reply to Dr Chandler's Appeal Defended* (Boston, MA: 1770), 17-26.
[438] Ibid., 58-61
[439] Ibid., 65.

Catholic Bishop of Quebec. Surely, Chauncy suggested, the French prelate would oblige these British Anglicans an ordination, given how kind the Parliament had been to allow French Catholics religious liberty. Chauncy also recommended that the Anglicans could receive an equally valid ordination from a Moravian bishop, given that they too owed Parliament a favor for allowing their settlement within the British Empire.[440] Mockery aside, Chauncy had hit the nerve of difference between a broadly Protestant Interest, modestly indifferent to institutional boundaries, and these pro-bishop partisans that cared only for institutional succession. It did not, theoretically, matter if episcopacy had come from a Protestant with sound doctrine (and it surely did not if the Church of England traced itself back through the Middle Ages). What mattered was institutional continuation, a spiritual corporation that could subsist through the ages in a variety of different realms, with less or more error, but with a legitimate clerical hierarchy.

Again, if North American Anglicans wanted a bishop, they could "ransack the whole earth, that they may enjoy truly apostolic episcopacy" from some legitimate bishop who could ordain them. But that they did not pursue this scheme was proof that Chandler was deceiving or deceived about the nature of Anglican episcopacy. English bishops were never simply clergy, but also peers of the realm, seated in the House of Lords and awarded civil power.[441] If Chandler wanted a purely spiritual bishop, he would have to substantially change canon law in his own church. Contrary to claims about apostolic origins, the Church of England was fundamentally a royal church, with a king as its supreme head and the only authority capable of calling Convocation to settle doctrinal and governmental issues. If Chandler denied the royal headship

[440] Ibid., 91-93.
[441] Ibid., 103-108.

over the Church, he excommunicated himself in denying the very constitution he claimed to defend.[442]

Additionally, the idea that colonial bishops would subsist on free-will offerings, when English bishops were awarded landed estates, would attract no prelate to come to the Americas. These bishops, according to Chandler, would also have no power to discipline the laity, a marked departure from the English episcopal bench. In both cases, Chandler severely diminished episcopal dignity and power, making bishops impotent to govern. Chauncy denied Chandler's plea that different parts of the empire allowed different settlements of bishops, from the pure mode in the colonies against the legally buffered episcopate in England. Chauncy, in contrast, appealed to imperial unity. Anglicans were under the same king and under the same Parliament, regardless if they lived in England or Pennsylvania or New England. Bishops were not like worldly kings that had more or less power depending on different realms. For Chauncy, the spiritual Kingdom of God did not exist in temporally distinct institutions, with a variety of laws and customs. Rather, the true Church of God was the same everywhere, not pertaining to the empirical institutional arrangements to advance or hinder it. English bishops were part of the Empire, and as part of that Empire they had right to the same civil privileges and benefits that other bishops possessed.[443] Chandler not only shattered the Church of England's canon law, but he also implied that "the king is deprived of that supremacy granted to him by acts of Parliament" and the constitution of the Church of England fundamentally altered.[444] While Chauncy agreed that such a constitutional change should occur, where "religious establishments are brought down as to be no more," that did not pertain to Chandler's contradictory

[442] Ibid., 113-120.
[443] Ibid., 122-129
[444] Ibid., 135-139.

clericalism.[445] In other words, Chauncy opposed the notion of a separate spiritual hierarchy that claimed both autonomy and authority. The true spiritual realm belonged to God alone and had no manifestation in a particular clerical rank. That did not mean Chauncy was opposed to religious politics within civil government, though he was opposed to bishops having peerage status. There was no independent spiritual society that was outside the inner life; all other forms of government belonged to civic authorities.

Chandler, however, did not represent all colonial Anglicans, many of whom agreed with Chauncy in rejecting a North American episcopate. Chandler only argued for a bishop so vigorously because he was a New Englander, and that region lacked many regular ministers. The southern colonies, according to Chauncy, had no interest in a bishop because they had a regular ministry. New England Anglicans, unlike their Southern peers, had no attachment to a broad Protestant Interest, doing nothing to convert French Catholics in Canada. Any good Protestant would be opposed to the continuation of popery in the Americas, and so Chandler and his ilk ought to convert them.[446] But instead, these Anglicans were only interested in growing their own numbers, conniving with elite members of society to improve their status. Anglican bishops would attack the rights of non-Episcopal Protestant ministers, and therefore it was "highly reasonable and not the least infringement on religious liberty" to prevent an Anglican bishop being settled in the colonies.[447] In an appendix, Chauncy offered proof of Anglican bigotry towards non-episcopal Protestants, where the Bishop of London refused a license to a Presbyterian congregation in New York after a whisper campaign by local Anglicans.[448] The real

[445] Ibid., 144-145.
[446] Ibid., 148-149.
[447] Ibid., 163-164.
[448] Ibid., 174-179.

scheme of a colonial bishop was to promote the Church of England at the expense of other Protestants. The real scheme, according to Chauncy, was to break the Protestant Interest.

Exasperated, Chandler rejected any accusation that colonial bishops would be creatures of either king or Parliament. French Catholics and Moravians both had colonial bishops that claimed only spiritual powers, an Anglican bishop would be no different, having only the powers to ordain clergy and discipline them.[449] Chandler reported that a group of lesser clergy in the colonies of New York and New Jersey had gathered together to petition George III, collectively, to permit the settlement of a colonial bishop. They asked the king only out of due concern for civil order, not because these bishops would be peers of the realm. These clergy only asked because they understood, according to Chandler, that North American Anglicans needed a bishop if they were to thrive. Chauncy's claim that many Anglicans did not want a bishop was absurd, as clearly demonstrated in this gathering of clergy. They waited upon the king who was merely governor of "the national church in subordination to Christ," not confounding his civil authority over the bodies of his subject with the spiritual power of clergy to regulate the conscience.[450] Nevertheless, neither the king nor any gathering of laity or lesser clergy could make new clergymen, only bishops had that right. On this point, Chandler cited George Hickes again favorably. [451] If Congregationalists, like Chauncy, were right about the transmission of legitimate spiritual authority, then they empowered both women and enslaved Africans to elect ministers. But Congregationalists did not do allow these marginal groups to participate, showing their arbitrary bigotry, with men having usurped "all that Right to themselves, in which, by their own Principles, they have but an equal share."[452]

---

[449] Thomas Bradbury Chandler, *The Appeal Farther Defended* (New York City: 1771), 16-17.
[450] Ibid., 20-29.
[451] Ibid., 64-65.
[452] Ibid., 79-82.

Confirming Chauncy's accusation, Chandler agreed that Anglicans were on better grounds to receive ordinations from Catholics or Moravians before seeking holy orders from the hands of a non-episcopal Protestant. Contemplating the radical possibility of colonial independence, more a hypothetical than a desire, Chandler admitted that "were the British colonies independent of their Parent-Kingdom the Episcopalians in this Country would be a Society Independent of the national Church; and in that Case they might seek for an Episcopate from any Part of the Globe."[453] It was only the "reasonableness" and "fitness" of churchmen to cooperate with king and Parliament as long as they remained within the fold of the British Empire. There was nothing intrinsic about the king as supreme governor to the constitution of the Church of England.[454] In other words, Chandler's reconceptualization of the colonial Church of England set forth the basic principles of an independent, episcopal, church that had no intrinsic attachment to England except as an accident of history. American independence, something roiling in Chauncy's Boston, was no impediment. Rather, the only thing that mattered was an entirely spiritual hierarchy, with bishops available to regulate and replenish the clergy. The colonial Church of England pertained not to the nation, not even to a parliamentary regime of Protestant religion, but was a denomination, even if *avant la letter*, unto itself.

