

Bangor University

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

A comparative study of the High Church party in the dioceses of Chester and Bangor between 1688 and 1715.

Wood, Craig David

Award date:
2002

Awarding institution:
Bangor University

[Link to publication](#)

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.


- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

**A Comparative Study of
the High Church Party in
the Dioceses of Chester
and Bangor between 1688
and 1715**

Craig David Wood



The following material has been **excluded** from the digitised copy due to 3rd Party
Copyright restrictions:

NONE

Readers may consult the original thesis if they wish to see this material

**A Comparative Study of
the High Church Party in
the Dioceses of Chester
and Bangor between
1688 and 1715**

**A Definition of High Churchmanship
According to Diocesan Consensus**

SUMMARY

Modern scholarship defines High Churchmanship as a distinct and partisan branch of the Anglican Church in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, especially in the context of religious intrigues in the houses of civil and church government in London. Throughout the period between the Revolution of 1688 and the accession of the House of Hanover in 1715, the High Church party are commonly associated with the political Tories and are deemed as those who supported the exiled Stuart dynasty and engaged in intrigues toward deposing King William III, undermining Queen Anne and opposing the succession of King George I.

In a religious context the High Church party are accepted as having been actively engaged in opposing religious Dissent, and in seeking to secure legislative censure against the Dissenters. They are perceived as a branch of the Church who sought to preserve some elements of Roman Catholic tradition within the Church of England, and actions such as bowing toward the altar and kneeling at receipt of Communion are espoused as indicative of High Church affiliation, as is the arrangement of church furniture, and particularly the positioning of the Communion Table.

By considering two specific dioceses, Bangor and Chester, both of which are a sufficient distance from London not to be shaped instantly or directly by events in Convocation or Parliament, this study will examine what High Churchmanship meant to the clerics, prelates and laity of two very different dioceses at the end of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth centuries. In doing so, it will also seek to establish how High Churchmanship survived as a distinct standpoint in the period between 1688 and 1715 as other religious viewpoints, such as Jacobitism and the Nonjuring stance, overlapped the High Church position, and will assess the extent to which this stance was an organised, partisan one.

CONTENTS


List of Tables	v
List of Appendices	vi
Preface	vii
Acknowledgements	viii
1 Defining High Churchmanship	1
The Appeal to History	4
The High Churchmen of the Seventeenth Century	9
The High Church Group	13
2 The Nonjuror Schism	17
The Deposition of James II and the accession of William and Mary	18
Schism among the High Churchmen	24
The Nonjuror Wilderness	29
3 The High Church Party after the Schism	33
Britain Under William and Mary	34
Comprehension and Toleration	38
The Convocation Controversies	43
King William and the Commission for Preferments	48
4 The Reign of Queen Anne	54
The Accession and Succession of Queen Anne	55
The Convocation Disputes under Queen Anne	60
The Church of England under Queen Anne	63
5 Evidence for a High Church Consensus in the dioceses of Bangor and Chester	74
Doctrinally Reconciling the Revolution	76
The Effect of Division on Practice	89
The Effect of Division on Doctrine	94
The Practical Expression of Division	99
6 Clerical Responses to Divisions and Political Developments in the dioceses of Bangor and Chester	105
The New Enemy of the Nonjurors and the Old Enemy of Popery	106
High Church Reactions to Toleration of Dissenters	115
Clerical Reaction to Henry Sacheverell, the Succession of King George I and the riots of 1715	122

7 Lay Evidence of the Existence of a High Church Consensus within the dioceses of Bangor and Chester	137
Lay Tory, Nonconformist and Jacobite Affinities	138
Lay involvement in the Riots of 1715	159
Lay Affiliation to the High Church Standpoint	162
8 Redefining High Churchmanship	170
Appendix A	ix
List of References	xv
Bibliography	

List of Illustrations

Map 1	x
Towns mentioned in a National Context	
Map 2	xi
Towns mentioned in Wales	
Map 3	xii
Towns mentioned in England	
Map 4	xiii
Areas mentioned around Preston	


Maps drawn by Philip Horrocks.



672 MILES

336 MILES

MAP 1



LLANDDYFNAN

MENAI

BEAUMARIS

• BANGOR

• LLANDDEINIOLEN

• CAERNARFON


• PENMACHNO

• LLANFYLLIN

116 MILES

MAP 2

MAP 1



PLEASE SEE MAP FOUR

STANDISH

PRESTON

WIGAN

LIVERPOOL

SALFORD

WARRINGTON

MANCHESTER

ALTRINCHAM

MACCLESFIELD

INCE

CHESTER


ECCLESTON

NANTWICH

336 MILES

MAP 3

440 MILES



MAP 4

List of Appendices

Appendix 1

ix

List of the Bishops of Bangor and
Chester Dioceses 1688-1715

PREFACE

In seeking to reach a definition of High Churchmanship contemporary to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, this study will begin by considering the background of the High Church standpoint, with reference to the history of the Church of England from the Reformation. It will then outline the tumultuous nature of the reign of King James II and examine the reasons for his downfall, and continue to consider the responses of Anglican clerics in a national and diocesan context, with the use of both primary and secondary material. This will involve consideration of issues like the settlement of the succession in the House of Hanover, the preservation of the Church and its offices, and support of both the Revolution and the Stuart cause.

Focusing on religious, temporal and lay reaction alike, the latter half of the study will then consider primary evidence gathered from original research to determine the extent to which High Churchmanship, as manifest in the dioceses of Bangor and Chester, was similar in its emphases and priorities to the national picture depicted by events in London. In so doing it will seek to redefine the term "High Churchmanship", and consider the validity of applying national evidence to a parochial society.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Every thesis must begin with a lengthy list of people to whom an enormous debt of gratitude is owed, and this one is no exception.

On an academic level, my thanks are owed to all the staff at the School of Theology and Religious Studies at the University Of Wales, Bangor, including Dr Densil Morgan for guidance in the early stages of the thesis, and more especially to my supervisor, Dr Geraint Tudur, for his continued advice and support. Dr Tony Claydon of the School of History and Welsh History also deserves recognition for his early assistance. The staff of all the libraries and depositories that I visited are also due my sincere thanks. Those at; the Archive Department of Central Library, Manchester, Chethams Library, Manchester, and especially Barbara and Tony Meehan for making my introduction to the library so easy, John Rylands Library, Manchester, the Lancashire County Records Office, Preston, Lambeth Palace Library, London, the National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth, the Local History Library, Salford and the Archives and Manuscripts Department at the University of Wales, Bangor. Also those libraries who replied to my initial enquiries with such speed and courtesy, including the Archive Library, Canterbury and Gwynedd County Records Office, Caernarfon.

Personally I owe a massive debt to numerous friends for their patience, tolerance and feigned interest, especially Phil Horrocks, Ian Simmonds, Emma Moore, Justin Barrass and Sarah Kelly. Special mention ought to be made of Niamh O'Neill, Lisa Major, Emma Garner and Ian Robinson for their assisting me in surviving London, and Bob Gillatt for his endless supplies of letters which helped combat loneliness in Aberystwyth. Mavis and Owen Von Blydenstein and all the friends I made through them in Bangor, also deserve my special

thanks for ensuring that I devoted suitable time to play, as well as to work.

Special mention must also be made of the people who have bravely borne the spectre of sharing a house with a PhD student; Graeme Edwards, Rob Jones, James Garside, Thomas and Taka, Dorothy Harkin and all of the San Marino Community who made me feel so welcome in London, and last but by no means least Carys Alwen Jones, Angharad Hughes, Jon Hughes and Clifford Tomos. As always though, my greatest debt of gratitude is to my parents, Chris and Dave, and my brother Mark, without whose continued support, love and humour this thesis would never have seen the light of day. All of those mentioned here have been more of a support than they can ever know.

CHAPTER 1

Defining High Churchmanship.

The High Church party of the period 1688 to 1715 was a discordant body whose coherence varied according to the behaviour, systems of beliefs, doctrinal allegiances and political affiliations of its individual adherents. Consequently, it is not always easy to distinguish a distinct High Church party within the Church of England, but it is possible to detect a High Church consensus. There was a body of Anglican divines who, though not divided into a clearly discernible partisan group, shared a specific sense of the cohesion and singularity of the Anglican faith. They envisaged a future role for the Church of England which embodied a return to the predominance it had enjoyed before the turmoil of revolution and the onset of the toleration of dissenters, which recognised their legal right to worship outside of the Church of England(1).

All Anglican divines, and especially the High Churchmen, sought to limit any discord within the Church following the revolution of 1688 as part of an effort to avoid the sectarianism that came to characterise the Church of England in the aftermath of the regicide of 1649. The upheaval of revolution at that time gave rise to a radicalism which though not typical of Protestant thought was noteworthy and proved divisive within the Church. Alongside the factious stalwarts of Calvinists and Presbyterians, the Church of England found itself embracing numerous groups all of which found a widely varying significance in the downfall of the monarch. Mortalism, for instance, associated the demise of the King, and with him the monarchy, with the death of the soul, at which it enters a state of sleep to await Armageddon. This implied that not only would the monarchy

enjoy a resurgence, but also that the soul entered an after life, a view which conservatives found contentious because it denied the concepts of divine reward and punishment, and therefore also a need for order. Meanwhile, the alcohol and tobacco revelling Ranters legitimised the act of revolution by asserting that sin "has its conception only in the imagination", and the Revolution therefore was not sinful. Such divisions furnished Nonconforming enemies of the Church with ample opportunities for conversion, and advances were made in rural areas, as at Warwickshire where it was claimed that Baptist missionaries led Anglicans into heresy. The Socinian John Biddle, whose biblical exegesis challenged the doctrine that salvation lay in the merits of Christ, also attracted some Anglican supporters who were accused of heresy. Censorship of the presses and parliamentary acts against adultery, fornication, swearing and blasphemy in 1650 helped to nullify the onslaught against the Church, but the period up to the Restoration in 1660 continued to be dominated by a sectarianism which hardened denominational lines and neglected practical morality(2).

With regard to the question of Restoration in 1660, one group of Anglican divines began to look back to the Church's inheritance from the Caroline divines like Archbishop William Laud (1573-1645), who had emphasised the primitive origins of the Church of England, which;

was for them no haphazard product of political compromise, but the one pure and authentic embodiment of primitive tradition(3).

These clerics recalled a "Golden Age" of the Church in which its affluence and predominance in all spheres of life was indisputable and its dedication to the spiritual welfare of its members of paramount importance. They looked beyond the English Reformers and the Puritans to the executed King Charles, who assumed the status of a martyr sacrificed for the well being of his Church(4).

During the reign of King James II their studies were subordinated by the monarch's obsession with restoring the Roman faith. The clergy were united in defence of the Church, maintaining her stance as part of the true apostolic church, whilst simultaneously highlighting her Anglican doctrine which rendered her irreconcilable with Rome on fundamental issues such as the significance of the eucharist(5). However, this atmosphere of comradeship was shattered in 1688 by the Glorious Revolution which removed the threat of Roman Catholicism by disregarding the foundation stone of the national Church, the right of a legitimate, hereditary monarch to rule both his kingdom and Church.

James' removal and the accession of William and Mary forced all Churchmen, lay and clerical, to choose between betrayal of their country in not supporting James or of their Church in not supporting the Prince of Orange and his bride, James' daughter(6). The vision of an all inclusive national Church, embracing both her Reformed and Catholic roots had been destroyed(7). For the first time, "the Anglican communion was made aware of itself as an independent branch of the church universal"(8), and its members struggled to reconcile themselves to the demands made of them. Fictious division ensued, and as each school of thought considered how best to "salvage the wreck of the Church establishment"(9), that group which at the Restoration had began to recall the dominance, discipline and apostolic nature of the Caroline Church, continued its reappraisal of ecclesiastical and spiritual life. Their study was part of a wider recognition of the importance of church history to theological enquiry and ecclesiastical issues, which was taking place during the seventeenth century(10), and it was in this context that the term "High Churchman" first became general(11).

1. The Appeal to History

The religious Reformation of the sixteenth century prompted theological debate across Europe and occasioned a ferment of ideas, both within and outside of the Church, that seemed impossible to suppress(12). In 1688 history seemed to be repeating itself on a smaller scale as the certainty of the Anglican position was called into question, and the spirit of High Churchmanship began to reaffirm itself by tracing its own origins.

A High Church standpoint had been evident within the Church of England since the mid-sixteenth century. King Henry VIII had precipitated the growth of a body committed to retaining its links with the universal church by seeking no noticeable change in ethos when he formed the Church of England. Royal supremacy had merely replaced the papacy, as George Booth, Lord Delamere of Cheshire attested with reference to the King in his comments on the Preface to the Book of Common Prayer;

save his throwing of the Pope's Supremacy, (he) did continue in all other respects of the Church of Rome to the time of his Death(13).

Queen Elizabeth I continued this tradition, informing Pope Pius IV that she was "as good a Catholic as any". But during her reign the Puritan clergy began to push for further ecclesiastical reformation, and in response to this pressure certain Anglican divines began a tradition of writing which established the High Church foundations. The most notable of these was Richard Hooker (1554-1600), who had experienced religion and learnt theology in the Elizabethan Church, and who published his Treatise on the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity in 1594. He appealed to reason and history in defence of the Elizabethan Church and asserted the authority of that Church, its clerics and early patristic writings in those

matters that were not included in biblical teaching(14). Hooker had been preceded in 1562 by the Apology written by Bishop John Jewel of Salisbury (1522-1571), who recanted his Calvinist leanings to support the logical basis of the Elizabethan Church. With the same appeal to history, he wrote;

We have planted no new religion, but only have renewed the old that was undoubtedly founded and used by the apostles of Christ and other holy fathers in the primitive church, and of this long late time, by means of the multitude of...traditions and vanities has been drowned(15).

His appeal to the first six centuries of church history as the foundation of Christian belief and practice, and Hooker's synthesis of temporal church authority and biblical revelation, emphasised the role of history on which later High Church scruples were to be based.

The accession of Elizabeth I in 1558 heralded the start of the third major religious transformation for the British people in as many reigns. Following the reign of Mary and her affirmation of Roman Catholicism, Elizabeth changed the religious focus back to that of Protestantism. But a "determined traditionalism" survived, committed to maintaining remnants of the old Roman religion(16). Elizabeth and her government were conscious of the complexity of conversion and of the ambiguities which lay in the opposition between the Catholic and Protestant allegiances of the population. Division was not institutionalised(17), but lay within individual concerns for spiritual welfare or political loyalty which could not be overcome by the requirements or demands of statutes. For this reason the state satisfied itself with prosecution of crimes committed by recusants but did not go beyond the deed into the beliefs of the perpetrator(18), so that Roman Catholic elements of religion were allowed to perpetuate themselves. In this vein, the Act of Uniformity of 1559 may have abolished the mass and

introduced a modified Prayer Book, but it did not leave "traditionalists" without hope that something of the old order might continue(19). Indeed, Archbishop William Laud's project of re-erecting altar rails around communion tables during the 1630's would not have been possible had Elizabeth not ordered through the Prayer Book that tables be accorded high regard and be kept "decently made" and "commonly covered" (20). Evidence that parishoners sought to maintain some elements of the Roman service can be seen at Chester, where visitors to the town were advised that a Mistress Dutton kept the Rood, two pictures and a mass book from the church of St. Peter, whilst a Peter Fletcher secretly kept certain images from the church of St. Mary(21). It was these unwilling converts to Protestantism, in perpetuating the historically affirmed processes of the Church of Rome, who began the High Church movement on a diocesan level.

During the reign of James I, Archbishop Richard Bancroft of Canterbury (1544-1610) went some way toward upholding this position when he quashed Puritan attempts at transforming the character of the Church of England at the Hampton Court Conference of 1604. The Puritans had sought reform on matters of practice and discipline, specifically the reviewing of "popish" elements in ceremonies, such as the use of a ring in the marriage service and the use of the cross in baptism. James regarded these practices as trivial and in a deliberate show of obstinacy prompted the newly appointed archbishop to enforce the canons of the 1604 convocation which required all clerics not merely to conform to the doctrines and ceremonies of the Church, but also to conform to them "willingly". Many Puritans recognised this as a portent, and in time were to withdraw to New England(22).

With the accession of Charles I in 1625, and the elevation of William Laud to Canterbury in 1633, the High Church appeal to antiquity reached its zenith. Laud defined a branch of High Churchmanship which became notorious in the period prior to the Civil War and was undoubtedly a

contributory factor to it. "Laudianism" as it was termed was distinct for its emphasis on loyalty to the monarchy; it assumed that the position of the reigning monarch within a nationally established church was as historically important as the apostolic inheritance of the episcopate through which it could claim its authority. Laudianism was also committed to the reform of ecclesiastical ceremony, buildings and discipline and aimed to restore some traditional elements to Church services. His reward was to be accused of Popery when he allowed the erection of rails around some Church altars. In conjunction with this stance, Laud stressed the importance of the sacraments as the principal means of grace, rather than the biblical revelation of the Puritans, and upheld an anti-Calvinist interpretation of the doctrine of election. He was also concerned to safeguard against the immoralities of his day, and sought tighter clerical controls. With the Puritanism of the Commonwealth which had seen the outlawing of the Prayer Book and the assertion of Independency(23) still fresh in the memories of those alive during the 1680's, the High Church stance offered an attractive alternative(24). However, when its emphasis of government by episcopal aristocracy under a Royal Supremacy was challenged in 1688 with the enforced removal of the legitimate sovereign, the High Church group themselves were to be divided(25).

That the High Churchmen of the seventeenth century owed something of their development to Laud and their Caroline counterparts is evidenced in a description of the characteristics of High Churchmen. C.O Addleshaw notes that they stressed the independence of the Church from the state but acknowledged a oneness of Church and society in which the role of the Church was to sanctify national life and give society a Godward purpose(26). John Stoughton draws attention to the basis of High Church theology, not just the early Church Fathers but also scripture, the Creeds and the Book of Common Prayer, coupled with a fierce prejudice against Nonconformists(27). Gordon Rupp also draws attention to their

loyalty to the monarch through a renewed emphasis on the doctrines of Passive Obedience and Passive Resistance. These concepts envisaged royal authority as a reflection of God's providential rule of the world and viewed the monarch as divinely appointed to the throne through a legitimate line of hereditary succession. For this reason supporters of them felt unable to offer any resistance to the monarch because to do so constituted a sin against God. Rather they considered it their obligation to offer only obedience to the monarch, regardless of the nature or severity of his transgressions(28).

Contemporary writers were also convinced of what constituted a High Church mentality. Henry Sacheverell, a London cleric and High Churchman who became notorious in 1709 when he gave a sermon which outlined the danger posed by Dissenters to the Church, emphasised in his Character of a Low Churchman of 1702, how a High Churchman;

is High for the divine right of Episcopacy...the uninterrupted Succession...the Liturgies against extemporary Prayers...the primitive Doctrine and Discipline of the Ancient Church. He much laments the destruction of the Episcopal Church in Scotland...He believes separation from the Church of England to be a damning Schism, and the Dissenters to be in a very dangerous state, notwithstanding the toleration...He is so High as to observe the traditional customs as well as the written laws of the Church, and he always bowed very low before the Altar and at the name of Jesus(29).

As well as High Church views of the history and authority of the Church, Sacheverell also stresses their support of the primitive doctrine of the Church, which gave them marked convictions on the ministry, the eucharist, baptism and confession.

However, both contemporary and secondary assessments of the characteristics of High Churchmanship are fraught with potential flaws. While some of the leading High Church protagonists of London, like Sacheverell, focused on the

threat of Dissent to the Church of England, or were divided on points of dogma concerning the arrangement of church furniture and emphasis of elements of service, other prominent High Church clerics were inflamed by different aspects of Anglican doctrine. An examination of the lives of individual clerics who have been labelled High Churchmen suggests that this diversity of emphasis was determined by the individual beliefs of each cleric, the importance he attached to various elements of the Anglican faith and the way in which he envisaged the future growth of the Church of England.

ii. The High Churchmen of the Seventeenth Century.

The variation in doctrinal concerns evident among prominent individual clerics is reflected parochially in the dioceses under consideration. This provides an intimate insight into the nature of High Churchmanship across the country but renders an extended examination of the High Church sentiments of any individual noted as a leading High Churchman beyond the scope of this work(30). However, a brief enquiry into the convictions of three individuals recognised as leading High Churchmen in a national context, might prove valuable in an attempt to identify a lucid, High Church criterion.

Archbishop William Sancroft of Canterbury (1617-1693) was one of those deprived in 1691 for refusing to swear the Oath of Allegiance to King William. He belonged to a group which became known as the "Nonjurors" who felt unable, at the Revolution of 1688, to switch allegiance to a usurper King at the deposition of the legitimate monarch, around whom Sancroft had attempted to build a loyalist, royalist Church(31). Although his belief in the High Church ideals of Passive Obedience and hereditary succession were so tenacious that they were to cost him his see, Sancroft was also known

as a conciliator of Presbyterians(32), believing as he did that spiritual appeal was the best means of tackling Nonconformity. In this way "the lot of nonconformists improved during his office" (33), which was hardly consistent with Laudian High Churchmanship.

A second leading cleric, William Wake (1657-1737), canon of Christ Church, Oxford, was, according to Norman Sykes' examination of his theology,

convinced of his adherence to the main stream of Anglican tradition, as moulded by leading representatives of Caroline high-churchmanship; though...prepared to make greater temporary concessions in face of the urgent necessity of unity amongst protestants(34).

Wake was prominent in the seventeenth century Church as a lone voice seeking to heal the wounds of the Church through unity with her European counterparts(35). He distinguished between fundamental and secondary points of doctrine, and believed that disagreement within the universal church on secondary points was tolerable. These he defined as beliefs which "do not concern the fundamentals of faith, nor destroy the worship of God" (36), and so for the Church of England, the fundamental articles were those revealed in the scriptures and attested to by antiquity, a point reminiscent of the Caroline High Churchmen. The issue of episcopacy was a secondary point because, although it was the preferred system of the Church of England, it did not necessarily constitute the crux of a true church. Wake outlined that he would be "unwilling to affirm that where the ministry is not episcopal there is no church nor any true administration of the sacraments" (37). Outside of the Church of England he rejected tenets of the Lutheran and Calvinist faiths, but his Christian sympathies did embrace Swiss Calvinists, Gallican reformists and the Roman Catholic Church, with whom he expressed a desire for union in his 1686 publication Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England(38). He

was also known to clash with some leading High Church figures, including Francis Atterbury whose 1703 assertion of Convocation's independent rights from the monarch and parliament aroused Wake's sensibilities(39).

His affinity with the High Church standpoint was evident in his refusal to occupy any vacated Nonjuring sees after 1691, and in this stance Wake had something in common with John Sharp (1645-1714), the dean of Canterbury, an ally of the parliamentary Tory party and, according to Rupp "an excellent example of a high churchman" (40). Sharp's refusal to occupy any of the vacated sees angered King William, but his candour in his theological beliefs and his open association with Nonconformists won for the future Archbishop of York a popular and well liked reputation(41). He was noted for his distaste of Rome, and refused to read James II's "Declaration of Indulgences" in 1688, but he upheld the doctrine of hereditary kingship and even offered prayers for James in parliament as he fled the country, while at the same time denouncing the King's deposition by his subjects(42).

Sharp's most notable diversion from High Church doctrine was his correspondence with foreign churches, many of whom the High Church denounced because of their non-episcopal status. He wrote to Jablonski of Prussia concerning a union of the Lutheran and Reformed churches, the Lutheran church being considered the closest to the Church of England in doctrine and discipline(43). This also brought him into correspondence with the Electress Sophia in Hanover, who favoured the introduction of the English liturgy to her court as a catalyst for union. Although this correspondence was incongruous with a High Church loathing of Nonconformity, Sharp asserted that the plan involved no compromise of his views. He maintained that he and his co-conspirators, John Grabe and George Smalridge, sought to establish Anglicanism as the corner stone of a great, united church, by embracing the established church of most of Germany. The episcopal nature of the Lutheran church and the similarity of its

liturgy with that of the Anglican church served as a basis for union, but as far as English Nonconformity was concerned, Sharp placed the onus of schism firmly with Dissent(44).

At the other end of the theological spectrum traditional supporters of other factions found something in common with the High Churchmen. Archbishop Thomas Tenison (1636-1715), whose concern for the Protestant succession led him to support the Whigs, shared some High Church views of the alliance between Church and state, as did the author and Irish cleric Jonathan Swift (1667-1745), who despite being generally of a "more middling nature", wrote,

A Church of England man hath a true veneration for the scheme established among us of ecclesiastical government(45).

Bishop Edmund Gibson (1669-1748), Chaplain to Tenison and an ally of the Whigs, followed the High Church line on the Toleration Act. The Act sought to retain all citizens under the aegis of ecclesiastical authority by offering Dissenters comprehension into the Church of England rather than toleration outside of it. Comprehension involved a "widening" of the Anglican Church so that it could incorporate moderate Dissenters within its fold, who differed from it only in points of secondary importance. It was hoped that such a scheme would combat the threat of fervent Dissenters by depriving their ministers and chapels of the protection of the law(46). Gibson also supported Sharp in the matter of reinforced Sabbath Observance, whilst his 1713 work Codex Juris Ecclesiastici Anglicani asserted such firm views of sacerdotal authority that it earned its author a comparison to Laud(47). Similarly, William Jane (1645-1707), dean of Christ Church, Oxford, was labelled a Calvinist but opposed plans for Comprehension in 1689 and campaigned alongside Francis Atterbury (1662-1732) as Prolocutor of the Lower House of Convocation, for the rights and privileges of the clergy in that House(48). Bishop George Morley of Winchester

was also a noted Calvinist, but was familiar with High Church circles, and even had a High Church chaplain in Thomas Ken(49), while the liberal Gilbert Burnet described Laud's Relation of a Conference with Fisher the Jesuit as "one of the best books we have" (50).

This considerable diversity of opinion among Anglican clerics suggests that few were primarily concerned with either party or political motives or a set agenda. Many harboured coherent convictions on numerous issues which cut across labels like Whig and Tory, or High and Low Church(51). Even those most closely associated with High Church values do not seem to conform to any partisan standpoint on any issue.

iii. The Low Church Group.

It is easier to appreciate what made High Churchmanship in the seventeenth century distinct by comparing it with other forms of Anglican Churchmanship during this period. If High Churchmanship can be said to represent the right wing of the theological spectrum within the Church of England then the left extreme was occupied by the Low Churchmen.

The Low Church were those who, at the Revolution of 1688, urged the Church to look forward and adapt to new circumstances rather than look back to antiquity(52). The Low Church developed from the religious settlements of 1604 and 1662 which left those despairing of finding spiritual satisfaction in the Church of England to form their own societies. Many Puritans remained part of the Church since many of its articles were written from their perspective, and it was from them that the Low Church movement grew. They dismissed forms of ecclesiastical government as unimportant, accepting those already established as harmless in so much as they allowed freedom in the sacraments. They held Erastian convictions that the Church should have no independent

initiative in moral discipline, and they argued that the Church should be run by the state to maintain it on a national basis, whilst eliminating ceremony and mysteries from worship as far as possible(53). They opposed Nonconformists in principle but felt some sympathy with them as fellow Protestants, and they desired friendship with anti-Catholic and Dissenter groups in the common struggle against Rome and France, who they felt posed the greatest threat to the Church of England(54). They viewed themselves as liberal, rational and moderate(55).

A contemporary tract entitled The Principles of the Low Church Men of 1714 lists eight important articles which distinguish Low from High Churchmen. It asserts that Low Churchmen support the supremacy of the crown; the maintenance of episcopacy and validity of Dissenters' baptism; the necessity of absolution and the observing of the Lord's supper as a sacrament; the principles of comprehension, toleration and moderation; the divine appointment of the Lord's day and the maintenance of the doctrines of Passive Obedience and hereditary right. It also states that they are firmly opposed to the practice of bowing toward the altar(56).

The Low Church group found their political counterparts in the parliamentary Whig party. The nickname "Whig" derived from the term "Whiggamore" which referred back to a group of Scottish Presbyterians who had organised petitions against the dissolution of parliament at the time that the succession of James II, then Duke of York, was being discussed. Opponents of the Low Church accused the Whig group of a similar interest toward revolution and republicanism. Indeed, they were firm supporters of the Revolution of 1688, but were subsequently also supporters of the Hanoverian succession, and came to be viewed less as threats to the constitution and more as liberals, who supported religious liberty through toleration. In contrast the parliamentary Tory party represented a counter to such liberty and attracted High

Church support. The label derived from the Irish language and referred to a group of dissident Irish papists who forged a living from highway robbery. The application of the term referred to the refusal of the party to support a bill excluding the Duke of York from the line of succession to the British throne in 1679, insinuating that those who would not support it were robbing the supporters of Protestantism(57).

At the centre of the theological spectrum stood the Latitudinarians, a group which had much in common with the Low Churchmen(58). The Latitudinarians, later labelled "Broad Churchmen", derived from the Cambridge Platonists, a group of mid-seventeenth century divines at the colleges of Cambridge University who regarded Plato and the Greek philosophers as the primitive fathers of the church. They rejected notions of religion, like outward observances, and stressed an internal understanding of religion based on its reasonableness, its rationality and its liberalism(59). Influenced by the dawn of the scientific age and continental Enlightenment, Latitudinarianism abandoned this philosophical stance and fell back on the traditional defences of the Athanasian creed, the apostolic succession and the Trinity. They sought to replace fixed creeds and dogmatic formulae with simplicity, order and intelligibility, believing that purity of heart and life was the way to true knowledge(60). They asserted that the authority of the Bible lay in its ability to speak directly to the heart, and they allowed liberty of worship and doctrine to a greater extent than any other Anglican body(61). An apology for their standpoint; "A Brief Account of the New Sect of Latitudemen: Together with Some Reflections on the New Philosophy" appeared in 1662 in which its author, Simon Patrick, asserted that the group did not deviate from accepted standards in liturgy and Church government, but preferred "virtuous mediocrity" to extreme rites and ceremonies, and considered the government of the Church to be apostolic. They accepted the Church's creeds and the Thirty-Nine Articles and claimed as their source the

writings of the apostles and clerics of the ancient church(62).

The difficulty facing the historian seeking to distinguish between these groups is the immense overlap which occurs between them all, not least because they were all part of the Anglican Church. Despite the division in doctrine that seems to have existed between them, it seems that a fundamental consensus survived within the Church and men with widely varying and incompatible views managed to maintain relationships. In this way the High Churchmen were not distinct in their allegiance to the Church of England, but,

shared with their Whig and Latitudinarian contemporaries a patriotism of the church such as no other communion possessed, but in their case it was a vision rooted in the long succession of Christian centuries and in the Apostolic church(63).

The High Church standpoint marked a resistance on the part of Anglicanism to absorption into an undifferentiated Protestantism. The High Church movement may not have represented a well organised party with a conscious programme, but they did constitute a group of individuals with a purpose that made them distinct from other Anglican individuals. As the Whig, or Low Church group, and the Latitudinarians sought to make the best of a fluid political situation, the High Churchmen refused to accept for the Church the "place in English society of a basically voluntary body working within the legal conditions of the establishment" (64), and in a national context they strove to preserve and restore the Church's authority.

CHAPTER 2

The Nonjuror Schism

The Revolution of 1688 occasioned divisions within the Anglican Church, and one of the most profound was that which occurred among the High Churchmen. The usurpation of the legitimate monarch and the succession he represented left those who scrupled the legitimacy of the Revolution facing the dilemma of hypocrisy or refusing to swear allegiance to King William and deprivation from their livings. Those who chose the latter were to become known as the "Nonjurors".

With their backward looking stance toward the traditions of Caroline, Elizabethan and Henrican clerics, and their appeal to scripture and patristic writings and practice, the High Churchmen of the restoration period were the ideological descendants of those who had supported King Charles I and Archbishop Laud in their reforms of the Church before 1649. During the Commonwealth they had either been in hiding or silent, but at the restoration of the monarchy in 1660 they emerged with similar objectives to those formerly cherished by Laud himself(1). They maintained the concept of a national church in a Christian realm where the clergy exercised spiritual discipline over the nation, supported by their lay counterparts who acted in parliament. They also upheld the doctrines of Passive Obedience, Passive Resistance and devotion to hereditary monarchy as "the shibboleth of good churchmanship" and the duty of every subject(2). They represented an Anglicanism that refused to be absorbed by continental Protestantism, embodying uncompromising convictions of the uniqueness, truth and rightness of the Anglican faith. At the heart of this High Church movement was a simple belief that the conditions of the old establishment could be restored by firm political action(3).

However, the accession of the Roman Catholic James II to the throne in 1685 brought a period of uncertainty to the Church as the King appeared to be attempting to reintroduce the Roman faith to Britain. Over the Christmas and New Year period between 1688 and 1689 a series of dramas were to be played out which culminated in James' enforced flight to France and the accession to the throne of William of Orange and his wife Mary, James' Protestant daughter. The usurpation of a legitimate, divinely ordained King forced the Church of England clergy into a reappraisal of all that they stood for theologically, morally and pastorally(4). It not only contravened the doctrines of Passive Obedience and Resistance, but it presented the High Churchmen with a crisis of conscience and raised doubts about the spiritual independence of the Church in the context of its Establishment(5). Government policy also played its part in the dilemma of 1689 as the High Churchmen were forced to choose between an enthusiastic Roman Catholic on the one hand and a Dutch Protestant on the other, for whom some High Churchmen, like Thomas Ken, Bishop of Bath and Wells, harboured a personal dislike(6). The result was a schism in the High Church ranks which had the profound effect of draining "off the cream of High Churchmanship from the national church"(7) while leaving those who remained within the Anglican communion vulnerable to criticism and plagued by deep-rooted uncertainty.

1. The Deposition of James II and the accession of William and Mary

In 1681 Charles II had begun preparations for his brother's succession by establishing an ecclesiastical commission to recommend preferments to the King(8). Charles ensured that the commission comprised of royalists who could be relied

upon to be loyal to both him and James, and one of its key members was the Archbishop of Canterbury, William Sancroft. The Archbishop was widely respected by clerics and laity alike as "a person of great prudence and moderation" (9); Bishop Turner of Ely wrote numerous letters to him expressing his respect (10), as did political figures such as Jonathan Swift (1667-1745) and John Dryden (1631-1700), despite his dislike of priests, and so too did Queen Mary as a Princess (11). He was a firm royalist, once describing Charles I as "the best Protestant in these kingdoms and incomparably the best King upon earth", and he was a supporter of the doctrines of Passive Obedience and Non Resistance and thus perceived James as the legitimate successor to Charles II (12).

Sancroft was also a realist and was prepared to accept that some degree of toleration had to be incorporated into the Church of England if it was to respond to the ferment of religious diversity prevalent in Europe (13). He advocated tenderness towards moderate Protestant Dissenters in the hope that they might be persuaded to join the Church in opposition to the common enemy of Rome, through a policy of comprehension (14).

The scheme of comprehension that Sancroft personally envisaged was closer to that which he was to pursue under King William. To incorporate Protestant Dissenters into the Church of England on a fully inclusive basis, he sought the repealing of the Test and Corporation Acts which excluded them from civil office, and the modification of the Prayer Book so that it was more compatible to the standpoint of the more orthodox Dissenters. The hope was that both measures would encourage these groups to return to the pale of the Church (15). As Bishop William Wake was to reflect in his Autobiography, Sancroft had realised that "things could not stand in their present posture", noting that;

It was said that after the civil wars, when the King returned, there was nothing in readiness;...we ought to

be better provided against another time, and duly to consider how we might not only improve our own constitution, but bring over the truly honest and well-meaning Dissenters to join in Communion with us(16).

King James, however, had a wider reaching plan for comprehension which embraced toleration of the common enemy. In 1687 he issued a Declaration of Indulgence, to be read aloud in all churches, that decreed;

all manner of penal laws in matters ecclesiastical for not coming to church or not receiving the sacrament, or for any other nonconformity...be immediately suspended(17).

The High Churchmen were horrified. From their perspective Popery posed as much of a threat to the Church as Puritanism and Whiggery, and in a Roman Catholic King who decreed toleration of Nonconformists they found an embodiment of all those evils(18). Sancroft, despite advocating tenderness toward moderate Dissenters, believed that continuing persecution of obdurate sectaries was necessary to preserve the discipline of the national Church and retain all citizens under its protection(19). He recognised that James' Declaration had placed the Church of England in a perilious position, open to attack from Papists who had the support of the Crown, whilst simultaneously threatened by Dissenters for whom the King had removed all necessity for comprehension to the Church(20). The Declaration had also been made without reference to any other body and with a blatant disregard for parliament and its processes, and came in the aftermath of the Monmouth Uprising, following the failure of which James had ordered three hundred of Monmouth's co-conspirators to be executed and a futher eight hundred sold into slavery in the West Indies(21). Sancroft and six of his Bishops, those of Bath and Wells, St. Asaph, Peterborough, Ely, Bristol and Chichester, felt the need to act in response(22), and submitted a petition to the King claiming that the,

Declaration is founded upon such a Dispensing power, as hath often been declared illegal in Parliament...and is a matter of so great moment and consequence to the whole nation, both in Church and State, that your Petitioners cannot in prudence, honour or conscience, so far make themselves parties to it...Your Petitioners therefore most humbly and earnestly beseech your Majesty that you will be graciously pleased not to insist upon their distributing and reading your Majesty's said Declaration(23).

James' response was to imprison all seven petitioners in the Tower on a charge of publishing a seditious libel, though they were later acquitted.

Other High Church clerics were also moved into decisive action against the Declaration. John Sharp, who as James' chaplain and Rector of St.Giles-in-the-Fields had preached against Roman Catholicism and James' Injunctions for Preachers in 1686, also refused to read the Declaration of Indulgences(24). Bishop Henry Compton of London (1632-1713) was suspended for his refusal to suspend Sharp, and was instrumental in organising a number of consultation meetings amongst clerics who shared his concern for renewal of the Church. By their aims and programme of discussion, which included issues such as practical and pastoral theology, administration of the sacraments, confirmation and catechising(25), these constituted the first definitive grouping of men sharing High Church sentiments during this period. Their concerns were manifested in 1689 in a collection of tracts intended as a reasoned statement of the case of the Church at that time. It was published in 1698 as A Collection of Cases and Other Discourses or The London Cases against Dissent and included work from clerics across the theological spectrum like Sharp, Tenison, John Tillotson, dean of St.Pauls (1630-1694) and Simon Patrick, Bishop of Chichester (1626-1707)(26).

The High Church lay response to the Declaration was typified by Henry Dodwell, Camdenian Professor of Ancient

History at Oxford who pointed out that toleration involved admitting into the Church those parties who ought to be excluded from it because of their exclusion from the apostolic succession. It was this threat to the Church's foundations that convinced scholars like Dodwell that the Church was now in danger(27).

Following the release of the seven Bishops, negotiations toward agreement on religious issues to be raised in the next parliament were begun between Nonconformist ministers, who visited the Bishops in the Tower, and the Archbishop and London clergy(28). Francis Lee's Life of Mr John Kettlewell, published in 1718, lists twenty one articles pertaining to "the better Securing and Strengthening of the Protestant Interest and Religion, and for making the Church of England the Head of that Interest"(29). George Every ascribes these articles to the negotiations between Dissenters and Anglicans(30), and points to William Wake's defence of Sancroft at Sacheverell's trial in 1710, where Wake described how;

The design was...To improve, and if possible, to inforce our discipline; to review, and enlarge our liturgy; by correcting of some things, by adding of others: and if it should be thought advisable by authority, when this matter should come to be legally considered, first in Convocation, then in Parliament, by leaving some few ceremonies, confess'd to be indifferent in their nature, as indifferent in their usage, so as not to be necessarily observed by those who made a scruple of them(31).

Bishop Francis Turner of Ely (1638-1700) wrote to warn Sancroft in September 1688 that;

It grows every day plainer to me that many of our divines, men of name and note...intend upon any overture for comprehension...to offer all our ceremonies in sacrifice to the dissenters, kneeling at the sacrament and all...(and) would strip this poor church of all her ornaments(32).

Turner's standpoint, Every asserts, is "the beginning of what became the appeal to a popular High Church feeling against" those "who would sell the ceremonies to win over the Presbyterians" (33).

However, the intrigues of the Church were rendered incidental by those of the politicians. During the trials of the seven Bishops, Edward Russell, the Earl of Shrewsbury, had taken advantage of the excitement it occasioned to highlight to William of Orange James' alienation from his subjects. With the birth of a heir to James, ending the consoling hope that the Crown would eventually be restored to Protestant succession, Russell saw his moment to execute a plan amongst the most influential men of state to invite William of Orange to England to assume the throne. On June 30, 1688 Russell himself, Lord Danby of Shrewsbury and Lord Lumley of Devonshire, Bishop Compton, the suspended and embittered Bishop of London, and Henry Sidney, Ambassador to the Hague, signed a letter urging William to come to England to maintain the Protestant religion and the laws and liberties of the country(34). William, who had been kept informed of events in Britain for some time, needed no further mandate and by November 1688 had landed at Torbay. By the following month he had reached Exeter and James, sensing the inevitable, fled Whitehall on 11 December, famously casting the Great Seal of England into the Thames as he went. With the King voluntarily gone, Archbishop Sancroft formed a Provisional Government which invited William to London to assume control. However, when James was captured at Faversham, Kent, the same government sent a party to retrieve him and return him to London as King. Upon reassuming the throne James once again flooded Whitehall with Papist priests and agents, and observing that he had learnt nothing from the previous few months, William had his mercenaries imprison James. On Christmas Day 1688 he was forcibly taken to Rochester to sail for France(35). England's legitimate King was in exile.

Events moved fast into the New Year. As the House of Lords began drafting a petition to William requesting that he assume the throne, Sancroft called his Bishops to London for discussions. Bishops Ken and Turner produced a guide for the deliberations which proposed that they should oppose the deposition of King James, the election of any other King and any intercepting of the right succession to the Crown(36), preferring that William be offered a Regency until a Convention parliament had a chance to discuss the issues. However when the Lords and Commons met in Convention on 22 January, Sancroft stayed away, citing old age and infirmity as his reasons, the same reasons as he had given for not yet having been to pay his respects to the new King(37). He knew what was about to happen and wanted no part of it. By 28 January the Commons had voted that James' desertion constituted abdication and they resolved that the throne be offered to William. When the Lords vetoed this decision William made it plain that he was not prepared to accept any designation other than King. Furthermore, Mary indicated that she was prepared to concede all her powers to her husband because only the position of monarch could make residence in, and devotion to, Britain tenable for William as the Prince of Orange whose devotion was also due to his Dutch subjects. Given the lack of any alternative, the Lords concurred with the Commons, and on 13 February 1689 William and Mary were crowned. Sancroft was not present, leaving Bishop Compton of London to conduct the ceremony(38).

ii. Schism among the High Churchmen

In 1689 the High Church clergy were forced to choose between a monarch who seemed determined to bring about the destruction of Anglicanism through his Popery, and recanting their theories of indefeasible hereditary right. Those who

subscribed to the doctrines of Passive Obedience and Non Resistance also recognised James' legitimacy through the hereditary succession of the monarchy, and believed that he embodied God's own authority upon which the preservation of the country was dependent. Britain's was a monarchical order, and it was to the monarch as leader of the country that its people looked for the preservation of harmony and order. This viewpoint had begun with the portrayal of Queen Elizabeth I as the Virgin Queen, virtuous and pure, which first propounded the dignified and religious aura of monarchy. The image was perpetuated by James I, who took a keen interest in theology and constantly propounded the godly aspects of his own position, drawing upon texts from the Psalter which asserted of earthly Kings that "Even by God himself they are called Gods" (39). Such was the extent of these sentiments by the reign of Charles I that in 1640 John Pym claimed that the King represented;

the fountain of justice, of peace, of protection;...the royal power and majesty shines upon us in every public blessing we enjoy(40).

In the aftermath of civil war and regicide, and with the restoration, such fervency, dismissed by one, archetypal Whig historian as a "superstition as stupid and degrading as the Egyptian worship of cats and onions", gained renewed impetus(41). Throughout the period 1688 to 1715 it had an added legitimacy in the person of Louis XIV of France, an enemy of Protestantism who was sure to maximise any British division in government. Although James II represented a hazard to the Church of England, all High Churchmen knew that his deposition represented a greater threat to the stability of the country.

For others, like Bishop Compton of London, James' exclusion seemed justified and sensible, while John Sharp agreed that it was the best course of action on behalf of the Church, but felt uneasy about it nevertheless(42). Few

clerics actually seem to have welcomed William, as Hugh Rice points out; in the Convention that offered him the crown "a majority regarded him merely as the lesser of two evils and a considerable minority as an unwanted usurper" (43). Lord Clarendon wrote in his Diary on the day of the new monarchs coronations;

I think this is the most dismal day I ever saw in my life. God help us: we are certainly a miserable undone people (44).

But on the other hand Samuel Wesley, the High Church father of John and Charles, favoured William and Mary and even went into print in their defence in 1688 (45). William Wake, describing a conversation with his friend Dr William Clagett (1646-1688) during these troubled times, seemed convinced as he wrote his Autobiography that James' deposition had been beneficial. Speaking of Clagett, Wake recalled;

I was startled at his discourse, when I heard him hint at something to be done to put a stop to the King's arbitrary proceedings;...that in some cases such endeavours might be lawful. For which I as much wondered at him then, as I have done at my own folly and ignorance since (46).

For others, though, the threat of Roman Catholicism did not seem to justify departure from the legitimate line of succession (47); Bishops like Sancroft, Thomas Ken of Bath and Wells, Turner of Ely and William Lloyd of Norwich (1637-1710), clerics like John Byrom, who resided within Manchester's Collegiate Church after his deprivation, and George Hickes (1642-1715), former Dean of Worcester, scholars like Jeremy Collier (1650-1726), lecturer at Grays Inn, and Henry Dodwell, and lay figures like William Law and Susanna Wesley, wife of Samuel, were left to wonder how, as Susanna Wesley wrote in 1709;

a King of England can ever be accountable to his subjects for any maladministrations or abuse of power, but as he derives his power from God so to him only must be the answer for using it(48).

The Churchmen stood firm in their convictions. For Thomas Ken, it seemed unreasonable for a parliament, itself of doubtful authority, to ask those men who had risked their lives in resisting the King by opposing his Declaration of Indulgences through their petition, to now agree that promises made to that King in a religious oath could be disposed of(49). As long as James remained alive, he asserted, the Crown was his and those Oaths of Allegiance sworn to him remained valid because he had neither abdicated or been legally deposed. They constituted;

a solemn promise and vow made, as it were, in the presence and name of God...parliament could not dispense them from keeping it(50).

As the government worked on the formulation of an act compelling an Oath of Allegiance to William, debate continued among the High Churchmen as to the legality and validity of the Revolution. Sancroft expressed in a memorandum quoted by George Every that his objection lay in the casting aside of the heir to the throne. He was prepared "To declare the King, by reason of such his principles, and his resolutions to act accordingly, incapable of the government, with which such principles and resolutions are inconsistent and incompatible". But he could not see how the King's actions could disturb the claims of the Prince of Wales(51). Similarly, the final work of William Thomas, Bishop of Worcester, who died in 1689, dismissed those who supported swearing an oath as Jesuits(52), and in the same year the deathbed declaration of John Lake, Bishop of Chichester, that Non Resistance and Passive Obedience were the distinguishing characteristics of the Church of England(53), provoked a series of pamphlets, letters and sermons on the issue.