Once again, it was Chauncy the Dissenter who did not understand the radical difference between spiritual and civil power. Bishops were spiritual monarchs, but that did not mean they ought to exercise their total powers whenever they wanted. As in the case of baptism, a priest never baptized a new layman without the layman's consent; similarly, the clergy obeyed the civil government in performing their sacramental rites. The king, as supreme civil governor, had no power to create or regulate spiritual power, but bishops consented to the king's desires for the

[453] Ibid., 112-113.
[454] Ibid., 154-160.

peace of the realm. There was no contradiction in claiming that "the episcopal Authority may be altogether from the Church, and not from the State; and yet it may be guided and controlled by the State"[455] This state power to legally regulate the exercise of spiritual powers was not mastery of spiritual authority, but in fact affirmed the autonomous origin of spiritual societies. Civil governments had a right to recognize any spiritual corporation, even if they taught erroneous religion, because it was the right of civil societies to police the body.[456] There was no contradiction, for Chandler, between state established religion and broad toleration, for "high church principles" were "not necessarily intolerant" as Dissenters in England currently experienced.[457] In Chandler's reimagined history of the Church of England, High Churchmen were always on the forefront of defending religious liberty against intolerance, against bodily persecution, which was the true evil of confounding civil and spiritual government. Because High Churchmen, like Chandler, accepted the total spiritual autonomy of the Church, completely separated from civil authority, they were most prone to protect the rights of conscience. Bishops only ever had "ecclesiastical" powers, whatever benefits the kings of England had given them. The Church of England was "originally, as a spiritual society, without any relation to the state." An Anglican bishop in North America would thus have "no temporal power, and consequently to hold no courts for the exercise of it." Bishops existed solely for "the exercise of their spiritual functions only."[458] For Chandler, High Church bishops, who saw themselves as spiritual monarchs and arbiters of the conscience, never claimed any power over the civil laws of bodies and property. Instead, these bishops were the incarnation of toleration, since they resisted any encroachment on their spiritual powers, mutually supporting the rights of civil government. The

[455] Ibid., 174-177.
[456] Ibid., 185-186.
[457] Ibid., 217.
[458] Ibid., 233.

Church of England may receive legal establishment, but that benefit was simply awarding the best denomination, with clear independent spiritual hierarchy, with the means to better promote its interest. There was no Protestant unity, for all non-episcopal Protestants were, governmentally, inferior. In contrast, episcopal non-Protestants or quasi-Protestants were superior. The blessing of the British Empire's policy of religious liberty meant all religions had a right to compete, with the full exercise of their institutional capabilities, to show themselves best.

The pro-bishop party, particularly in this gathering of New York and New Jersey clergy who sought a bishop for the colonies, received a blast not from a Bostonian Dissenter, like Chauncy, but a fellow priest in Thomas Gwatkin. A professor of natural philosophy at William and Mary College, which functioned as North America's only Anglican seminary, Gwatkin attacked any plan to settle bishops within the colonies. Gwatkin's Virginia had an established Church of England for nearly a century. The laity, in the form of landowning gentlemen, dominated the government of the church through vestries, with clergymen often serving as adjuncts for the congregation. While sometimes lamented as irreligious, this arrangement was a "comfortable" faith for the planter quasi-gentry who dominated Virginian society and politics. Local parish vestries regulated ministerial affairs and maintained the infrastructure of churches, with the SPG usually ignoring affairs in the colony. Lacking any clear ecclesiastical authority, with no courts, the process of appointing a new minister was a fraught affair between local gentry, the governor, and the ecclesiastical commissioner from the Bishop of London. Nevertheless, the Church of England in Virginia maintained regular affairs, as long as the clergy did not demand more rights than the House of Burgesses, the royal governor, and landed vestry members permitted.[459]

[459] Lauren Winner gives a descriptive account of how Anglican government functioned in colonial Virginia. For the problems of how this worked in practice, John Nelson has demonstrated division over lay vestries, the colonial

Gwatkin, a member of this quasi-gentry, was appalled in the efforts of his clerical brethren to impose High Church hierarchy on the North American colonies and diminish the elected assemblies. Gwatkin had already crossed swords with another High Churchman, John Camm, who had previously stirred trouble over the payment of tithes. Complaining directly to the Board of Trade, Camm lamented the House of Burgesses' Two Penny Act, that had, effectively, lowered pay for clergy. Camm despised this law as an "aim at power" by the elected assembly, circumventing clerical provisions and clerical autonomy.[460] Now, Camm wanted a bishop, going once more directly to royal authority and ignoring the House of Burgesses, and Gwatkin wrote vigorously to the clergy of the Mid Atlantic to dissuade them of this foolishness.

Camm had violated the rights of Virginia's elected assembly, for which Gwatkin claimed the same parliamentary prerogatives as the body in Westminster. Going directly to the king, whether by Camm or the gathered clergy, was a violation of these assembly privileges.[461] These clergy had no right to claim representation of all Anglican clergy in North America, they also no right to claim to speak for North America. To treat the colonies in such a fashion was to level them into a single bloc. Virginia clergy under a Virginia government were entirely separated from other North American colonies. Even if the clergy of New York and New Jersey got themselves a bishop, a Virginian priest would never submit to a non-Virginian bishop. A bishop in New York or New Jersey would be equally alien to the laws of Virginia as an English bishop. These High Church episcopal schemes were shortsighted, for they would result in undermining imperial unity, treating America as a united bloc instead of each colony, with its own

---

government, individual clergy, and the agents of the Bishop of London. Winner, *A Comfortable Faith*, 6-9. John K. Nelson, *A Blessed Company: Parishes, Parsons, and Parishioners in Anglican Virginia, 1690-1776* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 3-9, 14-15, 122-131.

[460] John Camm to the Right Honourable the Lords Commissioners for Trade and Plantations, 1763 in *Pamphlets of the American Revolution* Vol I, 353.

[461] Thomas Gwatkin, *A Letter to the Clergy of New York and New Jersey, Occasioned by an Address to the Episcopalians in Virginia* (Williamsburg, VA: 1772), 5.

parliamentary assembly to make laws, under a shared imperial framework. English bishops, representing this imperial unity, helped mediate between the different colonies as metropolitan administrators. The Bishop of London did a great job in this capacity and most Anglicans, contrary to these Mid Atlantic clergy, were happy with his work. Unless there was total unanimity among all colonial clergy on the question of a bishop (not merely a majoritarian preponderance, a form of politics that was unworthy for clergy) then there would be no American bishop.[462]

Additionally, it was unbecoming for clergy to take upon themselves the right to assemble, something only the king as supreme governor had a right to permit. Even if the king granted a colonial bishop, it was irrelevant for Virginia, as its House of Burgesses had already passed a statute that required all Virginia clergy to be ordained by an English bishop. Virginia's general court had had "entire and complete Jurisdiction over the Clergy of this Province." An American bishop's ordinations, therefore, would be null and void for clergy in Virginia. What these clergy, effectively, wanted was either for the king to use his "suspending power" against Virginia's assembly or Parliament to "make regulation for the internal government of America," the reason colonists rebelled against the Stamp Act.[463] Both of these examples smacked of the tyranny that rankled most Americans, with either a king behaving like James Stuart in suspending the laws of parliament or a Parliament to behave in such an imperious way that had provoked the resistance to, and ultimately revocation of, the Stamp Act. These clergy had placed the perceived needs of the Church, as an independent, albeit spiritual, society, above the needs of the British Empire.

Even more importantly, for Gwatkin, this idea of a purely spiritual bishop was alien to the Church of England. A bishop without civil powers was a "mongrel episcopate, unknown to

[462] Ibid., 6-8.
[463] Ibid., 9-11.

the constitution of England, or the laws of Virginia." Like English law, Virginia required native bishops to sit in councils of state, hold court, and exercise jurisdiction over both clergy and laymen. There was no such thing as a bishop that had a purely spiritual office over the rights of conscience, restricted to ordination and the discipline of clergy. Anglican canon law granted all bishops the right to discipline laity, not only with excommunication but with court imposed fines. Also, advocates for a colonial bishop ignored the fact that, at least in Virginia, lay government in the church participated in electing a new minister. The parish vestry voted to receive or reject a candidate. For Gwatkin, an American episcopate and the Virginia system of church government were in fundamental conflict. One would inevitably replace the other.[464]

Pro-bishop Anglicans appealed to the rights of conscience and religious liberty, that a colonial Church of England did not have the full expression of its own self-government, like any other church, and therefore their rights were infringed. This complaint was "truly ridiculous" for Gwatkin, as neither the "articles of religion" nor "the laws of the land" required a bishop for the Church of England. These novelties were so drastic that what these pro-bishop partisans wanted was a church entirely different from the Church of England. If they were willing to overlook the constitution and canon law for the Church of England, why did they not simply separate from the Church of England to create their own "new-fangled episcopate" to supply their needs. Ultimately, in Gwatkin's conclusion, those Anglicans who sought a bishop were not loyal to either England or Virginia, but to Jacobite sentiments that still existed in Scotland. These advocates for an entirely spiritual bishops for the colonies wanted a "Nonjuring kind of episcopate, independent of, and unconnected with, the state."[465] If advocates claimed a bishop would improve the morality of the colonies, the practice of the metropolitan Church of England

[464] Ibid., 12-16.
[465] Ibid., 18-19.

disproved this claim. England had twenty-four bishops and these clergy could still not silence immoral or heterodox churchmen. An American bishop would have even less means or majesty to compel the same. At bottom, Gwatkin believed the real issue was a different vision of England's government and empire. It was a "dispute concerning a matter of civil policy," with Gwatkin and those opposed to a bishop "preventing, as far as possible, their being led into schemes destructive of the general happiness of the British Empire." They alone had "regard to the lawful authority of a prelate [the Bishop of London" who alone was "held in universal esteem."[466] For Gwatkin, the British Empire meant a patchwork of colonial establishments that regulated themselves. Spiritual universality led to a flattening of colonial civic power, where Virginians no longer had a right to determine the functions of their clergy. Bishops were civil offices, as much as civil office pertained to the morality of the people. The idea of a separate autonomous spiritual authority was a fundamental threat to harmony of the British Empire.

Beyond the grave, former archbishop Secker continued to roil the bishop controversy through a newly discovered letter. Written to arch wit and Whig, Horatio Walpole, Secker had lamented how few cared for a colonial bishop. Neither Englishmen nor American colonists seemed to desire an office that would improve colonial missions. An American episcopate would be limited to the pure spiritual bounds of its office, with only the power to discipline lesser clergy and ordain. A colonial bishop would be no different than the Bishop of London's commissioner, except being able to perform sacramental rites. None had complained about the commissioner, so why was there this outrage against a bishop? Religious liberty for colonial Anglicans was in danger, forcing these colonial clergy to look elsewhere for support. They had found some aid from Scottish Episcopalians, but their loyalty, both to the Church of England and

[466] Ibid., 26-28.

the British Empire as a whole, was suspect. Secker did not want to wager "what chance the episcopal clergymen of that country may be disaffected to the government," for Jacobitism was likely rampant and likely to grow stronger if an American bishop was not promptly installed.[467] Again, the colonies had other non-Anglican bishops present, such as Moravians, who had "stricter notions of church government and discipline" than the Church of England. Nevertheless, Parliament was dragging its feet in permitting an Anglican bishop for the colonies, allowing Moravian bishops, even Roman Catholic bishops. Unbeknownst to Parliament and the king, Secker had reported that there had "nonjuring Jacobite bishops in our colonies, not very long since, if none now."[468]

If Secker's plan for a colonial bishop was not executed quickly, then the Church of England there would suffer a loss of ministers and its reputation would decline as a defunct, not fully functional, church. If bishops were not necessary, Secker had brooded, then there was really no reason for the Church of England to remain apart from Presbyterians or Congregationalists, there was no need to remain apart from Dissenters. If Parliament would never give legal permission for Anglicans, but allowed non-episcopal Protestants full access to their government, then why would anyone ever conform to the Church of England? The government had simply neglected the Church of England and had failed to permit it to govern itself against its many critics and foes.[469] Secker had been bewildered, if the Church of England was truly a spiritual corporation at its core, at this intransigence. Moravians and Catholics had bishops that they believed necessary for their government. Non-episcopal Protestants were allowed the full functioning of their ministry. The Church of England, alone among churches, had been

[467] Thomas Secker, *Letter to the Right Honorable Horatio Walpole* (London: 1751; repr. 1769), 2-9.
[468] Ibid., 14-15.
[469] Ibid., 26-27.

disadvantaged it the pursuit of its own interests. If Parliament did not permit them to do as they wished, then Nonjuring would become the attract model to abandon cooperation with the conforming Church of England and the Hanoverian dynasty. It was a matter of time before the colonial Church of England could no longer compete in the colonies with other churches.

The rediscovery of Secker's letter drew criticism from metropolitan, even Anglican, critics. Francis Blackburne, an Anglican deacon of a low church temperament, rebuked all advocates of an American episcopate. Secker, like Chandler and many of his temperament, was still plagued with the same Dissenter fanaticism that they brought with them in their conversion to the Church of England.[470] The issue of a colonial bishop was strictly political. Blackburne cited Robert Walpole's letter to Secker, warning the prelate that an American see would be highly destabilizing. Hostility from American colonists, along with the independent "manufacture" of Anglican clergy, would combine to weaken ties between the metropole and the colonies. Walpole compared independent manufacture of clergy to independent manufacture of finished goods, both dissolving the need of the colonies to rely upon England.[471] Secker was wrong to think a colonial bishop would strengthen loyalty to the British Empire, when it would weaken it. Dissenters had consistently been loyal to the Hannoverians without bishops, but churchmen were not so faithful. It was not Scottish Presbyterians who had fought for Jacobite pretenders, but Scottish Episcopalians, who became Nonjurors through their fixation on clerical authority.[472] Secker was either delusional or dissembling when he argued that a colonial bishop would be a purely spiritual office, since no bishop in England ever existed in such a way. Rather, Secker would, by intent or by accident, introduce church courts in North America to punish

[470] [Francis Blackburne] *Critical Commentary on Archbishop Secker's Letter* (London: 1771), 3-5. His name was revealed in a reprint of the tract in a postscript. Ibid., 66.
[471] Ibid., 5, 11.
[472] Ibid., 14-15.

heretics and schismatic. This coercive power was intrinsic to the Church of England's historic constitution and its canon law. Secker's vision was imaginary and had never existed. The result would be a breakdown between royal government and colonists, as colonial bishops would likely side with colonial magistrates to impose more draconian laws. If Secker's plan came about, North America would reject Great Britain and seek independence.[473]

Blackburne also rejected Secker's claim that religious liberty was in jeopardy for Anglicans if they were not allowed to have bishops. The example of Moravians was proof of Secker's confusion, for Parliament allowed the Moravians to have bishops so Parliament could exercise supervision over the church. Bishops were means to license and regulate Moravian behavior. For Blackburne, this arrangement was how Parliament could exercise religious control without the Moravians being the established church.[474] The other example of Catholics in Canada proved the opposite point. Blackburne fumed that Parliament had made a grievous error in allowing the French to practice their faith, since this settlement allowed Catholics to have a beachhead in North America to chip away at the Protestant Interest of the British Empire.[475] The real issue, in all of these polemics, was not religious liberty for Anglicans to grow themselves, but the stakes of Protestant unity throughout the Empire. That was why most Anglicans, in Blackburne's estimation, were opposed to a colonial episcopate. While defenders of the Protestant Interest were solid advocates for imperial moral reform, the pro-bishop "party" was full of corruption and perversion. As one example, Blackburne reported that the pro-bishop faction in Barbados sought to impose a bishop on the island through blackmail. The Bishop of London's commissioner had offered an episcopate to a Barbadian priest, but the priest had

[473] Ibid., 19-27.
[474] Ibid., 29-30.
[475] Ibid., 34-35.

rejected the idea of an American episcopate. To force him to accept, and force a bishop on the colonial assembly, the commissioner drugged the minister's drink and paid a prostitute to cozy up to him naked as he slept. Once this information was exposed, the minister would be ejected for his immorality, removing a roadblock from clerical control. In contrast, another Barbadian clergyman was a well-known public menace among the landowners of Barbados, but he received no punishment from commissioner, despite other ministers asking for his swift removal. If an episcopal commissioner scandalized good priests and protected bad priests, how much worse would colonial morality be if a full-fledged bishop was empowered to concoct these clerical schemes? It was clear to Blackburne that if a bishop ever set foot on Barbados, then "the people will toss him into the sea."[476]

Whether or not these reports had an ounce of truth, they mobilized Blackburne to damn any attempt to establish a colonial see. Clerical power was, for the deacon, no solution to immoral clergy. Bishops did not improve the discipline or wellbeing of the Church. Rather, bishops promoted the poison of clericalism, where ministers had more power over the consciences of the laity, subjecting them to abuse. Protestant Unity checked both clerical pretensions and public immorality, and that was what episcopal partisans, like Secker and his colonials allies, jeopardized. They put the Church of England over the wider Protestant Interest. Thus, concluding in a Jeremiad, Blackburne lamented to the deceased archbishop, an "excellent patriot" and "excellent archpastor of a free Protestant people," that he had failed. In choosing to magnify "a mere ecclesiastical office, no way essential to the faith or practice of Evangelical Christianity," Secker would "stifle the influence" of this faith, forsaking "the preservation of the religion and liberties" upon which Great Britain depended.[477]

[476] Ibid., 38-40.
[477] Ibid., 46.