That a parliamentary body should be involved in the overthrow of a rightful monarch offended many High Church sensitivities. Some believed that the submission of state to the Church was the rightful order of things because the Church of England had once believed in the Divine Right of Kings, and therefore England itself ought to be ruled by an absolute monarchy(54). That the state could also threaten lawfully consecrated Bishops with deprivation if they refused to swear an oath established by secular law was further proof that "the Church was in chains" (55). As Charles Leslie (1650-1722), an Irish Nonjuror argued;

as it is rebellion and usurpation in the Church to extend her commission to civil power, so it is the highest sacrilege and rebellion against Christ for the civil power to extend their commission into the spiritual kingdom...it is confounding of Heaven and Earth: These agree best at the distance God has plac'd them(56).

Caroline High Churchmen all over the kingdom refused to swear the forthcoming oath and Jonas Proast, former chaplain of All Souls, Oxford, who had been removed just prior to the revolution on a charge of "contempt" (57), was reported to have "damned all that gave the Prince of Orange the least countenance" and "ran about town saying he was damned if he took" the oath(58). William himself sensed the uneasiness caused by the question of the oath and suggested that all Bishops be exempt from any Oath of Allegiance unless specifically required to take it by him as a safeguard. Parliament however, were keen to pass the Oath without exception and on 23 February 1689 the bill making the Oath law was carried. All Church of England clerics were to have sworn allegiance to the King by 1 August on pain of suspension, and any who had not done so by 1 February 1690 were to be deprived of their livings(59).

Under such a threat many, including the previously indignant Jonas Proast, were persuaded to swear the Oath, choosing Williamite Toryism over Nonjuror wilderness with the

justification that "for the necessity of government, and by the laws of the land, there is an allegiance or obedience due to King William and Queen Mary" (60). Others asserted that they swore the Oath on the understanding that they agreed to obey William, but honour James (61), or by insisting that their allegiance was due to Mary as a Stuart, while some chose to ease their consciences by believing the rumour that James' recently born son and heir to the throne, was of doubtful lineage to the King (62), and therefore not the rightful heir.

But, despite persuasion from their friends and colleagues, some High Churchmen like Sancroft and Ken, who was even petitioned to take the Oath by his parishoners (63), chose to face the inevitable. They simply were not prepared to resign their offices, and were equally reluctant to embrace the popular sovereignty that rejection of hereditary right implied, steadfastly refusing to pledge their allegiance to a Calvinistic Presbyterian King whose throne was attained unlawfully (64).

As a further attempt at appeasing the situation William waited until April 1691 before making substitute appointments to Non Juring sees to allow tender consciences further reflection. However, the course of law made deprivation inevitable, and those who had not taken the Oath of Allegiance were duly removed from office. Tillotson succeeded Sancroft at Canterbury, delaying his consecration for a month so as not to be made "a wedge to drive out Sancroft" (65). In all, a total of four hundred clerics were deprived of their livings.

iii. The Nonjuror Wilderness

From 1691, with the deprivations of the Nonjuring clergy, the High Church party within the Anglican communion became

distinct from the group which had put such emphasis on the key concepts of divine right and Passive Obedience, the epitome of High Churchmanship. The new High Church group within the Anglican communion were left to redefine themselves, and they did so by entering the political arena in the House of Lords and the Commons in close conjunction with the Tory party. For the Nonjurors the future was to be a quiet, though not uncontroversial one. Their preoccupation was to become the English liturgy and the theological teachings of the primitive fathers, an interest illustrative of their affinities with Anglican divines such as William Wake(66). Ironically, they were to be further divided internally by theological argument regarding ceremonial practice, which came to be centred around the "Usager" and the "Non-Usager" groups(67).

The nature of the Nonjuring schism was a chiefly political one, caused by differences of opinion amongst High Churchmen pertaining to the political state of Britain, and it proved possible for them to maintain some contact with the Anglican High Church group through its disaffected brethren. These included men like Bishop Compton of London, who having signed the letter that invited William over to Britain had gained for himself a reputation as a trouble maker, and was repeatedly passed over for preferment(68). Such contact between the "two wings of the High Church party"(69) kept the Nonjurors involved in ecclesiastical life, albeit at a distance. Henry Dodwell, the former Professor of Ancient History at Oxford, also deprived of his position because of his refusal to swear allegiance to the King, championed their cause into the eighteenth century. In 1700 he exchanged a series of letters with the Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Tenison, which sought negotiations for a settlement between the Church and those clerics in spiritual exile. He suggested the restoration of the three remaining "fathers" of the schism, Sancroft, Ken and Lloyd, without their being required to take the Oath, but agreeing to their being deprived of a

third of their income and their seats in parliament. Opposition from the King seemed certain, so as an alternative Dodwell sought an agreement to disagree on matters of Passive Obedience, the Church's independency from the state and "immoral prayers", by which he meant prayers for the well being of the King and Queen or their heirs. It was his demand for an admission of error for the deprivations that proved too much for Tenison to stomach and the Archbishop's reply, though lost, seems to have left Dodwell in no doubt that negotiations were closed(70).

The lot of the Nonjurors was not an easy one because of the Roman Catholic ties that they were perceived to have. The group did not fit easily into any categorisation, and were labelled Roman Catholic Jacobite supporters because of their loyalty to James. When a plot to overthrow the regime was discovered in 1691, the Nonjuring Bishop Turner of Ely was implicated when one of three men arrested at Tilbury was found to be carrying letters to James from the deprived bishop(71). The Nonjuror conviction that the Church of England was a schismatical body had also led to their appointing suffragan bishops who occupied sees in conjunction with the formal Bishop of the diocese. The Nonjurors felt that this was the only way to preserve the true apostolic succession, but it succeeded only in providing evidence of a connection with a second church, such as the Roman Catholic Church, for those who sought it(72). Despite the fact that the Pope had been consulted about the first round of Nonjuror consecrations by the Archbishop of Paris who King James had involved from exile, the Nonjurors had no sympathy with Rome, and several of them had polemicised against Rome. They included Charles Leslie (1650-1722), George Hickes (1642-1715), Nathaniel Spinckes (1653-1727) and Thomas Brett (1667-1743) rector of Ruckinge, Kent, who refused to swear allegiance to George I following the Sacheverell trial and was deprived as a result(73).

With the accession of Anne in 1702 Nonjuror consciences were eased a little(74). However, by then most of their best known clerics were either gravely ill or deceased; Sancroft had died in 1693, and obscurity beckoned. When Bishop Ken, the last of the original Nonjuring bishops, died in 1711 the decline of the Nonjuring church was well under way, and though David Douglas documents the fate of one Nonjuring scholar who refused to swear an Oath of Allegiance to George I in 1715(75), with the accession of the Hanoverians the Nonjuror movement faded into obscurity. Their schismatical existence, preserving as it did the once linchpin High Church doctrines of Passive Obedience, Non Resistance and hereditary right, left those who remained within the Church seeking to legitimise and justify their stance and necessitated that they redefine their understanding of the link between Church and state.

CHAPTER 3

The High Church Party after the Schism.

The Nonjurors' detachment from the Church left those who swore the Oath of Allegiance to face the dilemma of their own survival. The turmoil of the Revolution left the Church of England a territorial church in a land which had overthrown its Godly Prince, struggling to balance the principles of a national church with those of royal supremacy and episcopal authority and autonomy, themselves incompatible with a national church. A new religious settlement was necessary, and division ensued between those who believed that strict conformity to Anglicanism was the only way to prevent religious anarchy and moral degeneration, and those who encouraged toleration of Dissent as a means of securing the survival of the Church(1).

As they endeavoured to come to terms with their role within a more tolerant society, the clerics of the Church of England were bitterly divided, and their disagreements were to be manifest throughout the Williamite years in a series of publications which ensured debate was both public and inflamed. The traditional divisions were maintained between the High and Low strands of the Church, characterised in the writings of John Locke, a Low Church moderate, and Jonas Proast, the High Churchman(2). However, this division assumed a greater significance in which;

the crucial polarity was not between Anglicanism and Dissent, but between the High Church ideals of the deposed Archbishop William Sancroft, and a new type of churchmanship which sought to seize the pastoral initiative in the aftermath of the Act of Toleration(3).

The future of the Church was dependent on its clerics responding with insight and vigour to the needs of a nation which now at least partially embraced Dissent, and had to look toward its future rather than its past. It was in this respect that the High Church party failed to reach out to the laity, choosing instead to preserve their traditional standpoint and become embroiled in political intrigues and internal bickering.

i. Britain under William and Mary

The involvement of both Whigs and Tories in the Revolution and in affirming William and Mary as King and Queen meant that both were to share in their first government. Despite initial Tory opposition to the idea of William assuming anything more than a regency or a consort, many came to believe that they had not dispossessed King James but that he had deserted them(4). A pro-Mary alliance of Tories and Whigs ensured that regency was defeated in the Lords in January 1689, and the more zealous Tories were forced to accept Mary's wish to share power with her husband. In William's first government, the principal offices of state were shared between the two political parties so that the Tories Daniel Finch, Earl of Nottingham (1647-1730), and Thomas Osbourne, the Earl of Danby (1631-1712) were appointed Lord President and Secretary, while the Whigs George Savile, Marquis of Halifax (1633-1695), and Charles Talbot, Earl of Shrewsbury (1660-1718), occupied the Privy Seal and the second Secretaryship respectively(5).

However, this cordiality was not to last. Williamite policy became one of experimenting with government and alternating power according to whichever party proved most

willing to provide him with finance for his war efforts. Political affiliation was rendered useless, and the formation of cabinets came to depend on the adjustment of personal and sectional groups to the royal will. "Placemen", those whose preferment was determined by their progress at court, seemed to be multiple, so that it became commonly assumed that court and country were the normal divisions of politics. Men like Shrewsbury and Robert Spencer, the Earl of Sunderland (1640-1702), John Churchill, the Earl of Marlborough (1650-1722) and Lord Sidney Godolphin (1645-1712) achieved particular notoriety as middlemen who believed that it did not matter, as Sunderland said, "who serves his Majesty, so long as his Majesty is served", because, as Shrewsbury contended, there was "no such a thing left in being as a party of my mind" (6). These were men who knew how to twist party affiliations without harbouring any of their own. But, as the make up of power alternated from predominantly Tory in 1690 to purely Tory by 1692 and entirely Whig by 1694 (7), the High Churchmen maintained their loyalty to that party with which High theological ground was assumed to lie, namely the Tories (8).

Since it was usual practice for the bishops to vote in favour of that party which secured their individual preferment (9), many of a High Church perspective were inclined to support the Tories. According to Queen Mary's Memoirs, William also considered the Tories to be the natural allies of the throne, but their divisions meant that the King could not be sure of their loyalty, and after 1695 he abandoned them for individuals he could trust. In response, a Country Party emerged which opposed court placemen and thrived on discontent. Political division therefore assumed a new impetus with, as John Lowther, a supporter of the idealised notion of a united parliament, lamented "the buried names of Whig and Tory" (10) assuming a revitalised importance because;

Purely religious scruples were losing their strength and being absorbed in factious political systems(11).

This intermingling of the spiritual and the secular was reflected in the High Church response to the King's management of ecclesiastical policy. As a Dutch Presbyterian William had few sympathies with any of the Church of England's principles or practices, although he was respectful of them. When he visited Chester in June 1690, Henry Prescott, Registrar for the County of Chester, noted that:

during the service, what is more important, (he was) not slothful but intent, not with his mind elsewhere but celebrating, not half asleep but composed, not bustling but well mannered, becoming grave, pious(12).

As a churchwoman, Mary was held in higher esteem than William by ecclesiastics, but her influence was limited because of her reputation as a supplanter of her own father. The Nonjuror Thomas Ken described the Queen as:

one, who I am well assured, had all the Duty in the world for other Relations, which after long and laborious considerations, she judged consistent with her obligations to God, and to her Country(13).

Ken did not doubt that the Queen believed that she acted during the Revolution as her position and duties demanded of her, but he also firmly believed that she had mistreated her father in doing so, and had hoped that forgiveness for her might have been asked by Archbishop Tenison as he administered final absolution to her. Ken wrote to Tenison to illustrate why this might have been necessary:

Was the whole Revolution managed with that Purity of Intention, that perfect Innocence, that exact Justice, that tender Charity, and that unrepachable veracity, that

there was nothing amiss in it, no remarkable failings, nothing that might deserve one penitent Reflection?(14)

With the deprivation of Archbishop Sancroft, William and Mary realised that they had to appoint a successor who shared their vision of the future, and who was capable of placating the Nonjurors and the High Churchmen who shared their sentiments from within the Church. When Sancroft finally left Canterbury in 1691 the King persuaded his friend John Tillotson to accept promotion to the see, despite his professing that "I do not love either the ceremony or trouble of a great place" (15). Tillotson was a Latitudinarian, a term which had several meanings(16). Doctrinally it referred to a group who emphasised that "Christianity was a rational religion and that its fundamental simplicity had been obscured by rigid abstractions" (17). Politically the term referred to that group which seemed to have accommodated themselves to the new regime with a suspicious eagerness(18), and it was the High Churchmen, who abhorred the Latitudinarian position, who were to assume the lead in opposing Tillotson and Mary. The new Archbishop was dismissed as a Socinian heretic(19), and clerics who had no scruples about swearing the Oath of Allegiance themselves developed numerous scruples concerning the deprivation of a bishop by a civil power for political reasons. As his successor, Tillotson bore the brunt of the reaction to Sancroft's departure.

From the outset Tillotson was a leading advocate of toleration of Dissenters. An impetus toward a lasting church settlement through either comprehension or toleration had already been begun by Archbishop Sancroft as a response to the threat of popery and the problem of a monarch who did not subscribe to the teachings of the Church of England. Along with Bishop Burnet and Queen Mary, who shared his

Latitudinarian principles, Tillotson endeavoured to devise a programme of reform which aimed at rectifying the problem of "so much formalism and little devotion" (20) within the Church of England. As well as tackling doctrinal offences like profanation of the sabbath, Tillotson also focused on practical problems, such as pluralism which deprived parishes of a resident vicar. Tillotson believed that this was unacceptable because pastoral and catechetical energy were central to the dissuasion of Dissenters.

Although Tillotson saw toleration as a foundation for peace within the Church, his method of attaining it evoked suspicion among High Churchmen. Avoiding Convocation as an unmanageable platform for High Church zealots, and evading the Commons because of their Church dominance, he introduced many of his measures by Royal Proclamation, arousing fears among the High Church group of a turn toward a Presbyterian constitution(21). The abolition of prelacy in Scotland and the establishment of a Presbyterian order fuelled speculation that William favoured such a system, although the reality of the situation was that he had been left with little choice after the refusal of every Scottish bishop to swear the Oath of Allegiance to him(22).

ii. Comprehension and Toleration

Archbishop Tillotson's endeavours raised questions throughout the Church concerning the extent of any toleration. One High Churchman voiced the concerns of his party that:

Whereas our former fears were of popery and arbitrary government, now it is of a commonwealth and the pressure of the church by the dissenters(23).

The Latitudinarian John Locke attempted to define for a contemporary the options presented by Sancroft and Tillotson's endeavours:

The question of toleration has now been taken up in parliament under a two fold title, namely Comprehension and Indulgence. The former signifies extension of the boundaries of the Church, with a view to including greater numbers by the removal of part of the ceremonies. The latter signifies toleration of those who are either unwilling or unable to unite themselves to the Church of England on the terms offered to them(24).

The Comprehension Bill, brought to the Lords by Nottingham in February 1689, attempted to incorporate Dissenters into the fold of the Church of England by offering limited freedom of worship to groups of orthodox, Trinitarian, Protestant Dissenters. In return for the protection of the law which membership of the established Church offered, all Nonconformist meeting houses were to be registered with either the ecclesiastical courts or the local Justices of the Peace and divine service could only be held with the doors to the building propped open. The officiating minister was also expected to have subscribed to the Thirty-Nine articles of the Church of England, and sworn the Oath of Allegiance and the declaration against Transubstantiation. Exceptions were made in those things considered inessential to religion(25) so that Baptists were excused from subscribing to Article twenty-seven concerning infant baptism, and Quakers were allowed to substitute an affirmation in place of the Oath and to profess their belief in the doctrine of the Trinity and the divine inspiration of the scriptures, with the wording simply stating:

I...do declare in the presence of Almighty God, the witness of the truth of what I say(26).

The bill also embodied a specific clause which excluded anti-Trinitarians and Papists although prosecutions of Roman Catholics were usually discouraged, except where there were rumours of plots, to appease the King's Spanish allies in the war against France(27). The Toleration Act, which was introduced to the Lords in conjunction with the Comprehension Bill, was to be applied to all Dissenters who refused to comprehend and merely suspended the penalties for Dissent, but did not remove the guilt of schism(28).

It was also proposed that the bill include the abolition of the Test and Corporation Acts which obliged all holders of offices of profit under the Crown to receive Anglican communion annually and to obtain a certificate from the officiating priest to prove that he had done so. The abolition of these acts, though presented as a concession, served to eradicate legislation that had long been criticised because of its allowing for occasional conformity, that is attending communion only once a year solely for the purpose of the examination.

Initially, High Churchmen favoured comprehension rather than toleration, or indulgence as they termed it, because the former preserved the discipline of the national Church and its authority over all citizens(29). However, with the change of monarch and the passing of the threat of Popery, many High Churchmen recanted on their promises and began to work against a comprehension settlement. In September 1689, while Sancroft was still the primate, and with Tillotson present, a committee of Convocation met to devise a satisfactory scheme in which to embody the proposals of the bills into law. Of the committee members, George Every identifies three High Churchmen, Bishop Thomas Sprat (1635-1713) of Rochester, William Beveridge (1637-1708) the Dean of Winchester and William Jane (1645-1707), the Dean of Christ Church, all of whom declared that

they no longer saw any necessity for change and withdrew from the discussions at either the second or third sessions(30). The commission degenerated into argument. The remaining High Church delegation, which included Dean John Sharp of London, raised objections to the wording of the imposition of hands, claiming that ecclesiastical and doctrinal differences between Churchmen and Dissenters were too great to make an agreeable re-ordination wording viable. Externally fears were circulating that comprehension would lead to a diversity of practice which would accomplish little more than to establish schism in the Church by law, a viewpoint attested to by the existence of the Nonjurors. Difference of opinion amongst the Nonconformists themselves also rendered the commission's efforts pointless, and the news that the King supported the plans contributed to their unpopularity because it was widely assumed that as a Presbyterian he believed all forms of Protestantism to be equal(31).

It was the impolitic actions of the King that resulted in the defeat of the Comprehension Bill. Following the second reading of both bills in March 1689 William, without reference to any of his ministers or advisors, proposed from the throne that the Test and Corporation Acts be abolished. It was all the provocation the High Church Tories needed, and not only was the King's proposal defeated but parliament also sacrificed the Comprehension Bill as a public assertion of their determination to resist Presbyterianism(32). The result was that the Toleration Act, devised to deal with a small number of Nonconformists, was passed alone and now had to apply to every citizen of the country. It meant that every minister had to subscribe to the Thirty-Nine Articles, every place of worship had to be registered and ancient laws compelling attendance at church on Sundays remained applicable. The result of this was that clerics lost any

control over churchgoing that they may have had, whilst intimidated churchwardens refused to present people for non-attendance. In the first year of the Act, 796 temporary and 143 permanent meeting houses were established, 9 of which were in Wales, and by 1710 the figure had swelled to 2536. In Wales, the number had grown to 50 by 1712(33). For the first time local clerics were having to compete with Dissenters for parishoners, and in education some Anglican parents chose to send their children to Dissenting academies which required no swearing of religious oaths unlike the conservative universities. The situation was further exasperated in 1695 with the lapse of the Licensing Act which brought a flood of heterodox propaganda, albeit less scurrilous and defamatory than previously because of its legitimisation(34).

However, the Church of England actually lost little from its demotion to an established rather than national church: she retained a presence in every parish, controlled the universities, and the House of Lords and enjoyed representation in the House of Commons. Moreover, her clerics continued to monopolise baptisms, marriages and burials(35). In the face of the growing power of parliament though, the Church was determined to revitalise itself, and sought to do so through its organ of deliberation, the House of Convocation(36).

iii. The Convocation Controversies

Hostility toward the issues of toleration and comprehension was embodied in the controversies surrounding the rights and duties of the Upper and Lower Houses of Convocation, which provided the Established Church with a forum for debate. The problem stemmed from 1664 and Archbishop Sheldon's agreement with Lord Chancellor Clarendon that the clergy should surrender their right to decide their own levels of taxation in their own assembly of Convocation. This meant that the Crown no longer had any financial incentive to summon Convocation, and at times of controversy when divisive deliberations were likely to occur, few monarchs, including William III, inconvenienced themselves with it. This aggrieved many High Churchmen who believed that the assembly of Convocation had ancient rights and privileges and who felt that a meeting was necessary immediately after the Revolution because of the threat to the Church from Dissenters(37).

In accordance with the King's desire to avoid controversy, both Tillotson and his successor Thomas Tenison, who was appointed in November 1694, managed to avoid sitting Convocations through a series of prorogations. However, the debate surrounding the role of Convocation was enlivened in 1697 by a pamphlet entitled Letter to a Convocation Man concerning the Rights, Powers and Priveleges of that Body, which was accredited to Francis Atterbury (1662-1732), archdeacon of Totnes and a member of the Lower House of Convocation(38). The pamphlet asserted that Convocation historically constituted a national synod and that the Lower House formed the spiritual counterpart of the House of Parliament, distinct from the Upper House and the control of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Furthermore it asserted that the

houses of Convocation had full right to consult and debate, petition or represent, propose new canons and consider the enforcing of, or abrogating of, old ones, regardless of royal sensitivities about divisive debate(39). The author referred back to the Norman conquest and the Roman empire in his portrayal of the body as a parliamentary organisation, referring to the "Praemunientes" clause, which he maintained had been introduced by the Crown to preserve national assemblies as an effectual summons of the clergy to parliament(40). By compelling bishops to bring their deans, archdeacons, proctors or representatives, the author also argued that the clause testified to the essential part of the Lower Clergy within this parliamentary system(41).

The document embodied all the grievances of the High Church party, so much so that it has been referred to as "a manifesto of the High Church"(42). The restoration of the mutual dependence between the Church as a national body and the state was a matter that was close to the heart of clerics concerned about the growth of "open looseness in men's principles and practices"(43), and to those conscious of a campaign by:

a sort of men, under the style of Deists, Socinians, Latitudinarians, Denyers of Mysteries and pretended Explainers of them, to undermine and overthrow the Catholick faith(44).

The conviction that the Church ought to be independent from secular control with Convocation acting as its parliamentary forum was echoed by Non Juror apologists like Charles Leslie and Henry Dodwell (1641-1711), who asserted distinct spiritual and temporal powers for rulers and bishops(45).

Atterbury had accused Archbishop Tenison of disregarding the rights of the Church because of his failure to call Convocation, and in his defence Tenison turned to William Wake (1657-1737) (46), a prolific scholar who was without benefice at this time because of ill health, but who was to become rector of St. James', Westminster, in 1695. His response to Atterbury was published in 1697 as The Authority of Christian Princes over their Ecclesiastical Synods Asserted, with particular reference to the Convocations of the Clergy of the Realm and Church of England. In tedious detail Wake addressed each of Atterbury's main arguments, dismissing his survey of the rights of Christian princes in the Roman empire as irrelevant to the insular problem of the English Church and affirming that since Old Testament times the precedent had been that the godly, later Christian prince, would summon all councils (47).

But it was in the matter of the "Praemunientes" clause that Wake caused his rival personal and academic humiliation. Wake outlined that two types of writ existed for the convening of a Convocation, one a Parliamentary Writ sent to every bishop and requiring him to summon the clergy of his diocese to London with him. The second was a Convocation Writ which was sent only to the Archbishop who commanded, through the Bishop of London, the other Bishops of his province to meet with him in Convocation. Wake outlined the differences between the two, and affirmed, firstly, that the Parliamentary Writ called the bishop and clergy of each diocese to the same place and at the same time as the new parliament was to be opened, but that the Convocation Writ called them to a place appointed by the Archbishop on any day apart from that on which parliament met. Secondly, as the Parliamentary Writ called all clerics to convene with the King, prelates and Lords, the Convocation Writ called them to meet amongst themselves and at

the King's instruction. Furthermore it was only the deans, archdeacons and proctors of the clergy who were summoned to parliament whilst all the regular dignitaries were summoned to Convocation. Wake ended this comparison with a dismissal of Atterbury's main contention, stating that:

It is therefore as plain as anything can well be, that the convocation of the clergy, considered as called by the parliamentary writs and sitting by virtue of them; and the convocation, considered as summoned by the convocation writ and the orders of the archbishop thereupon; are in their nature and constitution, two different assemblies; and which by no means ought to be confounded together(48).

Although the distinction between the defunct, fourteenth century Praemunientes clause cited by Atterbury and the existant writs cited by Wake, which were nonessential to parliament and did not have to be issued in conjunction with it, was an important distinction to the debate between the two clerics, it rendered Wake's response "tediously detailed and somewhat erastian in arguement" (49). It did nothing to settle the dispute, and prompted The Rights, Powers and Priveleges of an English Convocation stated and Vindicated, published by Atterbury in 1700. With reference to the history of the Church from the Norman conquest, it asserted that:

convocations, though held at a distance from the parliament, were, in their own nature as well as in the acceptance of the Crown and the eye of the law, parliamentary assemblies(50).

In turn this publication was followed in 1701 by a response from White Kennett, Tenison's Chaplain at the request of the Archbishop entitled Ecclesiastical Synods and Parliamentary Convocations in the Church of England historically stated, which aimed to provide a practical guide to the history of Convocation. Tenison's librarian, Edmund

Gibson, also penned Synodus Anglicana for the same purpose in 1702 and concluded that Convocation constituted:

an Ecclesiastical synod of bishops with their presbyters, and neither a parliamentary body on the one hand nor an assembly of presbyters on the other(51).

Wake's second contribution The State of the Church and Clergy of England, was "so vast and exhaustive that only experts in the field could bring themselves to read it" (52).

This prolonged debate and barrage of material convinced King William that a meeting of Convocation might resolve these issues and he relented and convened the clergy on 10 February 1701. Wake's promotion to the deanery of Exeter in that same month meant that he was entitled to join Atterbury in the Lower House of Convocation. As a consequence the Lower House was subjected to a campaign by speech for the recognition of its right to adjourn itself and hold intermediate sessions apart from the sittings of the Upper House. This constituted a direct challenge to Tenison's power as President of the House(53), and was to characterise its relationship with the Archbishop from the outset. As early as 25 February the House refused to meet in adjournments and to follow the Archbishop's schedule of prorogation, and on 28 February the Prolocutor or Leader of the House refused to attend Tenison. By early March 1701 the Lower House informed Tenison that they did not consider it his role to dissolve them and they voted for their right to adjourn themselves and remain sitting after the dissolution of the Upper House. By the end of April 1701 Tenison had tired of division and prorogued Convocation, appealing for "union and order" (54), but the Lower House continued to meet. When Convocation reconvened on 8 May 1701, Tenison refused to accept anything that had been determined during the period of prorogation, and dismissed a

representation concerning the Bishop of Salisbury's exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles as a matter outside of their jurisdiction. For the remainder of their tenure Tenison refused to place any important business before the Lower House of Convocation, and on 13 February 1702 when the Prolocutor and dean of Salisbury, Dr Robert Woodward, died, Tenison seized his chance and dismissed Convocation. He justified his decision by pointing out that it was Lent and that many clerics had returned to their cures to undertake pastoral work that he deemed too important to interrupt. When King William also died, on 8 March 1702, the Lower House tried to secure the House of Lords support for their existing outside of the King's writ, but failed to gain it and were dismissed(55).

The disputes surrounding the rights of Convocation and its two Houses were to spill over into the reign of Queen Anne. However, the controversy occasioned by King William's method of preferments within the Church was a divisive issue that was peculiar to his reign.

iii. King William and the Commission for Preferments

King William made little show of his own Calvinistic religion, but he "had as little understanding of, or sympathy for, the Church of England as the romanising King he was invited to oust" (56). During the first part of his joint reign with Mary, the King was distracted not only by a war against France which had become so protracted it was being waged on four fronts in Germany, the Netherlands, Italy and Spain, but also by a Jacobite conflict which resulted in warfare in Ireland following the Revolution. As a result, Mary was intermittently left to assume responsibility for government, a duty she

undertook with "profound misgivings" as she had no confidence in any of the nine counsellors who advised her because they were all divided by personal and party rivalries(57).

It was similar rivalries amongst the clerics of the Church of England that dictated the new monarch's early preferments. In September 1689 a number of "Whig Latitudinarians" and moderate High Churchmen, all of whom were noted for their liberal notions, won preferment, including Edward Stillingfleet (1635-1699) to Worcester on the recommendation of Gilbert Burnet (1643-1715), a favourite of the King, Simon Patrick (1626-1707) to Chichester, Richard Kidder (1633-1703) to the deanery of Peterborough and John Tillotson to that of St. Paul's. These appointments constituted an embodiment of the popular sovereignty that was demanded by the Revolution settlement(58), a sovereignty that would have to reconcile the clergy to the new regime with the minimum of disruption. Simultaneously it also had to meet the challenge of pacifying the disaffected Nonjurors who refused to recognise William as the King and attempt to pacify Whiggism, which sought to diminish the Church's influence(59). As a means of pacifying all poles of opinion, one fervent High Churchman was included in these preferments; John Sharp was appointed to the deanery of Canterbury(60).

These carefully orchestrated appointments had been designed to avoid conflict and anything that might be interpreted as a statement of policy. Churchmen on both sides of the religious divide had been alarmed by William's consent to an act of the Scottish parliament in June 1690 that abolished prelacy and established a Presbyterian church order. Despite William's limited course of action in the matter, reaction to the compromising of ecclesiastical unity in England was fierce(61). Emphasis had to be placed upon finding a middle ground amongst English clerics, and preferments had

to be carefully managed. In this atmosphere it is significant that in July 1689 William had been dissuaded by Viscount Halifax from appointing the Calvinist Dr John Hall to Worcester because it was feared that this would be seen as a declaration of policy(62).

Throughout his reign, King William based his ecclesiastical policies upon the convictions of whichever individual could manipulate the governing party to grant him money for warfare in return for reasonable concessions. Such was the extent of his independence that John Sharp of York saw the need to write to Archbishop Tenison at Canterbury to request that he put the King "some times in mind of the Expectancies of his own old chaplains"(63). In the early part of his reign William's policies revolved around the ideas of the Latitudinarian Heneage Finch, the Earl of Nottingham (1621-1682), who believed more in devotion to the traditional legal constitution than in devotion to the monarchy(64). In conjunction with Tillotson his son and heir had orchestrated the appointments of 1689, focusing William's policy efforts toward moderate Tories who were interested in compromise and conciliation(65). Following the deposition of the Nonjurors, a similar diplomacy to that adopted in 1689 was employed in the appointments made to fill those sees left vacant. The Whig party were given satisfaction by the elevation of the Calvinist John Hall to Bristol, whilst the prominent High Churchman John Sharp, who had refused the see of Norwich because it had been left vacant by a Nonjuror, was appointed to York, which had been left vacant by the death of Bishop Lamplugh in May 1691(66). Even the Nonjurors themselves were offered some recompense by the appointment of William Sherlock, one of the most active of their number, to the deanery of St.Paul's vacated by the new Archbishop of Canterbury, John Tillotson(67). However, the conviviality of

these appointments did not extend into Convocation, where the King's other advisors, particularly Marlborough, Caermarthen and Godolphin, ensured that the Upper House of Convocation contained bishops elevated by William to ensure loyalty to him. The troublesome Lower House comprised those clerics who opposed the Calvinism of the King and the liberalism of his policies.

The success of Nottingham's diplomacy was limited. William's leniency toward Jacobites was interpreted by many as a sign of weakness, as was his toleration of division amongst his own advisors, one of whom, Marlborough, enjoyed friendly correspondence with both St. Germain, where James II was in exile, and the Princess Anne. Indeed, the extreme High Churchmen had been made to feel so estranged from government that they too established favourable connections with the Princess, and gained a useful recruit in Bishop Compton of London who was vexed at having been passed over for preferment, in favour of Tillotson, for the second time since 1677(68). Nottingham, therefore, was not without his enemies, specifically the Earl of Sunderland, and when in 1693 Edmund Bohun, a Press Licensor appointed by Nottingham, allowed the publication of a pamphlet entitled King William and Mary Conquerors, Sunderland and his allies depicted its portrayal of the monarchs as usurpers as indicative of Nottingham's own stance and he was duly dismissed(69).

King William maintained a tight grip on all aspects of government throughout the early part of his reign, never, for instance, allowing parliament to meet during one of his long absences(70). He was equally fervent in his management of the Church of England. At the opening of the first Convocation of his reign in 1689 he dictated the matters for discussion, informing Bishop Compton that the license to the House was limited to those "matters as their Majesties shall think

necessary and expedient" (71). He was equally insistent on maintaining spirituality amongst clergy and laity, and enforcing morality, issuing a letter for circulation throughout Canterbury and York which required the clergy to examine all those about to take holy orders, to be resident in their parishes, to preach frequently against sins and vice and to ensure that all churchwardens present adulterers and fornicators(72). However, Mary's death on 28 December 1694 had a profound effect on William. In what may have been remorse for the neglect and ingratitude which had characterised his treatment of his wife, the King was consumed by a grief that dominated him for "days and even weeks" (73). In his convalescence, he chose to have less personal involvement in ecclesiastical appointments, and revived a Commission which had been established by King Charles II in 1681 to appoint clerics who would be loyal to his Roman Catholic brother and heir, James II(74). The Commission comprised of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, Tenison and Sharp respectively, and the Bishops of Salisbury, Worcester, Lichfield and Ely, who were to "recommend fit persons to all ecclesiastical preferment" (75). William retained the right to overlook their recommendations, but the Secretaries of State were prohibited from appointing anyone to ecclesiastical office without their agreement. Tenison's presence was required to constitute a quorum and he had the right of a casting vote, which meant that the commission was so comprised as to deny High Church hopes of any preferments. In fact all of those appointed by the Commission were "moderate and unexceptional men who would not meddle in politics" (76). Ultimately the Commission became a casualty of political intrigue and was disbanded in 1701 when a revitalised William realised the potential for bribery over the Tories that was presented by the commission's desire to promote only Whigs(77).

The intrigues of the period between William and Mary's joint accession in 1689 and William's death in 1702 were both beneficial and obstructive to High Church fortunes. The inconsistent nature of William's policy-making and his constant changes of allegiance saw numerous changes in government personnel. Although this meant that High Church fortunes rose and fell with the whim of the King it also facilitated the alliance between the High Church and Tory stances as bishops with power over ecclesiastical appointments became friends and allies with Whig and Tory politicians. In this way it was Williamite policy which meant that "all pretence at keeping the church neutral was abandoned as the rancour of party attachment drew all men into two opposing camps" (78). A regrouping of parties occurred, and in this climate the High Church men who supported the Crown but could not reconcile usurpation were alligned to like minded Tories. It was through this association that the High Church party survived the compromise in which the Revolution settlement had placed them(79).

CHAPTER 4

The Reign of Queen Anne

Queen Anne was crowned on 23 April 1702. The intrigues of Convocation which had dominated the reign of her predecessor continued throughout her reign with renewed impetus. The contentious issues of occasional conformity and the dangers posed to the Church by Dissenters continued to dominate discussions, with warnings that the "Church was in danger" becoming a popular Tory and High Church vehicle. These groups continued to strive for a return to the historical harmony between Church and state which countered the threat of Dissent by strict enforcement of universal adherence to Anglican creed and the freedom of Convocation to conduct Church affairs(1).

In addition, Anne's reign was marked by continual intrigues concerning the settling of her successor. The final years of King William's reign had also been subject to such concerns. Following the death of Mary in 1694, the King had been encouraged to build favourable relations with Anne by the Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Tenison, who was concerned to ensure that Britain was not faced with the threat of another Roman Catholic monarch or a return to the court of St. Germain. William agreed to be the godfather of Anne's son to Prince George of Denmark, also named William, in whom the succession was to be placed, and created the infant Duke of Gloucester. In July 1700, however, the child died, and the right of succession passed to Anne. An Act of Settlement was passed in June 1701 which sought to guarantee "the succession of the crown in the Protestant line for the happiness of the nation and the security of our religion" (2) by naming Princess Sophia, electress of Hanover and granddaughter of James I, as Anne's successor. Furthermore it sought to protect the realm from involvement in the interests of foreign princes who could

possibly receive the Crown as Sophia's successors, and thus prohibited the monarch from entering into war for the defence of a foreign territory, leaving the country for months at a time during peace, and from employing foreigners in the Privy Council(3). The act led several senior government and Church officials, including the Earl of Nottingham and Archbishop Tenison, to establish a correspondence with the Electress to familiarise her with Britain and its national Church. But such contact infuriated Anne who refused to be overshadowed and would not allow the presence of the Electress within her kingdom(4).

i. The Accession and Succession of Queen Anne

The accession of the new Queen in 1702 was, for the most part, greeted favourably. As Anne was a daughter of James II and sister to Queen Mary, and was to accept the Crown in her own right without any reference to her husband as monarch, her accession eased many High Church consciences and her legitimacy brought some Nonjurors back to the Anglican fold(5). In a sermon preached on Lamentations 4:20, the Curate of Great Chart, Kent, Thomas Brett, who was to become a Nonjuror with the accession of George I, described the Queen as a "Royal Granddaughter now sitting on the throne of her Ancestors", and prayed not only "That she be as dear to us as the Breath of our nostrils", but that she also be afforded, in an "episcopal manner", the "affection, loyalty and duty" that she deserved(6). Preaching in Manchester, the Warden of the Collegiate Church, Richard Wroe, was equally assertive of her right to the throne, and referred back to the events and outcome of the Revolution when he emphasised that God rules by providence and sets up His own magistrates(7). In Wales, Robert Wynne of Llanddeiniolen also offered prayers for Anne,

"her royal relations the Princess Sophia, and all the rest of the royal family" (8).

As the daughter of the exiled King, Anne's accession recalled the doctrines of divine right and Passive Obedience and facilitated the reopening of debate regarding their validity(9). The prevalent idea was that governments had to govern with the rights of the governed uppermost in their policy considerations, so that governing became a contract and the authority of a government rested on its ability to fulfil its obligations to its people. In a sermon to the House of Commons in May 1701, Francis Atterbury espoused the contention that although the doctrine of Passive Obedience renders it sinful for man to conspire to remove his monarch, God can do so in an act of supreme power. Referring to the plight of Jacobean Britain in 1688, Atterbury argued that:

No people can be reduced to such a wretched and forlorn condition, but that the good Providence of God may and will, if it sees fit, come to their rescue and deliver them; even without hope and against hope(10).

In this way, it was not man who had acted against his ruler in the Revolution, but God, with man assuming his role as merely an instrument of God(11). In a sermon of 1704 Atterbury elaborated this view by asserting that God had overthrown an evil monarch in James II and that obedience was due to the legislature and not a monarchical tyrant(12).

Nonjuror apologists, like the prolific Charles Leslie, were immediately suspicious of this revised definition and proved quick to point out that this was not what the doctrine of Passive Obedience had meant before the Revolution. The debate proved lengthy, and as late as 1708 Atterbury was again expressing the revised Tory standpoint from the pulpit of St. Paul's, London, from where he spoke specifically on the doctrine of Passive Obedience, asserting that:

if we owe entire obedience to good princes only, there's consequently none due to bad. Horrid doctrine! directly

opposite to Primitive Truth and Apostolic Institution; but exactly fitted to their inclinations, who would destroy all Government, and reduce everything to its first Chaos and Confusion(13).

The Whig members of the city corporation who formed his audience were infuriated, and Atterbury was neither thanked for his sermon, nor was it published.

The debate continued to gain momentum, and was still raging on 5 November 1709 when the Tory Lord Mayor of London, Samuel Garrard (1650-1724), sought to invite a preacher to address the City Fathers in St. Paul's Cathedral to commemorate the two anniversaries of the day. The discovery of the Gunpowder Plot which led to the arrest of Guy Fawkes in 1605, and the landing of William of Orange at Torbay in 1688 which delivered the nation from the grip of James II, both represented Protestant victory over the forces of Popery, and it was with "singular perversity and mischeivous intent", that Garrard, with a Whig government in ascendancy extended the invitation to Dr Henry Sacheverell. Sacheverell was a Tory and a High Churchman who despised Dissenters and their academies and rejected toleration, occasional conformity and comprehension as dangers to the Church. He also branded Whigs, Low Churchmen and moderate Tories who orchestrated such policies as equally dangerous, and held them responsible for the moral degeneracy of the day which he felt was reversible only by a return to Church authority(14). The sermon he gave in 1709 was based on the text of 2 Corinthians 11:26; "danger from false brothers and sisters", and provided him with the opportunity to attack those elements of the eighteenth century Church that he despised the most, and especially Dissenters, of whom he asked:

Whether these Men are not Contriving and Plotting our utter ruin, and whether all those False Brethren that fall in with these Measures and Designs, do not contribute basely to it, I leave every Impartial man that Wishes the Welfare of our Constitution to Determine(15).

Of those "Measures and Designs" he referred specifically to toleration and the denial of the sinfulness of schism, the attack on the Church for its "priestcraft", the pollution of the Anglican Church by those united to it only by Protestantism through moderation and occasional conformity, and most significantly for the question of the succession, the denial of absolute and unconditional obedience and the illegality of resistance(16).

In December 1709 the House of Commons declared that his sermon constituted "malicious, scandalous and seditious libels, highly reflecting upon Her Majesty and her government...and the Protestant Succession" and he was impeached(17). After a lengthy trial Sacheverell was found guilty, and was banned from preaching for three years and excluded from any preferment. The sentence was so lenient that it was widely interpreted as a victory and he became a hero(18).

The Sacheverell trial and its outcome did much to further the standpoint taken by the preacher. Passive Obedience and Non Resistance were no longer condemned, and the Tory rumour mill suggested that Archbishop Sharp and Queen Anne sympathised with his stance(19). In fact, it seems that the Queen opposed his extremity, and though she sanctioned the lenient sentence handed down to him, relenting on her initial desire to see him well punished, this was probably because she recognised the potential for public disorder that a harsh sentence would bring and not because she had been persuaded by his argument. Indeed, she dismissed a cleric from the Chapel Royal for having offered prayers for Sacheverell, and within days of the trial she also elevated Thomas Parker, a member of the House of Commons prosecution team against Sacheverell, to the post of Chief Justice(20).

Politically, Sacheverell's stance reflected well on the Tory party, and they enjoyed a huge majority in the general election of 1710. However, they failed to consolidate their position in the closing years of Anne's reign, and as the

Whigs consciously presented themselves as the party which would support the Protestant Succession through the House of Hanover, the Tories could agree on little except that something had to be done about the Church(21). A polarity occurred within the Tory party which was evident among the High Church clerics who were affiliated to it. Whilst some, like John Sharp of York, were devoted to the interests of the Church, others like Francis Atterbury and William Dawes (1671-1724) of Chester, noted in 1713 as "a high Tory" who was "against the court" (22), focused their loyalties on James III, the Pretender, and on the restoration of the Stuart line. In the closing months of Anne's reign the Earl of Sunderland was to claim that the Tory ministry were planning a restoration of the Stuarts at the death of the Queen, and the Earl of Marlborough further claimed that the Dutch possessed evidence of this plot(23). No such evidence was ever uncovered, and a letter written by the Pretender on 19 January 1713 suggests to the contrary, that many Tories were conspiring to bring over the Electoral Prince George of Hanover, son of the Electress Sophia(24).

For his part Prince George refused to commit himself to the Tories, and those clerics and laity inclined toward Jacobitism found themselves faced with an immovable Queen who refused to discuss her successor, a distrusting Elector and a Pretender who remained unviable as long as he remained Roman Catholic. In the face of such hostile prospects, Tory Jacobites focused their attentions on retaining office and preserving party(25), whilst clerical Whigs, like Archbishop Tenison of Canterbury, and Tories like Archbishop Sharp of York became allied to the same cause of securing the Protestant succession for the good of the Church of England. Both men had maintained a correspondence with the Electress Sophia and her family, Tenison from as early as 1705 when he assured her of the support of "the body of the people of England" (26), and Sharp since 1710 when he had become involved in discussions toward introducing the English liturgy to

Hanover (27). It was these associations, and those of politicians, that proved effective in ensuring that upon the death of Queen Anne on 1 August 1714, events moved quickly enough to secure the arrival of George I before Jacobite support could muster.

ii. The Convocation Disputes Under Queen Anne

The nature of the High Church schism under Anne and the disparity it occasioned among High Churchmen, meant that in Convocation the opposing aims of many High Church clerics resulted in the group being led against, rather than by, its bishops (28).

With the commencement of the new session of Convocation in November 1702 the old debates regarding the rights of each house were reopened. Archbishop Tenison repeated to the Lower House an assertion of his right over it, but conceded the appointment of a committee of bishops to meet between sessions. Atterbury refused the proposal and the Lower House responded by asserting its claim of right, to which the Upper House retorted by rejecting that. The Lower House requested that the matter be referred to the Queen for a decision and the Upper House replied by reminding the clergy of the Lower that the Church was episcopal and that decision making was the role of the bishops in the Upper House. The Lower House then sent up a resolution that the order of bishops was of divine apostolical institution and asked the bishops to concur with it and to make a declaration against Arian and Erastian opinions. It represented a quandary for the bishops, as Bishop Gilbert Burnet recorded:

if the bishops complied with them they gained their point, and if they refused it, they resolved to make them who would not come up to such a positive definition pass for secret favourers of Presbytery (29).

The Lower House won their point and petitioned the Queen before Convocation went into recess in autumn 1703.

In the spring 1704 the Convocation was resumed, and the Lower House presented the Upper with a document that catalogued the defects of the Church, especially decay of discipline and morality, and lack of due performance of divine service, baptism, marriage and communion. The bishops received it as a criticism of their offices and the debate concerning individual rights of the Houses reopened, raging until 1706 when the Lower House refused to concur in a declaration by the Upper of satisfaction in the government of the Queen. Tenison demanded that they submit their objections in writing and when they failed to do so he prorogued Convocation(30). A brief meeting followed in 1707 when a Royal Writ prorogued it again, and no further meeting was held until 1710(31).

When Convocation reconvened to discuss business in 1711, it was on a very different political plane. The Sacheverell trial and the Tory victory in the election of 1710 meant that a Lower House of Convocation comprising of High Churchmen like Atterbury could work in harmony with the Tory House of Commons. Atterbury was able to attempt the Anglican counter revolution he desired, encompassing measures to silence heretics, reform the Church courts and increase their powers, define the toleration, build new churches and create new parishes, and protect the revenue of parochial clergy(32). Though Anne did have some sympathy with the High Church cause, her distaste for extremities and concern for her own prerogatives prevented her from allowing Atterbury to achieve his designs completely(33). But her Letters of Business to Convocation did provide him, as Prolocutor of the Lower House, with the opportunity to effect some reforms. These included the regulation of excommunications, the preparation of occasional offices, the extension of the jurisdiction of rural deans, the exacting of terriers, globes, tythes and possessions and the regulation of the issue of marriage

licences. He was also requested to ensure that Convocation initiate,

the drawing up of a Representation of the present state of Religion among us, with regard to the late excessive growth of infidelity, heresy and profaneness(34).