Secker's letter and Blackburne's rebuttal began to circulate through the colonies, whipping up fear and resentment. Blackburne seemed to speak to a wider Protestant Interest that Parliament and the Church of England both willingly jeopardized through toleration for Roman Catholics and the promotion of Anglican interests above other, well established, Dissenters. Thus, in response to Blackburne's criticisms and in defense of Secker's earnest plea, Thomas Bradbury Chandler once again defended the plan to establish an American see. Repeating Archbishop Secker, an American bishop had the same powers as the Bishop of London's commissioner, but that provoked no widespread hostility. The bishop would be pure in his office, with no civil accretions, only able to ordain and discipline clergy. Religious liberty for the colonies meant each church had the full expression of its growth and organization, which Anglicans lacked if they did not have bishops at hand. If, as Blackburne feared, colonial bishops would disrupt unity through "manufacture" of independent clergy, that was a matter of general justice. Colonists were angry they could not manufacture their own goods; they were also equally angry that they could not manufacture their own clergy. If Presbyterians and Congregationalists were allowed, according to their own understandings of ordination, to create new ministers, why not Anglicans?[478]

Rebutting the Blackburne's accusation that Anglicans, particularly of the High Church variety, were more disloyal to Dissenters, that was stoking unreasonable recrimination. No Anglican minister in North America was ever hostile towards Dissenters.[479] Rather, Anglicans were jealous for their rights as much as Dissenters were jealous. Both wanted their religious liberty, which meant the right to organize their own church as they saw fit. For Anglicans, that

[478] Thomas Bradbury Chandler, *A Free Examination of the Critical Commentary on Archbishop Secker's Letter to Mr Walpole* (New York City: 1774), 9-18.
[479] Ibid., 20-24.

meant having bishops to ordain additional clergy.[480] There was no reason to suspect, as Blackburne had, that bishops in the colonies would be identical to bishops in England. Civil courts were already established in North America, there would be no need for bishops to act as civil magistrates in their own courts.[481] The reason why Secker, as well as men like Chandler, had turned to the king and Parliament for a bishop was to ensure loyalty. Neither the king nor Parliament made bishops or gave the power to practice their ministry, but it was a sign of goodwill that new bishops would be vetted by civil authorities to ensure their loyalty.[482] An Anglican bishop in North America, simply, would "favour religious liberty," promoting Anglican interests without seeking to require any non-Anglican to "conform to the national establishment."[483]

At this point, the arguments had become stale and frozen. Chandler pled again and again for an ideal bishop, one based on his understanding of the Bible and Church history, that had no other powers but to regulate his own membership (limited particularly to the lower clergy). Bishops were necessary to ordain more clergy, and the clerical order (with the power to confect the sacrament and withhold it through excommunication) was the most important feature of Christian religion. For Anglicans like Chandler, the bishop was simply a pillar of government and government was a pillar for the sacred. Religious liberty within the British Empire meant a competition between churches, without trying to prioritize an establishment as the national faith. Conformity came only from free will conversions, persuaded that the Church of England had the most legitimate claim on offices that had a spiritual-legal right to perform sacred rites. Contrary to hostile accusations of imperious civil domination, the ideal bishop had foresworn all civil

[480] Ibid., 34-37.
[481] Ibid., 53-54.
[482] Ibid., 64.
[483] Ibid., 90.

authority (what remained in Britain was simply an accident of ancient success). The spiritual authority of churches, nearly as proto-denominations, stood in an entirely different realm from civil authority, which operated as a neutral arbiter to promote religion in the abstract. This differed from a focus on the Protestant Interest, the idea of a confederated patchwork of informally established lay-led regional churches that cooperated. For them, England was Anglican, New England Congregationalist, and the varied ethnic enclaves of Dutch and Scots Presbyterians, all were to offer cooperation as fellow Protestants under a godly king. The emphasis on clergy was not a spiritual hierarchy operating in an independent realm, but a sure plot of civil encroachment, as no minister could claim strong powers over the conscience without claiming them over the body. Churches were territorial, not merely pertaining to spiritual allegiance. Between these two forces the Bishop Controversy exposed a rift between what it meant for the British Empire to be free and religious.

As this chapter has demonstrated, the Bishop Controversy was not simply a dress rehearsal for the kind of arguments that formed the American Revolution. Opponents of a bishop were not uniform in support for the Patriot cause, as proponents of a bishop were opposed to the Stamp Act. The major difference was the nature of religious politics within the British Empire, whether a broad Protestant Interest or neutral arbitrage in support of religion (with establishment as a possible reward for simply becoming the only game in town). For those who desire a bishop, this spiritual hierarch had powers entirely separated from civil bodily life. The spiritual realm was persuasion and conscience, and the broad toleration for religion (that did not threaten the civil government) should be extended to Quakers, Moravians, even Catholics. In effect, religious liberty meant a free market of competing religious affiliations, with the best group with the most legitimate standards winning in the end. This approach led to tendentious reimagination of the

past, where the tolerant High Churchmen stood against persecuting Dissenters, who fused spiritual and civil powers due to their own sense of illegitimacy. That failure did not mean pro-bishop Anglicans wanted to disbar Dissenters, but that they had to accept a level playing field of influencing. The true Church was a self-governing, entirely spiritual, society that cooperated with, but did not depend upon, civil government for mutual wellbeing.

This chapter offers a new window on the origins of separation between church and state. It was not only Deists, like a Thomas Jefferson or a Thomas Paine, who believed civil governments and churches were entirely separate entities. These pro-bishop Anglicans sought greater separation from civil powers, profusely rejecting any sense of civil authority associated with their spiritual offices. Clericalism was, in their use, a boon for separation, not intertwining, of church and state. A sacred hierarchy held laicizing at bay. While enemies of an American bishop cried against clerical corruption in the state, it was not that they desired an a-Protestant state, let alone a wholly secular one. Rather, the defense of the Protestant Interest meant an understanding of spiritual power that worked through the laity as much as the ministry. The power of a pastor resided in his ability to teach, not to excommunicate or perform any other uniquely reserved spiritual powers. Clericalism always meant tyranny, as it appeared to be the creature of absolute monarchy in disguise. It was opponents of a colonial bishop that sought a more confessional empire, though one that was irenic in its Protestantism, against the seemingly selfish interests of one church at the expense of others. There was nothing contradictory in a clericalism that claimed to be entirely irrelevant to civil society, for promoting the Church of England was an end unto itself for the affairs of conscience. This sense of spiritual authority formed a groundwork for denominationalism in what would become the United States, allowing bishops and other sacred monarchs to claim sweeping powers in the spirit realm without ever

suggesting civil influence. It would explain the origins of Anglo-Catholicism within the Episcopal Church of the United States of America, as well as the settling of Roman Catholics. Spiritual princes were commensurate with a civil government that had abandoned any strict religious confession.

Conclusion

William White, an odd combination of Anglican priest and American patriot during the War of Independence, was at odds to justify how a newly independent episcopal Church of England in the United States could exist without either episcopacy or England. The new Episcopal Church had no episcopacy, and it was unclear when or if it was forthcoming from English bishops who had previously been hostile. Samuel Seabury, an Anglican priest and ardent loyalist (who had locked horns with the precocious youth, Alexander Hamilton, over the jurisdiction of an imperial Parliament), had also been perplexed with how an American Episcopal Church could exist without regular bishops. Both men pursued very different ends, neither ultimately needed nor successful, but representing, in a way, a divide that still rippled throughout Anglicans cut off from the metropole.

For White, the solution was not as desperate at it seemed. First, the American Episcopal church was not simply an outcropping of England. Such a fear was not worry, as even the confessional doctrine of the Church of England, in the Thirty-Nine Articles, foreswore any supranational organization. All national churches were independent by dint of separate nationality, one English and now the other American.[484] But even more importantly, this new American episcopal church would not resemble the Church of England in its polity of having bishops with baronial status. The problem solved itself due to America, generally, being a disestablished nation:

> In most cases where spiritual jurisdiction has been established or defined, such has been the connection between church and state, that it was scarcely possible to adopt measures,

[484] William White, *The Case of the Episcopal Church in the United States Considered* (Philadelphia, PA: 1782), 6-7.

> which did not show some traces of accommodation to political views; but this may be avoided in the present instance, where all denominations of christians are on a level, and no church is farther known to the public, than as a voluntary association of individuals, for a lawful and useful purpose.[485]

White did not deny that churches and states often intermingle and influence one another in their polity. It was quite natural that in England bishops received seats in the House of Lords. But that was hardly the case in America, where all churches operated as voluntary societies. How then will Anglicans persist as an independent society? The laity would exercise a greater role in the government in the Church. As Parliament was the means for the Church of England to exercise decisions and government, bodies of laity would provide the same role. In England, the authority of Convocation was sanctioned by Parliament. In America, for White, it would be "necessary to deviate from the practice (though not from the principles) of that church, by convening the clergy and laity in one body."[486] This body then could elect candidates to the rank of bishops. As Parliament had acted the lay power in England to ratify ecclesiastical decisions, lay members meeting together with ministers could ordain new bishops, a practice White saw manifest in the early years of the Church, where bishops were chosen by popular election. The power of election in the laity meant, concomitantly, a power of removal, which was exercised on the "non-juring bishops at the revolution" by the lay authorities.[487]

These new bishops would be conditionally ordained, until receiving a more stable recognition from their English peers once the storm of war had passed, and thus could ordain others. While the threefold ministry that marked episcopacy from presbyterian government was,

[485] Ibid., 7-8.
[486] Ibid., 8-9.
[487] Ibid., 10.

for White, good and ancient. It was never to be a hindrance to the Church, which even advocates of "divine right" episcopacy would not deny.[488] To justify these claims, White cited the venerable Richard Hooker as having argued for the right of presbyters to ordain a bishop *in extremis*. White also cited Bishop Hoadly, as venerable "as any on the list of British worthies," who was a paragon in ability, virtue, and "his enlightened zeal for civil liberty."[489] Ultimately, the laity had a right to elect and regulate the clergy, even as they did not formally ordain, for the purposes of ministering in God's church. "If a Christian king may on an emergency constitute a bishop," White reasoned, "much more may the whole body of the churches interested; especially when they interfere not thereby with the civil magistrate."[490] This plan for a lay involved church government was not only entirely Anglican but consisted with other Protestants elsewhere.

But this outline, reflecting the designs of some other American churchmen, was odious to those clergy who had pursued, without success, a continental episcopate. Samuel Seabury, a Yankee priest and loyalist throughout the American rebellion, had made peace with independence, but not with the lack of a bishop. Seabury had sought, fruitlessly, ordination from the hands of English bishops. He did, however, receive it from the hands of those many, in Britain and in the new United States, considered dubious. Writing to the newly ordained bishop of an undefined, but northeastern, diocese, New England clergy praised Seabury for having returned safely to America with an ordination from the Scottish Episcopal church. Though Seabury failed in England, "for reasons which we are unable to assign," the American prelate gained "a pure, valid, and free episcopacy." The lesser American clergy were eager to submit to this bishop as their supreme head of government, a reality that returned the church to "her native

[488] Ibid., 27-28.
[489] Ibid., 28-29.
[490] Ibid., 20-31

purity" when it was "unconnected with, and uncontrouled by, any secular power." Though the English prelates denied their American brethren this honor, it made sense that the Scottish Episcopalians "pious and venerable bishops" who had "learned to renounce the pomps and grandeurs of the world" would confer this ordination.[491]

Seabury, thanking his new subordinates for their thanks, concurred in their estimation. He too was glad that he had received the episcopate "upon the true principles of the primitive church, before it was controuled and corrupted by secular connexions and worldly policy." It was not odd that the English bishops would not receive him, explaining that "where the ecclesiastical and civil constitutions are so closely woven together," as it was in England, that the virtues of potential clergy were "rendered ineffectual, by the intervention of the civil authority." Seabury, frustrated with this indifference to what he believed was a fundamental mark of Christ's church, weighed, with "serious consideration," whether Episcopal Christians should "submit quietly to this state of things" or "to risk that confusion which would probably ensue, should an amendment be attempted."[492] Passive obedience or, as had happened with the Nonjurors, a separation of church from state. It did not matter anymore, now that the American church, with its Scottish ordinations, was now free to ordain new priests and practice the episcopacy that men like Seabury had sought for decades.

Seabury carried these concerns in his first address to his assembled clergy, the first American Convocation under a kingless episcopate. The new bishop rejoiced, again, for a "free, valid, and purely ecclesiastical episcopacy" that returned primitive purity to the "infant church" of America. Seabury informed the clergy that his orders, and the orders he would pass on

[491] *The Address of the Clergy of Connecticut to the Right Reverend Bishop of Seabury with the Bishop's Answer and a Sermon Before the Convention at Middletown* (New Haven, CT: 1785), 3-6.
[492] Ibid., 7.

through ordination, came from the "old episcopal church of Scotland," who were "under the greatest persecutions" for their adherence to the old faith. These prelates had "at the revolution, fell a sacrifice to the jealous apprehensions of William the Third," an open declaration of a Nonjuring history of the episcopal churches of Great Britain. Seabury was gravely aware that "loss, and not gain, may, and probably will be the consequence of the step we have taken to procure for our church the blessing we now enjoy." But this potential ill was worth it if American Anglicans can now "enjoy the full advantage of our religious constitution."[493] However, Seabury and likeminded churchmen were aware that their vision was not the only one within the American episcopal church. There was, "in the southern states," a plan to revise the government of the church. Instead of what Seabury had brought about, a "government of the church by bishops" established by the Apostles, these other churchmen desired "lodging the chief authority in a convention of clerical and lay delegates." The result of this potential reform was "episcopal in orders, but presbyterian in its government." Seabury moderated his criticisms, seeing in Deists and Unitarians his most potent foes. But this division, in vision of government, saddened him. The success of the American episcopal church depended on using the "general judgment and practice of the primitive church," which provided the basis to determine good from bad practice.[494]

These two visions, between White and Seabury, did not appear suddenly or in a flash of lightning. Neither Seabury nor White were radically innovating in their efforts to establish a working government for an independent episcopal church in the United States. White's flexible indifference was anathema to churchmen like Seabury who had fought so long for an American episcopate, one that was entirely separate from civil government. It was, therefore, fitting that

[493] *Bishop Seabury's First Charge to the Clergy of his Diocess* (New Haven, CT: 1785), 3-5.
[494] *Bishop Seabury's Second Charge to the Clergy of his Diocess* (New Haven, CT: 1786), 11-16.

Seabury had received his holy orders from Nonjuring prelates, who had first pioneered this radical break. Embracing even the history of persecution and underground existence of the true church against a tyrannous civil government, Seabury married a God-ordained sacerdotal priesthood with disestablishment and wide religious liberty. England had corrupted through its embrace of this civil establishment, mingling spiritual power with a laity unfit (and incapable) of exercising this power. But now, in the United States, a primitive and pure church could once again take root to spread the true and apostolic faith of spiritual monarchy.

This project has demonstrated, through a century of argument and conflict (mostly through words, but sometimes through force), the internal development within the Church of England towards a separation of church and state. The Nonjurors began their crusade, not because of the Glorious Revolution *in se* (though almost all Nonjurors refused William's claims to kingship), to defend the offices of the church. If kings, who were merely laymen, had the power to remove and install church officers, then the very existence of the Christian church was in jeopardy. The Nonjurors advanced a radical division of civil and spiritual powers, each allotted to their respective monarch, parallel, with never the two meeting. Despite the minority of clergy and laity that left to form the true Nonjuring Church of England, as opposed to those clergy and laity that accepted the Glorious Revolution and the king's involvement in clerical government, these churchmen put forward a compelling argument in defense of sacred powers for the clergy. High Churchmen, who had postured as sacerdotal clericalists under the royal headship of the Church of England, had at first rejected and attacked Nonjurors. But their experiences, even under the supposedly friendly reign of Queen Anne, counseled that Nonjuring arguments were more true (or at least more useful) than not. The rise of Benjamin Hoadly, and his seeming attack on all sacred claims of the clergy whatsoever, was an occasion to more fully

embrace a theoretical separatism that several High Churchmen had considered for a decade. The paralytic victory over the Bangorian Controversy, which was silenced rather than solved, represented a turn towards a different kind of churchmanship. Empowered impotence, clergy who could claim the power to be spiritual monarchs incapable of royal interference, meant peace with a crown (and Parliament) that would no longer debate explosive ecclesiological questions.