Atterbury seized his opportunity and assumed responsibility for its composition. The resultant document constituted "a classic expression of Tory ecclesiastical doctrine" (35), pointing to the Civil War as the origin of the decline in national morality. It continued to attack blasphemous writings, the stage and the insulting of ministers, and it called for action against Dissenters who exceeded the legal toleration through the reviving of the laws against their excess, through the censorship of the press and the revitalising of Convocation so that,

some way might be found to restore the discipline of the Church, now so much relaxed and decayed, to its pristine life and vigour; and to strengthen the ordinary jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical courts(36).

The document was ultimately rejected by the bishops of the Upper House, and the Fifty New Churches Act of 1711, which inaugurated the greatest phase of Anglican church building since the Reformation, represented the only one of the measures toward revival of the Church that Atterbury attained(37).

After Easter 1711 the publication of William Whiston's An Historical Preface to Primitive Christianity Revived, which claimed that the christology of the ante-Nicene Fathers was Arian, preoccupied the Houses of Convocation with debate concerning heresy(38). The final Convocation of Anne's reign in 1714 was to be divided on a similar issue regarding the Holy Trinity, and little of a practical nature was accomplished by either meeting(39).

Although the Convocation controversies were of little relevance to the pastoral concerns of clerics in the dioceses of England and Wales, the party prejudices of the houses of Convocation were relevant to those dioceses. A letter from Archdeacon Frank of Bedford to Bishop William Wake of Lincoln in November 1707 testifies to the extent of division within that diocese concerning the election of clerics to the Lower House. Describing the candidates, Frank writes:

Mr Disney, I believe, has the best personal interest of any clergyman in that archdeaconry; but he must not be the man if it can be prevented. I have plainly told him that unless he very much alters his present sentiments with relation to the claims of the Lower House, I think myself obliged to oppose him... (As to) Dr Charlett. Whether he has declared himself on the controversy in convocation I know not, nor how far he is to be relied on. I think he has the general character of a hearty friend to the government; and if he be right in the Archbishop's interest, the very notion of an Oxford head will in all probability stifle all other enquiries amongst those of the clergy who call themselves High Church(40).

High Church and Low Church rivalries, were intensifying in the dioceses and amongst their clerics just as much as in Convocation.

iii. The Church of England under Queen Anne

In her Character of Queen Anne of 1738, Lady Sarah Marlborough, a favourite of the Queen, described her monarch as "religious, without Affection", and added "she always meant well" (41). This comment embodied the Queen's practical approach to management of the Church of England. Anne had no desire to impose radical change upon the Church and her own religious convictions were firmly rooted within it. Her ideal was a church embracing the whole nation, as the Church of England once had, so,

In religion...she did not move an inch from the principles of Charles I and Laud and Sancroft. Her Husband, Prince George of Denmark, was a Danish Lutheran, and she was deeply attached to him, but she showed no desire to bring the English Church nearer to the Protestant bodies(42).

She placed an emphasis upon maintaining the Church of England as a unified, coherent whole, and even offered the Nonjuror Thomas Ken a bishopric in an effort to reconcile the right wing of the Church(43). Mindful of the constant threat to the Church posed by the Romanism of her brother, Anne disliked factious clergymen and discord in religion. She did not entertain party distinction, affirming instead her "liberty in encouraging and employing all those that concur faithfully in her service, whether they were called Whigs or Tories"(44). She emphasised "the interests and religion of the Church of England", and would "countenance those who had the truest zeal to support it"(45). She perceived High Churchmanship as an agitation against the moderate and conciliatory policies that she employed in an effort to keep the Church united(46), and this perception shaped the nature of her appointments and preferments within the Church.

From the outset, Anne made it clear that the commission for appointments that King William had relied upon for preferments was to have no role in her administration. She appointed those clerics whom she deemed to have the most regard for the Church, and demonstrated her own regard for them by establishing the Queen Anne's Bounty in 1704 to alleviate the financial difficulties of poor clerics(47). In the context of Whig and Tory domination of the political scene, and:

in the keen party struggles of that time the political complexion of the successive ecclesiastical promotions was often the best indication of the rise and fall of the contending ministers(48).

Anne's early ecclesiastical appointments reflect a determined effort to reverse William's indifferent approach to the Church and to reassert the independence of the Crown(49). As Anne was wary of Whigs, regarding them as republican enemies of royal authority, it was Archbishop John Sharp of York, as a Tory, who the Queen was to approach for advice in ecclesiastical preferments, and indeed who she was to request to preach at her coronation in preference to the Whig Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Tenison(50). As a result, her early appointments favoured Tory High Churchmen and William Nicolson (1655-1727) was appointed to Carlisle in 1703, George Hooper (1640-1727) to St.Asaph in the same year and then on to Bath and Wells in 1704 with William Beveridge replacing him in Wales, and George Bull (1634-1715) being appointed to St.David's in 1705. When the see of Lincoln became vacant in 1705 with the death of the Whig Bishop James Gardiner (1637-1705), Tenison resolved to stem the flow of Tory appointments and pushed William Wake forward for preferment in opposition to Sharp's recommended candidate, William Dawes (1671-1724). With the Earl of Godolphin also pushing Anne toward Wake it was the Whigs who were victorious and William Wake was appointed to Lincoln(51). Queen Anne had proved to the Tory party and the High Church clerics that they should not presume her support to be unwavering, and in making appointments from within the Whig ranks she ensured that the Church remained a mixture of viewpoints and political persuasions and that no one party was able to dominate.

Whig good fortune continued into 1706 with the death of Bishop William Beaw of Llandaff and his replacement by another Whig Churchman, John Tyler, Dean of Hereford. In 1707 the vacancies in the three sees of Chester, Ely and Exeter aroused consternation in both Tory and Whig camps. In protest at the bullying she had been receiving from the Whig Godolphin regarding union with Scotland, Anne resolved to make the appointments to these sees with no reference to any of her clergy. William Dawes the Tory was immediately appointed to

Chester, and when Archbishop Tenison attempted to advise the Queen in her appointment to Exeter he was informed that the decision had already been made and another Tory, Offspring(sic) Blackall (1654-1716), was granted the see. Such were his Tory inclinations that Gilbert Burnet wrote that "he seemed to condemn the Revolution and all that had been done pursuant to it" (52). Tenison then wrote to Bishop John Moore of Norwich (1646-1714), who was favourite to occupy Ely, to ask for his assistance in securing a Whig successor at Norwich, but Anne, who disliked Moore because of his fervent Whiggism(53), refused to be swayed and delayed her decision. Tenison wrote to her to expound his experiences of the people of Norwich, where he had served as prelate. He warned her that she would have to make a decision quickly and be cautious in her appointment because the people of Norwich were "just as apt to run into extremes as any other". Furthermore, he warned her of the consequences that an ill advised appointment might have on the House of Lords, asserting that:

It is a great truth that the good temper of the present Bishops and their appearing for the true interest of their country is what has chiefly gained them that respect which they have acquired to you. But if it should come to pass by any means that such should come upon that Bench as must make it warp (...may God avert) episcopacy itself would be in danger of fleeing(54).

Ultimately the Queen realised the political need to pacify the Whigs, and after keeping all parties in suspense for some time, Moore was eventually appointed to Ely and another Whig, Charles Trimmell (1663-1723), succeeded him at Norwich(55).

With the consecrations of both Dawes and Blackall in 1708, from which Tenison absented himself with the excuse of gout, a further Whig concession was made with the appointment of the zealous William Fleetwood (1656-1723), a keen supporter of the Revolution and the Hanoverian succession, to St. Asaph. The following year witnessed the Sacheverell trial and the consequential Tory ascendancy and with it the promotion of the

preacher himself to a lucrative living at St. Andrew's, Holborn, granted by the Queen. From 1709 onwards the Tories manipulated the appointing of prelates though initially these appointments consisted only of moderate Tories who could be relied upon to preserve the unity and welfare of the Church. Accordingly, in 1710, John Robinson (1650-1723), a noted diplomat during his tenure as chaplain to the English Embassy in Sweden, was appointed to Bristol and Philip Bisse (1667-1721) was given St. David's (56). Then in 1713, Thomas Sprat, Bishop of Rochester and Dean of Westminster died leaving both positions vacant. With a bill to revive Church courts and their powers to imprison offenders being prepared for the new parliament, Anne became mindful of the need to placate the High Church Tories, and Lord Harcourt, the Lord Chancellor pushed forward the name of the leading High Church agitator Francis Atterbury. Both Queen Anne and Robert Harley, Earl of Oxford and Treasurer of the Exchequer, were horrified by the suggestion, but both agreed with "much reluctance" and Atterbury won position. This reluctance made Anne even more determined to assert her own mind in further preferments, and it was she and her initiative that transferred Bishop William Dawes of Chester to York in 1714 (57).

Robert Harley (1661-1724) was a leading Tory at the court of Queen Anne, and shared the High Church concern with reversing the decline in Church power that had occurred during the preceding years. However, he was also concerned with preserving the Tory party and following the Whig victory in the general election of 1705 it was he who had devised a manifesto for the future. The Tories and the High Churchmen were committed to "agitate for a return to the past when church and state had conjoined in a single authoritarian regime", but Harley recognised that an extremist stance would not be tolerated by the Queen, her government or the Church. He believed that the Tory party had to gain a reputation for responsible conduct and loyalty to the Crown, and therefore pursued a more moderate Tory position which sought to secure a

ministry that would not have to yield to the extremes of either Whig or Tory by comprising of "reasonable" Tories and moderate Whigs. This view was reflected in his advice on lay and ecclesiastical appointments to the Queen(58).

For his part, Archbishop Tenison found himself sidelined during Queen Anne's administration. Her preference of Archbishop Sharp was widely noted and left Tenison isolated. The nature of the Convocation disputes and the ascendancy of the Tories meant that his relations with his bishops always remained formal, and his distrust of Toryism and High Churchmanship meant that he was never able to be fully at ease with his Tory clerics and prelates. Tenison discerned the Tory standpoint to be one aligned to St. Germain and the Stuarts, and believed all Tories to hold Jacobite sympathies. The potential for the restoration and ascendancy of the Pretender that he perceived within the party alarmed the Archbishop, and he believed Whiggism to be the only safeguard against Popery. Bishop Gibson of London held similar sentiments and perceived that Tory domination would result in the overthrow of the Revolution settlement and of the Protestant Succession(59).

Every political standpoint therefore perceived a threat from another, and in such an atmosphere it is easy to see how the Church might be perceived to be in danger. The perils facing the Church of England had been discussed in Convocation and the Upper and Lower Houses had failed to reach agreement in declaring that the Church was safe under Anne. However, the differences of opinion between them revolved around the rights of each House to make such assertions, and not the underlying issue that they did or did not believe the Church to be safe(60). It was the Tory party who consistently maintained that the Church was in danger, and they were not wholly incorrect. An erosion of Christian principles coupled with a spread of immorality aided by a lack of censorship and insufficient governmental press control had been in evidence across the country and did present cause for concern(61). For the Whigs these assertions presented an opportunity, and

intrigues to ensnare the Tories began in the House of Convocation in November 1705 when a bill went before the Lower House asserting that any clergy who claimed that the Church was in danger acted out of prejudice and ambition. The Lower House returned the bill in an alternative form which omitted all reference to the issue, and Tenison ordered that the original bill be approved or the House state its objections to the condemnation of those who would read danger into the Queen's administration(62). In the following month a debate in parliament further compromised the Tories. Lord Rochester outlined that the Church was in danger from Scottish Presbyterianism which threatened the English bishops, from Dissenters, and specifically from occasional conformity, and those within the ministry who were working to frustrate the Occasional Conformity Bill. As a result of his speech a vote was carried that the Church was in "a flourishing condition" and that anyone who declared otherwise was "an enemy to the Queen, the Church and the kingdom" (63). The incident so enraged the Queen that she established new precedents for ecclesiastical preferment:

to give them to such as had shown a due zeal for her Supremacy and respect for their ecclesiastical superiors, and had made it their business to remove that reproach from her that the Church was in danger(64).

The practice of occasional conformity, once described by the Tory politician William Bromley as "that abominable hypocrisy, that inexcusable immorality of occasional conformity" (65), enraged High Churchmen and Tories alike. In 1702 the Tories introduced a bill before parliament that outlawed attendance of Dissenting chapels after the receipt of Anglican communion and imposed £100 fines on all who held office and were guilty of such duality, and an extra £5 fine for every day they remained in office. A further restriction determined that offenders should prove regular attendance at an Anglican church for one year before they could be restored

to their position(66). Fearing that such a bill could jeopardise the existing toleration, exasperate local animosities and create a network of amateur spies, as well as promote Tory interests, the Lords turned the bill down(67). When it reappeared in 1703, Marlborough, Godolphin and Oxford were successful in persuading many Tories to vote with the Whigs to prevent its imposition, and it was again defeated(68). With the ascendancy of the Whig party in the 1705 election, the bill was unlikely to win favour and no further attempts at imposing it were made until the Tory domination of the later years of Anne's reign. Dr Sacheverell had reignited the debate concerning the freedom of Dissenting worship and had highlighted specifically how he perceived Dissenters to be a threat to the Church of England when he said:

I would not here be Misunderstood, as if I intended to cast the least Invidious Reflection upon that Indulgence the Government has condescended to give them, which I am sure all those that wish well to Our Church are very ready to Grant to Consciences truly Scrupulous; let Them enjoy it in the full Limits the Law has Prescribed. But let them also move within their Proper Sphere and not grow Eccentric and like Comets that burst their Orb, Threaten the Ruin, and Downfall of Our Church, and State. Indeed they tell us they have Relinquished the Principles, as well as the Sins of their Forefathers. If so why do they not Renounce their Schism, and come Sincerely into Our Church? Why do they Pelt Her with more Blasphemous Libels and Scurrilous Lampoons, than were ever Published in Oliver's Usurpation? have they not lately Villainously Divided us with knavish Distinctions of High, and Low Churchmen? Are not the Best Characters they can give us those of Papists, Jacobites and Conspirators? And what do they mean by all this insiduous cant, but by False Insinuations and raising Groundless Jealousies and Fears, to Embroil the Public and to bring it into that Confusion, they are Suggesting upon us?(69).

The 1710 election returned Tories and Jacobites alike and constituted "a violent torrent against everything that did smell of Low church" (70), and the Occasional Conformity Act became law in 1711.

In the final year of Queen Anne's reign High Church aspirations succeeded in one legislative victory, the Schism Act of 1714, deemed necessary because:

persons dissenting from the Church of England have taken upon them to instruct and teach youth as tutors or schoolmasters, and have for such purpose openly set up schools and seminaries, whereby if due and speedy remedy be not had great danger might ensue to this Church and State(71).

The Act required all school masters and teachers to be licensed by the diocesan bishop, having produced a certificate to prove that they had received the Anglican sacrament and having pledged themselves to the liturgy of the Church of England. The penalty for Dissenting teachers incorporated up to three months imprisonment(72). The Bill passed through the House of Commons without controversy and, after some debate in the House of Lords, became law in June 1714, only to be repealed in 1719(73).

Although the drafting and passage of the Bill united the two poles of the High Church party in parliament during its passage, it did not prove unifying in the long term. The High Church clerics had polarized to two extremes. Prelates like Francis Atterbury hoped for a Stuart restoration with the death of the Queen and supported the Pretender's claims to the throne, whilst others like William Dawes believed that the future of the Church was best secured in the Protestant succession through Hanover. In the context of these prolonged debates concerning the succession, the Schism Act proved a welcome distraction(74), but the spirit of unification was not universal and not all High Church clerics could loan their support to the act. Several Whig prelates, including Bishop John Evans of Bangor, Wake of Lincoln, Moore of Ely, Tyler of Llandaff and Fleetwood of St.Asaph signed a formal protest at the passing of the Bill which they maintained constituted a contravention of the toleration and the rights of individual parents to choose how their offspring were educated(75). It

was this school of thought which was ultimately successful in having the Act repealed.

With the death of Queen Anne on 1 August 1714, Tories like the Earl of Oxford and Whigs like Thomas Tenison conspired to ensure that the arrival of King George I was swift, and in October 1714 the new King was crowned. The Whig party won favour in the Georgian administration, to such an extent that Atterbury lamented that the Tory party might never reassert itself(76). Jacobite aspirations for a Stuart restoration were dealt a bitter blow by the unsuccessful riots of 1715(77) and the loss of French support upon the death of King Louis XIV in September of that year.

Contemporary assessments of Queen Anne's reign focused upon the turbulence of the later years, and particularly the years preceding the Occasional Conformity Act. In his diary, the Lancaster merchant, William Stout, described Anne as a good Queen until the death of her husband, the Prince of Denmark, in October 1708. Stout records:

after the Prince of Denmark's death she heartened to new Counsellors who did suggest to her that...her ministry had brought the church into danger by encouraging schismatics and atheists and many of the Bishops and Priests Infused the same notions into the common people - it was also supposed she was advised that she usurped the power which was due to her pretended brother pretended son of her Father James II(78).

The Manchester cleric Thomas Ainsworth also recorded in his writings the "spirit of a discord" which characterised the final years of her reign, lamenting that "Our Enemies will tell the rest with pleasure"(79). Another Mancunian, the prominent Edward Byrom, a resident of the town, recorded in his writings a dream in which he was addressed by Queen Mary I and told to pray for all sinners, including James I and Queen Anne(80). Yet despite these uncomplimentary recollections of the later years of her reign, contemporary writers were all agreed that the early years, and according to Thomas

Ainsworth, the first seven years were honourable and popular(81). In Wales the writings of Ellis Wynne (1671-1734), a landowner in Meirionnydd, testify to the respect afforded Queen Anne, especially because of the work she had done in caring for the lesser clergy through her Bounty fund, and in her support of Church societies(82).

The reign of Queen Anne had been a turbulent one for the Tory party, and although they had witnessed some successes, the reign did not herald the restitution of Church power and the restoration of the ascendancy of the Church over the State that many Tories had been hopeful of at its start. Rather the Tory and High Church parties had both experienced extensive division during Anne's reign. The succession question had divided the party into those who supported Stuart restoration and those who did not, and the Queen's distinct way of ruling the Church and the country with a mixed ministry frustrated hopes of domination and occasioned division. Politicians like the Earl of Oxford, who were supportive of it, and clerics, like Atterbury, who believed that Tory ascendancy had to be established in order to begin the regeneration that the nation's people and Church needed, represented the irreconcilable divisions within the Tory and High Church parties that rendered them incapable of proving a serious threat to either the government of the Queen or the settlement of the Protestant succession. With the death of Archbishop Tenison in December 1715 and the appointment of the Whig William Wake as his successor, High Church aspirations of renewed supremacy in the Church of England were destroyed.

CHAPTER 5

Evidence for a High Church Consensus in the dioceses of Bangor and Chester

Throughout the period 1688 to 1715 both the dioceses of Bangor in North Wales and Chester in North Western England were comprised of rural and developing urban areas. The diocese of Bangor was based across most of North West Wales, and in 1688 the Bishop was Humphrey Lloyd (1610-1689), the sixteenth successive Welsh speaking prelate. This sequence had been deliberate to accommodate the numerous monoglot Welsh peasants in the diocese, and many parish clerics were also Welsh speaking(1).

The diocese of Chester was based around the town of Chester on the Anglo-Welsh border, but was exceptional in that it embraced several developing urban areas, including Liverpool, Wigan and Manchester. Throughout the period the cotton textile revolution transformed the area, and especially Manchester where the population doubled between 1660 and 1714(2). As fewer young Mancunians migrated, the town began to develop in trends and trades which were distinct from those of London(3), prompting Daniel Defoe (1661-1731) to describe the town as "one of the greatest, if not really the greatest, mere village in England"(4). Ecclesiastically the religious tone of the town was set by the Collegiate Church, around which, geographically and spiritually, the town was clustered.

In contrast, Bangor diocese was void of any such urban centre to provide a focal point, and was susceptible to the problems of a rural economy. Periods of bad harvests, like those of 1695-8 and 1708-11, could lead to hardship and deficiency, which in turn led to epidemics and infections, such as the outbreak of smallpox at Penmachno which accounted for sixty deaths in the area in 1705-6(5). Such unmanageable natural phenomena made Bangor a poor diocese, and one which

any ambitious young bishop would avoid(6). Defoe, during the same tour that took him to Manchester, observed that "Very few gentlemen have died Bishop of Bangor" because few enjoyed an enduring office, and parish clerics also experienced great hardship, many resorting to pluralism to survive. Some clerics therefore were resident in a particular parish, but administered to several and as a consequence spent the Sabbath day travelling hurriedly between parishes to officiate to awaiting congregations(7).

Both Bangor and Chester were distant from London, where all bishops were expected to spend eight months of each year at the House of Lords. As a result, events of national significance were received differently in both dioceses, and the reactions and convictions of each were shaped by local concerns and influence. Response to spiritual issues like doctrinal reconciliation of the Revolution, uniformity of practice and the advent of church societies were determined by local bishops and clerics. For Humphrey Lloyd at Bangor, management of his diocese meant avoiding the disaffection of the people toward the government and the liturgy of the Church. He was one of an aged group of clerics who emphasised avoiding the excesses of the republican regime whilst gazing longingly back to the days of Laud, and was "notoriously prone to see hell's fires in any puff of smoke"(8). In contrast Thomas Cartwright (1634-1689)(9), Bishop of Chester, was staunchly loyal to James II, and presided over a diocese which had been a haven for Dissenters since 1662, and which "was in the thrall of profound and longstanding political and religious divisions"(10).

1. Doctrinally Reconciling the Revolution

The anniversary of the execution of Charles I on the 30 January offered an opportunity for fasting, lamenting and blackening the name of Dissent, and with the Civil War still fresh in Welsh and English memories, it was widely observed(11). Edmund Harrold, a Manchester peruke maker, recorded in his diary for 1714 that the anniversary was "kept strictly" in Manchester(12), whilst the Bishop of Bangor, Humphrey Humphreys (1648-1712), gave a sermon to the House of Lords on the anniversary in 1695 which described favourably the nature of the King the nation had lost(13).

In a society that afforded such respect to the only royal it had ever removed forcibly from the throne, it is difficult to envisage how the British people came to reconcile themselves to the removal of James II. The extent of feeling toward him in the localities can be gleaned from the writings of local men like William Stout, a Quaker resident in Lancaster on the fringes of the diocese of Chester. He records in his diary how James appointed Papists as Lord Lieutenants, Judges and Justices of the Peace, and indicates that Presbyterians and Quakers were also being promoted to public office, one Quaker, John Greenwood, attaining the position of Mayor at Lancaster(14). In addition, Sir John Evelyn (1620-1706) records in his diary that members of the Independent and Presbyterian parties, like Sir John Trevor (1637-1717), and Roman Catholics like Sir Thomas Strickland, were being sworn onto the Privy Council(15).

The products of the printing presses during James' reign also caused controversy as anti-Protestant material was produced with the King's licence. In 1686, a tabulated comparison of the Donatist and Protestant Schism was published which paralleled the case of the fourth century schism from the Roman Church, with that of the Protestant schism thirteen hundred years later. It found that the latter

group were as guilty of error as the former, having ordained their own (sic)"anti-Bishop's", erected their own "anti-Tables", advanced the authority of a lay prince beyond all ecclesiastical authority, and having abrogated the liturgies, rites and canons of the church of the western patriarchs. It concluded that the Protestants of Britain had no common communion with any other church on earth, and that;

as is undeniable, according to St. Augustin(e), they are not in the Catholic church, are not Members of Christ, are without charity, beneficial sacraments, hopeful Holiness and eternal salvation(16).

Such damning publications alienated James from his subjects, and led to some, like Richard Illidge, a former army lieutenant of Nantwich in Cheshire, describing him as "a zealous begotted papist who was ruled by the popish priests and Jesuits" (17).

Few people from either the diocese of Bangor or Chester were directly or actively involved in the Revolution which deposed James II. In the diocese of Chester, the populace of Manchester saw no harm in the ensuing of the Prince of Orange and his Queen because of the trade possibilities presented by their associations with the merchants of Holland(18). One of the town's leading citizens, Sir Edward Mosley (1618-1695), did openly approve the Revolution as an assertion of civil and religious liberties(19), but it was among the gentry of the diocese that the most fervent stance was to be taken. With news of the coming of Prince William, the Lord Delamere, who's ancestral home was Dunham Massey Hall near Warrington, wrote to his tenants in that town to request that they join him in a force to support William, outlining that they must choose whether they will be "a slave and a papist, or a Protestant and a Freeman" (20). Delamere managed to muster 500 men who marched from Bowden Downs near Altrincham, to Gloucester, from where Lord Delamere accompanied the Lords Shrewsbury and Halifax to meet James in London as the

Prince's delegation, and inform the King that the Prince of Orange viewed him as his prisoner. They persuaded James to leave London for Rochester, and the King was later to recall that Delamere had treated him with the most regard, even though he had been ill used by the King(21).

There was some support for Delamere amongst his fellow gentry and members of the upper classes. A Jacobite broadsheet of the period recorded that there were "many worthy and Loyal Gentlemen to oppose" in the county, and it labels William a "Foreign invader, before the Just and unquestionable Interest" of the "Native Sovereign" (22). But reaction was not all supportive. The town of Chester, through its governor, Peter Shackerley, pledged to be "loyal and faithful to the King", and with assistance from a Roman Catholic regiment raised by Henry Gage, an Army Colonel, stood ready to defend Chester Castle against Delamere's forces. With James' first flight on 10 December 1688, the forces laid down their arms and the Bishop of Chester, Thomas Cartwright, who had stood with the town, fled into exile with the King. The Lord Lieutenant of Lancashire and Cheshire, the Earl of Derby, described Delamere as "a clapped out bankrupt nobleman on the make" (23), and his distrust of Delamere's motives was shared by one of his Lordship's own tenants at Warrington. In a printed letter of November 20, 1688, the tenant anonymously answered Delamere's letter to them with a point by point analysis of his Lordship's justifications. He began by asserting his religious convictions; "that I am a Protestant, not only, as that signifies me at large no Papist, but a Member of the Reformed Church of England, as established by law". Despite his loyalty to Protestantism the tenant refuted Delamere's assertion that there had never been a "better occassion to root out Popery and Slavery than by joyning with the Prince of Orange", stating that;

If the P(rince) of O(range) come only to make proposals for rooting out of Popery and Slavery...I do own that I should be like enough to join with him therein(24).

His scruple was that aligning himself with the Prince would involve his fighting against the King, which he claimed "were never to be justified" because as a subject of the King he owes the monarch allegiance;

for which reason, Rebellion, as being against the Dictates and Obligations of Nature is rightly called Un-natural, and twill deserve a worse name too, as being a violation of our Religion and our Oaths(25).

He goes on to remind Delamere of his own oaths to the King;

Did you not then swear from your heart, That you would bear faith and true allegiance to His Majesty, His Heirs and Successors and Him and Them defend to the uttermost of all your power against all conspiracies and Attempts whatsoever made against His or Their Persons, Crown and Dignity? Did you not then Declare, That no person whatsoever hath power to absolve you from these oaths?(26).

The tenant goes on to outline the unlawful nature of Delamere's undertaking through biblical exegesis. He quotes from 1 Peter 2, where the apostle illustrates the need for the community to rid themselves of malice, guile, insincerity, envy and slander, and he begs Delamere's pardon "if I am not willing to go to the Devil, though I should be sure of your Lordship's company" (27). He reminds Delamere of the biblical stance against force, and answers his claims that the Bible offers justification for his actions and his warning that God will mock the passive(28). The tenant then went on to attack war and Delamere's open declaration of it against the King, reminding him of the repugnance of the Civil War, and rejects the justification of evil so that "good may come" (29). He ends by urging Delamere to return to his duty to the King and the Church of England, and he signs himself "a Genuine Son of the Church of England" (30).

The Answer from one of his Lordship's tenants is indicative of two elements of the Revolution which lingered on English and Welsh consciences alike. The first was the

doctrine of Non Resistance, a recognised, authoritative principle by which the High Churchmen of the period were distinguishable(31), and an assertion of the Tory view of state and society(32) to which the High Church group were aligned. The second was William's motive in coming to England.

In the Letter of invitation to William of Orange, the architects of James' downfall infer the possibility of revolution by assuring William that "there are nineteen parts of twenty of the people throughout the kingdom who are desirous of a change, and who, we believe, would willingly contribute to it" (33). But most of the population did not seem to have realised that revolution was on the agenda at all.

In his autobiography, William Stout of Lancaster describes the earliest involvement of the Prince in British affairs;

application was made to the Prince of Orange and his Princess by the ancient nobility and principle commoners, who were zealous against popery, for them to interpose for their legal succession and preservation of the Protestant religion.

He described the doubts that had arisen concerning the legitimacy of the infant Prince of Wales, who was;

to be successor to the Crown if living at the King's death. But as the Princess of Orange and Princess Anne of Denmark were not at the birth, and others who ought to have been upon the birth of an heir to the Crown, it was suggested that he was not born of the Queen's body, but was an impostor(34).

Stout also describes the Prince's landing at Torbay from where he;

put out a proclamation that he did not come to conquer or subdue the nation, but in order to have an impartial and free parliament, to a real establishment of the King and kingdom in the Protestant religion. Which King James not

according with, and having sent the Queen and infant befor(e), he retired to France...Upon which the Prince of Orange marched up near London. And as King James had abdicated the government and left the kingdom, the principle (*Sic*) lords and commons requested the Prince of Orange to undertake the government till a convention of the estates might meet...And after some debates, the Prince and Princess of Orange were declared and proclaimed King and Queen of England(35).

However, not everyone saw the transition of power as such a straight forward process. Even those favourable to James' removal were critical of the manner in which it had been attained. Henry Prescott, Deputy Registrar of the Diocese of Chester, recorded in his diary in 1689;

A year is filled with completed months of the world since King James 2, the most unfortunate of kings, a slave of papism...an enemy of the established religion and laws, his own worst enemy, deserted, I almost said betrayed, by his friends, kinsfolk and soldiers, committed to a foreign, even enemy bodyguard, deprived together of rule, honour and reverence, treated unworthily everywhere, driven more by warnings rather than invited by counsel to steal himself untimely away...vanished, seceded, escaped (I do not say, as is commonly said) abdicated himself from the kingdom(36).

Peter Shackerley, the governor of Chester, shared Prescott's sensitivities. Following James' desertion Shackerley declared himself to be willing to obey the Prince of Orange, expressing his desire that "the loyalty and fidelity I showed to my King will not, I hope, be imputed to me a crime by the victorious Prince". However, rumours abounded later in that same month of December 1688, that an Irish force of ten thousand men was marching through the country killing all Protestants they encountered. To secure governmental support for the town, the Mayor of Chester, Alderman Streete, read Prince William's declaration of his intention to compel James to call a free parliament, and asked Shackerley to fire a 21-gun salute in celebration. The Governor refused, saying:

though I was well pleased with the preservation of the Protestant religion yet the sorrow I had (and which every Englishman ought to have) for the banishment, distress and misery of my King would not permit me to make such tokens of joy(37).

Shackerley was ultimately dismissed and imprisoned in the Tower of London. For other gentlemen like Rear Admiral Sir John Chicheley, the focus of events was not so much the deposed King but the consequences that deposition might have for the future of a monarchy which could be replaced at the discretion of the Lords and Commons(38).

John Davies asserts that in Wales, although the clergy were naturally inclined to the Tory party, their fear of Roman Catholicism, and specifically of being implicated in any Popish invasions from Ireland, was enough to incline them to support the Revolution(39). In the parish of Llanddyfnan in the diocese of Bangor, a collection of notes for sermons, dated 1711, and attributed to Robert Morgan, define sin as "Rebellion", and warn with reference to the gospel of Matthew that the accursed will not go unpunished(40). In a similar vein, Ellis Wynne(1671-1734) of Lasynys compiled an index in the closing leaves of his copy of a commentary on the books of the New Testament, which points to passages in Matthew that affirm the unity of the Church and state by lineage, and in John which emphasise perpetuity(41). Robert Wynne of Llanddeiniolen also preached the duty of "pious submission as sedulously as his Elizabethan forebears"(42).

Opposition to the Prince of Orange's arrival was especially marked in Wales. The common consensus was one of a conspiracy against the King and his people to trick them into accepting his usurpation. In A Remonstrance and Protestation of all the Good Protestants of this kingdom against Depositing their Lawful Sovereign K(ing) James II, the authors admit supporting William's arrival in the face of "the coming in of Popery", but they refute the falsity of the Prince of Wales,

James' league with France and his cutting off of Protestantism, and claim that a lack of evidence toward these points proves their falsity. They outline that it was by these deceptions that they were duped into accepting the Prince of Orange, and they describe James' desertion as an act of necessity(43).

In a similar vein, a Letter to a Friend...Containing a true state of the Nation claims that James' deposition and William's accession;

was yet farther than any true son of our church ever intended by his coming hither...For all we aimed at was to secure our religion, settle good Alliances, and follow him to France, that we might be safe from popery and Europe from war: Not to thrust out our King(44).

William's supporters are again accused of misleading the people by making false allegations against James, and this author also expresses a fear that James' deposition would bring "censure and dislike" upon the Church(45).

These recurring themes were elaborated in a tract entitled Some account of the Revolution in the year 1688. It portrayed how the two Princesses, Mary and Anne, were tricked into believing, one by her husband and one by Bishop Henry Compton of London, that their father intended to disinherit them in favour of a contrived, Roman Catholic son. It detailed the events of the closing weeks of 1688, conceding that James made mistakes in the management of his army, and in consulting his Papist advisors, whom it blames for his sending his wife and heir to France, a move which made his own desertion inevitable. It continued to detail the manner in which the crux of the episode came to be the issue of the Protestant religion being unsafe under King James, and it described how William rode into London amidst rumours of Irish papists planning a massacre(46), concluding that; "The pretended cause of his coming was redress of grievances, the

Real one needs not to be mentioned, and will easily be imagined" (47).

The centrality of the doctrines of Non Resistance and Passive Obedience to what was perceived to be a High Church standpoint is evidenced in contemporary writing. The Account of the Revolution continues to describe the process of settling a new monarch on the throne of Great Britain. It outlines that amongst those who opposed the appointment of William were the Church party, who "were almost as much oppos'd as the Jacobites" to setting up either Mary or her husband(48). When Princess Anne of Denmark, James' second daughter, became embroiled in the controversy, airing her objection to loosing her place in the rank of succession to William, both sisters came to be "assisted in their severall pretentions by the Church party, for one reason onely (viz) because they were bred up extremely devoted" to the Princess' right of succession(49).

As the House of Lords continued to debate the way forward, two letters from James were presented to them in which the exiled King explained that William had compelled him to flee to France as a ploy to turn the population against him, knowing how the French nation was abhorred by the British people. On both occasions the Lords refused to read or hear the letters, concluding that "the King haveing broken the Originall Contract & by haveing withdrawn himself out of the kingdom had abdicated the Government and the throne was become vacant". Debate in the House came to be divided between three parties:

That of the High Church inclined to the two Princesses. Those we now call Whigs; assured of the good employments under the Prince, and a third, very much the smallest, inclined to the unfortunate King(50).

The High Church group were faced with the truism that whatever their intention had been in inviting William to Britain, the result had been that by a combination of his own

doltish behaviour and the intrigues of many of his own subjects, James had gone. Whilst some lamented his loss and scrupled the possibility of replacing him, others realised that James himself had rendered his departure inevitable, and as a means of pacifying their convictions regarding Non Resistance, Passive Obedience and the divine right of kingship, they now sought to ensure that the throne of Great Britain remained within the rightful line of succession.

For contemporary authors this split in High Church affinities was easily explicable;

the Priests of the High-Church preached Passive Obedience to our Popish Princes, and Promoted their Arbitrary Power over the Protestant Laity, till they perceived King James was bringing Papists into their colleges, Bishoprics and Benefices...Then, and not till then, not for Gods sake or the Peoples, but for their own Preservation and interest, the Nature of these High-Church-men...began to rebel against their Principles; and so they joined in their Fright with the Low-Church-men, nay, what is yet stranger, they leagued with the Dissenters themselves to call over the Prince of Orange(51).

A distinct group emerged within the Anglican communion that may not have believed that James' deprivation was justified, but who were resolved to maintain their allegiance to the Church of England, and as such were prepared to swear oaths to the new monarchs. In 1728, the importance of Non Resistance was stressed in a verse entitled The Vicar of Bray, which described the continuous change of convictions that one cleric employed to retain his Berkshire living;

In Good King Charles' Golden Days
When Loyalty No Harm Meant
A Zealous High Churchman was I
And so I got Preferment

Unto My Flock I daily Preached
Kings are by God Appointed
And Damned are those who Dare Resist
Or Touch the Lords(sic) Anointed

And this is Law I will Maintain

Unto my Dying Day, Sir
That whatsoever King shall Reign,
I will be the Vicar of Bray, Sir(52).

As late as 1745 these principles were still maintained. Before his execution for his involvement in the insurrections of that year, George Fletcher proclaimed from the scaffold, "My religion is that of the Church of England, as it stood in its Purity, before the People were taught to pray for curses upon their country and to involve Heaven in Prejudice of that King and Family which alone can save this guilty land". His co-accused, Thomas Chadwick, claimed, "I die a sincere, tho an unworthy member of the Church of England as it stood before the Revolution, and from this Church, her Articles, Liturgies and Homilies, I have learnt to abhor all kingkilling and Deposing Doctrines" (53).

Yet the doctrine of Non Resistance was viewed as an element of Popery among some, such as the Mayor and Lieutenancy of London who described the Tories in a letter to King George I as "Non-resisting rebels, Passive Obedience rioters, abjuring Jacobites and Frenchified Englishmen" (54). A similar view was held in the Anglo-Welsh borderlands where James Owen of Shrewsbury wrote:

The Popish party in the two late reigns had interwoven non-resistance and passive obedience with the frame of the Government, by obliging all magistrates and ministers to swear that neither the King, nor any commissioned by him, must be resisted upon any pretence whatever. By this means they thought to make themselves absolute, and so to introduce Popery and slavery without opposition. And to make this new principle take the deeper root in men's minds, a number of mercenary divines were employed to preach up this enslaving doctrine, and to press it upon men's consciences, upon pain of damnation, as the distinguishing character of the Church of England. When those who had distinguished themselves by their blind zeal for this doctrine saw the consequence thereof - that it was turned as a two-edged sword upon themselves - they soon forgot their own doctrine and very generously sacrificed it to the common safety(55).

Defining a High Church consensus in the context of the Revolution is not, therefore, an easy exercise. In consideration of individuals, Robert Wynne of Llanddeiniolen and Nicholas Stratford (1633-1707), consecrated Bishop of Chester in 1689, afford interesting examples of unprecedented definitions of High Churchmanship. Both delivered sermons alluding to Charles I; Wynne's is dated only during the reign of Charles II, and Stratford affords two examples, one undated and a second, his Dissuasive From Revenge of 1684. Wynne begins by outlining his objectives; to show the absolute necessity of a supreme power in every state; to show that the supreme power is legally placed as supreme governor in all matters ecclesiastical and civil, and that it is unlawful for any subject to rebel against this power under any pretence. His text is Romans 13:5; "Therefore one must be subject, not only because of wrath but also because of conscience" (56). Stratford maintains the theory of the divine right of kings in his Dissuasive outlining that for any man, including himself, to rebel against any of his governors, even when he knows they are in error, is wrong because it is to rebel against God himself. In his sermon on Charles I he says that "To rise up in arms or levy an Army against a Supreme Magistrate is a sin, w(hi)ch without repentance, will bring Damnation" (57). Wynne also highlights rebellion as accompanied by damnation, and points out that "it is ye indispensable duty of every xtian to yield subjection to ye supreme governor yt is legally placed in ye nation, as to him who hath his commission from God" (58).

Yet despite these assertions against rebellion, Wynne's sermon collections date up to 1719, and Stratford remained at Chester until his death in 1706, which indicates that both men reconciled themselves to the events of 1688. Stratford seems to have had little trouble in coming to terms with the new regime. He was promoted to Chester by King William and his name appears in the pamphlet King William's affection to the Church of England Examined as an example of a man

promoted for his piety and devotion to the Church(59). As a personal friend of Lord Delamere(60), Stratford saw the usurpation of James in the same terms as his friend, and "His strong opposition to the encroachment of popery and to the general proceedings of James 2nd (sic) led him to promote and to confirm the accession of William and Mary and to advocate the Revolution principles of 1688" (61). Stratford subscribed to that branch of High Church thought which regarded King James as his own worst enemy, and who saw his promotion of Roman Catholicism as negating any obedience due to him, especially because to afford him that obedience would be detrimental to the future of the Anglican Church.

Robert Wynne, however, was not so readily convinced. In correspondence with his sister, Bishop Humphrey Humphreys, who assumed the see of Bangor in 1689, indicates that a cleric identified initially as "Robin" on January 14, 1689, was intending to "play the fool and refuse the oaths and so loose his place". On January 16 he is identified more fully as Robin Wyn(62). Since less than two dozen clerics in the whole of Wales became Nonjurors and refused to swear the oaths(63), only two of whom were from the diocese of Bangor, of which neither was Robert or Robin Wyn/Wynne(64), it appears that ultimately Wynne did take the oaths despite his scruples. In a later letter of 1691, Ann Humphreys, the daughter of the prelate, writes to her aunt from Caernarfon that;

I have this day discoursed with Rob(er)t Wynne ab(ou)t the London Journey(.) He tells me the Bishops Intends to set out the Latter end of this Instant and if he can Intercede with him he will not Go, they Pitched upon him to be a Convocation man(65).

If Robert Wynne is the same Wynne whose scruples had troubled him two years earlier, the inference here is that he does not view himself as a Convocation Man, which in the context of the Convocation controversy of the day(66), would

imply that he did not support the Tory party in their intrigues within the House of Convocation. This cleric, therefore, despite being seriously compromised by his view of the Revolution such that he almost refused to take the oaths, swore allegiance to King William, officiated within the Anglican communion, supported the King and established government, and preached the duty of pious submission. He was able to maintain his clerical career within the national Church and support his monarch, whilst retaining scruples about the legitimacy of the Revolution settlement. He had grown weary of "disputes over religion", which he lamented in a sermon had "over-stepped the bounds of propriety and good order", and was willing to remain silent on these points of controversy to preserve the communion of the Church of England which he felt unable to abandon(67).

ii. The Effect of Division on Practice

Although the clerical division which arose from the Revolution was centred around the doctrines of Passive Obedience and divine kingship, its practical expression at diocesan level was manifest in the practice and maintenance of the Anglican faith. As one coterie of the Church strove to uphold its affinity to the monarch and the state, other clerics sought to distance themselves from the excesses of the past and render worship less controversial. High Churchmanship came to be associated with the more traditional, unwavering approach to worship. The term became synonymous with exalted views of the sacraments and reverential views of episcopal office, the carrying of mitres, the burning of incense and bowing at the name of Jesus(68). Elements of Popery were also denoted as characteristic of High Churchmanship, especially the preservation of altar rails, stained glass windows and the

use of music, and it was in this context that the terms High and Low Churchmen first became general(69).

The design of churches was subject to continual variation throughout the Reformation and Restoration periods, as was the positioning of church furniture. The expression of the Protestant doctrine whereby scriptural revelation through sermons takes precedence over sacramental revelation was a feature of seventeenth and eighteenth century Protestantism. The perception is that churches became "boxes for prayer and preaching", with whitewashed walls and dominant pulpits(70). However, this was not always the case, as is evidenced in the work of Sir Christopher Wren(1632-1723)(71). The son of a former chaplain to Charles I and nephew of a friend and supporter of Archbishop Laud, Wren had been born into "a very royalist and very high Anglican society"(72). A tolerant man whose primary passion was architecture, his designs sought to satisfy the precept of the Book of Common Prayer which required that all celebrants partake of common worship, by ensuring that the preacher could be both seen and heard distinctly by his parishoners. As Wren observed:

The Romanists indeed may build larger churches: it is enough if they hear the murmur of the Mass, and see the elevation of the Host: but ours are to be fitted as auditories(73).

Such design stipulations meant that marked differences were observed between Roman Catholic and Protestant churches, and these differences extended into the Church of England. Protestant society abhorred all things that "smacked of Popery". Nigel Yates has illustrated that an emphasis on the word is evident in most reformed church buildings, as at Llandegwning in the diocese of Bangor, which has been preserved according to the minimalism required of reformed worship(74). This emphasis placed constraints on the use of church furniture and the layout of the church assumed an important significance. The setting up of the Communion Table

toward the east wall of the nave was especially controversial(75). At the restoration of Charles II in 1660, the Communion Table was, for the most part, returned to its altar wise position at the east end of the nave of the church. An exception is at Llanrhychwyn, again in the diocese of Bangor, where a double naved church retains its reading desk and pulpit from 1691 against the east wall in the north nave and the altar table is positioned against the east wall in the south nave(76). Despite the enthusiasm of clerics like Thomas Ainsworth of Manchester, who appealed to Tertullian and Athanasius in his argument that worship facing the direction from which the sun rose and brought light to the world every morning, commemorated the life of Christ, other writers saw altar erection as a step backward in spirituality. The author of A Serious Discourse of 1695 recalled in this context the office of Archbishop Laud and his "great zeal for a reconciliation with Rome" (77).

Even more controversial was the use of rails to set the table apart from the rest of the church. In many cases it constituted a practical measure to prevent abuse of the table, as at Canterbury where people stood on it in order to get a better view of the visiting Queen Mary(78), and at Caddington in Bedfordshire, where the vicar reported that it had been used as a workbench by glaziers and bricklayers, who had also carried mortar on it, and as a gambling table by parishoners(79). In other cases though, rails did assume a religious significance. Bishop Cartwright of Chester ordered that the table at Liverpool be set up against the eastern wall and railed as an altar(80), whilst at Manchester Nicholas Stratford revived a point of church order not used since the rebellion when he stipulated in 1668, that all communicants "should come up to the rails to receive the Holy Sacrament" (81), a practice still in use at Middleton in Manchester in 1701(82).

Embodied in this controversy was a fear of idolatry. The setting up of the Communion Table in an altar like position

encouraged kneeling and bowing towards it, which for many Protestants constituted a reversion to Roman Catholic practice. The author of A Serious Discourse outlined a number of reasons why the practice of kneeling should be disregarded, claiming that it had no divine or primitive precept and was not instituted by Christ(83). The vicar of Caddington described how he met with opposition from his parishoners when he tried to introduce kneeling in the church and was told that it was not required because it was kneeling in the heart that was required. He complained that;

it is a common principle with the People that whatever their minister introduces that is new or displeasing to them, must needs be Popery(84).

In Manchester the practices of kneeling and standing at the gospel met with little resistance, and were endorsed by Thomas Ainsworth as a means of recalling Christ's triumph over death and affording the gospel "our most Earnest attention" (85). The Nonjuror Thomas Brett went as far as to assert that;

communicants are required to receive that same kneeling, for a signification of our humble and grateful Acknowledgement of the Benefits of Christ therein given to all worthy receivers, and for the avoiding of such profanation and disorder in the Holy Communion as might otherwise ensue(86).

In an effort to settle the dispute, kneeling for receipt of communion was prohibited by King William in 1695(87), although debate about its validity continued into the 1750's when the Manchester poet John Byrom(1692-1763) wrote:

Suppose that kneeling was a pagan mode
Is it what Christians therefore must explode?
What posture or what gesture at this rate
May not be made the subject of debate?(88).

His sentiment is applicable to the late seventeenth century when the practice of bowing toward the altar caused consternation. In a letter of 1695 which refers to an unnamed third party, it is stated;

he is set up for a High Churchman. He bows at going into the Chapel, and at the name of Jesus...and seems to mind little in his family more than that they strictly conform to the Church services and ceremonies(89).

This specific association of bowing with High Churchmanship is evident in a 1714 tract entitled The Principles of the Low Church Men in which bowing toward the altar is forbidden because it has no canonical, rubrical or ritual basis(90). Other writers, like the anonymous author of A Serious Discourse, equated the practice with altar worship, "In which respect we out do the very Papists themselves"(91). Even before the Revolution bowing had been a contentious issue, as a letter of 1687 from a Private Gentleman in the country to a Clergy Man in the City outlines. The gentleman asserts that the Papist bows to the picture or image of Jesus, whereas the Protestant bows to the sound of His name. The difference he contends, lies in an outward sense of the action, since in both cases it is employed to commemorate the Saviour, but this does not make the Church of England blameless(92). Yet Bishop Morton writing before the Revolution, and William Wake thereafter, both regard bowing as an acceptable means of testifying due respect to God's representation(93).

The provision of music in services was another divisive issue. It features in the visitation enquiries of both Bishop Stratford of Chester and Bishop Humphreys of Bangor, the latter even offering one singing man extra payment if he improved his standard of singing(94). However, the anonymous author of a letter to an unnamed friend of 1688 parallels the noise with the Roman Catholic use of Latin as an obstruction to the intelligibility of the service(95).

Protestant sensibilities were also provoked by church decor. James Ogden, an eighteenth century Manchester historian records that in the 1680's the stained glass windows in the Collegiate Church were affected by iconoclasts during "that period when the painted Glass was broken" (96). The appearance of the presiding vicar was also controversial. The author of A Serious Discourse lamented in 1695 that many clerics appeared to have borrowed their garments from the Papists, and the surplice remained a contentious issue throughout the period(97). In most dioceses diversity of use was permitted, as was the case in Bangor in 1690 when Dean John Jones informed Bishop Humphreys that;

when I am in Bangor, I do generally wear my surplice and Hood according to my degree on Sundays and Holidays - For others I leave them to answer for themselves(98).

The inference from most contemporary observers and writers is that they were concerned that the practices of those labelled High Churchmen were leaning toward those of Rome. The disparity of practice within Anglicanism worried them, and they sought "a uniform and vigorous continuance in religion" to keep the Church and its adherents free from sin(99).

iii. The Effect of Division on Doctrine

Division amongst Anglican Churchmen also embraced fundamental Anglican doctrines. In 1695 William III found it necessary to issue a set of Directions to the archbishops and bishops for the preserving of unity in the church and the purity of the Christian faith concerning the Holy Trinity. In it he directed that only what is contained in the scriptures and is agreeable to the creeds and the Articles of Religion should be uttered by clerics, that they should avoid all new terms

pertaining to the Trinity, that they should strictly adhere to the fifty-third canon that prohibited public opposition between preachers, and that these directions should also be observed by those printing anything about the Trinity(100).

The importance of regular prayer and catechism was widely recognised as a basic precept to the practice of religion, and was ordained by the fifty-ninth canon and vigorously enforced by all clerics. Disparity occurred where the practicalities of life posed various considerations. In Bangor, Dean Jones' answers to Bishop Humphreys' visitation questions of 1690 and 1700 indicate that the Bishop enquired whether the clergy assumed their responsibilities of preaching to all daily in the church, and whether each cleric was resident in their parish. Jones responded that;

I cannot directly say, that the Vicars do duly perform their Dutys... (they) are obliged to constant attendance, which is not observed(101).

In rural areas like those that constituted the diocese of Bangor, magical cults survived as a substitute for scientific awareness and as a means of explaining the inexplicable. The paucity of entertainments and the vacuum left by the disappearance of Roman Catholic rituals and customs perpetuated the survival of explanatory superstitions and legends. Fairies were believed to be instruments of punishment for wrong doing, witches and witchcraft accounted for misfortunes by their sinister overtones, cunning men were viewed as healers in the absence of medical knowledge, and the healing properties of places or objects, such as wells, were also espoused, while almanacs were employed by farmers to predict the weather and thus the quality of a harvest. Clergymen did little to discourage this, ensuring only that churchgoers were able to discern the work of God from that of Satan, and dreams were accepted as a legitimate source of divine communication. The existance of ghosts was also accepted as credible and this embroiled some Churchmen in

offering prayers for the dead, a controversial practice in itself for those who believed that it implied the existence of purgatory(102). Controversy surrounding such points of doctrine facilitated the publication of Welsh language literature on these issues and writers like Ellis Wynne were keen to disparage the worth of such beliefs and point instead to trust in God(103).

The greatest barriers to uniformity of practice in Bangor were non residence and pluralism. An undated petition from the Vicars Chorell of Bangor to Humphrey Humphreys indicates that the Bishop did attempt to impose some clarity upon the provision of prayer in his diocese. The dispute revolved around an order that the vicars had received from the Dean and Chapter instructing them to read divine service "in the...cathedral oftner than twice in a Day particularly on Sundays and Holy Days". They disputed the authority of the Dean and Chapter to issue such an instruction, and claimed that it was not canonically enhanced, and never had been. They also addressed the assertion that this was common practice all over the country, pointing out that they did not know of this practice in any other cathedral in Wales, and that;

as for the English Cathedralls, we conceive it is not so with them as it is suggested. We will instance in the next to us, viz, that of Chester where there is no morning prayer on sundays as we are credibly informed(104).

In England, the anonymous writer of a letter to his friend indicates the attribution of political labels as early as 1688 when he complains that any man who preaches twice on the sabbath day is labelled a "Fanatick or Whig"(105), but the most contentious issue was that of baptism, specifically lay baptism. During the Interregnum it had become common practice for children to be baptised at home because of the unavailability of churches, and after the Restoration the

practice survived. In 1703 the Lower House of Convocation complained of the general failure of parents to baptise their children(106), and clerics impressed upon their flocks that infant baptism was not merely lawful but had been ordained by God in the Jewish rite of circumcision(107). The issue was also accompanied by some debate on the action of baptism, and the Bishop of St.Asaph, William Lloyd (1637-1710), asserted that dipping the child in water was a customary part of the ceremony in parts of both England and Wales(108). Renewed emphasis within the parishes was accompanied by renewed controversy on the printing presses, sparked by the publication of Bishop Gilbert Burnet's (1643-1715) sermons on the issue. He argued that baptism made in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost is Christ's baptism regardless of the doctrine, clerical status or sex of the person administering it(109). Fearing that Burnet had opened the floodgates for the Dissenting masses, Roger Lawrence, a Dissenting convert to Anglicanism, published Lay Baptism Invalid in 1708. The premise of the work is self evident, and it provoked a series of further tracts which transferred debate into the public forum. Wary of prolonged convocational involvement, Archbishop Thomas Tenison of Canterbury raised the issue at a customary dinner with his prelates on Easter Tuesday 1712, hoping to effect an expeditious resolution to the matter. Archbishop Sharp of York recorded in his diary;

We all agreed that baptism by any other person except lawful ministers, ought as much as may be, to be discouraged; nevertheless, whoever was baptised by any other person, and in that baptism the essentials of baptism were preserved, that is, being dipped or sprinkled in the name of the Father etc. such baptism was valid and ought not to be repeated(110).

Tenison had a declaration of the bishops sentiments drawn up which affirmed that in accordance with the Catholic church of Christ and the Church of England:

such Persons as have already been baptized in, or with water, in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost ought not to be baptised again(111).

Upon receipt of a copy of the declaration, Sharp called together several likeminded prelates who included Sir William Dawes (1671-1724) of Chester and the Bishops of Exeter and St.Davids, to discuss the implications of this declaration. Their reply to Tenison stated their agreement that they could not sign the declaration because it:

would be too great an Encouragement to the Dissenters to go in their way of irregular uncanonical Baptisms(112).

Although Sharp and his fellow clergymen had agreed in principle on Easter Tuesday that lay baptism was valid, their objections to Tenison's declaration were based on their desire to restrict the growth and survival of Dissent, a stance equated with the High Church(113). The contrasting Low Church view was espoused in an anonymous tract entitled The Principles of the Low Church Men, published in London in 1714. The author, who categorises himself a Low Churchman, admits that baptism is "irregular" when not performed by a "lawful minister", except in cases of necessity, for which he quotes Richard Hooker in support(114). The term "cases of necessity" refers to those instances where infants are in danger of dying unbaptised. Under such circumstances the role of the laity in lay baptism is, according to the author, acceptable. However, the Church of England did not pronounce on the eternal fate of children that died unbaptised, and by refusing to do so did not acknowledge the role of lay baptisers. Therefore, the stance taken by the Church aligns closely with that taken by John Sharp and his like minded prelates, representing the High Church view of baptism. In this way, High Churchmanship is characterised by a desire to preserve the national Church from the threat of Dissent by

perpetuating adherence to it through infant baptism, a conclusion which is reiterated by examination of the High Church response to occasional conformity and the question of legislative rights for Dissenters(115).

iv. The Practical Expression of Division

In the aftermath of the Revolution and as a part of the process of reconciling itself to it, the Church of England underwent a spiritual revival throughout the 1690's, which emphasised a pastoral ministry(116). This was at least partially attributable to Archbishop John Tillotson who succeeded William Sancroft as Archbishop of Canterbury in April 1691. Tillotson's Latitudinarian convictions occasioned great hostility, particularly among those clerics less inclined toward comprehension or toleration, who perceived that Latitudinarianism embraced conciliation(117). Yet, in practice this adherence translated into Anglicanism as an emphasis on reason, dispensing with the controversial and mysterious elements of religion and stressing a simplified Christianity centred on moral duty, a conviction evident in Tillotson's published sermons(118).

It was in this context that the High Anglican clergy became involved with religious societies. Some clerics doubted the worth of such societies; John Sharp for instance alleged of the Society for the Reformation of Manners that its cooperation with Dissenters meant that it "tended to obscure the distinction between loose living and actual crime"(119). Others were keen to be involved, and Bishops Stratford and Dawes of Chester and Evans of Bangor, and Richard Wroe, Warden of the Collegiate Church at Manchester, were all active in the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (SPG)(120). Bishop Humphrey Humphreys was also a supporter of the SPG and he and Dean John Jones were also

strongly linked to the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge (SPCK) which was established with the aim of educating the children of the poor to a level sufficient enough to allow them to earn a living in manual labour and to read the religious tracts issued by the society for their moral welfare. Such was its contribution to improving morality among the poor that Bishop John Evans of Bangor described the society as a counter to "the monstrous increase of Deism, Prophaness and Vice" (121).

The relation of the Church societies to the enforcement of moral life was made in April 1699 when Archbishop Tenison published a letter to his prelates urging them to declare "a national war on vice". He urged them to behave with prudence and lead sober lives, improve piety and order in their parishes, and use the civil law, the magistracy and catechism as a means of reclaiming obstinate sinners and retaining the devout (122). In Bangor, Humphrey Humphreys responded wholeheartedly by dividing the diocese into deaneries with monthly societies in each. In the deanery of Tindaethwy and Menai, the clerics of the area pledged to preach against immorality and threaten the punishment of the law as well as the gospel to sinners, to preach against cursing and swearing and to read the Act of Parliament against it, and to affirm the importance of both catechism and communion (123).

Emphasis of the latter revolved around a snobbery which surrounded the sacrament that convinced many people that they ought not to participate in it. Although numbers of communicants were large, this was often directly attributable to the efforts of local clerics in Wales, and many rural inhabitants felt that they did not have a right to attend because they could not find sufficient time to prepare for receipt of the eucharist. To combat this a number of devotional manuals emerged in the Welsh language as;

Welsh authors went to some pains...to emphasise that the sacrament was not the monopoly of the priveleged (Sic)

few, but was a necessary act of worship for high and low, rich and poor, literate and illiterate alike(124).

Literature such as George Lewis' Annogaeth i Gymmuno yn fynych, written in 1704 and Y Cymmunwr Ystyriol by Michael Jones in 1716, provided non-controversial assistance for Welsh peasants to undergo appropriate preparation for receipt of the Eucharist in their own homes. Richard Allstree's The Whole Duty of Man, "reckoned by the clergy to be an indispensable guide to moral conduct and family worship", was reprinted in Welsh in 1711 for the same purpose(125). It was the text to which Bishop Humphreys referred an ailing Lord Richard Bulkeley of Anglesey, who died in 1724, and in Cheshire it was the work to which Richard Illidge of Nantwich referred when he urged all Christians to give priority to the care of their own souls(126). All of these devotional works stressed man's threefold duty to himself, his neighbour and to God and espoused a morality that might affirm a pious, sober, chaste and content lifestyle.

In the diocese of Chester, practical involvement in pastoral Christianity was less fervent. In Manchester, Richard Wroe distributed material and raised funds for the SPG, and intense efforts were made by wealthy squires in rural parts of Cheshire. Francis Cholmondeley of Vale Royal and Peter Legh of Lyme, for instance, were involved in an effort to establish a school at Douglas on the Isle of Man and one in Scotland(127). However, emphasis on moral conduct was not lax. In Manchester Edmund Harrold, a peruke maker, records in his diary the involvement of a group he identifies specifically as High Churchmen in enforcing morality in the town. On 10 November 1714, he had spent the day working on orders;

and had completed but for General Cooper's going mad; he made an High Church storm on us. I bless God for enabling me to perform and govern myself so well as I did, considering that I was so much scoffed and derided and jeered, by the mob and other malicious persons, who

offered to baffle me with approbrious words. Indeed they told of all my faults and more than all, of drunkenness, foolishness, K.G, cash etc, and jockeying; and was very abusive, especially G.Cooper; but I pray God to forgive their folly, and I do(128).

Harrold enjoyed a colourful lifestyle. His diary attests to the existence of several lovers, and contains frequent references to his drunkenness, as at the coronation of King George on 20 October 1715, when Harrold awoke;

lying near 2 hours in dungeon by Files, constable of Salford; ill hurt of face, lost handkerchief, and indeed I deserve it all for being drunken: it shall be last time ever(129).

The "High Church" group also questioned Harrold's business management, and the reference to "K.G" which was assumed by a nineteenth century editor of a published version of the diary to refer to King George, might indicate his allegiance to the Hanoverian in opposition to the offending High Churchmen of this episode(130).

In the rapidly developing town of Manchester, therefore, it is a group Harrold categorises specifically as High Church that most earnestly resisted immorality and he makes a forceful affirmation that they were the self appointed guardians of Mancunian morality. However, in Nantwich in rural Cheshire, Lieutenant Richard Illidge depicts a different situation. He refers with exception to;

some of our high clergymen, that will preach against profaning (from the) pulpit, but will allow and laugh at it in an alehouse: and will rather reproach and (ref)ute an honest dissenter, for truly serving God; then (Sic) make complaint, or endeavour to (reproach) a profane swearer, a drunkard or a debauched wretch, that blasphemes the God of heaven and earth...we have good laws made against prophaneness; but not put in execution impiety and prophaneness is much continued: and as the profit (Sic) Hosea saith, like people, like priests. I once reprov'd a minister for sitting in idle company and hearing a deal of obseen (Sic) wicked talk, he answered, I am not to reprove such things out of the pulpit: so

careless and Lukewarme in religion are many of our high churchmen they live loose verminous lives themselves(131).

As well as an intolerance of Dissenters and their practices, Illidge asserts that immorality was indicative of the High Churchmen. His testimony stands in total contrast to that of Harrold, and suggests a diversity within the High Church group even across a single diocese. In the rapidly developing town of Manchester, morality was of great concern to the populace because of the economic importance of preserving a good reputation. In 1709 for instance, one anonymous resident penned A Compendious Character of the Celebrated Beauties of Manchester, in which he described the virtuous, respectful and respected characters of several prominent female residents, in response to;

The many scandalous Pamphlets and scurrilous lampoons which this town of late hath exposed to the Perousal of the censorious age and the animated caluminate and unjust aspersions which have been cast upon the Ladies...in order to brand those with infamy and disgrace(132).

The clergy of Manchester, therefore, merely assumed their part in enforcing the importance of moral behaviour and respectability when they launched their "High Church storm" on one of Manchester's most immoral citizens. But in rural south Cheshire, this concern for reputation was not prevalent, and some of the clergy were less strict in enforcing morality. In Nantwich, the least concerned clerics were those who also disparaged Dissenters, a group Richard Illidge called the High Churchmen.

The division within Anglicanism that was born out of the Revolution of 1688, was as diverse as it was widespread. As the once core doctrines of Non Resistance and Passive Obedience assumed Papist overtones, a distinction occurred between those within the Church of England who were prepared to deny the worth of these doctrines and those who retained

them with distinctions that allowed for the usurpation of James II, a group labelled High Church.

The national picture was that High Church ceremony during this period came to be associated with remnants of Papist elements in Anglican practice, but diocesan evidence for this premise is variable. In rural parts of Cheshire and Lancashire within the diocese of Chester, elements of Papist worship did survive, and St. Mary, Astbury, St. Oswald, Lower Peover and St. Werburgh, Warburton, in Cheshire, as well as St. Leonard Samlesbury in Lancashire, all retained Jacobean altar rails(133). In Manchester, divisions between the town's two churches which characterised one as High and one as Low Church were restricted to the laity(134), whilst in the diocese of Bangor, John Jones' admission in 1690 that he could not account for the behaviour of all the clerics of the diocese indicates that each individual cleric was left to his own devices at least to some extent.

This diversity, though unintentional and undesirable was necessitated by the poor communications of the period, and it allowed specific areas of a diocese to respond to the needs of its populace in its own way. But despite this diversity, the High Church clerics of Bangor and Chester dioceses retained their rigid adherence to the practices of the Catholic, apostolic Church of England, to its inviolable link with the monarchy, and to the enforcement of moral conduct.

CHAPTER 6

Clerical Responses to Divisions and Political Developments in the dioceses of Bangor and Chester

The period 1688 to 1715 witnessed considerable political change which had a far reaching effect on British religious life. The government of William III embraced toleration as "an effectual means to unite their Majesties' Protestant subjects in interest and affection" (1), and the "Act For Exempting Their Majesties' Protestant Subjects Dissenting From The Church Of England From The Penalties Of Certain Laws", known as the Toleration Act, relieved those Dissenters who swore the Oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance, from the legal obligation to attend an established Church service. In conjunction with the concessions granted to specific groups like the Quakers and Anabaptists, allowing them to omit subscription to certain of the Thirty-Nine Articles(2), the Act proved unpalatable to High Church consciences and the High Church group responded with claims that the purity and stability of the Church of England was endangered by toleration. As well as the cry of the "Church in danger", the High Church standpoint also became synonymous with objection to occasional conformity which had been borne out of the legislation governing the occupation of civil office. In addition to their continued association with Popery in the popular psyche, the High Church clerics also faced the challenge of the Nonjuring church as an alternative communion, which argued that it was the true remnant of the apostolic church and that only it retained the true Catholic values of the early church.

As the High Church group fought to maintain a distinct standpoint in the spiritual life of the country, political events developed apace, with the controversy that

accompanied Dr Sacheverell's infamous sermon at St. Paul's in 1709, and at the close of the period the riots of 1715 which followed the accession of George I. This was to prove a tumultuous period for the High Church clergy.

1. The New Enemy of the Nonjurors and the Old Enemy of Popery

In the aftermath of the Revolution and with the accession of William III, the High Church group came to realise that many doctrines which they had previously held as ecclesiastical precepts were no longer valid within the Anglican Church. The doctrine of divine right and opposition to the Oaths of Allegiance and Abjuration, the latter requiring office holders to formally disavow both James and his son, led the Nonjuring group to separate from the Anglican communion. They sought to maintain what they perceived as the true apostolic succession apart from a schismatical church which had erred toward the precedence of lay authority(3).

Despite such distinct principles, definitions of a Nonjuring standpoint varied. Samuel Hibbert-Ware, the nineteenth century Manchester historian who referred to the contemporary notes of his ancestors, defined three categories of Nonjuror. Firstly, there were those who refused to swear the Oath of Allegiance to any monarch other than James II and subsequently James III, and who separated themselves from the Church of England. Secondly, there were those who evaded the Oaths but were allowed to continue in office thanks to the leniency of the Whig administration, and this group included those bishops who absented themselves from the House of Commons on the day that the invitation to Prince William was issued. Finally, he defined a third group who swore the oaths to King William, but felt it perfectly acceptable to recant them and assist the

Stuarts in resuming the throne should they ever return. This group remained within the Church of England and included Dr Sacheverell; they were the High Church Anglicans(4).

A letter of 1712 outlines the issues of disagreement between the Nonjuring group and those who remained within the Anglican communion, from a Nonjuring standpoint:

if we enquire into the causes which brought the revolution Bishops into the schism, we shall find them to be their renouncing the Catholic doctrine of non resistance, their setting up Altars against Altars, their disowning the authority of Bishops deprived only for doing their Duty: their consecrating Bishops to the sees of the Deprived Bishops which Consecrations suppose their Belief of the churches Dependency on the state in matters purely spiritual and that the Civil Legislature has a power to dissolve the relation between a Bishop and his flock(5).

In a defence of an earlier work, the prolific Nonjuror writer Dr George Hickes (1642-1715) offered a definition of a High Churchman. Referring to the Church of England as schismatical, he asks:

Can they have her Spirit, who have a spirit of latitude so contrary to her principles that they will never teach the people that seperation (*Sic*) from her is a schism by which the Seperatists endanger their salvation, but nickname their Brethren who so teach their flocks high-churchmen, ... church men and dancers on the high ropes. Such Latitudinarians of the Priesthood that indulge men in the broad way of perdition, and would destroy their own mission and unchurch the church under a colour of enlarging her numbers, cannot have her spirit or the spirit of truth, but the spirit of confusion and error, for such the Spirit of latitude is in our church(6).

The response of clerics within the Church was disparate. The Nonjuror Thomas Wagstaffe (1645-1712), deprived as Chancellor of Lichfield in 1689 wrote that; "Tis very plain that this matter is not very clear, the grounds are not so evident, when there are scarcely two in the same mind about it" (7).

In Manchester the distinction between the Nonjuring and High Church groups was equally blurred. Such was the High Church ambience of the town's Collegiate Church that many of its clergy may have become Nonjurors except for their desire to retain their fellowships. J.H Overton's list of Nonjurors for the various dioceses of the country lists several members of the communion in the diocese of Chester, including Ralph Lowndes, Rector of Eccleston until his deprivation in 1690(8). Henry Prescott, Deputy Registrar of the diocese of Chester, recorded in his diary on October 15, 1689 that six priests refused to take, or were deferring taking, the Oath of Allegiance to King William. The following day he records that one of these priests, a Mr Swinton, was brought to the Bishop of Chester, Nicholas Stratford, and was "conquered by his arguments" and swore the oath(9).

However, deprivation was not a prerequisite for Nonjuror affinities. John Clayton, a chaplain of the Collegiate Church, was referred to by the Nonjuror leader in Manchester, Thomas Deacon, as sympathetic to the group in a letter to John Byrom of Manchester, although it appears from his obituary that Clayton remained a member of the Anglican communion(10). Radley Aynscough, a chaplain of the same church from 1709, is noted in the Lancashire Manuscripts as a Jacobite, but a different hand has recorded an obituary for him in 1728 which describes him as:

a High Churchman of the noble nonjuring type which was the glory of the English church at the end of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth century. He was no rebel, but almost a confessor, and denied the power of parliament to dispense with Oaths(11).

Such disparity indicates that the division between the Nonjuring and High Church standpoints may have been wide in principle, but in Manchester those clerics who had remained within the Church retained some understanding of Nonjuror

sensibilities. Those from the Collegiate Church may have been influenced by the example of their Warden Richard Wroe. As a supporter of the Revolution he had no aversion to the Oaths of Allegiance and remained aloof from the Nonjuror movement. Yet his "liberal and tolerant" nature, for which he was famed, did extend to the Nonjuring clerics of his jurisdiction(12).

Overton's list includes only two entries for Nonjurors in the diocese of Bangor; Richard Jones, the Chancellor of the diocese, and Hugh Morrice, Rector of Bangor-Monachorum. The Nonjuring communion in Wales was concentrated within specific areas. In the diocese of St. Davids, the Tory Bishop Thomas Watson (1637-1717) presided over a Whig clergy who opposed his reforming efforts, and gave little credence to his sympathies toward James II and the Nonjurors(13). In the diocese of St. Asaph, when Bishop Edward Jones (1641-1703) was brought to trial before the Archbishop of Canterbury charged with financial oppression and simony, the verdicts against him were called into question because:

One was obtained in Montgomeryshire the other at Salop both places Proverbially famous for Jurors(14).

In Bangor, Bishop Humphrey Humphreys harboured some sympathy toward those compromised by the oaths. In a letter to his sister from 1689, he writes:

We have yet some hope that some favour may be showed to those unfortunate men who cannot take the oaths(15).

However, his sentiments were not shared by Benjamin Hoadly, who assumed the prelacy of Bangor in 1715. In 1716, in response to the posthumous publication of the Nonjuror Dr George Hickes' papers, Hoadly composed A Preservative against the Principles and Practices of the Non Jurors. It asserted that the independency of the Church, authoritative benediction, the eucharistic sacrifice and the apostolic

succession were all doctrines that had either been contrived or revived by the Nonjurors(16). He went on to assert that God did not require subscription to any external communion as a condition of salvation and he criticised absolution as contrary to "the natural notions of God as well as the plain tenor of the gospel" (17). His work spurred a series of published responses which led the Lower House of Convocation to demand action against him. But they had chosen to take issue with a government and royal favourite, and the result was that they themselves were prorogued(18).

It is difficult to assess the extent of favourable and hostile attitudes toward the Nonjurors amongst the clerics of the dioceses. In Bangor, where evidence for the existence of a Nonjuring community is scant, it is the personalities of two contrasting prelates of the diocese which have determined attitudes toward them. In Manchester though, where a distinctive Nonjuring community did reside, the High Churchmen of the Collegiate church were sympathetic to their dilemma and tolerant of their principles, so that resistance was not universal.

Much of the hostility directed toward the Nonjurors arose out of their perceived link with the Roman Catholic Church. The Toleration was not intended to accommodate the Papists. Roman Catholicism was considered as a corruption of early Christianity, especially because of its retaining images of religious figures within churches, leaving it open to accusations of superstitious idol worship. A prevalent fear of foreign intrigue portrayed such elements of Roman Catholic faith as representative of Roman and French attempts to inculcate English devotion(19), and Nonjuror support for the Stuart dynasty facilitated an association between the Nonjuring church and Roman Catholicism for those who sought it. In fact, although Pope Alexander VIII had been consulted on the first round of Nonjuror consecrations by Archbishop Bossuet of Paris on behalf of James II, many leading Nonjuror protagonists like George Hickes and Charles

Leslie, had polemicised against Rome(20). English and Welsh Nonjurors alike were keen to dispute this association. Thomas Deacon's writings outlined that the communion he had initiated at Manchester felt no solidarity with either the churches of Rome or England:

the Church of Rome...has departed from the ancient Catholic Church, and...the Church of England...is equally guilty of the same charge. For the case in reality stands thus: If the former has her Pope's supremacy, the latter has her king's... (21).

A rejection of both communions is also required by the Form for Admitting a Convert to the Church, which was written by Deacon:

Do thou desire to be admitted into this branch of the Catholic Church militant in England, which has reformed all the errors, corruptions and defects that have been introduced into the modern churches of Christendom whether of Rome, England or others(22).

Similarly in the Welsh diocese of Bangor, an undated petition complains that the Nonjuring group has been "stigmatised with the name Papist" (23).

Stuart allegiances also proved problematic for the High Church clergy. In the context of being compelled to accept toleration, they feared that Britain's disunity would be Rome's opportunity(24), yet paradoxically, the High Church stance came increasingly to be viewed as one sympathetic, if not aligned, to the Roman Catholic Church. In seeking the restoration of a Roman Catholic monarch the High Church group had to reconcile itself to the fact that they would attract Roman Catholic support in their endeavours, and they began to communicate and cooperate with the Roman Catholic gentry, particularly in Lancashire(25). Although Rome did not teach Non Resistance, many British Papists based their allegiance to the Stuarts on the easing of persecution that they had experienced under Charles I, James I and James II,

and they were able to pledge allegiance to Queens Mary and Anne as God's viceroys(26).

For some clerics, though, there could be no justification for such an allegiance. Richard Wroe of Manchester issued a stark warning to all Anglicans:

a restless zeal moves the Papists to advance what they call Catholic Interest; which, without any Restraint will not keep within the bounds of Moderation...if the Laws are taken off I know not of any Obstruction they can meet with; then we must expect to be Governed wholly by Papists, and the consequence of such a government must be terrible to Protestants...a perfect establishing of Popery by law(27).

Wroe's sense of alarm was justified in 1696 by an attempt on the part of at least one churchman to discredit him. In January of that year, John Renshaw of Manchester swore upon oath that in the inn called the "Swan with Two Necks" at Manchester, he had heard Wroe declare that any sermon preached in the pulpit of a state Church was of false doctrine, that the Church of England was the Church of the devil, and that her communicants were damned. In the ensuing weeks, several other witnesses came forward to attest that they had either heard Wroe personally, or had heard John Leeds, a chapman of Manchester, declare as the words of Wroe that the Church was "diabolical", that her doctrine was "not pleasing to God", and that the Book of Common Prayer was "Mass in English" (28). The final document in this collection details a conversation between Leeds and a Mr William Walker on July 3 1696, and constitutes an admission of the falsity of these allegations. It records that Leeds had told Walker the previous day that if he needed to he would visit Wroe to ask his forgiveness for this episode. However, having visited the Vice-Chancellor, Lightbourne, who had "done his worst" and left Leeds feeling "light on my feet", he now concluded that he need not visit Wroe because there was little the latter could now do(29). Leeds was evidently a

member of the Collegiate Church, and he answered to its highest authority for his part in this episode. The involvement of a churchman in the slander of a fellow cleric, therefore, must be translated as a malicious attempt to discredit Wroe and capitalise on his tolerance and his reluctance to be drawn into party divisions.

The Welsh cleric Robert Wynne of Llanddeiniolen outlined that the Church had been chided for profanity in religion before the Revolution but was subsequently accused of the other extreme of Popery. He quotes Edward Stillingfleet's Unreasonableness of Seperation, where it is claimed "that the sons of the Church of England and the conforming clergy were popishly affected and did but wait for a fair opportunity to declare themselves openly for the Church of Rome". He adds "What grounds they had for this surmise I could never as yet learn" (30). John Evans, Bishop of Bangor from 1701, was transferred to Meath in Ireland in 1715 where he established connections with the French Stuart agent Beauvoir. In a letter from Dublin dated only January 6, Evans wrote to Beauvoir to request details of a plot against King George I, referred to as the Regent, which the former had "forgotten" to inform him of. He urges him to write "under Charles Maddocks Esq, at the castle of Dublin and be as full and as large as you can about public matters". He signs the letter "your very loving Brother and faithful friend" (31).

Concerns about such associations were expressed on a national basis by an election pamphlet entitled A Dialogue Between Jack High and Will Low, of 1710. It opens with the two characters discussing their support of Queen Anne and of the Revolution, and High's desire to keep "Fanatics" out of the Church. Low questions the involvement of Papists and Nonjurors in the High church group and queries their mutual aim of restoring the Pretender, to which High replies:

You widely mistake the Matter; I don't join with them in such designs as you mention; but only so far as they are

for preserving the Church by keeping out the Fanatics...You build your Argument on a wrong Foundation: You suppose the Papists and Nonjurors to be the Party; and we, that are true to the Interest of the church, their Auxiliaries; whereas we are that honest part of the church, who are always vigorous for its support, zealous Defenders of its Rights, and Opposers of its Enemies; and if those People you mention join with us in Elections, or in any other Matters, how can we help it? Shall we refuse any Assistance in a Good Cause? (32).

The pamphlet ends with Low asserting that the Dissenters who support the Low Church group seek only tolerance, but that the Papists and Nonjurors desire revolution.

For his part, James III waited in France for the opportunity to return to Britain and reclaim his throne, constantly issuing declarations which reassured the British people of his abilities and liberalism. He agreed to surrender all power over religion to the state if he were restored, and to hear arguments intended toward persuading him into conversion to the Anglican communion, which he agreed to do if he were convinced by them. For some, even this possibility was insufficient to secure the Pretender support. In A Letter from Mr Lesley to a Member of Parliament of 1714, the Nonjuror Charles Leslie quotes from a pamphlet identified only as Mr Steel's Crisis:

I cannot but wonder why so much stress is laid on the Pretender's turning Protestant; will that make him ever the less Imposter or Pretender? Will that be an antidote against the poison he has sucked in by his French education? Will his dissembling with God in matters of religion, make him not to dissemble with us in matters of Government? Let him turn High Churchman and what will the people of England be the better for that if they would be so mad as to take him? Is to turn High Churchman to turn Protestant? It is no turn at all; Prince Eugene is a Papist and yet I would sooner trust him with the cause of Liberty than any High Church champion in England: if he does not turn High Churchman, but does really turn Protestant, the High Church will have nothing to do with him: Protestant and High Church are two contrary parties, and papists are not worse: The Impostor knows what he has to do, he knows High Church

likes him never the worse for being a Papist, and that though he should turn Hugonet the true Church of England will not trust him(33).

Although the author of this work acknowledges that the High Church group and the Papists are two distinct groups, he perceives that they have a similar outlook which is incompatible with that of the Church of England. Any sort of association with Popery made the High Churchmen vulnerable to accusations of irreligion and political intrigue, and throughout this period association with the Nonjurors came to be viewed in the same light. Steel's equating High Churchmanship with Popery rather than Protestantism serves as evidence that the two convictions were regarded as one in the popular psyche, and as party division became increasingly intensive, even those who maintained a moderate stance, like Richard Wroe, were forced into the forum of controversy.

ii. High Church Reactions to Toleration of Dissenters

Distrust of Papists was matched in extent only by national mistrust of Dissenters. As late as 1707, the Irish Deist John Toland (1670-1722) wrote to Archbishop Tenison and described the extent of antipathy against the Dissenters in Britain:

all sorts of Protestants, Dissenting in this kingdom from the church established by law, are represented as unworthy of any civil Trust or honour in the Commonwealth, by certain persons...to create Distractions in the Government, and to weaken the Protestants by adding Jealousies to their Divisions(34).

He went on to affirm that Jesus' biblical precept of "do unto others as you would have them do unto you" compelled

all within the Christian church to support toleration. He conceded that the precept did have some approbation within the Church amongst a group who shared the Protestant religion;

to which...they must have resolved an Inseperable adherence, but not to any Distinguishing names of Party, which, tho admitted rather than approved out of custom, yet are ordinarily imposed by their antagonists...I doubt not, Sir, but you agree with me, that tis the worst mark imaginable of a Church, when none must be deemed a Sincere Member of her Communion, who has any Indulgence for others(35).

The implication is that one group within the Anglican communion were bitterly opposed to either legal toleration or any form of indulgence for the Dissenters, whilst a second group were open to it. The attribution of party labels infers reference to the High and Low Church groups.

A contemporary publication; The High Church Legion: or the Memorial Examin'd Being A New Test of Moderation, published in London in 1705, suggests the extent of hostility toward William III which was occasioned by his leniency towards Dissenters. The document cites an example of High Church reaction to news of the King's death in 1702:

Is the D-g Dead, said an Eminent Divine of the Church of England, not far from Gloucester Shire? Then your God Almighty is gone to the Devil, and not a Dissenter shall be left in the nation(36).

A further example of this hostility is documented in a rhyme of the period;

When William (Curse upon that hated name!
For ever blotted and unknown to Fame)
When William in Imperial Glory shone,
And to our Grief possess Britannia's Throne
Mark with what Malice he our church debased,
Her sons neglected, and her Rites defaced
To canting Zeal designed her Form a Slave,
And meant to ruin what he came to save

The verse closes with a Nymph called "Religion" appearing and speaking directly to William's opposers:

For you, y' inveterate Enemies to Peace,
Whom Kings can never oblige, nor Heaven can please;
Who blindly Zealous into Faction run,
And make those Dangers you'd be thought to shun(37).

King William had determined that one outcome of the Revolution was to be a toleration of Dissent, which would incorporate recognition of Scottish Presbyterianism and of Irish church courts. The accession of Queen Anne raised High Church hopes that the opportunity had arisen for them to reverse their fortunes and save the Church from the dangers of policies like toleration and comprehension(38). However, Queen Anne proved to be less fervently opposed to toleration than the High Churchmen had hoped, and despite her sympathies toward them feelings of disdain toward Dissenters were apparent throughout her reign. The ease with which they found acceptance in society offended some High Churchmen, as John Walker, a supporter of Sacheverell, expressed in An Attempt Towards Recovering an Account of the Numbers and Sufferings of the Clergy of the Church of England...in the late Times of the Grand Rebellion, published in London in 1714. Walker laments that under Queen Anne's auspices the Dissenters were;

in all Cases behaving themselves as though they had been the Constitution, and treating those of the Constitution (under the pretended characters of Jacobites and High flyers) as though they had scarce been supported with so much as the Countenance of an Indulgence(39).

He continues to define the term "High flyer" as indicative of loyalty, as a value and esteem for order and appointments, a concern for the true interests of the Church, and a zeal against the designs of the Church's adversaries(40).

An especially contentious issue for the High Churchmen was occasional conformity. This was the practice of Dissenters annually partaking of communion within the Anglican Church in order to obtain a certificate necessary to secure them the right to public office. Although they remained excluded from municipal, civil and military office within the government on a national basis by the Corporation Act of 1661 and the Test Act of 1673, it does appear that Dissenters were using this certificate to gain city, corporation and borough appointments in the localities, as well as employment in the navy and in the royal household. Such was the extent of this infiltration that even the moderate Mancunian cleric Richard Wroe supported action against occasional conformity as a means of securing the welfare of the Church from intrusive Papists(41). Despite Low Church assertions of the justification of the practice because Anglicans regularly attend communion in foreign Protestant churches, the High Church clergy continued to regard it as a subterfuge, arguing that no man could conform and be a Nonconformist simultaneously(42). Gilbert Burnet later recorded that "the bulk of the clergy" had been opposed to occasional conformity, and had:

showed great resentments against the Dissenters, and were enemies to the toleration, and seemed resolved never to consent to any alteration in their favour(43).

Richard Illidge of Nantwich in the diocese of Chester also noted in his diary how;

Of late we have had great divisions amongst us:...one reason I believe; there are many ill members got into the parliament house: who are for persecuting the dissenters: for taginge of bills: which is an affront to the queen, and makes a great difference betwixt the house of Lords and commons(44).

When the "tackers", a group of High Church Tories within the House of Commons, attempted to "tack" a bill against

occasional conformity onto a Land Tax Bill in 1704, they were crushed by the huge Whig majority in the Commons. In April 1705 the Queen's appointment of William Wake to the bishopric of Lincoln in opposition to the preferment of Sir William Dawes, later Bishop of Chester, exasperated the situation. The appointment was seen as indicative of the Queen's convictions, and one correspondent assured the parliamentary Whigs that "Queen Anne is turned Whig" (45).

In the General Election of the same year, the High Church campaign revolved around the contention of the "church in danger". The High Churchmen alleged that the Low Church dominance within Queen Anne's court testified that "the church does not hold the same Rank in the Queen's Esteem and confidence, that it held heretofore", and they condemned the impotencies of an Act of Comprehension and defended the actions of the tackers(46). Even as late as 1710 the group still asserted that the Church was in danger from an:

increase of Blasphemy and Profaness, which threatens Ruin to the Presbyterian Kirk of Scotland and all the Dissenting Congregations here, equally with the Church of England(47).

Although Dissenters were perceived as the popular enemy by the High Churchmen, others in religious life strove for the possibility of unity. Despite the spirit of the Collegiate Church over which he presided as Warden, Richard Wroe of Manchester appealed to the Dissenters of the town to be patient in their endeavours toward equality and do nothing which might jeopardise an easing of their legal situation. He wrote:

I hope you will manifest your real Love and Kindness to this Nation, by undergoing, for a time, as great Severities as ever, rather than in any degree be instrumental in ruining of this new happy kingdom (I mean in her laws)(48).

One of those to whom he appealed was Henry Newcome, a Presbyterian who founded a Congregational community in Manchester when he was ejected from the Collegiate Church in 1662(49). In 1689 he referred to High Church attitudes toward toleration when he recorded in his diary that:

Much struggling we are likely to have with the churchmen, who would unravel all, rather than not rule to persecute(50).

As the leading Nonconformist in Manchester, Newcome experienced first hand the hostility toward Dissent that existed within the town. As early as 1687 the windows of his barn had been smashed while he preached within by stones thrown by Sir John Bland, one of Manchester's wealthiest citizens and representative of the "church and King party" (51). His diary also attests to two incidents in 1690 when he was pelted with snowballs by a mob in January of that year, of which he lamented "it is but what these late times has bred them to", and in May when he was cursed by a miller at Knotmill "who bade that the devil go with Presbyterians" (52).

However, despite the pessimism of Newcome's account, Dissenting groups did enjoy some tolerance within the town, and even the Socinian, or Unitarian group, who were exempted from the Bill of Comprehension, were able to circulate their pamphlet, An Accurate Examination of the Principal Texts usually alleged for the Divinity of our Saviour(53).

In rural Cheshire though, tolerance was not a virtue that Richard Illidge noted amongst the High Churchmen of Nantwich. In his diary on July 16, 1705, he refers to the recent general election and says;

Among all these divisions and diversities of religions (which is our great unhappyness) I own myself to be a member of the established church of England, which in its purity I think there is none exceeds it: there are some needless ceremonies which many stumble at which are no offence to me: I was baptised in the church of

england, and have continued in that communion, all the days of my life to this day:- yet have great charity for all protestant dissenters; that truly fear God and love religion. I am much troubled when I hear such abused, reproached and scorned, by wicked profane wretches, which...will stick at no manner of debauchery...and grow envious at those that serve God after a more serious manner: though the(y) are of their own communion, true sons of the church, and perform all the ceremonies, and the whole order and discipline of the church: yet if they are serious moderate men, the(y) shall presently be branded with the title of low church man, or presbyterian, so that our high church men will not admit of one serious christian among (them) (54).

Illidge equates this intolerance with High Churchmanship, and his use of labels like High and Low Churchmen testifies to the uniquely intolerant stance of the High Church Anglicans.

James Owen of Shrewsbury encountered similar resistance as he preached in North Wales. In the town of Denbigh he delivered a lecture and was "rudely treated in the most solemn acts of religion" and:

Another time, when he was preaching in the same town, the hair-brained mob, actuated by a superior influence, surrounded the house, broke the windows, disturbed and abused the assembly by throwing stones among them(55).

In the diocese of Bangor, hostility to Dissenters was embodied in the Nonjurors of the diocese. In an anonymous and undated pamphlet they disparaged the proposal that Dissenters be given an equal share of government through the Toleration Act, outlining that it was they who conspired with King James II to effect Popery within the nation when it served their interests, and then abandoned the monarch when it became prudent to do so. They attributed guilt for this treachery particularly upon the Presbyterian, Anabaptist, Manichonian, Quaker and Arian groups(56).

On the isle of Anglesey, Dissenting communities were regarded with equal suspicion because of their propensity

toward unrest. In a letter dated December 9, 1707, Francis Bulkeley of Beaumaris wrote to Lord Bulkeley regarding a number of people who had appeared before the Constables of Beaumaris accused of dissenting. One was a Mr O. Hughes, who along with his coaccused was dismissed. Bulkeley wrote that he feared that this might encourage "the Mob. For upon Monday Last being the fair day at Beaumaris, The Captain without giving any provocation as I understand, was Assaulted" (57). In Wales, it was a desire to avoid such scenes that occasioned a more tolerant attitude toward Dissenters:

At local levels, ties of neighbourliness, the anxiety to avoid fractious disputes, and the common desire to raise the spiritual standards of parishoners, meant that most clergymen adopted a more conciliatory and sympathetic attitude toward Dissenting brethren(58).

This was certainly the case with Bishop John Evans of Bangor, who was one of five bishops to sign a protest against the Schism Act of 1714 which prohibited Dissenters from keeping a school and Dissenting parents from having their children educated by Dissenters. But despite this cordiality, Nonconformity remained limited within the Bangor area, and only two Dissenting chapels had been constructed in the county of Gwynedd by 1715, at Pwllheli and Caernarfon(59).

iii. Clerical Reaction to Henry Sacheverell, the Succession of King George I and the riots of 1715

Queen Anne died on 1 August 1714. The Lancaster merchant William Stout wrote an appraisal of her reign in his diary:

In the first eight years, whilst Prince George of Denmark her husband lived, she governed very steadily with the Council King William left her...But after the

Prince of Denmark's death, she hearkned to new counselors, who did suggest to her that the war would ruin the nation, and her Ministry had brought the church into danger by encouraging schismatics and atheists. And many of the bishops and priests infused the same notions into the common people. It was also supposed she was advised that she usurped the power which was due to her pretended brother, pretended son of James the 2d(60).

As the High Church battle cry infiltrated both the royal and popular consciences, and Nonconformity registered some effect in places with growing populations(61), the final years of Anne's reign proved turbulent. The catalyst for the beginning of pronounced hostility between High and Low Church Anglicans came on November 5, 1709, in a sermon preached at St. Paul's in London before the Lord Mayor and the Aldermen of London, by Dr Henry Sacheverell.

Taking as his text 2 Corinthians 11:26, Sacheverell delivered a sermon on "Perils among False Brethren". He began with reference to the solemnity of the day as the anniversary of the Gunpowder Plot, and branded the Dissenters and Papists equally abhorrent. He claimed that the Church of England stood as much in peril as the church of Corinth in St. Paul's letter, because:

Her Holy Communion has been Rent, and Divided by Factious, and Schismatical Impostors; Her Pure Doctrine has been Corrupted, and Defiled; Her Primitive Worship and Discipline Prophaned, and Abused; Her Sacred Orders Denied, and Vilified; Her Priests, and Professors (like St. Paul,) Calumniated, Misrepresented, and Ridiculed; Her Altars, and Sacraments Prostituted to Hypocrites, Deists, Socinians, and Atheists; and this done, I wish I could not say, without Discouragement, I am sure with Impunity, not only by Our Professed Enemies, but which is worse, by Our Pretended Friends, and FALSE BRETHEREN(62).

He went on to identify these false bretheren as Unitarians, Revisionists, Rationalists, Modifiers, Latitudinarians, and those who support toleration and deny the sin of schism. He asserted that resistance to the

supreme power was illegal and that the identity of the Anglican Church was endangered by its being mixed with other forms of Protestantism through such corruptive practices as occasional conformity. He then concluded by saying that the false brothers of the Church had betrayed the pledges they had undertaken under oath, and asserted that they would be banished to hell, and that they ought to leave the Church(63).