This arrangement, however, did not mean peace abroad. Throughout the North American colonies in the early eighteenth-century, where Anglicans began to develop their own colonial establishments or subsisted as a minority, not every churchman was happy with their state of affairs. Drawing on Nonjurors, whether their arguments or their orders, colonial Anglicans argued for a stronger split between spiritual and civil powers, sometimes imperiously in chastising an erring governor or elite laity. Not all Anglicans agreed with such high and spiritual views of the clergy, with some (both laity and clergy) resisting this drive to accentuate sacerdotal powers in the clergy. Rather than try to recreate a confessional state, these separatist churchmen wanted no state involvement whatsoever, and preferred religious neutrality (even competition among various Protestants over which of their churches was more legitimate) before granting any religious establishment whatsoever. It also meant disentangling the highest clergy in the Church of England, bishops, from all state power whatsoever. Even though English bishops had been, by right of their office, barons in the House of Lords since the Middle Ages, and far before the Protestant Reformation, these advocate for a spiritual church rejected all this history as accident, if not corruption, that had nothing to do with the primitive office. When English bishops began to greenlight a project to install a bishop in the North American colonies, this galvanized proponents and opponents into a war of words. For advocates, an American bishop was nothing more than a spiritual authority that only had power over the clergy, a spiritual figure

entirely disengaged from civil powers. Opponents, both Anglican and Dissenter, rejected these arguments, as bishops were intrinsically connected with civil power and lay government. Instead, they adhered to a broad Protestant Interest, one that respected a kind of informal religious establishment, prioritizing unity in governmental diversity over institutional competition. But episcopacy was *sine qua non* for the existence of Christianity. The Church of England, for these pro-bishop figures, was radically reimagined as an entirely spiritual entity, with spirituality being divorced from all considerations in civil life and government. It was now the bastion of religious liberty and a separation between church and state.

In effect, the Nonjurors pioneered a unique form of religious disestablishment, done not in the name of individual conscience or confessional agnosticism, but for spiritual monarchy. It was a strong belief in the divine foundations of a clerical kingdom that drove skepticism and hostility towards any religious establishments whatsoever. What had been an occasional boon, if kings towed the line in respect to God's vicars, had now become a curse, a constant threat of usurpation and spiritual tyranny. What began with the Nonjurors, influenced a compromised churchmanship within the Church of England, and then spilled back out in an independent American church, was, in effect, a desire for denominationalism. Questions of a national or state church withered, as rival claimants jostled for which was most likely the true church. While the Church was a divine mandate upon all mankind, it was, in practice, a voluntary society of those men and women who would submit to various clerical claims (or, having failed to obey, to be excommunicated). The practice of religious liberty emerged, in this case, from illiberal means. The effective secularization of civil government was born from those who believed in an unassailable and absolute spiritual monarchy.

Primary

A Declaration of the Sense of the Archbishops, and Bishops, Now in and about London, upon the Occasion of their Attendance in Parliament, Concerning the Irregular and Scandalous Proceedings of certain Clergiemen, at the Execution of Sir JOHN FRIEND and Sir WILLIAM PARKINS. London: 1696.

Apthorp, East. *The Constitution of a Christian Church.* Boston, MA: 1761.

--- *Considerations on the Institution and Conduct of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts.* Boston, MA: 1763.

Atterbury, Francis. *The Mitre and the Crown; or, a real distinction between them.* London: 1711.

--- *A Continuation of the Mitre and the Crown or, a real distinction between them.* London: 1712.

Bailyn, Bernard, ed. *Pamphlets of the American Revolution, Vol I.* Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University, 1965.

Bisbie, Nathaniel. *Unity of Priesthood Necessary to the Unity of Communion in a Church, With some Reflections on the Oxford Manuscript and the Preface annexed. Also Collections of Canons, part of the said Manuscript, faithfully translated into English from the Original, but concealed by Mr. Hody, and his Prefacer.* London: 1692.

Blackall, Ofspring. *The Lord Bishop of Exter's Answer to the Letter of Mr. Hoadly.* London: 1709.

Blackburne, Francis. *Critical Commentary on Archbishop Secker's Letter* (London: 1771

Bray, Thomas. *A Memorial, Representing the Present State of Religion, on the continent of North America*. London: 1701.

Caner, Henry. *A Candid examination of Dr. Mayhew's Observations on the charter and conduct of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel.* Boston, MA: 1763.

Chandler, Thomas Bradbury. *An Appeal to the Public in Behalf of the Church of England in America.* New York City: 1767.

--- *The Appeal Defended,: or, the proposed American episcopate vindicated.* New York City: 1769.

--- *The Appeal Farther Defended.* New York City: 1771.

--- *A Free Examination of the Critical Commentary on Archbishop Secker's Letter to Mr Walpole.* New York City: 1774.

Chauncy, Charles *The Validity of Presbyterian Orders Asserted.* Boston, MA: 1762.

--- *A Discourse occasioned by the death of the Reverend Dr. Mayhew.* Boston, MA: 1766.

--- *The Appeal to the Public Answered.* Boston, MA: 1768.

--- *Dr Chauncy's Reply to Dr Chandler's Appeal Defended.* Boston, MA: 1770.

Checkley, John. *A Modest Proof.* Boston, MA: 1723.

Collier, Jeremy. *The Office of a Chaplain Equir'd into, and Vindicated from Servility and Contempt.* London: 1688.

--- *A Caution against inconsistency, or, The connexion between praying and swearing in relation to the civil powers.* London: 1690.

--- *Dr. Sherlock's Case of Allegiance Considered with some remarks upon his Vindication.* London: 1691.

--- *A Brief Essay concerning the Independency of Church-Power.* London, 1692.

--- *The Case of the Two Absolvers that were Tryed at the Kings-Bench-Bar at Westminster, on Thursday the 2d of July 1696 For giving Absolution at the place of Execution to Sir John Friend and Sir William Parkens*, London: 1696.
--- *A Defence of the Absolution given to Sr. William Perkins, At the Place of Execution. April the 3d., With a Farther Vindication thereof, Occasioned by a Paper, Entituled a Declaration of the Sense of Arch-Bishops and Bishops, &c.* London: 1696.
--- *A Farther Defence of the Absolution given to Sr. William Perkins, Occasioned By a Paper, Entituled a Declaration of the Archbishops, and Bishops, &c.* London: 1696.
--- *An Answer to the Animadversions on two Pamphlets Lately Publish'd By Mr. Collier, &c.* London: 1696.
Defoe, Daniel. *Case of Protestant Dissenters in Carolina, Shewing How a Law to prevent Occasional Conformity There, has ended in the Total Subversion of the Constitution in Church and State.* London: 1706.
Dodwell, Henry. *AN ANSWER TO Six Queries Proposed to a Gentlewoman of the Church of ENGLAND, by an Emissary of the Church of ROME; fitted to a Gentlewomans capacity.* London: 1676.
--- *Two Discourses Against the Romanists.* London: 1676.
--- *Separation of Churches from Episcopal Government, As practised by the present Non-Conformists, Proved Schismatical.* London: 1679.
--- *Concerning the care of taking the new oath of fealty and allegeiance with a declaration.* London: 1689.
--- *A Vindication of the deprived Bishops, asserting their spiritual rights against a lay deprivation, against the charge of schism, as managed by the late editors of an anonymous Baroccian ms in two parts…to which is subjoined the latter end of the said ms. omitted by the editors, making against them and the cause espoused by them, in Greek and English.* London: 1692.
--- *The Case in View, Now in Fact, Proving, That the Continuance of a Separate Communion, Without Substitutes in Any of the Late Invalidity Deprived Sees, Since the Death of William late Lord Bishop of Norwich, is schismatical.* London: 1711.
--- *Appendix, proving that our late Invalidly-deprived Fathers had no Right to Substitute Successors.* London: 1711.
Ewer, John. *Sermon Preached before the Incorporated Society for the Propagation of the Gospel.* London: 1767.
Gwatkin, Thomas. *A Letter to the Clergy of New York and New Jersey, Occasioned by an Address to the Episcopalians in Virginia.* Williamsburg, VA: 1772.
Hickes, George. *A discourse of the soveraign power.* London: 1682.
--- *Reflections upon a letter out of the country, to a member of this present Parliament occasioned by a late letter to a member of the House of Commons, concerning the bishops lately in the Tower, and now under suspension.* London: 1689.
--- *A Vindication of Some among Our Selves Against the False Principles of Dr. Sherlock.* London: 1692.
--- *Two Treatises, one of the Christian priesthood, the other of the dignity of the episcopal order.* London: 1707.
--- *The Constitution of the Catholick Church Catholick, and the nature and consequences of schism.* London: 1716.

Hills, George Morgan, ed. *History of the Church in Burlington, New Jersey: Comprising the Facts and Incidents of Nearly Two Hundred Years, From Original, Contemporaneous Sources.* Trenton, NJ: 2nd Ed. W.S. Sharp Printing Company, 1885.
Hoadly, Benjamin. *The Reasonableness of Conformity to the Church of England.* London: 1703.
--- *A Sermon Preach'd Before the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor.* London: 1705.
--- *Some Considerations humbly offered to the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Exeter.* London: 1709.
--- *An Humble Reply to the Right Revered the Lord Bishop of Exeter's Answer.* London: 1709.
--- *A Preservative Against the Principles and Practices of the Nonjurors.* London: 1716.
--- *The Nature of the Kingdom, or Church, of Christ.* London: 1717.
--- *An Answer to the Representation Drawn up by the Committee of the Lower House of Convocation* in *Collected Works of Hoadly.* London: 1718.
Hody, Humphrey. *Animadversions on two pamphlets lately publish'd by Mr. Collier the one call'd, A defence of the absolution given to Sir William Parkins at the place of execution, April 3d, the other, A vindication thereof, occasion'd by a paper entituled, A declaration of the sense of the achbishops* [sic] *and bishops, &c.: shewing the nature of the late absolution, both as to church and state: in a letter to a friend.* London: 1696.
Holcombe, Richard. *A Sermon Preached before Incorporated Society for the Propagation of the Gospel.* London: 1761.
Inglis, Charles. *A Vindication of the Bishop of Landaff's Sermon from the Gross Misrepresentations and Abusive Reflections, contained in Mr. William Livingston's Letter to his Lordship.* Boston, MA: 1768.
Law, William. *Three Letters to the Bishop of Bangor.* 8th ed. London, 1721.
Leaming, Jeremiah. *Defence of Episcopal government of the church.* New York City: 1766.
Leslie, Charles. *The Case of the Regale and the Pontificat stated. In a conference concerning the independency of the Church, upon any Power on Earth, in the Exercise of her Purely Spiritual Power and Authority.* London: 1701.
--- *The Finishing Stroke Being a vindication of the patriarchal scheme of government.* London: 1716.
Livingston, William. *A Letter to the Right Reverend Father in God, John, Lord Bishop of Landau.* New York City: 1768.
Mayhew, Jonathan. *Observations on the Charter and Conduct of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts […] with Remarks on the Mistakes of East Apthorp.* Boston, MA: 1763.
--- *A Defence of the Observation on the Charter and Conduct of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, Against an Anonymous Pamphlet.* Boston, MA: 1763.
Potter, John. *A Discourse on Church Government: Wherein the rights of the church and the supremacy of Christian princes, are vindicated and adjusted.* 2nd ed. London: 1711.
R.B. *The Unreasonable of a Separation from the New Bishops Or, a Treatise out of Ecclesiastical History, Shewing, That although a Bishop was unjustly deprived, neither He nor the Church ever made a Separation; if the Successor was not a Heretic.* London: 1691.
Secker, Thomas. *An Answer to Dr. Mayhew's Observations on the Charter and Conduct of the Society.* London: 1764.
--- *Letter to the Right Honorable Horatio Walpole.* London: 1751; repr. 1769.

Sherlock, William. *The Case of the Allegiance due to sovereaign powers, defended, &c.* London: 1691.
Slafter, Edmund F., ed. *John Checkley; or, The evolution of religious tolerance in Massachusetts bay. Including Mr. Checkley's controversial writings; his letters and other papers Vol I.* Boston, MA: The Prince Society, 1897.
--- *John Checkley; or, The evolution of religious tolerance in Massachusetts bay. Including Mr. Checkley's controversial writings; his letters and other papers Vol II.* Boston, MA: The Prince Society, 1897.
Stillingfleet, Edward *Irenicum; A Weapon Salve for the Church's Wounds; or the Divine Right of Particular Forms of Church Government*. 2nd ed. London: 1662.
--- *The Mischief of Separation: A Sermon Preached at Guild-Hall Chappel, May II. MDCLXXX Being the First Sunday in Easter-Term, Before the Lord Mayor, &c.* London: 1680.
--- *The Unreasonableness of Separation, or, An impartial account of the history, nature, and pleas of the present separation from the communion of the Church of England to which, several late letters are annexed, of eminent Protestant divines abroad, concerning the nature of our differences, and the way to compose them.* London: 1681.
--- *A VINDICATION OF Their Majesties Authority TO FILL The SEES of the Deprived Bishops in a letter out of the country occasioned by Dr. B—'s refusal of the bishoprick of Bath and Wells.* London, 1691.
The Address of the Clergy of Connecticut to the Right Reverend Bishop of Seabury with the Bishop's Answer and a Sermon Before the Convention at Middletown. New Haven, CT: 1785.
The Book of Common Prayer. 1662. repr. Cambridge University Press, 2003.
Thorndike, Herbert. *A Discourse on the Right of the Church in a Christian State.* London: 1649.
--- *JUST WEIGHTS AND MEASURES: That is, The present STATE of RELIGION Weighed in the BALANCE.* London: 1662.
Trenchard, John, and Thomas Gordon. *An Apology for the Danger of the Church.* London: 1719.
White, William. *The Case of the Episcopal Church in the United States Considered.* Philadelphia, PA: 1782.
Wigglesworth, Edward. *Sober Remarks on a book lately reprinted at Boston, entituled, A modest proof of the order and government settled by Christ.* Boston, MA: 1724.
Williams, George W., ed. *Letters from the Clergy of the Anglican Church in South Carolina, c. 1696-1775.* Charleston, SC: University of Charleston Special Collections, 2008.

Secondary

Agamben, Giorgio. *The Kingdom and the Power: For a Theological Genealogy of Economy and Government* trans. Lorenzo Chiesa. Redwood City, CA: Stanford University Press, 2011.
Bejan, Teresa M. *Mere Civility: Disagreements and the Limits of Toleration.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2017.
Bell, James B. *The Imperial Origins of the King's Church in Early America.* London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
Bennett, G.V. "Conflict in the Church." In *Britain after the Glorious Revolution, 1689-1714*, ed. Geoffrey Holmes. Bungay, Suffolk: Macmillan and Co., 1969.
--- *The Tory Crisis in Church and State, 1688-1730: The career of Francis Atterbury, Bishop of Rochester.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.

Bonomi, Patricia U. *Under the Cope of Heaven: Religion, Society, and Politics in Colonial America.* 2nd ed. Oxford University Press, 2003.
Boster, Tania. "'Better to be alone than in ill company': Jeremy Collier the Younger: Life and Works, 1650-1726." PhD diss., University of Pittsburgh, 2008.
Bridenbaugh, Carl *Mitre and Scepter: Transatlantic Faith, Ideas, Personalities, and Politics 1689-1775.* Oxford University Press, 1962.
Broxap, Henry. *The Later Nonjurors.* Cambridge University Press, 1928.
Bulman, William J. *Anglican Enlightenment: Orientalism, Religion and Politics in England and its Empire, 1648-1715.* Cambridge University Press, 2015.
Butler, Jon. *Awash in a Sea of Faith: Christianizing the American People.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992.
Champion, J.A.I. *Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken: The Church of England and its Enemies, 1660-1730.* Cambridge University Press, 1992.
Clark, J.C.D. *English Society, 1660-1832: Religion, Ideology and Politics during the Ancien Regime.* 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press, 2000.
Claydon, Tony *William III and the Godly Revolution.* Cambridge University Press, 1996.
Colley, Linda. *In Defiance of Oligarchy: The Tory Party, 1714-1760.* Cambridge University Press, 1982.
Collins, Jeffrey R. *Allegiance of Thomas Hobbes*. Oxford University Press, 2005.
--- *In the Shadow of Leviathan: John Locke and the Politics of Conscience.* Oxford University Press, 2020.
Cornwall, Robert D. *Visible and Apostolic: The Constitution of the Church in High Church Anglican and Non-Juror Thought.* Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 1993.
du Rivage, Justin. *Revolution Against Empire: Taxes, Politics, and the Origins of American Independence.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2017.
Every, George. *The High Church Party, 1688-1718.* London: SPCK, 1956.
Field, Peter S. *The Crisis of the Standing Order: Clerical Intellectuals and Cultural Authority in Massachusetts, 1780-1833.* Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1999.
Fornecker, Samuel D. *Bisschop's Bench: Contours of Arminian Conformity in the Church of England, c. 1674-1742.* Oxford University Press, 2022.
Garrett, Jane. *The Triumphs of Providence: The Assassination Plot, 1696.* Cambridge University Press, 1980.
Gibson, William. *Enlightenment Prelate: Benjamin Hoadly, 1676-1761.* London: James Clark & Co, 2004.
Glasson, Travis. *Mastering Christianity: Missionary Anglicanism and Slavery in the Atlantic World.* Oxford University Press, 2017.
Goldie, Mark. "The Nonjurors, Episcopacy, and the Origins of the Convocation Controversy." In *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1759*, ed. Eveline Cruickshanks. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1982.
--- ed. *The entring book of Roger Morrice, 1677-1691, I: Roger Morrice and the Puritan Whigs*. Martlesham, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2007.
Gould, Eliga H. *The Persistence of Empire: British Political Culture in the Age of the American Revolution.* Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina, 2000.
Greenwood, Francis William Pitt. *A History of King's Chapel in Boston: The First Episcopal Church in New England: Comprising Notices of the Introduction of Episcopacy Into the Northern Colonies.* Boston, MA: Carter, Hendee, 1833.