Considered in its entirety the sermon was of an explosive nature, but there were two specific points of controversy in what Sacheverell said. The first was that with reference to his fellow clerics, he had spoken of the "vast scandal and offence" it gave "to see men of characters and stations thus shift and prevaricate with their principles"(64). If this assertion of inconsistent convictions were not tactless enough, the second point of controversy was Sacheverell's reference to "the crafty insidiousness of such wily Volpones", Volpone being an uncomplimentary nickname for the first Minister, the Earl of Godolphin, who had recently switched allegiance from the Tory to the Whig party in the Commons. The clear implication was that the Minister was insidious.

Even if this had not been enough to make action against him an inevitability, public reaction to the sermon and its preacher sealed his fate: Sacheverell was catapulted to instant notoriety. He was cheered on the afternoon of the sermon as he left the church by the crowds outside, and later that month his visit to St. Margaret's, Lothbury, attracted such a large crowd that rioting almost ensued. Despite this popular enthusiasm, the usual courtesy of having the sermon printed was denied by the Aldermen of London as two Whig members of their court, Sir Peter King (1669-1734), the Recorder, and Sir Gilbert Heathcote (ca1651-1733), Governor of the Bank of England, had taken exception to it. When Sacheverell had it printed privately, carrying a dedication to Samuel Garrard, the Lord Mayor of

London, he succeeded in drawing further attention to himself just as the Whig dominated parliament returned to London for the new session. As pirate copies of the sermon flooded the country, the government could not ignore either Sacheverell or his sermon.

Pre-empting controversy, Sacheverell had taken legal advice before the sermon's publication and knew that mounting a case against him would not be easy. His muddled style and ambiguous, contradictory wording rendered proof of his meaning impossible to detect. He had never directly condemned the Revolution, and only rarely mentioned it at all. He had referred to toleration in such vague terms that it was unclear whether he referred to the act itself or the subsequent abuse of it, and even his reference to "Volpone" was uncertain as he had used the term plurally, which allowed him to claim that he had not referred to any single person at all. After much consideration the House of Commons decided to impeach Sacheverell, and on January 9, 1710 he appeared before the Commons to hear the grounds for sedition and subversion with which he had been charged. The charges alleged that he had suggested and maintained that the Revolution was odious and unjustifiable and implied resistance, that toleration was unreasonable and unwarrantable, and that those defending it were false brethren. It was also claimed that he had asserted that the Church of England was in danger and that all those who had voted against this assertion in 1705 were conspirators in its ruin, and that he had defamed the Queen's administration, suggesting that it was destructive and consisted of false brethren(65).

The trial proved to be a long and exhaustive one, and attracted considerable public interest. The Queen's journey to Westminster on those days when she attended saw her chair accompanied by large crowds through St. James' park chanting "God Bless Your Majesty and the Church", "We hope Your Majesty is for Dr Sacheverell", and "No Presbyterians! No

Meetings!". In the closing days of February and early March 1710, a series of riots across London destroyed numerous meeting houses as the perpetrators chanted "High Church and Sacheverell" (66). Eventually, on March 20, 1710, after a trial lasting three weeks, the House of Lords returned a guilty verdict against the doctor. Whig hopes that the sentence against him would be harsh were dashed by their loss of a parliamentary majority on the day of debate due to absenteeism. The proposal to ban him from preaching for seven years was reduced to three, and his exclusion from any preferment was modified to exclude those offices he already held. The proposal to imprison him was abandoned completely, and only the clause that copies of the sermon must be burnt was carried out. The sentence, which was sanctioned by the Queen, amounted to little more than a lenient reprimand, and Sacheverell was told at his sentencing that it showed "extreme tenderness towards your character as a minister of the Church of England" (67).

Reaction to this outcome occasioned an outburst of song. One poem, The Tryall in Poland in 1709/10, documented the divisions of the church as illustrated by the trial;

How doth it consist wth the Oath of Allegiance
 To punish the Preacher of Passive Obedience?
 Why should not Homilies teaching the same?
 Along wth the sermons submit to the flame?...
 Now Passive Obedience is lost in the lurch,
 And lazy resistance abides in the church,
 Her Interest she preaches obedience today
 Tomorrow she teaches us too disobey
 To swear and unswear,
 Resist and Disown
 Address and betray,
 both the church and the crown
 For these contradictions she has an evasion
 By calling expulsion a free abdication...
 Six Prelates for High church and seven for low,
 at sixes and sevens Religion doth goe
 All clergy divided in points of salvation,
 Disfigure the church and Distemper the nation(68).

Another poem, A Health in the Same Year, also supports Sacheverell's stance:

He that owns with his Heart,
and holds with his hand
The church as established,
by the laws of the Land
Conforming for conscience,
and not on Occasion
Eluding the laws,
by a Knavish Evasion
Not molded through favours,
not frozen through fears
By the smiles of the Court,
or the frowns of the peers
But boldly maintains his Religion and Right
Dares die for the one,
for the other dares fight
This is the man,
Sacheverell alone
Whose health now I drink,
and whose friendship I own(69).

Many verses, like the following addressed to the Queen, warned of the lasting significance of the trial:

Oh! Anna, see the Prelude is begun,
Again they play the Game of fourty one
and he's a traytor that defends the throne,
Thy Laud, and they thy royal grandsire dyed(70).

Other poets, such as Matthew Prior, focused on the allegiances of particular clerics and the mutable nature of those allegiances:

Among the High Church Men, I find there are several
That stick to the Doctrine of Henry Sacheverell
Among the Low Church too, I find that as Odly
Some pin all their Faith on one Benjamin Hoadly
But we Moderate Men do our Judgment suspend
For God only knows where these Matters will End;
And Salisbury Burnett and White Kennet show,
That as the Times vary, so Principles go.
And Twenty Years hence, for ought you or I know,
Twill be Hoadly the high, and Sacheverell the low(71).

The trial was to prove a significant factor in the Tory success in the General Election of 1710, as one poet lamented;

The High Church parson wth (*Sic*) his non resistance,
Kept us in awe and killed us at a distance
That Daring Dr with his Pulpit maul,
Has been the fatal ruin of us all(72).

Following the triumphant climax to the trial, Sacheverell maximised on his popularity and undertook a tour of the country during which he visited east Wales and Cheshire. In Wales, at Wrexham, where news of his sentence had occasioned riots which had seen Dissenting meeting houses attacked by "a great rabble", he was greeted by the sight of decorated streets and houses. The community also burned effigies of Benjamin Hoadly, later Bishop of Bangor, who had published a condemnation of the behaviour that followed the trial in The Thoughts of an Honest Tory of 1710. In it Hoadly stated that as a Tory he had taken the oaths of allegiance to the monarch and could not reconcile the obligations of those oaths to Sacheverell's affirmation of resistance of the supreme power as illegal(73).

Interest in the trial had also been great elsewhere in Wales. In a letter of March 24, 1709/10, Mrs Margaret Wynne of Bodewryd, Anglesey, in the diocese of Bangor, was informed by her son that the Bishop of St. Asaph, William Fleetwood, had been amongst those who voted Sacheverell guilty, whilst the Lord Conway was among those who voted him not guilty. The letter also outlined that Lord Delamere of Cheshire voted him guilty, whilst the Bishop of Chester, William Dawes, was among those who had voted not guilty(74). Indeed, during Sacheverell's journey through Cheshire he stayed with the bishop at Chester, and was entertained to breakfast at Ellesmere in Cheshire, where he complained that the corporation members attended him without gowns(75). News of the trial also reached the town of Manchester, where the

peruke maker Edmund Harrold read a published account of it(76).

The county of Cheshire also provides evidence of opposition to Sacheverell. Following the trial, Sir Joseph Jekyll (1663-1738), one of the managers of the Commons' prosecution team against Sacheverell, visited his circuit of Assizes which included that of, Cheshire. There he received this Address from the Grand Jury of the county:

Good Sir sin(ce) the Queen has don(e) with addresses
Each man here among us, just glappen'd professes,
Himself at your service, for finding the Bill,
And settling Sacheverell, who lately did fill,
With pestilents Doctrine, this large wheedy nation,
So full of and famous, from firm moderation.
An't please your good Lordship we o'th Grand Jury,
With hearts truly Low Church may bound to assure ye...
In short we for liberty and property stand,
Gainst the higher powers, with hatchets in hand...
When next yo(u) burn books, ding into the fire,
Paul's thirteenth to the Romans, we mainly desire,
Nay all his Long Letters, for we'll swear before ye,
That this very Paul we speak off was a ranke Tory
A down right High Church man an and mooder'd Loone...
A Catholic convert, a right Roman bred,
I'n impeach and suspend him although he be dead.
We dearly, most dearly do love Moderation,
And with tooth and nail we'll defend Toleration...
So long as your Lordship and Brother I sa(y),
Rule the roast as the old saying is, surely we may,
In a spiritual manner, Rebell and Betray?(77).

Yet again the Address of the Grand Jury of Cheshire employs the labels High and Low Churchmen in the context of toleration, as the former supported Sacheverell's stance against it and the latter opposed him.

In 1714, clerical response to Queen Anne's death and King George's accession was to be equally as defining. The succession had been a cause of concern since the reign of King William III, and Thomas Ainsworth of the Collegiate Church of Manchester recalled in his writings attempts to secure the throne for the Duke of Gloucester, William's

nephew, which were abandoned with the child's sudden death.
Ainsworth records:

Nothing remained to comfort and support us under this heavy stroke but the necessity it brought the King and Nation under of setting the succession in the house of Hanover and giving it an hereditary right by act of parliament as long as it continued Protestant. So much good did God in his merciful providence produce from a misfortune, which we could never otherwise have sufficiently deplored(78).

In the years preceding Queen Anne's death, Archbishop Thomas Tenison of Canterbury had been in communication with the Princess Sophia of Holland to ensure that a Protestant succession was guaranteed, and in 1705 he assured her by letter that her succession was supported by "the body of the people of England" (79). The securing of a Protestant successor from the Dutch house of Hanover was afforded such emphasis because of the extensive threat of a Jacobite rebellion following the death of the Queen. The government of the day knew that rapidity would be the determining factor in settling the succession, and it was eager to prevent the restoration of the Stuarts and James III. The Jacobites contested that only the Stuarts had a legitimate right to the throne and their sentiments were expressed in a verse set to the tune of the national anthem. Verses three and five reflect its tone;

Shall an usurper reign
and Britons hug the chain? That we deny
Then let us all unite
To relieve Stuarts rights
For Church, King and Laws we fight, Conquer or die

Down with Dutch Politics
Whigs and their knavish tricks, The Old Rump cause
Recall your injured Prince
Drive Hanoverians hence
Such who rule here against, all English Laws(80).

The High Church group showed some sympathy toward this standpoint. The anonymous author of The High Church Legion: or the Memorial Examined Being A New Test of Moderation, defined the standpoint of various groups. Of the "Jacobite Non-Jurant Clergy and High-Church complying clergy" he wrote:

The first of these were in hopes of some Turn in Favour of their old Masters Posterity, and at least expected from the Queen that the Right of the Prince of Wales should be recognized, and that Her Majesty enjoying the Crown for life should restore it as to the Right Owner after her Decease.

It was thought most of our High Church-Men would have come into this project, but when they began to Examine it, it struck so directly at Her Majesty's Right of Possession that they saw it was to no purpose to attempt it...it would be to acknowledge Her Majesty an Usurper...

This Necessity of owning the Queen's Right to depend upon the Revolution Settlement, drove the High-Church-Men all to a yet worse Extreme, and that was to fall in with the Hanoverian Succession, confirmed with an Abjuration...

These steps...brought them gradually to see the open Designs of the Jacobite Party; and the consequence was plain, That if the Queen sat upon the throne by the Right of Parliament Limitation, which was the Effect of King William and the Revolution, all those Parties who were enemies to the King and the Revolution, could not but be Enemies to the Queens Interest and the succession of Hanover.

Thus the church and the Dissenters were found to have but one and the same Civil Interest, whatever their Religious Interest might seem to be.

This was such a choak-Pear to this High-Party, who, in their Imagination, had swallowed up the Dissenters, that it put them out of all manner of Bounds(81).

In the Collegiate Church of Manchester in the diocese of Chester, Richard Wroe, the Warden, strongly opposed the restoration of the Stuart line. In a sermon given at Queen Anne's accession, Wroe asserted that God ruled by providence, setting up His own magistracy. But Wroe dismissed the issue of removing an unsatisfactory magistrate or monarch because it was irrelevant in discussion of such a

"virtuous Queen". Wroe was especially loyal to Queen Anne because of her assisting the poor clergy through the bounty that she established, and her programme of extending the gospel overseas, both of which he avidly supported(82). A second Manchester cleric, Thomas Ainsworth, was equally loyal to the Queen, and he offered this explanation of the purpose behind the collect for her:

To Entrust our wealth at home, to serve us against foreign Enemies and to defend us in the Exercise of true religion for the reign of our Glorious Queen, the Prayer of all Good an subject and the end of government itself(83).

Welsh clerics were also keen to warn of the threat to the succession that was posed by the Pretender. In an undated and unattributed sermon on 1 John 4:7, "Beloved, let us love one another", one Welsh preacher reminds his congregation of:

O(u)r late unhappy rebellion, which though it has pleased almighty God to deliver us from before we were quite ruined. Yet we know not how soon we may be delivered up to the like calamities if we don't pray to the same God for union and peace. What will a designing ambitious Prince wish more for than to see his adversaries disagree among themselves...when the members are at variance with one another that the whole body is in a languishing state(84).

Following the death of Queen Anne in August 1714, an air of unrest settled across the country. Edmund Harrold of Manchester sensed it, and recorded in his diary:

Heard King George prayed for at St. Ann's Church this day. O God, send us peace(85).

A year later in August 1715 he entreated God to "bless and preserve the church of England", and with good reason. When King George I assumed the throne in October 1714 he announced that he would adhere to the Toleration Act, and

"the anger of the High Church faction in Manchester knew no bounds" (86). The group marched on Henry Newcome's Dissenting chapel in Cross Street chanting the name of Henry Sacheverell and wreaked havoc upon the building, to the extent that it had to be rebuilt from public money. Such localised disturbances were repeated across the country, in the diocese of Chester at Warrington and Wigan, and in Wales at Llanfyllin and Wrexham, where two Dissenting chapels were destroyed (87). As tensions mounted the Jacobite contingent in Scotland came to be the focus of hostilities, and sporadic rioting was seen across Scotland and England. Wales saw little direct action, although had the Pretender's forces reached the Anglo-Welsh border, "Wales would certainly have risen" (88).

As the Scottish Jacobites and Presbyterians who had taken up arms against the new King began to march toward England, they harboured hopes that the High Churchmen of the various towns en route would join with them (89). One of their number was Robert Patten, a cleric who later recanted his part in the events of 1715 and testified for the King against his co-conspirators. In 1717 he wrote The History of the Late Rebellion. With Original Papers and Characters of the Principal Noblemen and Gentlemen Concerned in it, which records how the rebels encountered High Church resistance and support during their march. In Newcastle, for example, the town militia was called upon to defend it as the residents declared for King George, but the "High party" of the town extended their "well-wishes to the Rebels at Hexham" and warned them that the town was opposed to them (90). In Appleby, Westmorland, Patten was ordered to read prayers for the Pretender in the parish church even if the parson or curate refused to allow it. But, Patten records:

they were not very backward as to the thing it self,
though they thought it their safest way modestly to
excuse themselves, testifying however their

Satisfaction, in giving Orders for the Bells to ring, and having all things made ready for the Service; nor did the Parson and his Curate scruple to grace the Assembly with their presence, or to join in the Prayers for the Pretender; which encouraged the Highlanders to believe the High-Church party were entirely theirs, and would join in a little time(91).

Patten notes the similar attitude of a Parson in Lancaster, where the group received news that the Pretender had been proclaimed in Manchester. Patten recalls:

For in that time a great many Lancashire gentlemen joined us with their Servants and Friends. It's true, they were most of them Papists, which made the Scots Gentlemen and the Highlanders mighty uneasy, very much suspecting the cause; for they expected all the High-Church party to have joined them. Indeed, that Party, who are never right Hearty for the cause, 'till they are mellow, as they call it, over a Bottle or two, began now to show us their blind side; and that it is their just Character, that they do not care for venturing their Carcasses any farther than the Tavern; there indeed, with their High-Church, and Ormond, they would make men believe, who do not know them, that they would encounter the greatest Opposition in the World; but after having consulted their Pillows, and the Fume a little evaporated, it is to be observed of them, that they generally become mighty Tame, and are apt to Look before they Leap, and with the Snail, if you touch their Houses, they hide their Heads, shrink back, and pull in their Horns. I have heard Mr Forster say he was blustered into this Business by such People as these, but that for the time to come he would never again believe a drunken Tory(92).

Forster commanded the troops who had instigated the insurrection for the Pretender at Northumberland, and Ormond was a Duke who had been sent to England to muster support for the Pretender upon Queen Anne's death.

However improbable it may seem that the High Churchmen of Manchester had agreed to join the Pretender's forces whilst inebriated, Patten's account is given credence by the long association of the High and Low Church groups in Manchester with particular public houses. "The Angel" in

Marketstead Lane is depicted as the Low Church rallying point(93), while "The Bull's Head" in Market Place was that of the High Churchmen. It was from there in 1745 that volunteers for the Manchester Regiment in the Jacobite uprising of that year were recruited, and a ballad of 1790 also attests to the use of the tavern by that group. Describing the High Churchmen's opposition to a group of "Protestant Dissenters" in a discussion about repealing the Corporation and Test Acts, the ballad runs:

Then next to oppose, the old Tories they met,
Came soon to secure the best Seats they could get;
They bounced and they blustered, but no one took heed;
So they passed their Resolves, in which all were agreed.

Circumvented - distressed - at a loss where to fly
Till an old Beagle Hound enlivened their Cry;
Follow me the Choice Pack, and I'll lead you a Chace,
So off they all set to the Bulls-Head a Race(94).

Further evidence of this association comes from the Churchwardens' accounts for the Collegiate Church, where in 1711 it is recorded that the church contributed £2. 6s. 6d "toward changes at the Bull's Head" (95).

To ascertain whether it is true that High Church promises of allegiance to the rebels were made in a stupified haze of tobacco and ale is now impossible. The important fact in Patten's account is that he and his fellow rebels clearly believed that they had received an indication of support from the High Churchmen of Lancashire, which was never fulfilled. Sobriety, insufficient time to gather adequate resources and supporters and the knowledge that the King's forces were being deployed from Wigan may all be factors which contributed to the High Church change of heart. The fact that they considered aligning themselves with the enemy of Popery at all depicts the desperation they felt, and it was an alliance that was greeted with surprise in London:

But that professed members of the Church of England should join with them in this, and, out of private discontents, attempt to set up a person whom they have so often and so lately abjured, is so vile and detestable a thing, as may justly make them odious both to God and man(96).

The elevation of the "leading High Church Hanoverian" Bishop William Dawes of Chester to York in 1714 was a conciliatory appointment to reassure all those who feared Jacobitism(97). Dawes, therefore, was not allied to the Lancashire High Churchmen and had not committed himself to supporting the rebels, so that as with their approach to the Nonjurors and Papists, the allegiances of individual High Churchmen are blurred and inconsistent with the perceived party approach. Only the Sacheverell sermon seems to have occasioned a decisive standpoint from those labelled High Churchmen, and that was one utterly opposed to toleration but vague and uncertain about the legitimacy of the Revolution and the Revolution settlement.

CHAPTER 7

Lay Evidence of the Existence of a High Church Consensus within the Dioceses of Bangor and Chester

Throughout the period 1688 to 1715, religious groups within the dioceses of Bangor and Chester and nationally, defined each other according to religious and political stereotypes. For example, during the general election campaign of 1698, one broadsheet defined adherents of King James as "the New Country Party so-called", and a second grouped the "high churchmen" and "non-jurors" with this party(1). Such stereotyping provided a neat characterisation of each group, and while indicating their motivations, lifestyle, comprehension of God and history, and their social and political ideologies, they also fuelled religious bigotry which spurred a mob culture of violence and unrest.

Political and religious affiliations therefore were interchangeable and determined by popular opinion and conception. Individual writers were able to influence the popular mood toward any single group, and inflamed passions invariably led to violence. In this context the Toleration granted to Dissenters might be perceived as a government condemnation of mob tactics, an assertion that religious violence was disruptive to social and political harmony and was not to be encouraged(2).

1. Lay Tory, Nonconformist and Jacobite Affinities

The indiscriminate nature of the definitions of terms like "Tory" and "High Churchman" espoused in broadsheets and other literature of the period, render identification of such sympathies difficult. In the dioceses of Bangor and Chester the term "Tory" varied widely in meaning.

In Wales the political scene was dominated by certain wealthy families who had represented specific parliamentary areas for generations. The seat of Anglesey was retained by the Bulkeley family, Denbighshire by the Williams-Wynn family, Caernarfonshire by the Whig Wynns of Glynllifon and Merioneth by the Vaughans of Corsygedol. For these families, parliamentary representation meant enhancing the prestige of the family and enjoying the perks of office, and few did anything to enhance the lot of Wales or the Welsh(3).

Welsh Tory representatives included Sir Richard Myddleton of Chirk Castle, who had characteristically voted against the change of sovereign in 1689, but did not support attempts to restore the Stuarts to the throne and voted in favour of securing the succession to Hanover in 1702(4). Despite this opposition to the Pretender, Myddleton was a supporter of Sacheverell and offered him accommodation at his Denbighshire home during the preacher's journey around the country(5). Another "Hanoverian Tory" who supported Dutch succession to the throne, was Lord Anglesey, who also supported Dr Sacheverell in the Lords. On one of the few occasions that he ever stood to speak, Anglesey took the opportunity offered by the debates on Sacheverell's sentence to defend preachers' rights to preach on feasts like 30 January and 5 November, and asserted that the issue of Non Resistance was not relevant to the Sacheverell enquiry since

a "vacancy of throne" and not usurpation was the crux of the issue(6).

Sympathies toward Sacheverell personally and toward the content and tone of his sermon are especially demonstrative of Tory affiliation. It is significant, therefore, that a speech given by Sir Simon Harcourt to the Committee of Elections in January 1708/09 is preserved among the Baron Hill manuscripts belonging to the Bulkeley family of Anglesey. The outcome of the speech was that Harcourt was deemed not duly elected for Abingdon and freed from the obligations of elected office, which allowed him to join Sacheverell's defence team in the Commons. Its preservation indicates both Harcourt's Toryism and more significantly, his link with the Bulkeleys through the Bertie family of Abingdon(7).

Within the diocese of Chester, support for Dr Sacheverell was evidenced in Cheshire. During his stay in the Anglo-Welsh borderlands, the preacher divided his time between Richard Myddleton's home in Denbighshire and that of George Shackerley, brother of the Tory member of parliament for Chester(8). Party affiliations in the North West of England were strong among particular families, and as Lancashire housed several Papist families the wealthy county of Cheshire was the focus for political allegiance. The Legh family of Lyme for example, were ardent Tories and Peter Legh was Tory Member of Parliament for Newton. The matriarch of the family, Elizabeth Legh, was noted for her detest of the Whig party and once responded to news of the appointment of a Tory Bishop with the statement; "May the Whigs always meet with such disappointments"(9). Lord Delamere's intrigues against King James, assisted by the Earl of Derby, have already been noted(10), and he was countered in his

efforts by the Earl of Macclesfield who represented the county's Whigs(11).

Lay reaction to and comprehension of the Revolution was markedly different in each diocese. In Wales, geographical distance from events rendered the Revolution passive, whilst in England events constituted an aristocratic revolution embarked upon with the sole aim of keeping England safe for its landowners(12). In the diocese of Chester specifically, the Revolution amounted to a localised response to James II's reorganising of local magistracies. James had pursued a policy of demoting local magistrates and replacing them with his Roman Catholic appointments as a means of saturating the country with Papism, and the oligarchical nature of local government in the period meant that Roman Catholicism within it could be perpetuated by the co-opting of new members to fill vacancies by those already appointed. The Lieutenant and six Deputy Lieutenants of Lancashire had been replaced in this manner by Roman Catholics and the town of Wigan had been infiltrated by a Roman Catholic Mayor(13). These appointments convinced even the most fervent Tories of the necessity of deposing the King, and even Peter Legh could not approve of James' arbitrary measures and accepted the change of regime as inevitable, though he was to refuse to swear allegiance to the new monarchs. His equally conservative uncle, John Chicheley, wrote to his nephew from London on December 11, 1688, to inform him that all were agreed that James had forfeited the throne and that his assault on the Church could not be allowed to continue. However, a later letter of February 9, 1689, suggests that the manner of William's succession was not acceptable to him:

placing ye Crown on ye Prince, which will be a precedent for placing it on another whenever ye Lords

and Commons please, and so consequently make this kingdom, which has ever been elective into a Commonwealth if they please, which God forbid...when necessity may force a man, that one must submit to(14).

His sentiments were shared by Benjamin Hoadly, later Bishop of Bangor. In his Tracts Hoadly responds to The Revolution no Rebellion, Offered to the Rev Benjamin Hoadly by a Citizen of London, by asserting that the Revolution was orchestrated by men who acted in a private capacity to invite William to England "to owe their legal King, and force him into a Compliance", and while he agrees that the Revolution did deliver the country from the threat of Popery, he is not convinced that it was legal, and asserts that it casts doubt on the succession(15).

Amongst the laity of the nation, therefore, the Revolution was orchestrated by those who had either the most to gain politically from James' deposition or the most to lose financially from his preservation. As with clerics of the Anglican Church, reactions to and support for the Revolution varied according to individual scruple, despite the portrayal of a unified Tory or High Church standpoint by the broadsheet writers of the period.

The intolerance traditionally associated with the Tory and High Church standpoint was also variable. In Lancaster, William Stout recorded in his diary that a Presbyterian neighbour, William Cornish, was aggrieved and envied by one particular religious group:

the Papists and Jacobit party, partly upon the account of his religion, and that he could not comply with their former indirect and illegal practizes in the custom; and they sought all oportuneties to find ocation to accuse him of any defect in the management of his office(16).

It is significant that Stout equates the two as a single party; Roman Catholics who sought the restoration of the Stuart dynasty, and from whom the town's Dissenting denominations were harrassed rather than the Anglican population.

Dissenting communities experienced toleration across the diocese of Chester, to such an extent that the hundred of Salford housed the greatest number of Dissenters outside of Essex. In 1689, six petitions were presented to the Quarter Sessions at Preston for the licensing of meeting houses at Pendleton, Altham, Read, Clayton le Moors, Haslingden and Whalley(17). Across the River Irwell in Manchester the Dissenters of the town gained a firm foothold with the opening in 1694, by the followers of Henry Newcome, of Cross Street Chapel, only the second place of worship in the town which had been ecclesiastically monopolised by the Collegiate Church. In 1699 the Dissenters consolidated their position with the opening of a house for academic learning in nearby Deansgate using Chetham's Library as its reading resource. Founded by Newcome and a second Presbyterian, John Chorlton, it offered arts and theological tutoring for students without requirement of subscription to creed or catechism, unlike the formal universities(19). In contrast, a sermon attributed to Robert Morgan and given at Llanddyfnan, Anglesey, in 1711, notes; "The Ch. angry wth ye Presbns" (20).

Such Anglican inconsistency towards Dissenting groups amongst both the clergy and the laity extended to the Nonjurors. The oaths to King William and Queen Mary, intended as a test of those friendly to the Revolution and its settlement, occasioned as much reaction in the diocese of Chester as elsewhere, and it has already been noted that Manchester housed a large Nonjuring community under the

auspices of Thomas Deacon. In Cheshire, the diary of Henry Prescott affords an indication of the extent of the community there. An entry for 7 October 1689, remarks on the number of priests in the diocese who have not yet taken the oaths, and goes on to describe the conversation at table between Prescott and the Bishop of Chester, Nicholas Stratford, about how "Mr Gee, a man distinguished for learning, utters things that are sufficiently learned but not wise about the matter of the monarchy" (20). In the context of a discussion about the oaths, the inference is that Gee, a Mancunian writer based in London who wrote mainly anti-papal texts, had been expressing Nonjuror objections to the new monarchs, the issue of allegiance to them and the implications of their accession for the succession (21).

These issues remained controversial throughout the period. In 1713 the Mancunian John Byrom was studying at Trinity College, Cambridge, and became acquainted with "one Law", namely William Law, the Nonjuror. In April 1713, Byrom described in a letter to a friend how, in a speech Law had made, he had asked his audience;

Whether good and evil be obnoxious to revolution...whether, when the children of Israel had made the golden calf the object of their worship, they ought to keep to their God de facto, or return to their God de jure?(22).

Byrom outlines that in "a sad Whiggish place" like Cambridge, such a standpoint was not well received and Law was set back a year in his studies as a result of it. Byrom maintained contact with Law for several years, despite his once labelling him "a vain, conceited fellow", and he even passed on financial contributions from Law to Deacon (23).

The wealthy and politically active families of Cheshire came to epitomize the uncertainty faced by many High Anglican Tories in the aftermath of the Revolution. Francis Cholmondeley, for instance, was Member of Parliament for, and a resident of, Vale Royal in Cheshire, and in 1689 became the first Member to be imprisoned in the Tower for having refused to swear the oaths of allegiance. In January 1689, he wrote to his friend Peter Legh of Lyme Hall and informed him of a debate that had taken place in the House of Commons that day, from which he concluded that:

I am made ye first example of this kind, to be imprisoned for refusing ye Oaths(24).

Cholmondeley's suspicions proved correct, and he was given a suspended sentence to the Tower on account of the grave physical conditions of both a cousin of his and a mutual friend of he and Legh. When the former wrote to the latter to inform him of the friend's death, he commented that he expected to be expelled from the House and placed in the custody of a cousin he identified as G. Cholmondeley, "who will be firm for ye Ch: of Engld" (25). Whether this cousin was successful in persuading Cholmondeley to swear the oaths remains uncertain. In his History of Cheshire, Oldmixon asserts that he was not and names Cholmondeley as a Nonjuror, but J.H Overton in his work Nonjurors, doubts this and describes Cholmondeley rather as "a kind friend and patron of Nonjurors", pointing to his composition of an epitaph to John Oakes, a deprived Nonjuring cleric, as evidence (26). Certainly by September 1689 Cholmondeley had been freed from the tower and was visited at Vale Royal by Henry Prescott, who recorded a conversation in his diary which suggests either that Cholmondeley had relented and was troubled by his own conscience, or that he had not and

sought to instill appropriate guilt upon Prescott, who had taken the oaths. Referring to Cholmondeley, Prescott recalled:

Stirred up by keen acumen he utters in passing but deliberately some harsh things about that new oath and those who maintain it. But I not in the least guilty of injured conscience or ruined loyalty (thank God) decide that there is nothing to be ashamed of in having performed a citizen's public duty(27).

Although Cholmondeley's position remains doubtful, it is absolutely certain that Peter Legh of Lyme persistently refused to swear the oaths and maintained a loyalty to King James that brought suspicion upon him. Shaped by his mother's fierce hatred of Whiggism and his late father's devotion to his monarch, Peter was compromised by the Revolution which left him, as has already been noted, in a position requiring adherence either to a deposed King who had orchestrated his own downfall, or to a usurper who had acquired the throne by illegal, immoral and unconstitutional means. When Peter refused to be drawn in either direction his position became perilous. His mother, who had relocated to London following the death of her husband, had warned him that there were many prepared to "work their spit(e)" against him, and his uncle, John Chicheley, warned him twice in 1690 of murmurings against him in Cheshire. On the first occasion he told Peter that the Commissioners of the county were considering whether "you should taste their rigour and malice", a position they reconsidered on appeal from Henry Bradshawe of Marple who pointed to Peter's youth and inexperience as reason for his dalliance(28). On the second occasion, a month later in July 1690, Chicheley warned Legh that:

At Nantwich session yrself and Jacobite acquaintance were indicted as such, yt have obstinately refused ye oaths(29).

Their equating Legh with the Jacobites of the area is an indication of the links between the Nonjuring and Jacobite standpoints and the Legh family correspondence does suggest some "Jacobite acquaintance". Indeed, a letter of 1689 from Peter's brother, Richard, to Mrs Leigh of Lyme, probably Peter's wife, suggests a definite Jacobite affinity as it relates the:

great news that the French have shipp'd thirty thousand foot and horse wth mallocks Pickaxes and shovells. The King has commanded my Ld Gerard, my Ld Hawley and my Ld of Oxford's Troopes to march forthwth to the sea-side...to give what opposition they can(30).

A further undated letter signed by "Tho Ashsheton" (*Sic*), the Constable of Chester Castle, urges Peter Legh into action on the Pretender's account. He is asked to "press (a name too) our Representatives on old Toweys account", possibly a reference to the Jacobite Townley family, and is warned "yt a country bitter of regrett makes little or no importance". The letter then asserts that it is imperative to act to preserve "yt memory" of the deposed King, because he is "out of sight, out of mind. I need to say no more of this subject you know well enough how it is". A second letter from Assheton to Legh of August 3, 1714 also indicates Jacobite affinities when it informs Legh of Queen Anne's death and of King George being conveyed to Britain "w(i)th a considerable number of men of war", which it describes as a "melancholy occasion". The Assheton family had definite Jacobite connections, and a Robert Assheton, chaplain of the Collegiate Church of Manchester from 1699,

is described in the Lancashire manuscripts as "a Jacobite in his political principles" (31).

As the years progressed Legh did little to help his own case. In 1701 he severed his links with the Tory hierarchy of Lancashire when he failed to support the Earl of Derby in a declaration against the right of the French King Louis XIV to name a King of England. Legh was asked by the Earl to support his public declaration against this at Derby on the first Wednesday of November 1701, but he did not attend. The Earl charitably assumed in a letter to Legh that he had been unavoidably delayed at Derby race course, but he was conspicuous by his absence (32).

His association with "The Cheshire Club", which he was accredited with having established, also occasioned hostility and distrust. It comprised of a number of gentlemen from Cheshire, including Thomas Assheton, Robert Cholmondeley of Holford and Henry Legh of High Legh, who met as a sounding forum to discuss the pressing issues of the day. However, government fears were that its actual purpose was to commemorate the exiled King and even plot for his restoration, and the club was paralleled with those like it in North East Wales, specifically "The Cycle of the White Rose club", which was founded on the day of James III's birthday, June 10, 1710. Although it later embraced members from Cheshire, its original base was in Flintshire and Denbighshire, and it was this group who were accredited with having instigated riots against meeting houses in Wrexham in 1715 (33). Rumours abounded that "a favourite pastime, nurtured by clubs like the Cycle of the White Rose" was toasting "the king across the water" (34). This practice involved proposing a toast to the King and then meeting glasses and drinking over a bowl of water, so that the group could not have been said to have directly proposed a toast

to the Pretender, but drank instead to the King who was, literally, "over the water". At Lyme Hall, the preservation of glasses bearing Jacobite emblems of the six petalled Stuart rose with two buds to represent James II and Prince Charles Edward, and a tear drop on one, suggests that the Legh family, if not the Cheshire Club, had distinctly Popish leanings, especially as the collection stands in sharp contrast to a collection of Huguenot Silver at Lord Delamere's residence of Dunham Massey Hall(35).

The precise nature of the Cheshire Club and its aims remain a matter of conjecture. That the club did harbour Jacobite sympathisers is suggested by an account of its final meeting at Ashley Hall in 1715. Peter Legh was left to cast the deciding vote in a debate to determine whether the club would support the Pretender in his efforts toward restoration. Legh determined that they would not, and the fact that the vote was so close signifies division among the members. It was then decided that the group should not meet again as "The Cheshire Club", though its dissolution was amicable enough for all members to agree to pose for portraits which to this day hang on a staircase in Tatton Hall, Cheshire(36).

One of the clubs members, Thomas Assheton, had written to Legh in 1689 to request his support for the Pretender, and Legh was to be implicated in two further "Popish Plots" in 1694 and 1696. The specific intrigues of these conspiracies are beyond the scope of this work, but two contemporary accounts outline the basic chain of events. One of them, a True History of the Several Designs and Conspiracies against his Majesty's person and government as they were carried on from 1688 till 1697, written by Richard Kingston, a court scribe, asserts that James II initiated a plot against William when he suggested at his departure that

someone ought to be commissioned to raise a ferment toward his restoration. A Mr Bromfield, who posed as a Quaker, travelled to Ireland where he met a Mr Lunt who had been in France with James, and undertook to bear James' commissions to the north of England. Meanwhile, the Jacobite Colonel Parker had devised a plot to instigate William's assassination and sent his representative, Edmund Threlfall, to meet Lunt. As they sailed back to Cockerham, England, Lunt left the commissions, declarations and other important papers on the vessel and they were discovered by Customs House Officials, so that as Lunt and Threlfall began to deliver copies of the commissions to Jacobites across Lancashire, Cheshire and Staffordshire and Yorkshire and Durham respectively, they did so as wanted men. When Lunt was captured in 1691, the inefficiency of the Customs Officers and the unavailability of a witness led to his acquittal, but in the meantime Colonel Parker and a Major Crosby assumed the impetus for the plot. In 1693 Lunt shared details of it with a Roman Catholic priest who was "against it as a damnable sin", and either Lunt's conscience, or his greed for a reward, led him in 1694 to betray the names of his fellow conspirators, one of whom he claimed, was Peter Legh(37).

Lunt testified that one of James' commissions to Cheshire had been addressed to Legh, and he was arrested on 19 July 1694. A search of Lyme Hall found nothing incriminating, and after detention in Chester Castle and the Tower of London, Legh was brought to trial at Chester in October 1695. Lunt's testimony was exposed as unreliable by Roger Dickenson of Manchester who proved that he had never met several of the people he accused by introducing him to them under alternative names, so that when Lunt was asked to point to Sir Rowland Stanley at the trial, he pointed to Sir

Thomas Clifton(38). When no other witnesses came forward against him, Legh was acquitted.

In 1696 rumours of a second plot led to Legh's second imprisonment in Chester Castle until he was again discharged because of lack of evidence. His association with Thomas Cartwright and his vast personal wealth have both been suggested as reasons for his implication in these plots(39). In his will, Legh referred to them when he instructed his heirs that:

I would have no monument set over me, only a plain brass nailed to the wall to express my innocency in that wicked conspiracy by false witnesses, imprisonments and trials, in 1694 and 1696, and that I die a member of the Church of England, looking upon it to be the best and purest of Churches, and do most sincerely wish it may continue for ever(40).

Peter Legh occupied unusual ground. He had reconciled himself to a change of regime before the arrival of William of Orange but was never able to commit himself to the Hanoverian succession. The fact that he never swore the Oaths of Allegiance to William and Mary and that he voted against actively supporting the Pretender as a member of The Cheshire Club, suggests that he occupied a Nonjuring stance, but he never deviated from worship in the Church of England and retained the trust of his prelate. In a letter of December 8, 1705 concerning the appointing of a Clerk of Legh's choosing for presentment at Disley parish, as was required by his family title, Bishop Nicholas Stratford outlined his implicit trust in Legh when he wrote:

I am confident you will present no Person who is not very well qualified for the place(41).

In contrast, Peter's sister Isabella "Belle" Legh eloped in 1700 to marry a man she was rumoured to have met in the Nonjuring church of Ebenezer Sellor, vicar of Charles at Plymouth, Devon, whilst his brothers Richard and Francis went out for the Pretender in 1715, Francis, or Frank, being part of General Forster's troop who entered Preston. He evaded capture by escaping to France where he remained until 1737(42). The Legh family therefore were a devoted Anglican family who were compromised by the Revolution. As Belle Legh rejected the right of the usurper and deviated from the Anglican communion to join the preservative church of the true apostolic succession, her brothers Richard and Frank could not reconcile themselves to usurpation and joined the ranks of those who sought to restore James and later his son. Only Peter found himself unable to reconcile himself to either side. As a politically active gentleman he knew that James' policies had been devisive and dangerous to government, and that the King had made his own exile inevitable. But he could not accept the nature of his downfall, nor the ease with which Oaths of Allegiance to the King had been forgotten in the clamour to welcome the Prince of Orange to the throne. Neither could he accept division from the Anglican Church, and so he occupied a fringe position, excluding himself from politics and isolating himself in his Cheshire home whilst continuing to profess the Anglican faith and resist attempts by the Pretender to regain the throne of Britain. His position differed only from those who might be characterised High Church in that he refused to swear allegiance to the new monarchs. He belonged to no party, but held very distinct principles. His predicament and those of his siblings echoed the bewilderment and division faced by numerous families in the wake of the Revolution.

Apart from the Legh family, Papism did have a firm foothold in the diocese of Chester. The River Ribble spans the county of Lancashire, and south of that river resided England's largest concentration of Roman Catholics, specifically in West Derby, part of modern day Liverpool, Leyland near Preston and Blackburn(43). A letter to Archbishop Tenison of November 3, 1709, from John Hulme of the parish of Blackburn reports that the Popish Bishop Smith had visited Mr Walmsley of Lower Hall, Samlesbury, between the eighth and the tenth of July of that year and was attended by a "very great" number of Papists. However, he reported:

I cannot find that any persons of note were there, or any Protestants, except one or two of Mr Walmsley's servants, who dare make no Discoveries of these matters...The neighbouring Protestants seemed to take little notice of this matter, it being no novelty with them(44).

He continued by asserting that the Bishop of Chester had no knowledge of it, and that his own account was so sparse because of:

the unwillingness of people in this country to intermeddle agst Papists, which if it should come to any of their Ears, they would study to requite them with the greatest mischief they could think of; And indeed tis dangerous meddling with them here, where they bear down all before them with their Power and Intrest(45).

Bishop Cartwright's diary attests to his association with numerous wealthy Papist families of Lancashire including the Tildesley's of Stansacre, the Molineux's of Sefton and the Townley's of Townley(46). Thomas Tyldesley of Stansacre, a diarist, was the son of a Cavalier and father

of two Benedictine nuns and one Canoness at a Paris convent. He and a namesake relative were also implicated in the plot of 1694 by Lunt but were also discharged. Thomas died before the riots of 1715, but had been involved in planning the seizure of the jails at Lancaster and Preston as early as 1713, and had held a small celebration with friends upon the death of Queen Anne. Like many of his fellow Jacobites, he was able to maintain a favourable relationship with those Anglican clerics around him, specifically John Winter of Cockerham(47).

Other famous Roman Catholic families in the diocese included the Standish family of Standish. Lord William Standish was the Jacobite ringleader in Lancashire, facilitated by the seclusion of Standish Hall which stood in a forest. In 1690 Robert Dodsworth told his friend Roger Kenyon that while he was a guest at Standish over Christmas 1689 a plot against King William had been discussed. Shortly afterwards he was murdered. In 1694, John Wombswell, a Carrier, testified that he had delivered arms to Standish Hall which was searched, and although nothing was found William Standish fled, amidst further allegations that his servants had recruited men in the Pretender's cause from Standish and Wigan. It was enough evidence to spur the King into issuing a proclamation which placed £500 on the detaining of Standish(48). In 1757 during the reconstruction of a wall on the Standish estate, ciphered papers were discovered which included a Declaration of Loyalty to King James, an assurance of support for him signed by Standish and Charles Towneley amongst others, and a reply from James approving arrangements for his return(49).

Other Papist families lived quite peaceably and posed little threat to William. Nicholas Blundell, head of the Blundell family of Ince for example, was elected

Churchwarden of Sefton parish church in 1714. He also had ancestors who had been acquitted of involvement in the plots of 1694 (50). Papist inclinations were also claimed for Manchester. In a broadside entitled Plain Answers, the town's Jacobites were accused of fund-raising for a civil war and for weaponry, and of corrupting the army. It asked:

Who have been for three Years past, incessantly endeavouring to overthrow the British Constitution, and to substitute an irrational System, imported from France, in its stead?

English Jacobins

Who, secretly and in the Stillness of Midnight, assembled their Ruffian Adherents, to train them to the Use of Arms, in order to destroy the present Government, and pillage the nation?

Manchester Jacobins

Who have attempted to Murder one of the most amiable Monarchs that ever sat on a throne, when discharging the Duties of his high Office?

English Jacobins (51).

John Byrom is often characterised as one of Manchester's famous Papists, but his actual convictions are unclear. During a trip to France in 1716 he was rumoured to have met the Pretender at Avignon, where he recorded in his journal that he had kissed his hand. Byrom claimed that the reason for this trip was to study medicine at Montpellier, but he never gained a degree from there (51). Manchester's Whig populace claimed this as proof of Byrom's Papism, but his writings indicate that he was not a Papist. In letters to his Papist friend John Stansfield he referred to "your P", denoting no connection between the Pretender and himself (53). It seems rather that Byrom was an astute observer and commentator on life, and in 1745 he

demonstrated his niche for sarcastic observation with the following verse :

God bless our Lord the King, the Faith's Defender;
God bless (what harm in blessing?) the Pretender.
But which Pretender is, and which is King,
God bless us all, is quite another thing(54).

The Welsh owed the Stuarts little. Charles II had never visited Wales during his reign and James II's Catholicism was as unpopular there as anywhere else, yet regionalised pockets of support for the exiled King did survive. During his tour of the country in 1696, the French Abbot Eusebe Renaudot recorded the disposition of various areas towards Jacobitism, and of North and South Wales he noted, "well disposed" (55).

North East Wales housed many Jacobite communities. The Cycle of the White Rose club, based around Wrexham in Denbighshire was founded by Sir Watkin Williams-Wynn in 1716, and in 1696, when King William granted the Lordship of Denbigh and those of Bromfield and Yale in England to a Dutch favourite, Welsh Members of Parliament united in opposition and displayed a rare show of unity to successfully oppose the appointment and have it revoked(56). A letter of October 18, 1703, penned by a Popish priest, Thomas Brown, alias Thomas Day, described his upbringing in Llanhasa, Flintshire, where his mother's Popish family, the Reynolds, were well known, and it described his education under the tuition of the minister of Llanhasa Dr Maurice, his Curate Rob Jones and the Curate of Hawarden, Humphrey Thomas(57).

The diocese of Bangor also boasted a notable Papist population, and Bishop Benjamin Hoadly was said to have been appointed to Bangor in 1715 precisely to crush

Jacobitism(58). As in Cheshire(59), Welsh Papism revolved around the convictions of the wealthy families of the area, such as the Owen's of Clennau, Caernarvonshire. In November 1688 Sir Robert Owen wrote to King James offering his assistance in "raising 500 men for his service", an offer which was not accepted(59). In an undated statement, Bishop Humphrey Humphreys of Bangor related how the same Sir Robert Owen was due to give evidence against a Popish priest named Gethin who had claimed during the reign of James II that neither Anne or Mary were legitimate heirs to the throne because James had never been married to their mother. On the day Owen was due to testify, he was arrested on "some sham action" and bail set so high that for Humphreys to buy his witness' freedom would have plunged him into financial ruin. Owen therefore was unable to testify, and Humphreys' case against the priest collapsed. The Bishop clearly suspected that Owen had been deliberately detained(60).

On the isle of Anglesey, Papist tendencies are well attested. In 1689, in a draft letter to Bishop Humphreys explaining why he could not accept the Deanery of Bangor, John Jones, minister of Beaumaris cited as his reason that he still had too much to accomplish on Anglesey, identifying Llanfihangel as:

one of the worst and most unpardonable remainder of popery that are left among us, and ought with all speed to be purged(61).