Habermas, Jurgen. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society* trans. Thomas Burger. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1991.
Haselby, Sam. *The Origins of American Religious Nationalism.* Oxford University Press, 2015.
Haugen, Kristine Louise. *Richard Bentley: Poetry and Enlightenment.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011.
Hawkins, L.M. *Allegiance in Church and State: The Problem of the Nonjurors in the English Revolution.* London: Routledge, 1928.
Hills, George Morgan. "John Talbot, the First Bishop in North America." In *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography.* Vol 3, No 1, 1879.
Horwitz, Henry. *Parliament, Policy and Politics in the reign of William III.* Manchester University Press, 1977.
Hylson-Smith, Kenneth. *High Churchmanship in the Church of England: From the Sixteenth Century to the late Twentieth Century.* Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993.
Ingram, Robert G. *Reformation Without End: Religion, politics and the past in post-revolutionary England.* Manchester University Press, 2018.
Israel, Jonathan. *A Revolution of the Mind: Radical Enlightenment and the Intellectual Origins of Modern Democracy.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2011.
Kay, Richard S. *The Glorious Revolution and the Continuity of Law.* Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2014.
Levitin, Dmitri. *Ancient Wisdom in the Age of the New Science: Histories of Philosophy in England, 1640-1700.* Cambridge University Press, 2015
Livesey, James. *Civil Society and Empire: Ireland and Scotland in the Eighteenth-Century Atlantic World.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009.
Locke, Kenneth A. *The Church in Anglican Theology: A Historical, Theological and Ecumenical Exploration.* Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2009.
Macpherson, C.B. *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism: Hobbes to Locke.* Oxford University Press, 2011.
Marsden, George *Jonathan Edwards: A Life.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2004.
Marshall, John. "The Ecclesiology of the Latitude-men 1660-1689: Stillingfleet, Tillotson, and 'Hobbism.'" In *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*. Vol. 36, No. 3, 1985.
McConville, Brendan. *The King's Three Faces: The Rise and Fall of Royal America, 1688-1776.* Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina, 2007.
Mullins, Patrick. *Father of Liberty: Jonathan Mayhew and the Principles of the American Revolution.* Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2017.
Nelson, John K. *A Blessed Company: Parishes, Parsons, and Parishioners in Anglican Virginia, 1690-1776.* Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2003.
Noll, Mark. *The Rise of Evangelicalism: The Age of Edwards, Whitefield and the Wesleys.* Lisle, IL: Intervarsity Press Academic, 2010.
Overton, J.H. *The Non-Jurors: Their Lives, Principles, and Writings.* London: Smith, Elder, & Co., 1902.
Padley, Kenneth. "Rendering unto Caesar in the Age of Revolution: William Sherlock and William of Orange." In *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*. Vol. 59, No. 4, 2008.
Pagden, Anthony. *The Enlightenment: And Why It Still Matters.* Oxford University Press, 2015.
Parkin, Jon. *Taming the Leviathan: The Reception of the Political and Religious Ideas of Thomas Hobbes in England 1640-1700.* Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Parrish, David. *Jacobitism and Anti-Jacobitism in the British Atlantic, 1688-1727.* Martlesham, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2017.
Pincus, Steven. *1688: The First Modern Revolution.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2011.
Pocock, J.G.A. *Barbarism and Religion: Volume 1, The Enlightenments of Edward Gibbon, 1737-1764.* Cambridge University Press, 1999.
Quantin, Jean-Louis "Anglican Scholarship Gone Mad?: Henry Dodwell (1641-1711) and Christian Antiquity." In *History of Scholarship: A Selection of Papers from the Seminar on the History of Scholarship Held Annually at the Warburg Institute* eds. C.R. Ligota and J-L Quantin. Oxford University Press, 2006.
--- *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity: The Construction of a Confessional Identity in the 17th Century.* Oxford University Press, 2009.
Rose, Jacqueline. *Godly Kingship in Restoration England, Politics of Royal Supremacy.* Cambridge University Press, 2011.
--- "'By law established': The Church of England and the royal supremacy." In *The Later Stuart Church, 1660-1714*, ed. Grant Tapsell. Manchester University Press, 2012.
Rupp, Gordon E. *Religion in England, 1688-1791.* Oxford University Press, 1987.
Sehat, David. *The Myth of American Religious Freedom.* Oxford University Press, 2011.
Sirota, Brent S. "'The Leviathan Is Not Safely to Be Angered': The Convocation Controversy, and Anglican High Churchmanship, 1689-1702." In *Religion and the State: Europe and North America in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, eds. Joshua B. Stein and Sargon G. Donabed. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2012.
--- "The Trinitarian Crisis in Church and State: Religious Controversy and the Making of the Post-revolutionary Church of England, 1687-1702." In *Journal of British Studies*, vol. 52 January 2013.
--- *The Christian Monitors: The Church of England and the Age of Benevolence, 1680-1730.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2014.
--- "'The Manifest Distinction Established By Our Holy Religion': Church, State and the Consecration of Samuel Seabury." In *Religion and American Culture.* Volume 32, Issue 1, Winter 2022.
Smith, Hannah. *Georgian Monarchy: Politics and Culture, 1714-1760.* Cambridge University Press, 2006.
Spurr, John. *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1991.
Stanwood, Owen. *The Empire Reformed: English America in the Age of the Glorious Revolution.* Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011.
Starkie, Andrew *The Church of England and the Bangorian Controversy, 1716-1721.* Martlesham, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2007.
Stevens, Laura M. *The Poor Indians: British Missionaries, Native Americans and Colonial Sensibility.* Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.
Strong, Rowan. *Anglicanism and the British Empire, c. 1700-1850.* Oxford University Press, 2007.
Sykes, Norman. *Edmund Gibson: Bishop of London, 1669-1748.* Oxford University Press, 1926.
--- *From Sheldon to Secker: Aspects of English Church History, 1660-1768.* Cambridge University Press, 1959.

Walsh, Ashley. *Civil Religion and the Enlightenment in England, 1707-1800.* Martlesham, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2020.
Walsham, Alexandra. *Charitable Hatred: Tolerance and intolerance in England, 1500-1700.* Manchester University Press, 2008.
Wand, J.C. *The High Church Schism.* London: The Faith Press, 1951.
Weil, Rachael. *A Plague of Informers: Conspiracy and Political Trust in William III's England.* New Haven, CT.: Yale University Press, 2013.
Weir, Robert M. *Colonial South Carolina: A History.* Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1997.
Winiarski, Doug L. *Darkness Falls on the Land of Light: Experiencing Religious Awakenings in Eighteenth-Century New England.* Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2017.
Winner, Lauren F. *A Cheerful and Comfortable Faith: Anglican Religious Practice in the Elite Households of Eighteenth-Century Virginia.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2010.
Winship, Michael P. *Godly Republicanism: Puritans, Pilgrims and a City on a Hill.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012.
Woolverton, John Frederick. *Colonial Anglicanism in North America.* Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1984.
Young, B.W. *Religion and Enlightenment in Eighteenth Century England: Theological debate from Locke to Burke.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.