The focus for these allegiances was the influential Bulkeley family. Although Lord Richard Bulkeley disputed his Jacobitism if challenged directly, he certainly held distinct views which were inclined toward the Stuart family. In 1715, Bulkeley surrendered his seat of Beaumaris at Parliament to Meyrick of Bodorgan because he could not bring

himself to sit in the court of King George I(62). He was also rumoured to encourage pro-Jacobite behaviour, as at the christening of one his sons in 1717, when Bulkeley provided ale for the people of Beaumaris, as a result of which his Head Gardener William Jones and servant Marris Roberts spent the day throwing stones at the house of the Constable of the Castle and making toasts to the health of "Jemmy", or James II(63).

The Bulkeley family had a long connection with Roman Catholicism. Henry Bulkeley, Lord Richard's cousin, was Master of the Household to both Charles II and James II and accompanied James to exile in France. He later converted to Roman Catholicism(64). Although Richard swore the oaths to William and Mary and remained an Anglican, his adherence to the Protestant succession is a matter of conjecture. A letter of February 23, 1709/10 from "Bowmaris Burrough" and signed by Mr Thomas Bulkeley, Richard's uncle, John Evans, Bishop of Bangor, and the Rev. John Owen of Llaneilian, declared that Bulkeley was a man "firm to the true interest of his Country and Church of England as now Establish'd" (65). An Irish publication of 1711, Mr Higgins' Printed Case Relating to Sir Rich Bulkeley and Col Forster, Prov'd Notoriously false and scandalous also asserted Bulkeley's loyalty to the Revolution and disputed the assertion that Bulkeley had professed the Crown to be elective and that the people could remove the Queen if she failed to govern according to law(66).

In contrast, on June 24, 1709, Bulkeley records that Simon Langford had claimed that he would not vote for him because he was for bringing in the Pretender. When it was pointed out to him that Lord Bulkeley had taken and sworn the Oaths of Allegiance, Langford replied; "He and his party may, when they please, have a Dispensation for it, from the

Pope". Langford was later to claim that he had been misrepresented(67).

An incident of September 26, 1712 involving Bulkeley suggests that he scrupled the legitimacy of an Oath of Allegiance to a usurping monarch. He led a mob of about 140 of his friends and tenants, in a "riotous and tumultuous manner", into Caernarfon where they broke into the town hall and swore in about 140 Burgesses, and made the oath "differently" to that usually employed. Since the court was pro-rogued at the time, the actions were afforded little credence, but illustrated Bulkeley's disaffection to the required Oath of Allegiance(68).

Welsh involvement in the intrigues of the 1690's was minor, and Robert Dodsworth in his testimony at Manchester in 1690 knew of only one Welsh conspirator, "Lieut. Penalt or such like Name", who served with Colonel Molyneux(69). However, the possibility of the Pretender's return was discussed on Anglesey. Amongst the Bulkeley family papers survives an address from the Pretender which asserts the rights of hereditary succession and expresses disdain that the opportunity for his restoration presented by the death of Queen Anne had been allowed to pass. It continues to describe how he had sought support from France but had been denied both it and passage through the country because of the terms of the Treaty of Peace. In a number of letters from John Richards of Beaumaris, further plans for tactical manouveres of both the Pretender and the Protestant forces are also discussed(70).

Many of the leading families of both dioceses felt allied or opposed to the Stuart family by ancestral ties to either the Roundhead or Cavalier forces. As had evidently been discussed on Anglesey, the Pretender's best chance of restoration came with the death of Queen Anne in 1714, and

although this opportunity remained unfulfilled the Pretender's supporters mounted considerable resistance to King George I.

ii. Lay Involvement in the Riots of 1715

The riots of 1715 began in many cases as a localised response to the accession of King George I, and specifically, as at Manchester, to his intention to adhere to the Toleration Act(71). Apart from rioting at Wrexham, Welsh involvement in the hostilities of 1715 was limited. However, the Bulkeley family manuscripts do infer the involvement of Sir Richard Mostyn in unrest, speculating that he would be turned out and that another three unnamed Lords were sure to die(72).

In the diocese of Chester, tensions had been building in Manchester since January 1715 when a P.Kenyon recorded in a letter that "As to Manchester, they are ready to pull one anothers eyes out"(73). Rioting was ultimately occasioned by a blacksmith named Thomas Syddall. The family name was synonymous with Popery, and Thomas' namesake son was one of those later executed in 1745. In objection to what he termed "a foreign, dull and slow King who was a stranger to this country and who was German in origin and thought and custom, lacking the personal attraction of the Stuarts", Syddall assumed leadership of the mobs in Manchester and instigated an attack on Cross Street Chapel, the only Dissenting place of worship in the town, with the object of extirpating schism "root and branch"(74). A contemporary account of the riot exists in a History of the late Rebellion raised against His Majesty King George by the friends of the Popish

Pretender, by Peter Rae(75). It describes how the Mancunian mob "pulled down the Presbyterian meeting-house, all but the walls" whilst chanting the name of Sacheverell(76), and then went on to march toward Yorkshire, pulling down Presbyterian meeting houses as they went(77). Similar riots occurred at Leeds, Warrington and Wigan(78), before Syddall was arrested and detained at Lancaster Castle. When the Pretender's forces liberated the castle on their march through England, Syddall joined with them and was captured at Preston. He was executed in Manchester in 1716 and his head set upon the Market Cross(79).

It was at Preston that the Pretender's forces met with their final defeat. Having marched successfully through Scotland to reach Preston by November 1715, the Pretender's forces were enjoying the hospitality of the town's alehouses when the King's troops were espied on the advance. The Pretender's forces held the bridge over the River Ribble that made the river impassable, and it was presumed on both sides that they would try to hold it, especially since the King's troops would be exposed as they approached it. However, Thomas Forster, a Protestant of Northumberland who had assumed command at Preston, ordered his troops to withdraw from the bridge, and the town and the troops therein were quickly surrounded. Forster's decision was attributed by the Tories to his seeking to preserve his own life in return for the surrender of the rebels, while Patten in his history of the rebellion attributes it to his cowardice and inexperience. General Wills, who led the King's troops, assumed that Forster had simply realised that he was outnumbered and that resistance was futile(80). When news came that on the same day the rebels had also been defeated at Inverness and Dunblane in Scotland, the Pretender's quest was over.

Among those arrested at Preston were members of some of the diocese's most influential families. Richard Townley of Townley was a famous Papist who had considered fleeing, but remained to face trial because he did not want to jeopardise his son's inheritance. When a woman at the trial failed to point him out amongst his co-conspirators, he was acquitted(81). Edward Tildesley of Lodge in Lancashire, related to the Tyldesley family of Stansacre who had been implicated in the plot of 1694, was also acquitted at trial(82), but Ralph Standish of Standish, son of William Standish who had died during the planning of the riots, was found guilty and sentenced to death. His wife Phillipa was successful in lobbying friends and relations to use their influence in his favour, and he was eventually released and bought back much of his confiscated estate(83). Other Papist families were unnerved by the events of 1715, and Nicholas Blundell of Ince was so fearful that he fled to Flanders, despite having had no involvement in hostilities(84).

The rebels who were found guilty were dealt with severely. William Stout recorded the fate of some of them in his diary:

after the Rebellion at Preston was suppressed about 400 of them were brought to Lancaster Castell...in about a month time about 100 of them were conveyed to Liverpool to be tried where they were convicted and neare 40 of them hanged at Manchester Liverpool Wiggan Preston Garstang and Lancaster and about 200 of them continued a year and about 50 of them died and the rest were transported to America except the Lords and Gentr who were had to London and there convicted and their estates forfeited(85).

When Thomas Syddall and his co-conspirators William Harris, Stephen Seagar, Joseph Porter and John Finch were hanged at Manchester, it was the first public execution the

town had seen in a century(86). Public outrage was provoked to such an extent that in 1745 the Young Pretender's supporters urged the people of England to:

Compare his clemency tow'rds all the Prisoners and wounded at the Battle of Gladsmuir, w(i)th the Executions, Imprisonments and Banishments exercis'd by the German family after their success at Preston in the year 1715, and your affections will tell you, who is the true Father of the People(87).

Hibbert-Ware suggests that the merciful King George was unaware of the severity of these sentences as he was in Germany, and that he interjected at the trials in London to ensure that the Whig ministry who had given such severe sentences in the North West were not able to do so again(88).

Lay affiliation to the Stuart family therefore, found a forceful and volatile expression in loyal clubs of England and Wales, such as the "Cycle of the White Rose" and "Cheshire" clubs, and ultimately in the violence of 1715. In contrast, lay High Church affiliation found its expression in argument and largely peaceable division within communities in both the dioceses of Chester and Bangor.

iii. Lay Affiliation to the High Church Standpoint

In the dioceses of both Chester and Bangor, religious division amongst Anglican laity caused some unrest. Appeals for Church unity were made between 1688 and 1715, all of them attacking the notion of division amongst Protestants. In an undated tract, Case for the Protestant Religion,

submitted to parliament and to Archbishop Tenison, Abel Carew warns that:

it is not the great learning of the great wits of eloquence with all their disputes and controversy or of diabolical intrigues, stratagems and inventions of the titles of Whigs and Tory or High Church and Low Church (and it is a wonder there has not been printed the Title of the devills church for revenge Envy malice hatred and uncharitableness which is contrary to the doctrine of Christ of love and charity) will carry them to heaven but the merits of our saviour Christ if preached both in public and private(89).

In an address to Tenison of August 26, 1707 from A.Lorrie of Plumtree Square, he warns that:

Papists indeed are in the wrong. But the divisions of Protestants are not the less, but the more inexcusable. The being guilty of Schism is reckoned in scripture among the most damnable sins, and was judged by the Primitive Christians to be so heinous as not to be attoned by Martyrdom(90).

Warnings against division were just as stark in the diocese of Chester. In Bury in Lancashire a sermon given in 1688 laments that "wherever we come amongst Protestants" every one of them is "impropriating Christ unto themselves, enclosing and impaling religion within a party" (91), whilst in Cheshire Lord Delamere warned in a speech to the Grand Jury at Chester in 1692, that such divisions were designed to "gull the nation into Popery and Slavery" (92).

Until the opening of Cross Street chapel in Manchester, the Tory dominated Collegiate Church had been the sole focus of worship in the town. Those residents who felt distaste at its distinctly Jacobite emphasis were inclined toward Cross Street, and one such resident was Lady Ann Bland. Lady Bland was the daughter of one of Manchester's leading citizens,

Edward Mosley, and wife of Sir John Bland, a drunkard and a gambler who was noted for his support of the "Church and King" and who had thrown a stone through the window of Henry Newcome's barn as he preached in 1687(93). His wife shared her father's support for William of Orange and the Protestant Succession, and refused to attend the Collegiate Church because of its Stuart bias. When the minister at Cross Street, Henry Newcome, died in 1695, Lady Bland was instrumental in convincing the townsfolk of the need for a second Anglican church in the town. Though that need was indeed genuine as Manchester's population was increasing at a significant rate, Lady Bland had an ulterior motive, the erection of a church that might prove a focus for all those who supported the Hanoverian succession. In 1708 she and several supporters petitioned parliament for the building of a second Manchester church and the petition was granted. Land was set aside for the construction of a church and accompanying thoroughfare at Acres Field, and on July 12, 1712 Bishop Dawes of Chester consecrated the new church which was aptly named "St. Ann's" in honour of the Queen, and partly in honour of Lady Bland(94).

Its opening divided the populace of the town. St. Ann's epitomised that element of the Revolution settlement that the Collegiate Church abhorred; allegiance to the Protestant succession and the house of Hanover. Some sections of Manchester society refused to have any connection with the church, and divisions developed between the more stubborn minded of the town's residents, like Lady Bland and another Manchester lady, Madame Drake of Long Millgate.

The rivalry between these two ladies was political, social and ecclesiastical(95). Madame Drake was a Tory, and a supporter of the Stuart cause. She was also an instigator

of fashion, and was the first Mancunian to own a private carriage. She was conspicuous for her silk stockings and notorious for her preference for home brew rather than tea, and her love of cigars(96). She and Lady Ann came to represent the female focus of the High and Low Church causes within Manchester respectively, and their rivalry was such that on one occasion when Madame Drake encouraged all the ladies of the Collegiate Church to wear Stuart tartans, Lady Ann responded by leading female supporters of the Protestant succession in a moonlight dance along King Street dressed in orange(97).

However, not all Mancunians aligned themselves to only one of the town's churches. John Byrom, despite the Papist sympathies allotted to him by some Mancunians, was a regular attendant at St. Ann's, and Edmund Harrold records in his diary that he regularly attended both churches, as on May 3, 1713, when he attended the "old" church in the morning and the "new" one in the afternoon(98). Lady Bland was also prudent in her choice of Rector to the new church, choosing one of the few men in the town who had connections with all three of its houses of worship. Nathaniel Banne had been familiar with Henry Newcome and remained loyal to Cross Street chapel after his appointment to St. Ann's, and he was a college chaplain. This meant that Lady Ann was able to ensure, as she wished, that no Jacobite should occupy the pulpit of a church built with Hanoverian money, whilst simultaneously selecting a candidate connected with the Collegiate Church so that the College Warden Richard Wroe, and some of the more Jacobite fellows, like Clayton, were rendered without objection(99).

In Manchester, therefore, religious division amongst the laity found an expression in the animosity between some members of society who focused their loyalties on one or

other of the towns churches which they perceived to represent either the Jacobite or Hanoverian standpoint. In large towns like Manchester taverns and coffee houses also became foci of loyalties. It has already been noted how the "Bull" and "Angel" taverns respectively entertained High and Low allegiances(100), and a letter to Archbishop Tenison of April 13, 1704 from Thomas Lane of Oxford attests to the association of particular coffee houses with particular causes in that town. He wrote:

I carefully avoided all Jacobite company or even those coffee houses that had that repute(101).

The popularity of coffee houses meant that rumours espoused in them could have serious repercussions, as Francis Cholmondeley warned Peter Legh in a letter of January 17, 1711. Cholmondeley informed Legh that he was the subject of coffee house scandal in Chester because of comments that he had allegedly made regarding the standard of his nephew's education. Although Cholmondeley affords the rumour little credence, he did consider it prudent to alert Legh to its existence(102).

In smaller towns like Bangor, disputes concerning the laity were much more protracted. In 1709 a paper sent to Godolphin in London accused Lord Richard Bulkeley and his ancestors of several crimes including vandalism of Beaumaris Castle, inappropriate taxation charges in levying his friends less than others, charging boats to moor, the murder of a ferry boatman, and asserted "that so long as your Lordship continues in the Posts and Honours therein mentioned they must expect nothing but oppression"(103). It had been signed by several clergymen, prompting Lord Bulkeley's uncle, Thomas, to write to Bishop John Evans in August and November 1709 to protest. By September 1710 no

reply had been forthcoming, so Lord Bulkeley wrote to Evans levelling the accusation that:

You think fitt to tell one of your clergy that you wonder any of that Function will cherish an acquaintance with me: Another you threaten to do it at his Perill. And least they should be at a loss what to object against me, you supply them with an objection(104).

In a letter of the same day to Dean John Jones of Bangor, Bulkeley outlines what he believes that objection to be. Referring to Evans he writes:

I am Arranged by him as an Enemy to the church and an oppressor of the rights of it...What an Excess of Party is it to refute it a crime in clergymen when that they come Near me. When such things are said openly to those who are my known friends, what may I think to be said to others in Private? Or how shall I judge but by their discourses? One of whom to distinguish his zeal is no sooner warm in his Preferment but he gives it as his opinion that I am for bringing in the Pretender(105).

In a second letter to Jones dated September 20, 1710, he goes on to refer to Evans as an "Enemy to this Bishoprick" and "that unworthy prelate". Despite Jones' assurance that the whole episode was due to "misinformation and mistake" Bulkeley remained convinced that Evans was deliberately attempting to slur him on the basis of his Jacobite convictions, an "excess of party" typical of both the High and Low church groups(106).

Evans' reply, which had been subject to delay because it had been edited by Jones to remove all offence to Bulkeley, began by asserting that the bishop wished to remain detached from "public affairs and private misunderstandings, hoping thereby to expect the government

would permitt me to live in quiet and to discharge my Episcopall office with comfort and satisfaction". He claims he was provoked into making comment by the injustice of Bulkeley's tythes, which were unfair to the poor of the diocese, and he mentions his rights to the sea, Admiralty and Fishery, which Bulkeley has encroached upon, and which Jones attests are substantiated by patent. The Bishop then dismisses the idea that he signed the declaration against Bulkeley; "which has as much truth in it as if I had been said to have assassinated your Grand Father", and stresses that he was in London when it was composed, as Dean Jones can testify, and that he took appropriate action against those clerics who had signed it when he was informed of it. He ends by outlining his hope that this representation would suffice to deter Bulkeley from his threat of legal action. Bulkeley's reply in December 1710 demanded only that Evans answer his uncle and write to his clergy to instruct them to afford him "proper satisfaction" (107).

Evans' reply therefore indicated that the bishop had a purely pastoral motive for involvement in this issue, but Bulkeley's reaction to it illustrates the extent of religious division in North Wales. Similar evidence is found in a letter dated July 10, 1706, from Conway, complaining that the two judges of the Conway circuit, William Peisley and Marmaduke Gwynne, had:

acted contrary to her Majesty's Commission and brought fear upon many honest gentlemen, by declaring publicly in court that they had the Queen's commands to assure the Non-jurors that as she looked upon them as her fathers best friends so she doubted not that she should find them so to her, and that she was resolved to screen them from exorbitant taxes and other hardships, they lay under. Their conduct had encouraged some Jacobite justices in Merionethshire to prevent the new levies and to discharge several soldiers in the officers' absence who had enlisted.

They had favoured papists and the malignant high party, and magnified that nasty pamphlet called the Memorial of the Church of England, both of the judges in the writers hearing having said that it could not be answered and of any book it ought to be next esteemed to the Bible; and they had moreover presented many copies to the gentlemen of the several counties in their circuit(108).

However, supporters of the house of Hanover were also evident in Wales, and especially in the diocese of Bangor on Anglesey, from where a letter addressed to King George and signed the "County of Anglesey" assured him that:

We have been always educated in those principles of Loyalty and Obedience which are taught by the Church of England and enforced by the laws, which both command us to abhor the doctrine of resistance and the practice of sedition in the state and strictly enjoyn us to support the right of your Majesty and your Royal house to the Imperial crown of this realm(109).

The diocese of Bangor, therefore, like that of Chester, represents an area in which both clerical and lay High Churchmen lived alongside Low Churchmen, and where Jacobites and Nonjurors were tolerated as part of the local community. Amongst the clergy this division expressed itself in debate concerning doctrine, ceremonies and sacraments, while the laity confined their differences to personal rivalries, as at Manchester, and political intrigues as at Bangor and Conway. However enflamed or petty these divisions may have appeared they were never sufficient to divide either diocese, and as the dual worship of Manchester's citizens and the address of Anglesey's to King George illustrate, opposing viewpoints survived alongside each other.

CHAPTER 8

Redefining High Churchmanship

The traditional hallmarks that are commonly assumed to point to High Church convictions in a cleric or prelate in the period between 1688 and 1715 are not applicable in every instance. In a comparative study of two very different dioceses, one in the heart of rapidly industrialising England, the other in the rural heartland of north west Wales, an examination of individual clerics and their approaches to those elements of religious life which have been deemed as indicative of High Churchmanship has shown variation not only from diocese to diocese, but even from parish to parish and cleric to cleric.

Contemporary literature emphasised a number of traits which were indicative of the High Church group, among which was an association with the remnant of a Laudian standpoint within the Church of England. They were commonly seen as that group within the Anglican Church which had the greatest affinity with the Roman Catholic standpoint, emphasising the sacramental rather than biblical and rejecting the Calvinist doctrine of election. They were perceived as that group which affirmed the importance of particular sacraments such as baptism and confession and which sought a restoration of certain elements within the service, such as kneeling upon receipt of communion, and of the observation of customs such as bowing. They believed the Church of England to represent the true apostolic succession away from the corrupting influences of Popery, and they therefore rejected Roman Catholicism, but recognised the patristic teachings as authoritative within the early life of the church(1).

The emphasis given by those labelled High Churchmen to some elements of service and church decoration is a tentative

means of identifying High Churchmen. The use of furniture such as altar rails was on occasion dictated by practicality rather than spirituality, and use of those elements of service regarded as Romanist was not confined to any single religious group. The fact that the Non Jurors maintained the practices of kneeling for communion and standing at the gospel indicates the historical precedent extant within the church which condoned their use, and explains why both practices could be maintained and regarded with indifference by the Protestants of Manchester(2). It is also significant that in Bangor, Protestant sensibilities were provoked by other issues which do not feature in the local concerns of the Chester diocese, specifically the use of the surplice in divine service and the problem of pluralism(3).

The pastoral ministries of the clerics within the dioceses under consideration also illustrate variations in the concerns of High Churchmen. The evidence presented by Edmund Harrold in his diary suggests a strict adherence to maintaining morality and the upkeep of virtuous behaviour, as he describes being castigated for his own moral laxity by a group he identifies specifically as High Churchmen in Manchester. Yet in Nantwich which lies within the same diocese, Richard Illidge complains in his diary that a group he identifies specifically as High Churchmen are themselves lacking in moral discipline and take no concern in enforcing it within his parish, which suggests that even within the same diocese the approach which contemporaries labelled indicative of High Church affiliation was variable. In urban Manchester, where maintaining a good reputation for the town was essential for its future economic prosperity, to such an extent that contemporary publications sought to espouse the virtuous nature of the city and its residents, the High Churchmen were fervent in enforcing moral order. But in the rural corners of Cheshire, which were not so dependent on outside investment for the future, a very different stance was adopted(4). This localised variation in priority points more significantly to a variation in

definition amongst contemporaries, who were divided about what constituted a High Churchman. In the diocese of Bangor, another area not yet dependent on outside investment, further diversity of priorities has been noted, as Bangor's prelates emphasised the church societies as a means of promoting virtue, whilst simultaneously working to counter the indifference that existed amongst the poorest parishoners toward the sacraments and devotions(5).

With the Glorious Revolution of 1688, the High Churchmen were faced with the dilemma of the doctrines of Passive Obedience and Non Resistance. These doctrines dictated that King James II was appointed monarch by God, and that to him was owed a strict adherence and allegiance which had been affirmed in the Oath of Allegiance. The oath therefore prevented all loyal Anglican churchmen of conscience from offering any resistance to the King or support for his usurper William of Orange. However, many Anglican churchmen were aware that King James could not be entrusted with the care of either the country or its national church, and while some in both England and Wales scrupled the invitation extended to Prince William(6), others recognised that the preservation of the Anglican church should be the priority of its clerics. With reference to the sermon collections of two clerics, Robert Wynne of Bangor and Nicholas Stratford of Chester, a comparison has proven how even those churchmen who preached ardently against revolution in the context of Charles I and the experience of 1649, came to reconcile the events of 1688-9 and maintain their previous devotion to the Church and to William and Mary(7).

Further evidence from Wales affirms that after the Revolution of 1688-9 the term "High Church" came to refer to those clerics who gave greater priority to their allegiance to the Church than that owed to the monarch. Specifically, those who supported the Hanoverian succession through Mary and Anne, and who did not believe King James' deprivation to be justified, but remained loyal to the Church of England. They

stood in contrast to those who supported the Whiggish dominance of William III, the Low Church, while a third group, identified as a "small" number, supported the restoration of James - the Jacobites(8).

If, however, loyalty to the Oaths of Allegiance and the doctrines of Passive Obedience and Non Resistance can be claimed as indicative of High Church allegiance, then the true High Churchmen of the Church of England must have been that group who separated from it after refusing to swear allegiance to the new King - the Nonjurors. Favourable relations and an affinity between Anglicans and Nonjurors in both Bangor and Chester dioceses have been noted, and was exemplified in Manchester in 1728 by the use of the term "High Churchman of the noble nonjuring type" (9). The term "Nonjuror", therefore, in a political context and in the context of reconciling the Church to the Revolution settlement, was not necessarily synonymous with only those clerics who had separated from the Church of England, but had a much wider context which embraced all those who harboured doubts as to the validity or justification of the settlement.

For those who remained within the fold of the Church, the years following the Revolution were spent justifying their stance and arguing that they still supported the doctrine of Non Resistance whilst recognising that it could be reviewed if applicable to a King, like James, who placed the well-being of his Church, people and nation in danger. For that group the issues most pressing to the preservation of the Church of England became the question of the succession and the threat posed by toleration granted to Dissenters.

In reality both issues were exaggerated and exasperated by what was perceived as a High Church stance. Whilst evidence for the existence of Popish conspiracies and plots, aimed at securing the restoration of the Roman Catholic Stuart dynasty, is available in both Chester through the intrigues of the Standish family, and Bangor through those of the Bulkeley family(10), evidence of High Church involvement is difficult

to establish. The most damning suggestion of such involvement was the assurances that the High Churchmen of Lancashire gave to Scottish rebels in 1715, but the fact that these were never fulfilled testifies that the group quickly realised the folly of becoming involved(11). In conscience, the High Church group could support neither the usurping Hanoverian line of succession nor the Papist Stuart line, and those riots which did occur in Manchester and throughout the north west of England in 1715 were in the main occasioned by local animosities, as evidenced in the rivalry between Manchester's two Anglican churches and their adherents(12). In contrast to these hostilities, the diocese of Bangor remained peaceable in 1715, as families like the Bulkeleyes of Anglesey proved that practically minded opponents of the Church of England and the Revolution settlement could be relied upon to exercise discernment in their opposition(13).

Toleration also proved to be a divisive issue. Recognised definitions of High Churchmanship refer to an abhorrence of Dissent and Dissenters. Richard Illidge supports this criteria, outlining how, in Nantwich, a group he defines specifically as High Churchmen harboured a vehemence toward clean living Dissenters, whilst in Manchester, the ministry of Thomas Deacon and the construction of Cross Street Chapel testify that Dissenters were tolerated within the community. Local concerns were seldom of such a consequence that dictated the exile of non-Anglicans from the area, and in Bangor an attitude of tolerance was adopted to maintain local harmony(14).

A unique illustration of the indeterminate nature of religious groupings can be gleaned by examination of the Legh family of Lyme, who provide an example of an educated group of individuals with a common grounding in religion, who came to reconcile themselves to the Revolution in very distinct ways. The sister of the family veered firmly toward the Nonjuring communion, whilst the two brothers aligned themselves with the Pretender and held Jacobite convictions. The head of the

family, Peter Legh, offers a good example of a lay High Church standpoint. He felt unable to reconcile himself with the usurpation of a monarch to whom he had sworn allegiance according to the doctrines of Passive Obedience and Non Resistance, but retained his loyalty to the Church and would not break from communion with it. Thus he became a lay man who worshipped according to the practices of the Church of England but could not adhere himself to the monarchs(15).

Such divisions within a single family highlight the problem of defining the standpoint of any given religious group, including High Churchmen, in the period following the Glorious Revolution. The divisions between local clerics concerning toleration, practice and the succession were symptomatic of the national debates raised by national figures, but this study has shown that such national concerns were never wholly relevant to the life of any one diocese during any given period. As clerics like Henry Sacheverell spoke in general terms about the threat of Dissent, and used his platform to make political points about "Volpones" (16), clerics in dioceses like Bangor and Chester, far removed from London, were concerned rather with administering to their parishoners and aiding their spiritual growth in a climate that nurtured division, antagonism and the constant threat of unrest. But whilst the intrigues of Francis Atterbury and the High Church group in Convocation or the discussions and debates of Archbishops Tenison and Sharp regarding the validity of infant baptism were far removed from the daily concerns of the clerics of Bangor and rural Cheshire, there were those in both dioceses who agonized in the same way as their London counterparts over issues like Passive Obedience and Non Resistance. In 1689, as Archbishop Sancroft of Canterbury struggled to reconcile the usurpation of a divinely ordained monarch, so too did Robert Wynne in an isolated Welsh village and Nicholas Stratford in a growing English town. Their uncertainty and anguish reflects a view of monarchy and

its divinely ordained nature that was as cherished in the dioceses as it was in the capital.

But, the only consistent element of High Churchmanship in the dioceses was that it embraced the teachings of the Anglican Church regarding antiquity and the early church fathers. Thus in the diocese of Chester, Thomas Ainsworth of Manchester referred to Justin Martyr in defence of kneeling at public devotion, and in the diocese of Bangor Robert Wynne of Llanddeiniolen found biblical condemnation of the Revolution in 1 Chronicles(16). Otherwise, High Churchmanship was inconsistent in its emphases. It was outwardly loyal to the Hanoverian succession, but allowed clerics like Robert Wynne and Nicholas Stratford to retain scruples regarding the legitimacy of the Revolution settlement. Its emphasis on the sacraments translated into some areas, like Manchester, as an emphasis on incorporating the adoption of previously abandoned elements of service, which was never the case in Bangor. In Manchester it came to focus on enforcing morality whilst tolerating Dissent, whereas in rural Cheshire it rejected the need for a moral code amongst scant parish populations and was devoted instead to retaining its parishoners by an outright rejection of Dissent. In the diocese of Bangor, High Church energies were devoted to pastoral work, ensuring uniformity of worship as far as possible and improving the devotion of parishoners through the work of the SPCK and the eradicating of pluralism, whilst simultaneously tolerating Jacobitism and Popery.

In common with Jeffrey Chamberlain's study of High Churchmanship in Sussex, this comparative study has observed the disputes and controversies and examined the writings(17) of High Church clerics in two British dioceses, and has shown that the High Church standpoint was not consistent, and furthermore that elements of it were parochial. With London as its focal point scholarship came to define High Church concerns as those which occupied its most prolific scholars and orators in the capital. In so doing it failed to notice

that in the vast areas embraced by dioceses like Bangor and Chester, High Churchmanship was defined by local needs and issues, and varied in its emphasis according to diocese, prelate and cleric.

Appendix A

Bishops of Bangor 1688-1715:

Humphrey Lloyd - Consecrated from the deanery of St:Asaph in 1673. Died in office in 1689.

Humphrey Humphreys - Consecrated from the deanery of Bangor in 1689. Translated to Hereford in 1701.

John Evans - Consecrated in 1701. Translated to Meath, Ireland, in 1715.

Benjamin Hoadly - Consecrated in 1716. Translated to Hereford in 1721.

Bishops of Chester 1688-1715:

Thomas Cartwright - Consecrated from the deanery of Ripon in 1686. Died in exile with James II before being formerly deprived in 1689.

Nicholas Stratford - Consecrated from the deanery of St.Asaph in 1689. Died in office in 1706.

William Dawes - Consecrated from the Mastership of Catherine Hall, Cambridge in 1707. Translated to York in 1714.

Francis Gastrell - Consecrated from a Preachership at Lincoln's Inn, London in 1714. Died in office in 1725.

Glossary

Church - Where an upper case C is used, the term Church refers specifically to the Anglican Church.

De Facto - By virtue of act of parliament.

De Jure - By virtue of God.

Pluralism - Administering to two separate parishes simultaneously.

Suffragan - Another bishop.

List of References - Chapter 1

- 1 - R.S Boshier, "The Making of the Restoration Settlement" in Paul Avis, Anglicanism and the Christian Church, London, 1951, p94. John Davies outlines how Protestantism was characterised by a "sullen acceptance" of governmental will during the period of Henry VIII, but was embraced with enthusiasm at the restoration of Charles II, and incorporated nine out of ten Welsh worshippers by the 1700's. Cf: A History of Wales, London, 1993, pp239, 284, 295.
- 2 - Henry D.Rack, Reasonable Enthusiast, 1989, p29 & Derek Hirst, Authority and Conflict, London, 1992, pp288-9, 308, 296 & 324.
- 3 - R.S Boshier, op. cit, p94.
- 4 - Gordon Rupp, Religion in England 1688-1791 Oxford, 1986, p72. For an example of this martyrdom cult, Cf: A Letter From Major General Ludlow to Sir Edward Seymour, Printed in Amsterdam, 1691. Reference to this feeling is also made by Gordon Rupp, p10, and the Welsh Rare Book (WRB) archive at the University of Wales, Bangor (UWB) also contains a collection of sermons from numerous clerics of this period, including William Beveridge, later bishop of St.Asaph, John Thomas (1691-1766), later successively the bishop of Lincoln, Salisbury and St.Asaph and William Higden, later a prebendary of Canterbury who had initially refused the oaths to William and Mary. All of these sermons refer to Charles I as a martyr, and the same collection also houses a number of published responses from Dr Richard Hollingworth (1639-1701), vicar of Chigwell, Essex, to Major General Edmund Ludlow (1617-1692), the fortieth signatory on Charles I's death warrant who fled to Dieppe at the restoration. He had written A Letter...to Sir Edward Seymour comparing the Tyranny of the first four years of King Charles the

- Martyr with the Tyranny of the four years reign of the late abdicated King which prompted his controversies with Hollingworth. From Sidney Lee (Ed), Dictionary of National Biography, London, 1893, Vols 26, 27, & 34.
- 5 - F.L Cross & E.A Livingstone define the Church of England's claim to be part of the Catholic church without any affiliation to Rome as specifically Anglo-Catholicism, in The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, Oxford, 1997, p69.
 - 6 - J.H Overton, Life in the English Church 1660-1714, London, 1885, pp11-12.
 - 7 - John Spurr, The Restoration Church of England, London, 1991, p379.
 - 8 - P.E More & F.L Cross in "Anglicanism", 1935, pxix quoted by John Spurr, Ibid, p396.
 - 9 - Craig Rose, "The Origins and Ideals of the SPCK 1699-1716" in John Walsh, Colin Haydon, Stephen Taylor (Eds), The Church of England c1689-c1833, Cambridge, 1995, p175.
 - 10 - Norman Sykes, Man as Churchman, Cambridge, 1960, p3.
 - 11 - J.H Overton, op. cit, p13.
 - 12 - Gordon Rupp, op. cit, p53.
 - 13 - J.W.C Wand, Anglicanism in History and Today, London, 1963, p96 & George Booth, Comments on the Preface to the Book of Common Prayer, undated, p5, Dunham Massey MSS, EGR 3/6/2/6/1, John Rylands Library, Manchester.
 - 14 - J.W.C Wand, Ibid, p97.
 - 15 - J.B Black, The Reign of Elizabeth 1558-1603, Oxford, 1949, p28.
 - 16 - Eamon Duffy, The Stripping of the Altars, London, 1992, p479.
 - 17 - Michael C. Questier, Conversion, Politics and Religion in England 1580-1625, Cambridge, 1996, pp204-5.
 - 18 - Ibid, p167.
 - 19 - Eamon Duffy, op. cit, p566.
 - 20 - William P. Haugaard, Elizabeth and the English Reformation, Cambridge, 1970, p148.

- 21 - R.Hutton, "Local Impact" in C.Haigh (Ed), The English Reformation Revised, 1987. p134 quoted by Eamon Duffy, op. cit, p570.
- 22 - Derek Hirst, op. cit, pp99-100.
- 23 - Ibid, p99. Wand points out that Independence was the religion of the army, widely endorsed during the Commonwealth.
- 24 - Ibid.
- 25 - See Ch2.
- 26 - C.O Addleshaw, The High Church Tradition, 1941 pp9-10 quoted by J.W.C Wand, op. cit, p98.
- 27 - John Stoughton, Religion in England Vol 1, 1702-1800, London, 1928, p14.
- 28 - Gordon Rupp, op. cit, p54 & G.V Bennett, The Tory Crisis in Church and State, Oxford, 1975, p6.
- 29 - Henry Sacheverell, "Character of a Low Churchman", 1702, p26 quoted in George Macaulay Trevelyan, England Under Queen Anne, London, 1932, p52.
- 30 - Cf William Wake by Norman Sykes, The Tory Crisis in Church and State by G.V Bennett, a synopsis of the career of Francis Atterbury, The Trial of Dr Sacheverell by Geoffrey Holmes & Thomas Ken, Bishop and Non Juror by Hugh A.L Rice.
- 31 - G.V Bennett, op. cit, p6.
- 32 - Paul Avis, op. cit, p88.
- 33 - J.H Overton, op. cit, p54.
- 34 - Norman Sykes, William Wake, Vol 2, p88 quoted by Paul Avis, op. cit, p137.
- 35 - Paul Avis, Ibid, p131.
- 36 - Ibid, p138.
- 37 - Sykes in Avis, op. cit, p136.
- 38 - Paul Avis, op, cit, p132.
- 39 - Ibid, pp131-2.
- 40 - Gordon Rupp, op. cit, p70.
- 41 - J.H Overton, op. cit, p64.
- 42 - Paul Avis, op. cit, p191.

- 43 - Ibid, p89.
- 44 - Gordon Rupp, op. cit, p84. John Ernest Grabe had come to England from Germany in search of a church with an apostolic succession after questioning the validity of the Lutheran church. He was sympathetic toward the Nonjuring stance, and became chaplain of Christ Church, Oxford, in 1700. George Smalridge was minister of Westminster in 1698 and a chaplain to the Queen before being awarded the see of Bristol in 1714. He refused to sign a declaration against the Pretender after the disturbances of 1715. From Sidney Lee (Ed), op. cit, Vols 22 & 52.
- 45 - Ibid, p75.
- 46 - G.V Bennett, op. cit, p9 & Richard Lodge, The History of England 1660-1702, London, 1910, p14.
- 47 - John Walsh & Stephen Taylor, "Introduction: The Church and Anglicanism in the long eighteenth century" in John Walsh et al, (Eds), op. cit, p35.
- 48 - Ibid.
- 49 - Paul Avis, op. cit, p88. Bishop George Morley died in 1684, and Thomas Ken was deprived of the see of Bath and Wells as a Nonjuror in 1691. From Sidney Lee (Ed), op. cit, Vol 30.
- 50 - George Macaulay Trevelyan, op. cit, p191, Vol 2 quoted by Ibid. Gilbert Burnet was a prominent cleric in the court of William and Mary and had been aware of William's planned arrival beforehand. He was a Scotsman and was appointed to the see of Salisbury by William. From Sidney Lee (Ed), op. cit, Vol 7.
- 51 - Gordon Rupp, op. cit, p74.
- 52 - Craig Rose, op. cit, p175.
- 53 - J.W.C Wand, op. cit, p111.
- 54 - George Macaulay Trevelyan, op. cit, p51.
- 55 - John Stoughton, op. cit, p13.
- 56 - Anon, published in London, Lambeth Palace Library, H5133.204.

- 57 - Richard Lodge, op. cit, pp170 & 163 & G.M.D Howat (Ed), Dictionary of World History, London, 1973, p1610. Such liberalism is described as characteristic of Low Church affiliation with reference to Samuel Peploe, appointed Warden at Manchester's Collegiate Church in 1716, Raines Lincs MSS Vol44, p369.
- 58 - Cf John Stoughton, Ibid, p13. J.W.C Wand distinguishes between the two groups saying that Latitude men were also referred to as Low Churchmen, p109.
- 59 - J.W.C Wand, op. cit, p106. Wand asserts that the term "Broad Churchmen" was used of the group by the nineteenth century. Cf. C.A Patrides, "Introduction" in C.A Patrides (Ed), The Cambridge Platonists, London, 1969, pp4, 14-15, 16-17 & 40.
- 60 - J.H Overton, op. cit, p52.
- 61 - J.W.C Wand, op. cit, p105.
- 62 - H.R McAdoo, The Spirit of Anglicanism, London, 1965, pp192-3.
- 63 - Gordon Rupp, op. cit, p70.
- 64 - John Spurr, op. cit, p380.

List of References - Chapter 2

- 1 - Archbishop Laud was renowned for his administrative skills and undertook to reform order and uniformity within the Caroline Church, and especially within ceremonies, to preserve the peace and security of that Church. This involved an anti-Calvinist policy of reversing previous trends within the Church. Cf: Kevin Sharpe, "Archbishop Laud" in Reformation to Revolution, Margo Todd (Ed), London, 1995, p76.
- 2 - George Macaulay Trevelyan, England under Queen Anne, London, 1932, p62.
- 3 - Gordon Rupp, Religion in England 1688-1791, Oxford, 1986, p53.
- 4 - Smith quoted in R.S Boshier, "The Making of the Restoration Settlement", London, 1951, in Paul Avis, Anglicanism and the Christian church, Edinburgh, 1989, p94.
- 5 - Gordon Rupp, op.cit, p6.
- 6 - Ken had been disgusted by the way William treated his Queen during his time as her Chaplain in Holland. Cf: Florence Higham, Faith of our Fathers, London, 1939, p193.
- 7 - J.W.C Wand, Anglicanism in history and Today, London, 1963, p100.
- 8 - G.V Bennett, "King William III and the Episcopate" in Essays in modern English Church History, G.V Bennett & J.D Walsh (Eds), London, 1966, p107.
- 9 - White Kennett, History of England III, p361 quoted by J.H Overton, Life in the English Church 1660-1714, London, 1885, p54.
- 10 - From the Correspondence of Henry Hyde, Earl of Clarendon II, p507 quoted by J.H Overton, Ibid, p57.
- 11 - Swift in Ode to his Memory, Dryden in Absalom and Achitophel and Princess Mary, Clarendon Correspondence.

- II, p484, quoted by J.H Overton, *ibid*. Swift was a Whig who had been the dean of St.Patrick's, Dublin before the Revolution and moved to Leicester in England thereafter. For more on Swift see Sidney Lee (Ed), Dictionary of National Biography, London, 1893, Vol 55, pg204ff. For more on the poet John Dryden see *Ibid*, Vol 16, pp64-75.
- 12 - From D'Oyly, "The Life of Archbishop Sancroft", I, p44 quoted by Gordon Rupp, *op. cit*, p10 & G.V Bennett, The Tory Crisis in Church and State, Oxford, 1975, p6.
- 13 - Gordon Rupp, *op. cit*, p53.
- 14 - From E.Cardwell, Documentary Annals II, clxiv-v, pp368, 375-6 quoted by Norman Sykes, From Sheldon to Secker, Cambridge, 1959, p84.
- 15 - George Macaulay Trevelyan, The English Revolution 1688-9, London, 1938, p162.
- 16 - Quoted by Norman Sykes, *Ibid*, p34.
- 17 - G.V Bennett, Tory Crisis, *op. cit*, p9.
- 18 - Mark Goldie, "John Locke, Jonas Proast and the Religious Toleration 1688-1692" in The Church of England c1689-1833, John Walsh, Colin Haydon & Stephen Taylor (Eds), Cambridge, 1995, p148.
- 19 - G.V Bennett, Tory Crisis, *op. cit*, p9.
- 20 - Norman Sykes, *op. cit*, p83.
- 21 - Richard Lodge, The Political History of England 1660-1702 VIII, London, 1910, p251.
- 22 - Kenneth Hylson-Smith, High Churchmanship in the Church of England, Edinburgh, 1993, p75.
- 23 - Quoted by Hugh A.L Rice, Thomas Ken, Bishop and Non Juror, London, 1958, p218.
- 24 - J.H Overton, *op. cit*, p64, Paul Avis, *op. cit*, p89, Gordon Rupp, *op. cit*, p48.
- 25 - Gordon Rupp, *Ibid*, p49. Compton adapted well to the new regime and was held in great favour by both Queen Mary and Anne. From Sidney Lee (Ed), *op.cit*, Vol 11.
- 26 - *Ibid*, p50.
- 27 - Paul Avis, *op. cit*, p96.

- 28 - From Ellis Correspondence, 1829, Vol II, p63 quoted by George Every, The High Church Party 1688-1718, London, 1956, p22.
- 29 - Quoted by George Every, *Ibid*, p23. Lee's "Life of Kettlewell" was based on the collections of notes left by George Hickes and Robert Nelson, a fellow Nonjuror. Lee had been tutor to William Dawes, later bishop of Chester, and left England for Leyden in 1691. From Sidney Lee (Ed), *op. cit*, Vol 32.
- 30 - *Ibid*.
- 31 - From State Trials, 3 Ed, 1742, Vol V, pp844-6 quoted in George Every, *Ibid*, p24.
- 32 - *Ibid*, p25. Turner had preached at James' coronation and maintained contact with him after the Revolution, almost leaving for France in 1694 to join him but being prevented from fleeing by arrest. From Sidney Lee (Ed), *op. cit*, Vol 57.
- 33 - *Ibid*.
- 34 - Richard Lodge, *op. cit*, p278.
- 35 - Hugh A.L Rice, *op. cit*, p144-9.
- 36 - *Ibid*, p152.
- 37 - *Ibid* & George Every, *op. cit*, p30.
- 38 - D'Oyly, *op. cit*, Vol I, pp414-22, quoted by George Every, *Ibid* & Richard Lodge, *op. cit*, p311.
- 39 - Norman Sykes, Church and State in England in the Eighteenth Century, The Historical Association Pamphlet, 1930, p2, & Derek Hirst, Authority and Conflict, London, 1992, p86.
- 40 - Derek Hirst, *op. cit*, p87.
- 41 - George Macaulay Trevelyan, quoted by Gordon Rupp, *op. cit*, p7. J.C.D Clark notes that the doctrine of divine hereditary right continued to win adherents after 1688, so that Whig arguments against it became focused on defending William and later Anne's positions with refernce to their legitimate biological claim to the throne, or to the "divine right of precedence" which

- identified God as "the great disposer of Crowns". J.C.D Clark, English Society 1688-1832, Cambridge, 1985, p124.
- 42 - Gordon Rupp, op. cit, p55.
- 43 - Hugh A.L Rice, op. cit, p156.
- 44 - Quoted by George Every, op. cit, p31.
- 45 - Gordon Rupp, op. cit, p26.
- 46 - Quoted by Norman Sykes, Sheldon to Secker, op. cit, p34.
- 47 - George Every, op. cit, p18.
- 48 - Gordon Rupp, op. cit, p27.
- 49 - Hugh A.L Rice, op. cit, p159.
- 50 - From Ibid quoted by Kenneth Hylson-Smith, op. cit, p76.
- 51 - Hugh A.L Rice, Ibid, ppp159-60.
- 52 - Ibid, p162.
- 53 - George Macaulay Trevelyan, op. cit, p63.
- 54 - Ibid, p64. Jeffrey S. Chamberlain also notes that for the High Churchmen, the doctrines of divine right and passive obedience were "inextricably linked to their concept of divine right episcopacy". Jeffrey S. Chamberlain, Accommodating High Churchmen: The Clergy of Sussex 1700-1745, Illinois, 1997, p60.
- 55 - Ibid.
- 56 - Charles Leslie, Works, quoted by Gordon Rupp, op. cit, p9.
- 57 - Proast had been suspended following an election at the college in which he had persuaded various members of the ways to use their votes. Cf: Mark Goldie, op. cit, p150.
- 58 - Ibid.
- 59 - Hugh A.L Rice, op. cit, p159-60.
- 60 - Mark Goldie, op. cit, p150.
- 61 - G.V Bennett, Tory Crisis, op. cit, p10.
- 62 - George Macaulay Trevelyan, op. cit, p63.
- 63 - Hugh A. L Rice, op. cit, p171.
- 64 - Norman Sykes, Church and State, op. cit, p2. J.C.D Clark notes that the doctrine of divine hereditary right became "an affirmation of allegiance and Anglican

religious ascendancy" in the years following the revolution. J.C.D Clark, op. cit, p124.

- 65 - Edward Carpenter, Thomas Tenison, London, 1948, p194.
- 66 - Gordon Rupp, op. cit, p17.
- 67 - Kenneth Hylson-Smith, op. cit, p72. The "Usagers", led by Jeremy Collier, supported the use of specially devised Communion services within the church which intended to preserve some Roman Catholic elements, so that they advocated the use of a mixed chalice, prayers for the dead, a prayer for the descent of the Holy Ghost over the elements, and the use of an Oblatory prayer. Those who opposed such services were known as the "Non Usagers" and were led by Nathaniel Spinckes.
- 68 - George Every, op. cit, p68.
- 69 - Ibid.
- 70 - Edward Carpenter, op. cit, p201.
- 71 - Hugh A.L Rice, op. cit, p187.
- 72 - Ibid, p186.
- 73 - Paul Avis, op. cit, p91. Charles Leslie was an Irish Nonjuror who had been deprived as Chancellor of Connor, see Sidney Lee (Ed), op. cit, Vol 33, pp77-83. George Hickes was deprived as rector of Alvechurch, Worcester and was Nonjuring bishop of Thetford, see Lee, Vol 26, pp350-354. Nathaniel Spinckes was deprived as rector of St.Martin's, Salisbury and succeeded Hickes as suffragan bishop of Thetford in 1713, see Lee, Vol 53, pp405-6. For more on Thomas Brett see Lee, Vol 6, pp285-6.
- 74 - George Macaulay Trevelyan, op. cit, p65.
- 75 - David C Douglas notes the case of Thomas Hearne, English Scholars, London, 1939, p226-30.

List of References - Chapter 3

- 1 - John Spurr, The Restoration Church of England 1646-1689, London, 1991, pp381 & 399.
- 2 - Locke and Proast were engaged in an exchange of tracts and letters throughout the period 1689 to 1706. Locke began their debates with A Letter Concerning Toleration published in October 1689. Proast replied with The Argument of the Letter Concerning Toleration Briefly Consider'd and Answer'd, published at Oxford in 1690. From that date the letters are all entitled second, third and fourth letters or replies. For a chronology of all their writings see Mark Goldie, "John Locke, Jonas Proast and the religious toleration 1688-1692" in The Church of England c1689-1833, John Walsh, Colin Haydon & Stephen Taylor (Eds), Cambridge, 1995, p143.
- 3 - Mark Goldie, Ibid, p145.
- 4 - From Bohan, "History of the Desertion" quoted by Keith Feiling, A History of the Tory Party, Oxford, 1924, p248.
- 5 - Daniel Finch was a strong anti-Jacobite who opposed Toleration (See Sidney Lee (Ed), Dictionary of National Biography, London, 1893, Vol 19, pp1-5), while Sir Thomas Osbourne had been one of those to sign the invitation to William of Orange and was later to support the contention that the Church was in danger, See Lee, Vol 42, pp295-305. George Savile had also been involved in organising William's arrival although he claimed not to have been (See Lee, Vol 50, pp356-362), while Charles Talbot had been a Godson of Charles II and converted to Anglicanism from Roman Catholicism. He favoured the Whig revolution settlement, See Lee, Vol 55, pp301-7.

- 6 - Keith Feiling, *op.cit*, pp277 & 283. Sidney Godolphin, the first Earl of Godolphin, was actually inclined toward the Tories and supported regency at the Revolution, maintaining written contact with St.Germains after 1688, See Sidney Lee, *op. cit*, Vol 22, pp42-46. Robert Spencer had renounced the Protestant religion in 1689 and fled to Rotterdam, but returned to reassert his Protestantism and swear the Oaths of Allegiance in 1691. He made himself invaluable to William by his efforts to reconcile the King with his heir, Princess Anne, following Queen Mary's death in 1694, See Lee, Vol 53, pp368-377. John Churchill had been Lieutenant General to James II and was suspected of involvement in a plot to restore the Stuarts in 1691-2. He retained William's support however, and did vote with the High Tories in the Lords, which Lee suggests points to his being a man prepared for all contingencies, See Lee, Vol 10, pp315-341.
- 7 - *Ibid*, p276.
- 8 - Paul Avis, "Anglicanism and the Christian Church", p150 quoted by Kenneth Hylson-Smith, High Churchmanship in the Church of England, Edinburgh, 1993, p84. H.T Dickinson notes that religion was important as a focus of political rivalry in 40 specific constituencies throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and points out that High Church parsons voted overwhelmingly for Tory or Conservative candidates. H.T Dickinson, Liberty and Property: political Ideology in Eighteenth Century Britain, London, 1979, p55. Dickinson refers to Frank O'Gorman, Voters, Patrons and Parties, pp361-2 & S.W Baskerville, The Political Behaviour of the Cheshire Clergy 1705-1752, NH, 23, 1987, pp74-97. James E Bradley adds that a Low Church

perspective embodied voting Whig, tolerating dissent and becoming the corollary of opposition to the King's involvement in the Church. High Churchmen however, voted Tory, opposed toleration and envisaged the King as the head of the Church. James E. Bradley Religion, Revolution and English Radicalism: Nonconformity in Eighteenth Century Politics and Society, Cambridge, 1990, p28. Jeffrey S. Chamberlain in a detailed study of the voting trends of High Church Anglicans in Sussex concludes that High Churchmen supported the Tory party because they saw it as the church party. Jeffrey S. Chamberlain, Accommodating High Churchmen: The Clergy of Sussex 1700-1745, Illinois, 1997, p60.

- 9 - Gordon Rupp, Religion in England 1688-1791, Oxford, 1986, p73.
- 10 - Keith Feiling, op. cit, p275.
- 11 - Quoted from the English Historical Review, Vol XXX, 1915, Firth (Ed), by Keith Feiling, ibid.
- 12 - John Addy, John Harrop & Peter McNiven (Eds), The Diary of Henry Prescott, Vol 3, Records Society of Lancashire and Cheshire, Stroud, 1997, p825, June 8, 1690.
- 13 - Thomas Ken to Thomas Tenison, March 29, 1695, Jacobite Collection, Chethams Library, Manchester, A7 55, p15.
- 14 - Ibid, Cf: J.H Overton, Life in the English Church 1660-1714, London, 1885, p13.
- 15 - From Thomas Birch, "The Life of Dr John Tillotson", 1753, pp140-2, quoted by J.H Overton, ibid, p58.
- 16 - See John Spurr, "Latitudinarianism and the Restoration Church" in The Historical Journal, No31, Vol I, 1988, pp61-82.
- 17 - John Davies, A History of Wales, London, 1993, p289. For a more detailed definition of the Latitudinarian standpoint see page 15.

- 18 - John Spurr, The Restoration Church of England, op. cit, p380.
- 19 - Cf. Charles Leslie, "Charge of Socinianism", 1695, from J.H Overton, op. cit, p59.
- 20 - Queen Mary quoted by Mark Goldie, op. cit, pp164 & 65.
- 21 - Norman Sykes, Church and State in England in the Eighteenth Century, 1930, p4.
- 22 - G.V Bennett, The Tory Crisis in Church and State, Oxford, 1975, p45.
- 23 - R.S Boshier, "The Making of the Restoration Settlement" quoted by Paul Avis, op. cit, p95.
- 24 - John Locke, Letters to Limborch, March 1689, "Correspondence", Vol III, pp583-4 quoted by Mark Goldie, op. cit, p160.
- 25 - Ibid, p161 & Richard Lodge, The History of England, London, 1910, p87.
- 26 - From Act in relief of Quakers, Statutes of the Realm, Vol VII, p152, quoted by Andrew Browning (Ed), English Historical Documents, London, 1966, p404.
- 27 - Norman Sykes, From Sheldon to Secker, Cambridge, 1959, p90, George Macaulay Trevelyan, The English Revolution 1688-89, London, p160.
- 28 - Mark Goldie, op. cit, p156.
- 29 - G.V Bennett, op. cit, p9.
- 30 - George Every, The High Church Party 1688-1718, London, 1956, p44 & Diary of Bishop Williams, MS1774, Lambeth Palace Library, London. For more on Thomas Sprat see Sidney Lee (Ed), op. cit, Vol 53, pp419-424, on William Beveridge, Vol 4, pp447-8, and on William Jane, who became an active opponent of comprehension, see Vol 29, pp244-246.
- 31 - A. Harold Wood, Church Unity without Uniformity, London, 1963, pp271-3.

- 32 - G.V Bennett, "King William III and the Episcopate" in Essays in modern English Church History, G.V Bennett & J.D Walsh (Eds), London, 1966, p116.
- 33 - From E.D Bebb, "Nonconformity and Social and Economic Life 1660-1800", 1935, pp45 & 174, quoted G.V Bennett, The Tory Crisis in Church and State, op. cit, p13, & Thomas Rees, History of Protestant Nonconformity in Wales, London, 1883, p247.
- 34 - One such academy existed at Manchester for the teaching of arts and theological subjects. See "Memoirs and Proceedings of the Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society", Vol 84, 1939-41 quoted by H. Mc Lachlan, Cross Street Chapel in the Life of Manchester, Manchester, 1941, p29.
- 35 - Craig Rose, "The Origins and Ideals of the SPCK 1699-1716" in John Walsh et al, op. cit, p177 & George Macaulay Trevelyan, op. cit, p172.
- 36 - John Spurr, op. cit, p377.
- 37 - Norman Sykes, William Wake, Vol I, Cambridge, 1957, p149.
- 38 - Francis Atterbury was Chaplain to King William and was to become dean of Carlisle from 1704 and Bishop of Rochester from 1713. See Sidney Lee (Ed), op. cit, Vol 2, pp233-8.
- 39 - Norman Sykes, op.cit, pp80-7.
- 40 - Ibid.
- 41 - G.V Bennett, The Tory Crisis in Church and State, Oxford, 1975, p49.
- 42 - William Holden Hutton, The English Church, London, 1903, p272.
- 43 - Francis Atterbury quoted by G.V Bennett, op. cit, pp48-9.
- 44 - Norman Sykes, op. cit, p82.

- 45 - John Spurr, The Restoration Church of England 1646-1689, London, 1991, p381. For more on Charles Leslie see Ch2, footnote 73. Henry Dodwell was deprived from the Camden Professorship of History in 1688, and was to be readmitted to the Church of England in 1710 by Archbishop Sharp. See Sidney Lee (Ed), op. cit, Vol 15, pp179-181.
- 46 - William Wake was a noted scholar and was to become Archbishop of Canterbury in 1716. See Sidney Lee (Ed), op. cit, Vol 58, pp445-6.
- 47 - Norman Sykes, op. cit, pp88-91 & William Wake, The Authority of Christian Princes, pp224-226, Quoted by Ibid, pp92-3.
- 48 - Ibid.
- 49 - G.V Bennett, op. cit, p52.
- 50 - Norman Sykes, op. cit, p101.
- 51 - Quoted by David C. Douglas, English Scholars, London, 1939, p272.
- 52 - Norman Sykes, op. cit, p106 & G.V Bennett, op. cit, p53.
- 53 - Norman Sykes, op. cit, p118.
- 54 - White Kennett, A Complete History of England, Vol III, p844 Quoted by Edward Carpenter, Thomas Tenison, London, 1948, p253.
- 55 - Edward Carpenter, ibid, pp251-262.
- 56 - G.V Bennett, "King William III and the Episcopate" in G.V Bennett & J.D Walsh (Eds), Essays in Modern English Church History, London, 1966, p111.
- 57 - Richard Lodge, The History of England, Vol VIII, London, 1910, pp365 & 374.
- 58 - Norman Sykes, Church and State in England in the Eighteenth Century, The Historical Association, 1930, p2. Edward Stillingfleet was active on the Commission

for the Revision of the Prayer Book but argued in favour of more rigid restrictions on Papism, see Sidney Lee (Ed), op. cit, Vol 54, pp375-378. Gilbert Burnet had established himself as a royal favourite with his support of William's arrival, See Lee, Vol 7, pp394-405, while Simon Patrick was also a Commissioner for the Revision of the Prayer Book, See Lee, Vol 44, pp45-7, as was Richard Kidder, who later succeeded Thomas Ken at Bath and Wells and was killed there when the chimney stack of his palace collapsed during a storm, See Lee, Vol 31, pp96-98.

- 59 - G.V Bennett, "King William III and the Episcopate", op. cit, p105.
- 60 - F.G James, "Bishops in Politics 1688-1714" in W.A Aiken & B.D Henning (Eds), Conflict in Stuart England, 1960, p233 quoted by G.V Bennett, *ibid*, pp104 & 118.
- 61 - G.V Bennett, The Tory Crisis in Church and State, op. cit, p45. Cf: Ch2, p6.
- 62 - Spencer House Journals, p223 quoted by G.V Bennett, "King William III and the Episcopate", op. cit, p117.
- 63 - Keith Feiling, A History of the Tory Party 1640-1714, Oxford, 1924, p276 & John Sharp to Thomas Tenison, May 29, 1700, Gibson MSS924-161, Lambeth Palace Library, London.
- 64 - G.V Bennett, "King William III and the Episcopate", op. cit, p109. Heneage Finch had illustrated his passive nature by avoiding all involvement in the conflicts of the civil war, and had successively been Solicitor General, Lord Keeper and Lord Chancellor. See Sidney Lee (Ed), op. cit, Vol 19, pp8-11.
- 65 - G.V Bennett, The Tory Crisis in Church and State, op. cit, p46.

- 66 - G.V Bennett, "King William III and the Episcopate", op. cit, p122.
- 67 - Richard Lodge, op. cit, p373.
- 68 - Ibid, p370 & Memoirs of Mary, p39 quoted at p374.
- 69 - Keith Feiling, op. cit, pp294 & 296.
- 70 - Richard Lodge, op. cit, p365.
- 71 - William Holden Hutton, op. cit, pp269, 271 & 266.
- 72 - Ibid, p268.
- 73 - Richard Lodge, op. cit, p390.
- 74 - G.V Bennett, "King William III and the Episcopate", op. cit, p107.
- 75 - Foxcroft, A Supplement to Burnets History of My Own Time, p40 quoted by Edward Carpenter, op. cit, p167.
- 76 - Ibid, p172 & G.V Bennett, The Tory Crisis in Church and State, op. cit, p47.
- 77 - Edward Carpenter, op. cit, p172.
- 78 - G.V Bennett, The Tory Crisis in Church and State, op. cit, p60.
- 79 - Keith Feiling, op. cit, p275.

List of References - Chapter 4

- 1 - John Spurr, The Restoration Church of England 1646-1689, London, 1991, p381.
- 2 - From Andrew Browning (Ed), English Historical Documents, 1660-1714, Vol VIII, London, 1966, p130
- 3 - Keith Feiling, A History of the Tory Party 1640-1714, Oxford, 1924, p344 & *ibid*, p134.
- 4 - Edward Carpenter, Thomas Tenison, London, 1948, pp409 & 412, & Keith Feiling, *Ibid*, p391.
- 5 - George Macaulay Trevelyan, England Under Queen Anne, London, 1932, p65.
- 6 - Brett Papers, MS 2220, p7, Lambeth Palace Library.
- 7 - Published as "A Sermon Preached in the Collegiate Church of Manchester, March 8 1703, being the day of Her Majesty's Happy Accession to the Throne", quoted by Samuel Hibbert-Ware, Foundations of Manchester, Vol II, Manchester, p45.
- 8 - Bodewryd MS89, Vol VIII, National Library of Wales Microfilm Unit.
- 9 - For a definition of the doctrine of Passive Obedience see Chapter 2, pp8-9.
- 10 - Francis Atterbury, "Sermons and Discourses", Vol I, 1723, p258 quoted by G.V Bennett, The Tory Crisis in Church and State 1688-1730, Oxford, 1975, p104.
- 11 - G.V Bennett, *ibid*, pp104-5.
- 12 - G.V Bennett, "Conflict in the Church" in Geoffrey Holmes (Ed), Britain after the Glorious Revolution 1689-1714, London, 1969, p169.
- 13 - G.V Bennett, The Tory Crisis in Church and State, *op. cit*, pp105 & 108.
- 14 - Geoffrey Holmes, The Trial of Doctor Sacheverell, London, 1973, pp 53, 55 & 61. Samuel Garrard was the Lord Mayor of London in 1709-10 and was commended for the way he dealt with the rioting in the aftermath of Sacheverell's sermon. See Sidney Lee (Ed), Dictionary of

National Biography, London, 1893, Vol 21, pp11-12. The Sacheverell trial and details of his sermon are fully discussed in Chapter 6. J.C.D Clark notes the importance that the date 5 November attained when he quotes Gerald M.Straka that for the Whigs it came to illustrate a direct, divine commission. J.C.D Clark, English Society 1688-1832, Cambridge, 1985, p124, quoting Gerald M.Straka, Anglican reaction to the Revolution of 1688, Wisconsin, 1962, pp65-79.

- 15 - Henry Sacheverell, The Perils of False Brethren, both in Church and State, London, 1709, pp19-20, North Wales Baptist Church Library.
- 16 - Geoffrey Holmes, op. cit, pp65-7.
- 17 - Howell, "State Trials", Vol XV quoted by William Holden Hutton, The English Church, London, 1903, p261.
- 18 - See Chapter 6.
- 19 - William Holden Hutton, op. cit, p262.
- 20 - Geoffrey Holmes, op. cit, pp116 & 211. Holmes identifies the cleric from the Chapel Royal only as "Palmer". Sir Thomas Parker was appointed Lord Chancellor in 1718 and created Earl of Macclesfield in 1721. He was impeached for high crimes and misdemeanours in 1725 and died in 1732. From I.S Leadam, The History of England, 1909, pp168, 331-2.
- 21 - G.V Bennett, The Tory Crisis in Church and State, op. cit, p162.
- 22 - Raines Lincs MS, Vol 44, p363 & Jonathan Swift, Vol 22, p224, Chethams Library.
- 23 - Sunderland to Bothmar, 1/12 August 1713 & Marlborough to Robethon, 6 January 1714, BM Stowe MSS242 quoted by Keith Feiling, op. cit, p455. J.C.D Clark suggests that following the death of her infant son in 1700, Anne herself had possibly led the court at St.Germaine to believe that the rights of James, Prince of Wales might be restored after her death provided her right of

accession after William's was not threatened. J.C.D
Clark, op. cit, p130.

- 24 - Salomon, Stratford, Historical Manuscripts Commission, Portland VII, 181 quoted by *ibid*, p456.
- 25 - *Ibid*, p460.
- 26 - Gibson MSS 930-181, Lambeth Palace Library.
- 27 - Gordon Rupp, Religion in England 1688-1791, Oxford, 1986, p81.
- 28 - George Macaulay Trevelyan, op. cit, p64.
- 29 - Quoted by William Holden Hutton, op. cit, p276.
- 30 - Edward Carpenter, op. cit, p267 & William Holden Hutton, op. cit, p277.
- 31 - William Holden Hutton, op. cit, p278.
- 32 - G.V Bennett, The Tory Crisis in Church and State, op. cit, p126.
- 33 - Gordon Rupp, op. cit, p59.
- 34 - G.V Bennett, The Tory Crisis in Church and State, op. cit, p131.
- 35 - *Ibid*, p137.
- 36 - *Ibid*.
- 37 - *Ibid*, p134.
- 38 - *Ibid*, p136.
- 39 - William Holden Hutton, op. cit, p280.
- 40 - Quoted by Norman Sykes, William Wake, p151.
- 41 - Non Juror Notebook, MS2522, p205, Lambeth Palace Library.
- 42 - William Holden Hutton, op. cit, p255.
- 43 - Keith Feiling, op. cit, p362.
- 44 - Anne to Godolphin, 30 August/10 September 1706, Coxe, Marlborough quoted in *ibid*.
- 45 - Edward Carpenter, op. cit, p177.
- 46 - G.V Bennett, "Conflict in the Church", op. cit, p167.
- 47 - William Holden Hutton, op. cit, pp256-7. Queen Anne's Bounty was a fund established in 1704 to recieve and administer ecclesiastical revenues and distribute monies to poorer clergy to relieve their financial hardships.

From Stephen Friar, The Local History Companion, Stroud, 2001, p436.

- 48 - Norman Sykes, Church and State in England in the Eighteenth Century, The Historical Association, 1930, p9. Paul Langford asserts that many clerics during the reign of Queen Anne felt that material and moral resources were being diverted from worthy purposes to protracted disputes pertaining to party loyalties. Langford quotes Gilbert Burnet, who observed of clerics that "a Profuseness to support a Party may starve not only their Charities, but even their Families". Paul Langford, Public Life and Propertied Englishmen 1689-1798, Oxford, 1991, p122 & Gilbert Burnet, A Sermon Preach'd at St. Bride's before the Lord-Mayor and the Court of Aldermen, London, 1711, p10 quoted by *ibid*. Cf H.T Dickinson, Liberty and Property: Political Ideology in Eighteenth Century Britain, London, 1979, p100.
- 49 - *Ibid*, p12.
- 50 - Edward Carpenter, *op. cit*, p177.
- 51 - *Ibid*, pp178-9 & Norman Sykes, Church and State in England in the Eighteenth Century, *op. cit*, p12. William Nicolson had caused controversy in 1704 when he had refused to institute Francis Atterbury to the deanery of Carlisle because of his views on regal supremacy, see Sidney Lee (Ed), *op. cit*, Vol 41, pp55-58. George Hooper had been a friend of the Nonjuror Thomas Ken, and was a supporter of both Sacheverell and the church in danger contention (See Lee, Vol 27, pp301-304), while George Bull, as an elderly cleric, did not enjoy an active prelacy, See Lee Vol 7, pp236-238. James Gardiner had opposed the Occasional Conformity Bill (See Lee, Vol 20, pp413-414), while William Dawes was an aristocratic Tory, See Lee Vol 14, pp215-7. For more on William Beveridge see Chapter 2, Footnote 30.
- 52 - William Beaw had been Bishop of Llandaff since 1679 and had enjoyed a peaceable prelacy. John Tyler succeeded

him upon his death in 1706 and remained within the see until his death in 1724. From William Stubbs, Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum, Oxford, 1897. Offspring Blackall had been a Chaplain to King William and had been accused of harbouring Nonjurors after the revolution. From Sidney Lee (Ed), Dictionary of National Biography, London, 1893, Vol 5, pp117-8.

- 53 - Ibid, Vol 38, pp359-361.
- 54 - Thomas Tenison to Queen Anne, June 12, 1707, Gibson MSS930 - 195, Lambeth Palace Library.
- 55 - Edward Carpenter, *ibid*, pp179-184 & G.V Bennett, The Tory Crisis in Church and State, *op. cit*, p89. Charles Trimmell had been a Chaplain to Queen Anne, had been prominent in the convocation controversies of 1701-2 and was to be a prominent opponent of Sacheverell in 1710. See Sidney Lee (Ed), *op. cit*, pp233-4.
- 56 - G.V Bennett, *ibid*, p141. William Fleetwood was a well liked prelate and one of the few English prelates of the period who occupied Welsh sees and instructed his clerics to use the Welsh tongue. He was also popular with Queen Anne, who despite her dislike of excess referred to him as "my bishop". See Sidney Lee (Ed), *ibid*, Vol 19, pp269-271. Despite his career on the continent, John Robinson was regarded in London as ignorant (See Lee, Vol 49, pp23-26), while Philip Bisse was a discerning man noted for his honour, sanctity and sweetness of manner, See Lee, Vol 5, p98.
- 57 - Dartmouth's Note in Gilbert Burnet, History of my own Time, Vol VI, p165 quoted by *ibid* p169 & Edward Carpenter, *op. cit*, p186.
- 58 - British Museum Loan 29/171/2, Harley to Stratford, 10 October 1705 quoted by G.V Bennett, The Tory Crisis in Church and State, *op. cit*, pp82, 22 & 93. Robert Harley was the first Earl of Oxford, a Whig dissenter by birth who converted to become a High Church Tory. Lee asserts that he came to office intending to effect a Stuart

restoration, see Sidney Lee (Ed), op. cit, Vol 24, pp399-406.

- 59 - Edward Carpenter, op. cit, p187 & Norman Sykes, Church and State in England in the Eighteenth Century, op. cit, p10.
- 60 - Norman Sykes, William Wake, op. cit, p122.
- 61 - Gordon Rupp, op. cit, p70.
- 62 - G.V Bennett, The Tory Crisis in Church and State, op. cit, p83.
- 63 - From William Wake, Diary, folio 8, 5-6 December 1705, quoted by ibid, p82.
- 64 - New York Public Library, Hardwicke MSS.33 ff125-6, memorandum by Somers, 1709, quoted by ibid, p84.
- 65 - Bodl MS Ballard 38, ff137 to Charlett, 22 October 1702 quoted in G.V Bennett, "Conflict in the Church", op. cit, p167.
- 66 - Norman Sykes, From Sheldon to Secker, p97 & Andrew Browning (Ed), op. cit, p406.
- 67 - William Holden Hutton, op. cit, p259.
- 68 - Keith Feiling, op. cit, p372.
- 69 - Sermon, op. cit, pp19-20.
- 70 - Wentworth to Raby, 27 October, Christ Church Wake MSS, 31 October, and Beaufort to Harley, 23 September, quoted by Keith Feiling, op. cit, p423.
- 71 - Andrew Browning (Ed), op. cit, p409.
- 72 - G.V Bennett, The Tory Crisis in Church and State, op. cit, p177.
- 73 - G.V Bennett, The Tory Crisis in Church and State, op. cit, p178 & I.S Leadam, op. cit, p291.
- 74 - Keith Feiling, op. cit, p470.
- 75 - G.V Bennett, The Tory Crisis in Church and State, op. cit, p178 & Norman Sykes, From Sheldon to Secker, op. cit, p95.
- 76 - Kenneth Hylson-Smith, High Churchmanship in the Church of England, Edinburgh, 1993, p81.
- 77 - See Chapter 7.

- 78 - Raines MS, Vol II, p340, dated only 1714, Chethams Library, Manchester.
- 79 - Ainsworth MS, p193, Chethams Library.
- 80 - Religious Journal of Edward Byrom, Vol I, p405, April 4-5, 1688, Chethams Library.
- 81 - Ainsworth MS, op. cit, p193.
- 82 - Ellis Wynne, Gweledigaethu y Bardd Cwsc, Translated as "The Vision of the Sleeping Bard", 1703, quoted by John Davies, A History of Wales, London, 1993, p297. Ellis Wynne had also edited the Welsh Prayer book of 1710, and entered into holy orders at the request of those impressed by "Y Bardd Cwsc". See Sidney Lee (Ed), op. cit, Vol 63, pp261-2 & Dictionary of Welsh Biography, Honorable Society of Cymmrodorion, p115. Cf.Ch5.

List of References - Chapter 5

- 1 - W. Hughes, Bangor, London, 1911, pp106-7. For more on Humphrey Lloyd see Sidney Lee (Ed), Dictionary of National Biography, London, 1893, Vol 33, p424.
- 2 - N.J Frangopulo, The Growth of Manchester, Manchester, 1962, p32.
- 3 - Henry Broxop, A Biography of Thomas Deacon, Manchester, 1911, p56 from Samuel Hibbert-Ware, Foundations in Manchester, Vol II, pp69-70.
- 4 - Daniel Defoe, A Tour Thro the Whole Island of Great Britain, 1727, p296, from Charles Wareing Bardsley, Memorials of St. Ann's Church, Manchester, 1877, p3.
- 5 - Geraint H. Jenkins, Literature, Religion and Society in Wales 1660-1730, Cardiff, 1978, p135.
- 6 - Ibid, p3.
- 7 - Ibid, p7. Pluralism refers to the practice of one cleric administering to two or more parishes simultaneously.
- 8 - Ibid, p59, from Bodleyan Library, Tanner MS40, ff18-19.
- 9 - Thomas Cartwright's inclination toward Roman Catholicism had made him unpopular and contributed to his decision to flee the country. See Sidney Lee (Ed), op. cit, pp230-232.
- 10 - T.H.G Stevens, Manchester of Yesterday, Altrincham, 1958, p47 & Michael Snape, The Surey Impostor, Lancashire and Cheshire Antiquarian Society, Vol 90, p94.
- 11 - Geraint H. Jenkins, op. cit, p45.
- 12 - John Harland (Ed), Collectanea, Manchester, 1866, p202 & original MSS of diary at Chethams Library, Manchester.
- 13 - Published pamphlet at Bodewryd MS89, Vol VIII, National Library of Wales (NLW). Humphrey Humphreys was the son of a Royalist officer. For more on him

and his background see Sidney Lee (Ed), op. cit, Vol 28, pp249-250 & Dictionary of Welsh Biography, Honorable Society of Cymmrodorion.

- 14 - J.D Marshall (Ed), The Autobiography of William Stout 1665-1752, Manchester, 1967, Vol 14, p92.
- 15 - Diary entries for 12 & 13 July 1688, E.S De Beer (Ed), Kalendarium, Oxford, 1955, Vol IV, p590. Sir John Evelyn lived in retirement following the revolution and was too great a Tory to approve it wholeheartedly. See Sidney Lee (Ed), op. cit, Vol 18, pp79-83. John Trevor was the Speaker of the House of Commons under William III and the Constable of Flint Castle under Anne, (See Lee, Vol 57, pp222-223), while Thomas Strickland fled to France at the revolution and became a French bishop, See Lee Vol 55, p53.
- 16 - Published by Henry Hills, Printer to the Kings Most Excellent Majesty for his Household and Chappel, London, 1686, preserved in Wroe Tracts, Chethams Library, Manchester.
- 17 - Dated October 9, 1705 in the Local Studies Unit (LSU), Manchester Central Library.
- 18 - T.H.G Stevens, op. cit, p48.
- 19 - W.H Thomson, History of Manchester to 1852, Altrincham, 1967, p144. Sir Edward Mosley of Collyhurst was a religious Dissenter and was married in a Dissenting chapel. His father, Nicholas Mosley, had been a famous author. From the Catalogues of the Local Studies Unit, Central Library, Manchester.
- 20 - The National Trust, Dunham Massey, Hatfield, Hertfordshire, 1986, p46. Henry Booth, Lord Delamere (1652-1694) had been implicated in the Rye House Plot against James II in 1685, but the witness against him contradicted himself so much that the charges were dismissed. From Sidney Lee (Ed), op. cit, Vol 5.

- 21 - Baron Hill MS6740, University of Wales, Bangor (UWB) Archive.
- 22 - News From Cheshire, Printed at London, preserved in the Broadsheet Collection F1688/1, LSU, Manchester Central Library, p1.
- 23 - HMC Kenyon MSS 199, 201, 208, 210 Add:41805 F.136, Lancashire County Records Office quoted by Eveline Cruickshanks, "The Revolution and the Localities: Examples of Loyalty to James II" in Eveline Cruickshanks (Ed), By Force or By Default?, Edinburgh, 1989, pp35-6 & T.H.G Stevens, op. cit, p48.
- 24 - The Lord Delamere's Letter to his Tenant's at Warrington in Lancashire, Answered by one of his Lordships Tenants, 1688, Warrington, preserved in Coedymaen Papers No56, f18, NLW.
- 25 - Ibid.
- 26 - Ibid.
- 27 - Ibid.
- 28 - Cf: 1 Sam 24 & 26, Prov 17:16, 17:11 & 1:10, & 1 Peter (NRSV).
- 29 - Rom 3:8, (NRSV).
- 30 - The Lord Delamere's Letter to his Tenat's at Warrington in Lancashire, Answered by one of his Lordships Tenants, op. cit, f19.
- 31 - Samuel Hibbert-Ware, The State of Parties in Lancashire Before the Rebellion of 1715, Manchester, 1865, p31.
- 32 - G.V Bennett, "Conflict in the Church", in Geoffrey Holmes (Ed), Britain after the Glorious Revolution 1689-1714, London, 1969, p169. For a definition of the doctrine of non resistance see Chapter 2, p8ff.
- 33 - Letter of invitation to William of Orange, 1688, in Andrew Browning (Ed), English Historical Documents 1660-1714, London, 1966, p120.
- 34 - J. D Marshall (Ed), op. cit, p92.

- 35 - Ibid, p93.
- 36 - Diary entry dated December 11, 1689, John Addy, John Harrop, Peter Mc Niven (Eds), Diary of Henry Prescott, Record Society of Lancashire & Cheshire, Stroud, 1997, Vol 3, p761.
- 37 - Kenyon MSS Add 38695 ff.100, 103, 106, 112, 134, MS33589 f.300 quoted by Eveline Cruickshanks, op. cit, pp36-7 & Richard Lodge, The History of England, London, 1910, p286.
- 38 - Dated February 9, 1689, Lady Newton, Lyme Letters 1660-1760, London, 1925, p160. Sir John Chicheley died in 1691 leaving a namesake son. See Sidney Lee (Ed), op. cit, Vol 10, p231.
- 39 - John Davies, A History of Wales, London, 1993, p291.
- 40 - Mt 25:41 (NRSV), from Bodewyrd MS83, p3, NLW.
- 41 - Jn 1:30 (NRSV) & Mt 1:8, 1:10 (NRSV), from Bangor MS16411, UWB.
- 42 - Geraint H.Jenkins, op. cit, p19.
- 43 - Coedymaen Papers, MS56, f23, NLW.
- 44 - Ibid, MS57, f13.
- 45 - Ibid, f14.
- 46 - Baron Hill MS6740, p19, UWB.
- 47 - Ibid, p6.
- 48 - Ibid, p21.
- 49 - Ibid.
- 50 - Ibid, p24.
- 51 - The Memorial of the State of England in vindication of the Queen, the Church and the Administration, Anon, London, 1705, Preserved at Lambeth Palace Library, London.
- 52 - "Vicar of Bray" song in A.Norman Jeffares & Martin Gray (Eds), Dictionary of Quotations, Glasgow, 1995, p10.
- 53 - From True Copies of the Papers Wrote by Arthur Lord Balmerino, Tho Syddall, David Morgan, Geo: Fletcher, Jn Beswick, Tho Deacon, Tho Chadwick, Ja Danson,

Andrew Blide and others And Delivered by them to the Sheriffs at the Places of their Execution, Tower Hill, London, August 18, 1746, preserved at Chethams Library, Manchester. George Fletcher's speech was given at Surry, July 30, 1746, p23. Thomas Chadwick's was given at Surry, July 30, 1746, p33.

- 54 - Oldmixon, "History of England" quoted by Samuel Hibbert-Ware, Lancashire During the Rebellion of 1715, Manchester, 1865, p21.
- 55 - Life of James Owen, pp42-44, quoted by Thomas Rees, History of Protestant Nonconformity in Wales, London, 1883, p244.
- 56 - Bodewryd MS89, Vol II, NLW. Robert Wynne MA was awarded the benefice of Llanddeinolen on May 22, 1679/80 under the patronage of The Crown. He seems to have remained there until the awarding of the benefice to Richard Parry in 1723. From Arthur Ivor Pryce, The Diocese of Bangor During Three Centuries. Nicholas Stratford was a High Church Tory but so extreme were his clerical colleagues in Manchester that he had resigned the Wardenship of the Collegiate church, to which he was appointed in 1667, in 1684 because he was unable to agree with the stance of the Court Party of the time. He was retired to London before returning to Manchester as bishop after the revolution. See Sidney Lee (Ed), op. cit, Vol 19, pp33-34.
- 57 - Published in London, 1684 & Raines MS Vol 45, p315, attributed to Robert Assheton.
- 58 - Bodewryd MS89, Vol II, NLW.
- 59 - Raines MS, Vol 40, p130.
- 60 - Samuel Hibbert-Ware, Foundations of Manchester, Manchester, p20.
- 61 - Raines MS Vol 40, p136.
- 62 - Penrhos Papers, MSS136 & 137, UWB.
- 63 - John Davies, op. cit, p290.

- 64 - J.H Overton, The Nonjurors, London, 1902, pp471-496.
- 65 - Penrhos Papers MS1691, UWB.
- 66 - Reference to Chapter 4 to point toward the Convocation crisis.
- 67 - Geraint H.Jenkins, op. cit, p46, Cf:Bodewryd MS89c, part 4, P146, NLW. Jeffrey S.Chamberlain highlights a similar example of apparent contradiction in his study of Sussex with the example of John Shore, Rector of Hamsey, who voted Tory and upheld the doctrine of Passive Obedience but preached in defence of William and Mary. Chamberlain concludes that as long as the Church of England was secure, the clergy were satisfied. Jeffrey S.Chamberlain, Accommodating High Churchmen: The Clergy of Sussex 1700-1745, Illinois, 1997, pp40-43.
- 68 - John Walsh & Stephen Taylor, "The Church and Anglicanism in the "long" eighteenth century", pp30-35, in John Walsh, Colin Hayden & Stephen Taylor (Eds), The Church of England 1689-1833, Cambridge, 1995, pp33-4.
- 69 - J.H Overton, Life in the English Church 1660-1714, London, 1885, p13.
- 70 - Henry D.Rack, Reasonable Enthusiast, London, 1992, p19.
- 71 - F.C Mather, "Georgian Churchmanship Reconsidered", pp255-283, from Journal of Ecclesiastical History, Vol 36, No 2, 1985, p264.
- 72 - Harold F.Hutchinson, Sir Christopher Wren, London, 1976, p22.
- 73 - Basil Clarke & John Betjeman, English Churches, London, 1964, pp33-34.
- 74 - Nigel Yates, "Church Buildings of the Protestant Establishments In Wales and Scotland: Some Points of Comparison" in John R.Guy & Roger L.Brown (Eds), The Journal of Welsh Ecclesiastical History, Vol 9, Cardiff, 1992, p5.

- 75 - John Betjeman (Ed), Guide to English Parish Churches, London, 1958, p71.
- 76 - F.C Mather, op. cit, p264 & Nigel Yates, op. cit, p7.
- 77 - Ainsworth MSS, Chethams Library, Manchester, p124 & Gibson MSS 937-8, Lambeth, Anon, June 3, 1695, p28.
- 78 - J.H Overton, op. cit, p198.
- 79 - Edward Bowerman to Thomas Tenison, December 17, 1692, Gibson MSS 933-9, Lambeth.
- 80 - Diary of Thomas Cartwright, Bishop of Chester, 1687 quoted by J.H Overton, op. cit, p200.
- 81 - Raines MSS from College Register, 10 February 1668, Vol 40, p132, Chethams Library, Manchester.
- 82 - Diary of Henry Newcome Jnr of Middleton, 25 December 1701, Microfilm Unit, MF136, Local Studies Unit, Central Library, Manchester.
- 83 - Gibson MSS 937-8, op. cit, pp2-11.
- 84 - Edward Bowerman to Thomas Tenison, op. cit.
- 85 - Ainsworth MSS, op. cit, p167.
- 86 - Lambeth MS 2183, August 29, 1714, Wye, p195. For DNB entry on Brett see Chapter 2, note 73.
- 87 - "An Act for Uniting His Majestys Protestant Subjects, 1695, Gibson MSS 930-165, Lambeth. Byrom was the son of a prosperous Manchester merchant and had strong Jacobite leanings. He avoided active involvement in the uprising of 1745 but was known in Manchester as "a warm supporter of the high church and Jacobite party". From Sidney Lee (Ed), op. cit, Vol 3.
- 88 - Raines Lancs MSS, Vol 45, p13, Chethams.
- 89 - Kenneth Hylson-Smith, High Churchmanship in the Church of England, Edinburgh, 1993, pxi.
- 90 - Lambeth MSS H5133.204, p54, published in London.
- 91 - Ibid, p27.
- 92 - Published as Old Popery as Good as New or The Unreasonableness of the Church of England in some of her Doctrines and Practices, 1688, signed N.N, pp10-11.

- 93 - J.H Overton, op. cit, p197 & William Wake, An Exposition of the Doctrines of the Church of England, Introduction quoted by Norman Sykes, William Wake, Vol 1, Cambridge, 1957, p22.
- 94 - B/MISC/VOL/23 NLW, Church in Wales MSS.
- 95 - J.H Overton, op. cit, p15.
- 96 - James Ogden, Manchester: A Hundred Years Ago, 1783, William E.A Axon (Ed), Manchester, 1887.
- 97 - J.H Overton, op. cit, p30 & Bishop G Smalridge, Sixty Sermons, 1719, quoted by J.H Overton, p189.
- 98 - B/MISC/VOLS/1 NLW Church in Wales MSS.
- 99 - Sermons of T.Bates, Local Studies Unit, Manchester Central Library, 1697.
- 100 - Norman Sykes, op. cit, Vol II, pp153-4.
- 101 - B/MISC/VOLS/1 NLW Church in Wales MSS.
- 102 - Keith Thomas, Religion and the Decline of Magic, London, 1971, p591 & William Wake quoted by Norman Sykes, op. cit, p23.
- 103 - Ellis Wynne, Gweledigaethu y Bardd Cwsc, Translated as "The Vision of the Sleeping Bard", 1703, quoted by Geraint Jenkins, "Popular Beliefs in Wales from the Restoration to Methodism" in The Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies, Nov 1977, Cardiff, Vol 27, 1978 (1976-78), No27, p460 & John Davies, op. cit, p297.
- 104 - B/DC/136 NLW Church in Wales MSS.
- 105 - Geraint Jenkins, op. cit, p16.
- 106 - Nelson, Life of Bull, p259 quoted by J.H Overton, op. cit, p164.
- 107 - Tredegar MS Box 76/48 NLW, Undated and unattributed & Deacon MS, p80, Chethams, ca.1718.
- 108 - From Diary of Bishop Williams, MS1774, Lambeth Palace Library, London, pp18-37. William Lloyd would have been the eighth bishop to sign the declaration against King James II in 1687 but that his request to delay signing was denied. He was deprived as Bishop

of Norwich in 1690 but continued as suffragan bishop of that diocese until his death. See Sidney Lee (Ed), op. cit, Vol33, ppp435-6.

- 109 - Edward Carpenter, Thomas Tenison, London, 1948, p316.
- 110 - Ibid.
- 111 - Ibid, p317.
- 112 - Gibson MSS 941-32, April 20, 1712, Lambeth.
- 113 - Edward Carpenter, op. cit, p318.
- 114 - See Chapter 6.
- 115 - Lambeth MSS H5133.204, p12.
- 116 - G.V Bennett, "Conflict in the Church" in Geoffrey Holmes (Ed), Britain after the Glorious Revolution 1689-1714, London, 1969, p165.
- 117 - John Spurr, The Restoration Church of England 1646-1689, London, 1991, p61. For a definition of Latitudinarianism see Chapter 2, p5.
- 118 - Henry D.Rack, op. cit, pp21 & 24.
- 119 - George Every, The High Church Party 1688-1718, London, 1956, p149.
- 120 - Gibson MSS 941-4, 941-931 & SPG Papers Correspondence Vol VII, Nos 127 & 74, Lambeth.
- 121 - Mary Clement (Ed), Correspondence and Records of the SPG Relating to Wales, Cardiff, 1973, p8 & Plasgwyn Papers No88, NLW & Norman Sykes, William Wake, Vol II, Cambridge, 1957 p220.
- 122 - D.W.R Bahlman quoted by Geraint Jenkins, op. cit, p74 & Plasgwyn Printed Papers, Charles Bill, April 4, 1699, No144b, NLW.
- 123 - Plasgwyn papers, Misc Ecclesiastical Papers Nos 19-21 & 24, NLW.
- 124 - Geraint Jenkins, op. cit, p73.
- 125 - Ibid, p114. Translated as The Urge to Commune as a Monk & The Meaningful Communicant. "The Whole Duty of Man" published as Holl dyletswydd Dyn.
- 126 - Penton Papers MS9070E, NLW & Diary, August 23, 1704, Local Studies Unit, Central Library, Manchester.

- 127 - Legh Correspondence, March 10, 1703 & September 11, 1704, Rylands Library, Manchester.
- 128 - Diary, Chethams.
- 129 - Ibid.
- 130 - Ibid & J.Harland (Ed), Collectanea, Manchester, 1866, p204.
- 131 - Diary of Richard Illidge, 16 & 22 July 1705, Local Studies Unit, Central Library, Manchester.
- 132 - Raines Lancs MSS, Vol 44, p290, Chethams.
- 133 - Selected Lists of Lancashire Churches, by Peter Fleetwood-Hesketh, and Cheshire Churches by Robert Wakeford.
- 134 - See Chapter 7.

List of References - Chapter 6

- 1 - From "An Act For Exempting Their Majesties' Protestant Subjects Dissenting From The Church of England From The Penalties Of Certain Laws", in Andrew Browning (Ed), English Historical Documents, London, 1966, p400.
- 2 - Richard Lodge, The History of England, Vol VIII, London, 1910, p310.
- 3 - Samuel Hibbert Ware, Lancashire During the Rebellion of 1715, Manchester, 1865, p208 & Hibbert Ware, The State of Parties in Lancashire Before the Rebellion of 1715, Manchester, 1865, p36, & Chapter 2 & Ibid, p369.
- 4 - Ibid, State of Parties, pp33-5.
- 5 - Letter from Mr Collier of London to Mr Parker, January 14, 1712 in Non Juror Notebook, pp81-2, Lambeth.
- 6 - "Remarks on ye true Character of a Churchman wch by the style seem to have been Dr Hickers'", Ibid, ff248, MS3171, Lambeth.
- 7 - J. Le Neve, Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, Oxford, 1854, p586 & Non Juror Notebook, MS 2522, Lambeth Palace Library, London, p96. Thomas Wagstaffe was the Nonjuring bishop of Ipswich, and had visited Rome. See Sidney Lee (Ed), Dictionary of National Biography, London, 1893, Vol 58, pp433-436.
- 8 - Ernest Axon, "History of Manchester" in The Book of Manchester and Salford, British Medical Association, Manchester, 1929, p6 & J.H Overton, The Nonjurors, London, 1902, pp471-496.
- 9 - John Addy, John Harrop & Peter McNiven (Eds), The Diary of Henry Prescott, Vol 3, Record Society of Lancashire and Cheshire, Manchester, 1997, p751.
- 10 - Owen MS, Vol 23, p165, Manchester Central Library & John Byrom, Correspondence, February 21, 1730,

- Chethams & Gordon Rupp, Religion in England 1688-1791, Oxford, 1986, p23.
- 11 - Raines Lancs MSS, Vol 41, p274, Chethams.
- 12 - Ibid, Vol 40, p146. Jeffrey S. Chamberlain also notes that some Sussex parsons respected and even sympathised with the Nonjuring standpoint, and he points to the burial of two of the group in church chancels in Sussex as evidence. Jeffrey S. Chamberlain, Accommodating High Churchmen: The Clergy of Sussex 1700-1745, Illinois, 1997, p39.
- 13 - J.H Overton, op. cit, pp471-496 & Edward Carpenter, Thomas Tenison, London, 1948, pp244-5. Thomas Watson became notable for his deprivation from St. Davids in 1700 on a charge of simony. See Lee, op. cit, Vol 60, pp38-40.
- 14 - Gibson MSS 933-35, Lambeth. Edward Jones was deprived of the see of St. Asaph following this trial in 1698. He later confessed to being guilty of excesses in his diocese. See Lee, op. cit, Vol 30, pp97-8.
- 15 - Penrhos Papers, MS110, University of Wales, Bangor (UWB).
- 16 - George Every, The High Church Party 1688-1718, London, 1956, p161.
- 17 - Norman Sykes, William Wake, Vol I, Cambridge, 1957, p141.
- 18 - J.W.C Wand, The High Church Schism, London, 1951, p52.
- 19 - Jan Albers, "'Papist traitors" and "Presbyterian rogues": religious identities in eighteenth century Lancashire" in John Walsh, Colin Haydon & Stephen Taylor (Eds), The Church of England 1689-1833, Cambridge, 1995, p324.
- 20 - Paul Avis, Anglicanism and the Christian Church, Edinburgh, 1989, p91.

- 21 - Letter to Mr Pierce of London from Thomas Deacon, May 4, 1750 in "Letters Concerning Mr Pierce's Conduct in leaving Dr Deacon's Communion", copied from a volume in the Scottish Episcopal Church Library, Edinburgh, by Walton Bele, 1862 at Chethams.
- 22 - Deacon MSS, 1747, p7, Chethams.
- 23 - Baron Hill MSS 6768, UWB.
- 24 - Geraint Jenkins, Literature, Religion and Society in Wales 1660-1730, Cardiff, 1978, p171.
- 25 - Samuel Hibbert Ware, State of Parties, op. cit, p48 & Lancashire During the Rebellion of 1715, op. cit, p267 & Chapter 7.
- 26 - Samuel Hibbert Ware, State of Parties, Ibid, p28.
- 27 - Richard Wroe, Tracts, p9, Chethams.
- 28 - Kenyon MSS 1033, January 1697, Lancashire County Records Office, Preston.
- 29 - Ibid, July 3, 1696.
- 30 - Bodewryd MS90, Vol 2, undated, National Library of Wales.
- 31 - Beauvoir Papers, MS1554, f31, National Library of Wales.
- 32 - Anon, published in London, 1710, pp9-10, Lambeth.
- 33 - Baron Hill MSS 6778, UWB & MS6779.
- 34 - Gibson MSS 933-8, Lambeth, Dated only 1707.
- 35 - Ibid.
- 36 - The High Church Legion: or the Memorial Examin'd Being A New Test of Moderation, London, 1705, Anon but attributed by Lambeth palace Catalogues to Daniel Defoe, H5133.825, Lambeth.
- 37 - A Satyr dedicated to all...true friends to her present Majesty and her Government, to the Church of England, and the Succession as by law established: And who gratefully acknowledge the preservation of their religion, Rights and Liberties, due to the

- late King William, Swan Tripe Club, Dublin, 1707, preserved at Gibson MSS938-910, pp13, 19-20.
- 38 - Keith Feiling, A History of the Tory Party, Oxford, 1924, pp408 & 363.
- 39 - John Walker, An Attempt Towards Recovering an Account of the Numbers and Sufferings of the Clergy of the Church of England...in the late Times of the Grand Rebellion, London, 1714, pviii.
- 40 - Ibid.
- 41 - Richard Lodge, op. cit, p311 & Occasional Conformity Act, 1711 in Andrew Browning, op. cit, p407 & Samuel Hibbert-Ware, Foundations of Manchester, Vol II, p53.
- 42 - Samuel Hibbert-Ware, State of Parties, op. cit, pp41-2 & Geoffrey Holmes, The Trial of Doctor Sacheverell, London, 1973, p40.
- 43 - Gilbert Burnet in Horwitz, p224.
- 44 - Diary, Local Studies Unit Archive, Manchester Central Library.
- 45 - R.Gwynne to Robethan, April 1705, BM Stowe Mss 222, in Keith Feiling, op. cit, p379.
- 46 - Ibid, cf: Chapter 4.
- 47 - The True Genuine Tory - Address, 1710, London, Anon attributed to Benjamin Hoadly, p1, NN214.H6, Lambeth.
- 48 - Richard Wroe, op. cit, pp10-11.
- 49 - James Johnston, Pioneers of Lancashire Nonconformity, Manchester, 1905, p69. Newcome refused to declare his acceptance of the doctrines of the Prayer Book revised in 1662 before the deadline of August 24, 1662, and was therefore deprived from his living at the Collegiate church of Manchester.
- 50 - Richard Parkinson (Ed), Autobiography of Henry Newcome, Manchester, 1852, Vol II, February 4, 1689, p269.

- 51 - James Johnston, op. cit, p72.
- 52 - Richard Parkinson (Ed), op. cit, p271, January 19 & May 1, 1690.
- 53 - Samuel Hibbert-Ware, Foundations of Manchester, op. cit, p31.
- 54 - Diary, Local Studies Unit Archive, Manchester Central Library. Jeffrey S. Chamberlain finds little evidence that Sussex was as tolerant, and points to the example of William Jenden who drew attention to the dangers posed by nonconformists in his will. This apprehension and uneasiness also extended to the Whig tolerance of nonconformity. Jeffrey S. Chamberlain, op. cit, pp44-50.
- 55 - From Life of James Owen pp36,7 & 44 quoted by Thomas Rees, History of Protestant Nonconformity in Wales, London, 1883, p248.
- 56 - Baron Hill MSS 6768, UWB.
- 57 - Ibid, MSS 6752.
- 58 - Geraint Jenkins, op. cit, p174.
- 59 - Norman Sykes, op. cit, p95 & John Davies, A History of Wales, London, 1993, p293. The chapels referred to were opened by Daniel Phillips who died in 1722, and had an average attendance for both of 250. Cited by Thomas Rees, op. cit, p262.
- 60 - J.D Marshall (Ed), The Autobiography of William Stout of Lancaster 1665-1750, Manchester, Vol 14, 1967, pp170-1.
- 61 - Geoffrey Holmes, op. cit, p36.
- 62 - Henry Sacheverell, The Perils of False Brethren, both in Church, and State, London, 1709, pp7-8, Baptist Library, Bangor.
- 63 - Ibid & Geoffrey Holmes, op. cit, pp64-9. Holmes defines Revisionists specifically as those in favour of revising the articles of belief as a move towards comprehension.
- 64 - Geoffrey Holmes, op. cit, p68.

- 65 - Ibid, pp77-100. Sir Peter King was a notable Whig who went on to defend William Whiston at trial for heresy in 1713 and served as Lord Chancellor from 1727, see Lee, op. cit, Vol 31, pp144-46. Sir Gilbert Heathcote succeeded Garrard as Lord Mayor of London between 1710-11, and was a founder member of the Bank of England, see Lee, Vol 25, pp351-353.
- 66 - Ibid, pp134 & 165.
- 67 - Ibid, pp228-231.
- 68 - Tredegar MS Box 76/48 NLW.
- 69 - Ibid.
- 70 - Ibid.
- 71 - "Dr Sacheverell and Benjamin Hoadly", 1709, in Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse 1660-1714, Vol 7, F.H Ellis (Ed), New Haven, 1975 pp359-360 quoted by Julian Hoppit, A Land of Liberty, Oxford, 2000, p235.
- 72 - All out at Last, or ye Whiggs ffarewell to Westminster, 1710, in Ibid.
- 73 - Jekyll to Sunderland, April 4, 1710, State Papers 34/12/14 in Geoffrey Holmes, op. cit, p235 & Benjamin Hoadly, The Thoughts of an Honest Tory, p3, NN214.H6, Lambeth.
- 74 - Bodewryd Letters, No 184, NLW.
- 75 - Flying Post No 2243, 2246, 2248, June 22-9, & July 4 1710, in Geoffrey Holmes, op. cit, p244.
- 76 - Diary, Chethams.
- 77 - Baron Hill MSS 6805, undated, UWB. Sir Joseph Jekyll was the Master of the Rolls at parliament. See Lee, op. cit, Vol 29, pp287-88.
- 78 - Ainsworth MSS, dated 1720, p192, Chethams.
- 79 - Gibson MSS 930-181, Lambeth.
- 80 - Notes on Jacobitism, Anon & undated, A7 55, Chethams.
- 81 - The High Church Legion, op. cit, p10.

- 82 - Richard Wroe, "A Sermon Preached in the Collegiate Church of Manchester March 8, 1703/4 being the Day of Her Majesties Happy Accession to the Throne", quoted in Samuel Hibbert-Ware, Foundations of Manchester, op. cit, p44.
- 83 - Ainsworth MSS, dated 1720, p124, Chethams.
- 84 - Bodewryd MS 72, NLW.
- 85 - Diary, August 6, 1714 & August 11, 1715.
- 86 - Charles Wareing Bardsley, Memorials of St. Anns Church, Manchester, 1877, p42.
- 87 - David Fraser, The Adventurers, Cardiff, 1976, p248 & Thomas Rees, op. cit, p267.
- 88 - Charles Petrie, The Jacobite Movement, London, 1948, p185.
- 89 - Samuel Hibbert-Ware, State of Parties, op. cit, p53.
- 90 - Robert Patten, The History of the Late Rebellion, London, 1717, p35.
- 91 - Ibid, p87.
- 92 - Ibid, pp93-4.
- 93 - T.Swindells, Manchester Streets and Manchester Men, Vol I, 1906, p104.
- 94 - Central Library Broadside Collection, Local Studies Unit, F1790/1G, Central.
- 95 - Farrer Collection L55/5/13, p245, Central Library Local Studies Archive, Accounts book p496.
- 96 - Samuel Hibbert-Ware, State of Parties, op. cit, p50.
- 97 - G.V Bennett, The Tory Crisis in Church and State 1688-1730, Oxford, 1975, p174. In his study of High Church affinities in Sussex, Jeffrey S.Chamberlain also notes the role of alcohol in local assertions of the Stuart cause. He cites the example of Meredith Jones, curate of Haskmere in Surrey, who engaged in a drunken exchange with a parishoner in the village inn. For the most part he concludes that Sussex clerics held a sentimental, nostalgic Jacobitism that doted on what might have been, and

belittled what was. Jeffrey S. Chamberlain, op. cit,
pp39-40.

List of References - Chapter 7

- 1 - Pamphlet entitled "A Prospect taken of England, divided in the Election of the next Parliament" in Henry Horwitz, Revolution Politicks, Cambridge, 1968, p238.
- 2 - Jan Albers, "'Papist traitors" and "Presbyterian Rogues": religious identities in eighteenth-century Lancashire", in John Walsh, Colin Hayden & Stephen Taylor (Eds), The Church of England 1689-1833, Cambridge, 1995, p333.
- 3 - David Fraser, The Adventurers, Cardiff, 1976, p246 & John Davies, A History of Wales, London, 1994, p299.
- 4 - P.D.G Thomas, "Jacobitism in Wales", in Glanmor Williams (Ed), The Welsh History Review, Cardiff, 1960, p295.
- 5 - Cunningham, II, p298 quoted by Geoffrey Holmes, The Trial of Doctor Sacheverell, London, 1973, pp218 & 246.
- 6 - Eveline Cruickshanks (Ed), "Introduction" in Ideology and Conspiracy, Edinburgh, 1982, p7.
- 7 - Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts & Baron Hill MS6743.
- 8 - Geoffrey Holmes, op. cit, pp218 & 246.
- 9 - Lady Newton, Lyme Letters 1660-1760, London, 1925, p225.
- 10 - See Ch5.
- 11 - Lionel K.J Glassey, The Revolution of 1688 in the North West of England, Manchester, Lancashire & Cheshire Antiquarian Society Transactions, Vol86, 1990, pages unnumbered.
- 12 - Ibid.
- 13 - Ibid & H.T Dickinson, The Politics of the People in Eighteenth Century Britain, London, 1994, p99.

- 14 - Lady Newton, op. cit, p160 & Lady Newton, The House of Lyme, London, 1917, pp353-4.
- 15 - NLW BX5136 015 Main Library, p11.
- 16 - The Autobiography of William Stout of Lancaster 1665-1752, J.D Marshall (Ed), Manchester, 1967, Vol14, p109.
- 17 - J. Walton, Lancashire - A Social History", Manchester, 1987, p92 quoted by Michael Snape, The Surey Impostor, Lancashire & Cheshire Antiquarian Society, Vol 90, p94. Dissenting groups were significant in number in other parts of England, such as Coventry and Nottingham, where H.T Dickinson describes them as a major force of political opposition for the High Churchmen and the Tories. H.T Dickinson, Liberty and Property: Political Ideology in Eighteenth Century Britain, London, 1979, p55. Dickinson quotes James E. Bradley, Nonconformity and the Electorate in Eighteenth Century England, PH, 6, 1987, pp236-7 & 244. However, Dissent was not in the ascendancy across the whole of England, and Jeffrey S. Chamberlain notes that in Sussex dissent declined by a quarter between 1676 and 1724. Jeffrey S. Chamberlain, "The Changes and Chances of Mortal Life: The Vicissitudes of High Churchmanship and Politics among the Clergy of Sussex 1700-1745", University of Chicago PhD Thesis, 1992. In a similar vein, James E. Bradley notes that Dissenting groups were not, by themselves, a formidable electoral force, but that they became such when associated with Low Churchmen. He notes that "In those constituencies where there was a strong High-Anglican party, the Low-Church Anglicans and the Nonconformists normally voted in concert". James E. Bradley, Religion, Revolution and English Radicalism: Nonconformity in Eighteenth Century Politics and Society, Cambridge, 1990, p28.

- 18 - H. Mc Lachlan, "Cross Street Chapel in the Life of Manchester", in Memoirs and Proceedings of the Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society, Vol 184, 1939-41, p29.
- 19 - Bodewryd MS82 NLW, Microfilm.
- 20 - October 7, 1689 in The Diary of Henry Prescott, John Addy, John Harrop, Peter Mc Niven (Eds), Vol 3, Record Society Of Lancashire and Cheshire, 1997, p751.
- 21 - Microfiche Newspaper Cuttings, Central Library, Manchester.
- 22 - The term "de facto" refers to the belief that the monarch attained power by virtue of an act of parliament, which High Churchmen believed King William had. The term "de jure" indicates belief that the King attains power by virtue of divine right and God. The passage is dated April 27, 1713 in The Private Journal and Literary Remains of John Byrom, Richard Parkinson (Ed), Manchester, 1854, Vol 1 - Part 1, p21.
- 23 - Byrom Correspondence, Chethams, dated only 9th.
- 24 - Legh of Lyme Correspondence, John Rylands Library, Manchester, January 9, 1689.
- 25 - Ibid.
- 26 - Oldmixon, The Cheshire Sheaf, No 80, August 1896 & J.H Overton, Nonjurors, London, 1902, p271.
- 27 - Diary of Henry Prescott, op. cit, p741, dated September 6, 1689.
- 28 - Lady Newton, Lyme Letters, op. cit, p182 dated June 1690.
- 29 - Lady Newton, House of Lyme, op. cit, p360, July 26, 1690.
- 30 - Raines MS Lancs, Vol 44, p36 dated only "New Years Day".

- 31 - Legh of Lyme Correspondence, John Rylands Library, Manchester, undated & 3 August, 1714 & Raines Lancs MSS, Vol 41, p270.
- 32 - Ibid, dated October 28, 1701.
- 33 - P.D.G Thomas, op. cit, pp287-8.
- 34 - Nicholas Rogers, "Riot and Popular Jacobitism in Early Hanoverian England" in Eveline Cruickshanks (Ed), op. cit, p71.
- 35 - Lady Newton, House of Lyme, op. cit, p368 & Dunham Massey, The National Trust, Hatfield, Herts, 1986, p24.
- 36 - Lady Newton, ibid.
- 37 - The Jacobite Trials at Manchester in 1694, William Beamont (Ed), Manchester, 1853, pp v-xxxii.
- 38 - Samuel Hibbert-Ware, Foundations of Manchester, p24, Vol II.
- 39 - William Beamont (Ed), op. cit, plxix & Lady Newton, House of Lyme, op. cit, p361 & for evidence that Thomas Cartwright dined with Peter Legh see Cartwrights Diary published by the Camden Society, London, 1843, p82, September 30, 1687.
- 40 - William Beamont (Ed), Ibid, p42.
- 41 - Legh of Lyme Correspondence, John Rylands Library, Manchester.
- 42 - Lady Newton, Lyme Letters, op. cit, pp215,265,306-7.
- 43 - Michael Snape, op. cit, p94.
- 44 - Gibson MSS 930-27, Lambeth Palace Library, London.
- 45 - Ibid.
- 46 - Diary published by Camden Society, London, p71, 1843.
- 47 - John Lunn, History of the Tyldesleys of Lancashire, Altrincham, 1966, pp99,102,104-5.
- 48 - Broadside Collection, LSU Central Library, Manchester, F1694/1, March 14, 1694.

- 49 - Eleanor Johnson, The Standish Family 1189-1920, Standish, 1972, pp25-6.
- 50 - Jessica Lofthouse, Lancashires Old Families, London, 1972, p81.
- 51 - Broadside Collection, Central Library, Manchester, LSU, FND113. The broadside bears the date 1691, but the library catalogue lists it as undated, and the use of the term "Jacobins" does suggest a later date.
- 52 - Byroms Remains, op. cit, Vol II, p259, & Poems of John Byrom, A.W Ward (Ed), Vol 1, p34, & W.H Thomson, History of Manchester to 1852, Altrincham, 1967, pp148-9, & Men and Women of Manchester, City of Manchester Public Relations Office, Manchester, 1979, p4.
- 53 - Byroms Remains, op. cit, p27, July 8, 1714.
- 54 - C.H Hereford, "Literary Manchester", in W.H Brindley (Ed), The Soul of Manchester, Manchester, 1929, p131.
- 55 - Abbot to Croissy, 3 March 1696 in "A Study of the Papers of the Abbe' Eusebe Renaudot", Pierre Burger in Eveline Cruickshanks (Ed), "Ideology and Conspiracy", Edinburgh, 1982, p125. Translations aided by French-English Dictionary, Beryl T. Atkins et al, London, 1981.
- 56 - David Fraser, "The Adventurers", Cardiff, 1976, pp248 & 251. Sir Watkin Williams-Wynn belonged to the Wynn family of Ruabon and adopted the second surname upon inheriting his mother's families estate in 1718/9. He served as Member of Parliament for Denbighshire between 1716 and 1741 when he lost his seat to John Myddleton of Chirk Castle because of an act of deception by the High Sheriff. He was restored to the seat in 1742 and was noted as a "hearty" supporter of the Pretender in 1745, when he was alledged to have written to Prince Charles to promise the support of his part of the country. He is also rumoured to have retained contact

with the Pretender after 1745, but these rumours cannot be substantiated because after his death from a riding accident on 26 September 1749, his wife, Francis Shakerley of Hulme, Cheshire, destroyed any incriminating papers. Cited by Mahon, "History of England", 2 Edition, Vol III, p43 in Dictionary of Welsh Biography Down to 1940, Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion, London, 1959, p1100 & Sidney Lee (Ed), Dictionary of National Biography, Vol LXIII, London, 1900, p259.

57 - Gibson MS 941-2, Lambeth Palace Library.

58 - W. Hughes, Bangor, London, 1911, p107. Benjamin Hoadly was born at Westerham, Kent in 1676. He became the leader of the Low Church divines and his satirical publication "Dedication to Pope Clement XI" of 1715 included "fulsome adulation" of King George which led to his promotion to Bangor from the rectory of St. Peter-le-Poor, which he had held since 1704. His work "Nature of the Kingdom or Church of Christ" denied the existence of a visible church and his subsequent reply to criticism of it sparked the Bangorian controversy by denying even apostolic authority. The Lower House of Convocation deemed his writing to have "a tendency to subvert all government and discipline in the church" and referred the matter to the Upper House. To avoid confrontation with a royal favourite, Convocation was prorogued and the controversy continued in an exhaustive published exchange between Hoadly and William Law. Hoadly was translated to Hereford in 1721. He was so severely crippled that he delivered sermons on his knees, and never visited his see of Bangor because it was too far for him to travel. Cited by Sidney Lee (Ed), *ibid*, Vol 27, p19.

- 59 - Chapter 7, pp15-18.
- 60 - Letter to Henry Somerset in "Reports of the Historical Manuscripts Commission", 7th, Appendix, pp347-8 quoted by P.D.G Thomas, "Jacobitism in Wales" in Glanmor Williams (Ed), The Welsh History Review", Cardiff, 1960, p280 & Bodewryd MS 535, NLW.
- 61 - Plasgwyn Papers, No79b, NLW, dated 1689.
- 62 - P.D.G Thomas, op. cit, pp281 & 286 & David Fraser, op. cit, p246.
- 63 - Nicholas Rogers, "Riot and Popular Jacobitism in Early Hanoverian England" in Eveline Cruickshanks (Ed), op. cit, p84.
- 64 - "Report on Bulkeley Family and Estate Papers", UCNW, Bangor, Baron Hill MS 183, by Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts, p44.
- 65 - Baron Hill MS 6746, UWB. John Owen BA, was the son of Owen Price of Bodafon and was presented to Llaneilian on November 11, 1704. Cited by Arthur Ivor Pryce, The Diocese of Bangor During Three Centuries, Cardiff, 1879, p15 & Richard Rhys Hughes, Biographical Epitomes of the Bishops and Clergy of the Diocese of Bangor from the Reformation to the Reconstruction, 1932, Part VI, p847.
- 66 - Printed by F.Dickson, Cork Hill, Dublin, preserved at Gibson MS 938-8, p2.
- 67 - Baron Hill MSS 5561 & 5567, UWB.
- 68 - Panton Papers, MS9086D, National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth.
- 69 - William Beamont, "The Jacobite Trials at Manchester in 1694", Manchester, 1853, pXXV.
- 70 - Baron Hill MSS 6777 & 6781-3. Under the terms of the Treaty of Utrecht, agreed at the close of the War of the Spanish Succession in 1713, King Louis XIV of

France accepted the Hanoverian succession to the throne of Great Britain and refused the Pretender access to French soil as he tried to journey across to Britain in line with that acceptance. Cf: I.S Leadam "The History of England", London, 1909, p225.

- 71 - T.Swindells, "Manchester Streets and Manchester Men", Manchester, 1906, Vol 1, p104 & Samuel Hibbert-Ware, "Lancashire During the Rebellion of 1715", Manchester, 1865, p16.
- 72 - Baron Hill MS 6785, dated February 28, 1716 & cf chapters 6 & 7.
- 73 - Kenyon MS1172, January 10, 1715/6, Lancashire Records Office, Preston.
- 74 - John Harland (Ed), "Collectanea", Manchester, 1866, Vol 1, p210 & Samuel Hibbert-Ware, op. cit, p16.
- 75 - Quoted Ibid, Published at Dumfries, 1718.
- 76 - Geoffrey Holmes, "The Trial of Dr Sacheverell", London, 1973, p265.
- 77 - Rioters destroyed chapels at Blakeley and Monton, Lancashire. Quoted by Samuel Hibbert-Ware, op. cit, p17.
- 78 - Charles Petrie, "The Jacobite Movement", London, 1948, p159.
- 79 - John Harland (Ed), op. cit, p211 & James Greswell Collection, Chethams Library, p262.
- 80 - Robert Patten, "The History of the Late Rebellion", London, 1717, pp119-20, 124 preserved at A2, Chethams Library.
- 81 - Ibid, p137 & Raines MS VolXXIII, "Memoirs in the Handwriting of the 13th Earl of Derby", p408, Chethams Library.
- 82 - Patten, Ibid.

- 83 - Eleanor Johnson, "The Standish Family 1189-1920", Standish, 1972, p27.
- 84 - J.J Bagley, "Lancashire Diarists", London, 1975, p78.
- 85 - J.D Marshall (Ed), "The Autobiography of William Stout of Lancashire 1665-1752", Manchester, 1967, Vol 14, p342, dated 1716.
- 86 - Criminal Cases in the Eighteenth Century, The Reliquary, 1868/9, Vol 9, p211, Chethams Library.
- 87 - "The Declaration and Admonitory Letter of Nobility etc under the auspices of HRH Charles, Prince of Wales, Steward of Scotland, to those against them and those not yet declared", Collection of Notes on Jacobites, A7 55, Chethams Library.
- 88 - Samuel Hibbert-Ware, op. cit, pp239-40.
- 89 - Gibson MS 935-4, Lambeth Palace Library.
- 90 - Ibid, MS932-67.
- 91 - Bury Sermons, p263, Chethams Library.
- 92 - Samuel Hibbert-Ware, "Foundations of Manchester", p32.
- 93 - James Johnston, "Pioneers of Lancashire Nonconformity", Manchester, 1905, p72.
- 94 - Charles Wareing Bardsley, "Memorials of St. Ann's Church", Manchester, 1877, pp4, 10, 12.
- 95 - James Johnston, op. cit, p73.
- 96 - T.Swindells, op. cit, Vol 1, p104 & Vol 4, p56.
- 97 - Ibid, Vol 1 & City of Manchester Public Relations Office, "Men and Women of Manchester", Manchester, 1979, p59.
- 98 - James Johnston, op. cit, p75 & Diary, Chethams Library.
- 99 - Charles Wareing Bardsley, op. cit, pp24-7.
- 100- See Chapter 6. Paul Langford draws attention to the fact that religious disputes were so avid in Manchester that as late as 1731 it was conflict between Whig and Tory, Hanoverian and Jacobite and High Church and

Dissent in the town that scuppered the campaign for a Workhouse Bill. Paul Langford, Public Life and Propertied Englishmen 1689-1798, Oxford, 1991, pp76 & 120.

- 101- Gibson MS 933-120, Lambeth Palace Library.
- 102- Lyme Correspondence, Rylands Library.
- 103- Panton Papers MS 9070E, TI3b, NLW.
- 104- Baron Hill MSS 5562 & 5563 & Ibid, TI5.
- 105- Ibid, JII50.
- 106- Ibid, TI7 & Baron Hill MSS 5567 & 5571.
- 107- Plasgwyn Papers No123, NLW & Panton Papers MS9070E, JII51, NLW & Plas yn Cefn Papers No2769, NLW & Baron Hill MS 5570, UWB.
- 108- Historical Manuscripts Commission 14th Report, Appendix Part II, "The Manuscripts of His Grace The Duke of Portland", 1894, p316, VolIV from L.S to Sir Charles Hedges, Secretary of State.
- 109- Baron Hill MS 6776, dated October 8, 1714, UWB.

List of References - Chapter 8

- 1 - See Ch 1, pp3-4.
- 2 - See Ch 5, p92 & Raines MS, p146, Chethams Library, Manchester.
- 3 - See Ch 5, pp94 & 96.
- 4 - See Ch 5, pp101-103, & "A Compendious Character of the celebrated Beauties of Manchester", Chethams Library, Manchester.
- 5 - See Ch 5, pp99-101.
- 6 - See Ch 5, pp77-81 & "Answer from one of his Lordship's Tenants", NLW.
- 7 - See Ch 5, pp87-89.
- 8 - See Ch 5, p84, & Some Account of the Revolution in the Year 1688, Baron Hill MS6740, p24, UWB.
- 9 - See Ch 6, p108 & Raines MS, Vol 41, p274.
- 10 - See Ch 7, pp138-9 & pp148ff.
- 11 - See Ch 6, pp133-135.
- 12 - See Ch 7, pp163-166.
- 13 - See Ch 7, pp159-166. In the diocese of Chester, the same was also true of the Blundell family of Ince in Lancashire, cf:p161.
- 14 - See Ch 7, pp140-143.
- 15 - See Ch 6, p145-151.
- 16 - See Ch 5, p87, Ainsworth MS, p167, Chethams Library & Ch 5, pp12-15, Bodewryd MS89, NLW.
- 17 - Jeffrey S. Chamberlain, Accommodating High Churchmen: The Clergy of Sussex 1700-1745, Illinois, 1997, p36.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

General Reference Works

- Atkins, Beryl.T, French-English Dictionary, Collins, London, 1981.
- Cheshire County Council, Cheshire Record Office Guide, Chester, 1991.
- Clapham, Frances.M et al, Factfinder, Galley Press, Leicester, 1988.
- Clement, Mary (Ed), Correspondence and Records of the SPG Relating to Wales, University of Wales Press, Cardiff, 1973.
- Collins Gem, English Dictionary, HarperCollins, Glasgow, 1991.
- Cross, F.L & Livingstone, E.A (Eds), The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1997.
- Fleetwood-Hesketh, Peter, Selected List of Churches in Lancashire.
- Friar, Stephen, The Local History Companion, Sutton, Stroud, 2001.
- Holy Bible, The, New Revised Standard Version (NRSV), Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1995.
- Honorary Society of Cymmrodorion, Dictionary of Welsh Biography Down to 1940, London, 1959.
- Howat, G.M.D (Ed), Dictionary of World History, Nelson, London, 1973.
- Howells, B.E (Ed), A Calendar of Letters Relating to North Wales, University of Wales Press, Cardiff, 1967.
- Hudson, Rev.Henry.A, "A List of the Wardens of the College of Manchester, with Remarks upon an old Manuscript Catalogue and an Early Printed List" in Transactions of the Lancashire and Cheshire Antiquarian Society, Vol 33, 1916.
- Hughes, Richard Rhys, Biographical Epitomes of the Bishops and Clergy of the Diocese of Bangor from the Reformation to the Reconstruction, Bangor, Part VI, 1932.
- Jeffares, A.Norman & Gray, Martin (Eds), Dictionary of Quotations, Collins, Glasgow, 1995.

Le Neve, John, Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, University of London Press, London, Vol VI, 1986.

Lee, Sidney (Ed), Dictionary of National Biography, Smith Elder & Co, London, All Volumes, 1893.

Observations on all the Parishes in Lancashire and Cheshire after the Restoration, Preserved at Lambeth Palace Library.

Pryce, Arthur Ivor, The Diocese of Bangor During Three Centuries, William Lewis Ltd, Cardiff, 1929.

Stubbs, William, Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1897.

Wakeford, Robert, Selected List of Churches in Cheshire.

Williams, E.N, A Documentary History of England, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, Vol 2, 1965.

Williams, W.R, The Parliamentary History of the Principality of Wales, Edwind Davies & Bell, Brecknock, 1895.

Primary Sources

Act for the Building of the Church of St. Annes, 1708, Preserved at Manchester Central Library, Local Studies Unit.

Addy, John, Harrop, John & Mc Niven, Peter (Eds), The Diary of Henry Prescott, Record Society of Lancashire and Cheshire, Sutton, Stroud, Vol 3, 1997.

Ainsworth Manuscript, Chethams Library.

Annesley, Arthur, The Kings Right of Indulgence in Spiritual Matters, 1665, Preserved at Lambeth Palace Library.

Anon, A Dialogue Between Jack High and Will Low, London, 1710, Preserved at Lambeth Palace Library.

Anon, An Historical Account of the Controversies that have arisen respecting the Divine Predestination and the Free Will of Man from early times in the Christian Church to the Seventeenth Century, Preserved at Chethams Library.

Anon, Away with the Tories, Preserved at Manchester Central Library, Local Studies Unit, Broadside Collection.

Anon, Ballad, 1790, Preserved at Manchester Central Library, Local Studies Unit, Broadside Collection.

Anon, Plain Answers, Undated, Preserved at Manchester Central Library, Local Studies Unit, Broadside Collection.

Anon, The Case of the Church of Englands Memorial Fairly Stated, London, 1705, Preserved at Lambeth Palace Library.

Anon, The Declaration of an Honest Churchman, London, 1710, Preserved at Lambeth Palace Library.

Anon, The Dissenters Ditty, 1790, Preserved at Manchester Central Library, Local Studies Unit, Broadside Collection.

Anon, The High Church Legion; or the Memorial Examin'd Being A New Test of Moderation, London, 1705, Preserved at Lambeth Palace Library.

Anon, The Lord Delamere's Letter to his Tenants at Warrington in Lancashire Answered By one of his Lordships Tenants, Warrington, 1688, Preserved at National Library of Wales.

Anon, The Memorial of the State of England in Vindication of the Queen, the Church and the Administration, London, 1705, Preserved at Lambeth Palace Library.

Anon, The Priests Concession, A New Song, ca.1790, Preserved at Manchester Central Library, Broadside Collection.

Anon, The Revolution no Rebellion, Offered to the Rev Benjamin Hoadly by a Citizen of London, London, 1709, Preserved at National Library of Wales.

Anon, Volume of Sermons, Preserved at Chethams Library.

Autographs of and notes on the Wardens and Fellows of Christ Church, Manchester, Manchester Central Library, Local Studies Unit.

Bangor Manuscripts, University of Wales, Bangor, Archive Department.

Banne, Nathaniel, A Sermon Preached at the Consecration of St. Annes Church in Manchester, 1712, Preserved at Manchester Central Library, Local Studies Unit.

Baron Hill Manuscripts, University of Wales, Bangor, Archive Department.

Bate, T, Sermons, Preserved at Manchester Central Library, Local Studies Unit.

Beauvoir Papers, Lambeth Palace Library.

Bele, Walton, A Letter to the Clergy of his Communion By the Right Reverend Thomas Deacon, Bishop... copied from a Volume in the Scottish Episcopal Church Library, 1862, Preserved at Chethams Library.

Bodewryd Manuscripts, National Library of Wales, Microfilm Unit.

Brett Papers and Sermons, Lambeth Palace Library.

Browning, Andrew (Ed), English Historical Documents, Eyre & Spottiswoode, London, 1966.

Bury Sermons, Chethams Library.

Byrom, Edward, Religious Journal, Vol 1, 1688, Preserved at Chethams Library.

Byrom, John, Correspondence, Preserved at Chethams Library.

Cartwright, Thomas, Diary, Camden Society, London, 1843.

Cartwright, Thomas, Final Will and Testament, Preserved at Chethams Library.

Coedymaen Papers, National Library of Wales.

Collection of Spoken Warnings, Chethams Library.

Crossby Sermon Collection, Chethams Library.

De Beer, Esmond Samuel (Ed), Diary of John Evelyn, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1955.

Deacon Manuscripts, Chethams Library.

Dunham Massey Manuscripts, John Rylands Library.

Everett, James, Sermons, Preserved at Manchester Central Library, Local Studies Unit.

Farrer Collection, Manchester Central Library, Local Studies Unit.

Gibson Manuscripts, Lambeth Palace Library.

Green, Henry (Compiler), Some Short Account or Brief Hints of All Questions Proposed, Cases discussed, Determinations made and Other Occurences at the Several Meetings of the Cheshire Ministers held in that County 1691 to 1745, Compiled from a letter of John Howe of London, 1691, Preserved at Chethams Library.

Greswell (James) Collection, Preserved at Chethams Library.

Haddon Manuscripts, Manchester Central Library, Local Studies Unit.

Harland, J (Ed), "Diary of Edmund Harrold, a Manchester wig maker" in Collectanea, Chetham Society, Manchester, 1866.

Harrold, Edmund, Diary (Original), Preserved at Chethams Library.

Heawood, William, "The Manner of the Solemnity of the King's Coronation At Manchester in Lancashire, 23rd April, 1661" in Frangopulo, N.J (Ed), Rich Inheritance, Manchester Education Committee, Manchester, 1962.

Heywood, Thomas (Ed), The Diary of the Rev. Henry Newcome, Chetham Society, Manchester, Vol 18.

Hickes, George, The Genuine Remains of the late Pious and Learned George Hickes D.D and Suffragan Bishop of Thetford, Lambeth Palace Library.

Historical Manuscripts Commission, The Manuscripts of His Grace The Duke of Portland, 14th report, Appendix, Part II, Vol IV, 1894.

History of Prestwich Parish Church, Vol 54, Preserved at Manchester Central Library, Local Studies Unit.

History Of St. Marys and St. Peters Churches, Oldham, Vol 52, Preserved at Manchester Central Library, Local Studies Unit.

Hoadly, Benjamin, The True, Genuine, Tory - Address, London, 1710, Preserved at Lambeth Palace Library.

Illidge, Lt Richard of Nantwich, Cheshire, Diary, Preserved at Manchester Central Library, Local Studies Unit.

Jacobite Collections, Chethams Library.

King and Queen, The, A Proclamation of 13 May 1690, London, Preserved at Manchester Central Library, Local Studies Unit, Broadside Collection.

Lambeth Manuscripts, Lambeth Palace Library.

Legh of Lyme Correspondence, Preserved at John Rylands Library.

Leslie, Charles, A Letter from Mr Lesley to a Member of Parliament, for Dispersing of which Myths was punish'd, 23 April 1714, Preserved in Baron Hill Manuscripts, University of Wales, Bangor.

Lloyd Letters, Manchester Central Library, Local Studies Unit.

Marshall, J.D (Ed), The Autobiography of William Stout of Lancaster 1665-1752, Chetham Society, Manchester, Vol 14, 1967.

Matthews, A.G, Walker Revised, Oxford, 1948.

Microfiche Newspaper Cuttings, Manchester Central Library, Local Studies Unit.

Miscellaneous Papers, Lambeth Palace Library.

Newcome, Henry, Diary, Preserved at Manchester Central Library, Microfilm Unit.

News from Cheshire, Broadsheet, Preserved at Manchester Central Library, Local Studies Unit, Broadside Collection.

Non Juror Notebook, Lambeth Palace Library.

Norris Family, Papers, Chetham Society, Manchester, Vol 9, 1846.

Norwich, Bishop of, The Declaration and Profession of His... Lord Bishop of Norwich Deprived, March 23, 1694/5, Preserved in Ainsworth Manuscripts, Chethams Library.

Notes on Jacobitism, Chethams Library.

Notes on the Collegiate Church, Manchester Central Library, Local Studies Unit.

Ogden, James, "Manchester: A Hundred Years Ago" in Axon, William, E.A (Ed), A Reprint of: A Description of Manchester by a Native of the Town, John Heywood, Manchester, 1887.

Owen, Hugh (Ed), The Life and Works of Lewis Morris 1701-1765, 1951.

Owen Manuscripts, Manchester Central Library, Microfilm.

Panton Papers, National Library of Wales.

Parkinson, Richard (Ed), The Autobiography of Henry Newcome, Chetham Society, Manchester, Vol II, 1852.

Parkinson, Richard (Ed), The Private Journal and Literary Remains of John Byron, Chetham Society, Manchester, Vol 1-Part 1, 1854.

Patten, Robert, The History of the Late Rebellion, London, 1717, Preserved at Chethams Library.

Penrhos Manuscripts, University of Wales, Bangor, Archive Department.

Petitions, Manchester Central Library, Local Studies Unit, Broadside Collection.

Plasgwyn Papers and Printed Papers, National Library of Wales.

Plas yn Cefn Papers, National Library of Wales.

Raines Lancashire Manuscripts, Chethams Library.

Rawl Manuscript, Manchester Central Library, Local Studies Unit.

Reliquary, The, Criminal Cases in the Eighteenth Century, Vol 9, 1868/9, Chethams Library.

Sacheverell, Henry, The Perils of False Brethren both in Church and State, Henry Clements, London, 1709, Preserved at Baptist College Library, Bangor.

Sermons etc, Manuscripts, Lambeth Palace Library.

Schedules of the Church in Wales Records, Diocese of Bangor, National Library of Wales.

Southey, Robert, Espriella's Letters, Chethams Library.

SPG Papers and Correspondence, Lambeth Palace Library.

Stratford, Nicholas, A Dissuasive from Revenge: in a Discourse Upon these Words, Recompense to no man evil for evil Rom 12:17, London, 1684, Preserved at Chethams Library.

Tredegar Manuscripts, National Library of Wales.

True Copies of the Papers wrote by Lord Arthur Balmerino, Thomas Syddall, David Morgan, George Fletcher, John Beswick, Thomas Deacon, Thomas Chadwick, James Danson, Andrew Blide and others and Delivered by them to the Sheriffs at the Places of their Execution, Tower Hill, London, 1746, Preserved at Chethams Library.

Vinegard, Letter to the Reverend at Kirkham, 1691, Manchester Central Library, Local Studies Unit.

Walker, John, An Attempt Towards Recovering an Account of the Numbers and Sufferings of the Clergy of the Church of England...in the the late Times of the Grand Rebellion, London, 1714, Preserved at Chethams Library.

Ward, A.W (Ed), Poems of John Byrom, Chethams Society, Manchester.

Watson Manuscript, Manchester Central Library, Local Studies Unit.

Williams, Bishop, Diary, Preserved at Lambeth Palace Library.

Wroe, Richard, Tracts, Preserved at Chethams Library.

Secondary Sources

Addleshaw, C.O, "The High Church Tradition" in Wand, J.W.C (Ed), Anglicanism in History and Today, Faber, London, 1941.

Albers, Jan, "'Papist Traitors" and "Presbyterian rogues": religious identities in eighteenth-century Lancashire" in Walsh, John, Haydon, Colin & Taylor, Stephen (Eds), The Church of England 1689-1833, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.

Avis, Paul, Anglicanism and the Christian Church, T&T Clark, Edinburgh, 1989.

Axon, Ernest, "History of Manchester" in British Medical Association, The Book of Manchester and Salford, George Falkner & Sons, Manchester, 1929.

Bagley, J.J, Lancashire Diarists, Phillimore, London, 1975.

Bardsley, Charles Wareing, Memorials of St. Ann's Church, Chetham Society, Manchester, 1877.

Batsford, Harry & Fry, Charles, The Cathedrals of England, B.T Batsford Ltd, London, 1960.

Beaumont, William (Ed), The Jacobite Trials at Manchester in 1694, Chetham Society, Manchester, 1853.

Beeching, H.C, Francis Atterbury, Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons Ltd, London, 1909.

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

Bennett, G.V, "King William III and the Episcopate" in Bennett, G.V & Walsh, J.D (Eds), Essays in Modern English Church History, Adam and Charles Black, London, 1966.

- Bennett, G.V, The Tory Crisis in Church and State 1688-1730, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1975.
- Betjeman, John (Ed), Guide to English Parish Churches, Collins, London, 1958.
- Black, J.B, The Reign of Elizabeth 1558-1603, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1949.
- Bosher, R.S, The Making of the Restoration Settlement, Dacre Press, Westminster, 1951.
- Bradley, James.E, Religion, Revolution and English Radicalism: Nonconformity In Eighteenth Century Politics and Society, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990.
- Brown-Lawson, Albert, John Wesley and the Anglican Evangelicals of the Eighteenth Century, Pentland Press, Durham, 1994.
- Broxop, Henry, A Biography of Thomas Deacon, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1911.
- Bruton, F.A, A Short History of Manchester and Salford in Roeder, C in Lancashire and Cheshire Antiquarian Society, Vol 21.
- Butler, David, Methodists and Papists, Darton Longman and Todd, London, 1995.
- Carpenter, Edward, Thomas Tenison, SPCK, London, 1948.
- Carswell, John, From Revolution to Revolution: England 1688-1776, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1973.
- Chamberlain, Jeffrey.S, Accommodating High Churchmen: The Clergy of Sussex 1700-1745, University of Illinois Press, Urbane, Illinois, USA, 1997.
- City of Manchester Public Relations Office, Men and Women of Manchester, City of Manchester, Manchester, 1979.
- Clark, J.C.D, English Society 1688-1832, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1985.
- Clarke, Basil & Betjeman, John, English Churches, Vista Books, London, 1964.
- Clifton-Taylor, Alec, The Cathedrals of England, Thames and Hudson, London, 1967.
- Cobb, Gerald, English Cathedrals, Thames & Hudson, London, 1980.

Collinge, Elsie, Historic Places of Manchester, Manchester Tourist Board, Manchester.

Crossley, Fred.H, English Church Craftmanship, B.T Batsford Ltd, London, 1947.

Cruickshanks, Eveline, "Introduction" in Cruickshanks, Eveline (Ed), Ideology and Conspiracy, John Donald Publishers, Edinburgh, 1982.

Cruickshanks, Eveline, "The Revolution and the Localities: Examples of Loyalty to James II" in Cruickshanks, Eveline (Ed), By Force or By Default?, John Donald Ltd, Edinburgh, 1989.

Davies, John, A History of Wales, Penguin Books, London, 1994.

Dickinson, H.T, Liberty and Property: Political Ideology in Eighteenth Century Britain, Macmillan Press, London, 1979.

Dickinson, H.T, The Politics of the People in Eighteenth Century Britain, Macmillan Press, London, 1994.

Douglas, David.C, English Scholars, Jonathan Cape, London, 1939.

Duffy, Eamon, The Stripping of the Altars, Yale University Press, London, 1992.

Edwards, Maldwyn, Sons to Samuel, Epworth Press, London, 1961.

Ertman, Thomas, Birth of the Leviathan, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997.

Every, George, The High Church Party 1688-1718, SPCK, London, 1956.

Feiling, Keith, A History of the Tory Party 1640-1714, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1924.

Frangopulo, N.J, "The Growth of Manchester" in Frangopulo, N.J (Ed), Rich Inheritance, Manchester Education Committee, Manchester, 1962.

Fraser, David, The Adventurers, University of Wales Press, Cardiff, 1976.

Fryer, W.R, "The High Churchmen of the Earlier Seventeenth Century" in Pinto, V De S (Ed), Renaissance and Modern Studies, Sisson & Parker Ltd, University of Nottingham, Vol 5, 1961.

Glasse, Lionel K.J, The Revolution of 1688 in the North West of England, Lancashire and Cheshire Antiquarian Society Transactions, Vol 86, Manchester, 1990.

Goldie, Mark, "John Locke, Jonas Proast and Religious Toleration 1688-1692" in Walsh, John, Hayden, Colin & Taylor, Stephen (Eds), The Church of England, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.

Gray, Margaret, The Reflection of National Events in the History of Manchester, Manchester.

Haugaard, William.P, Elizabeth and the English Reformation, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1970.

Herford, C.H, "Literary Manchester" in Brindley, W.H (Ed), The Soul of Manchester, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1929.

Higham, Florence, Faith of our Fathers, Student Christian Movement Press, London, 1939.

Hirst, Derek, Authority and Conflict, Edward Arnold, London, 1992.

Hitchen, Mary, Personalities of Manchester, Manchester Tourist Board, Manchester.

Holmes, Geoffrey, The Trial of Dr Sacheverell, Eyre Methuen, London, 1973.

Hoppit, Julian, A Land of Liberty?, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 2000.

Horwitz, Henry, Revolution Politicks, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1968.

Hughes, W, Bangor, SPCK, London, 1911.

Hutchinson, Harold.F, Sir Christopher Wren, Victor Gollancz Ltd, London, 1976.

Hutton, William Holden, The English Church, Macmillan & Co, London, 1903.

Hylson-Smith, Kenneth, High Churchmanship in the Church of England, T&T Clark, Edinburgh, 1993.

James, J.W, A Church History of Wales, Arthur.H Stockwell Ltd, Ilfracombe, 1945.

Jenkins, Geraint H, Literature, Religion and Society in Wales 1660-1730, University of Wales Press, Cardiff, 1978.

Jenkins, Geraint H, "Popular Beliefs in Wales from the Restoration to Methodism" in The Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies, University of Wales Press, Cardiff, November 1977, Vol 27, No 27, (1976-1978), 1978.

Johnson, Eleanor, The Standish Family 1189-1920, Standish Local History Group, Standish, 1972.

Johnston, James, Pioneers of Lancashire Nonconformity, Manchester, 1905.

Langford, Paul, Public Life and Propertied Englishmen 1689-1798, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1991.

Leacroft, Helen and Richard, Churches and Cathedrals, Lutterworth Press, London, 1972.

Leadam, I.S, The History of England, Vol IX, Longmans Green & Co, London, 1909.

Lodge, Richard, The History of England, Vol VIII, Longmans Green & Co, London, 1910.

Lofthouse, Jessica, Lancashire's Old Families, Robert Hale, London, 1972.

Lunn, John, History of the Tyldesleys of Lancashire, John Sherratt & Son, Altrincham, 1966.

Mather, F.C, "Georgian Churchmanship Reconsidered" in Journal of Ecclesiastical History, Vol 36, No 2, 1985.

Mc Adoo, H.R, The Spirit of Anglicanism, Adam and Charles Black, London, 1965.

Mc Cormick, Rev.J Gough, "Sermon" in A Quincentenary Celebration - The Ancient Collegiate Church of Manchester, Sherratt & Hughes, Manchester, 1921.

Mc Grath, Alister, Christian Theology, Blackwell, Oxford, 1994.

Mc Lachlan, H, "Cross Street Chapel in the Life of Manchester", in Memoirs and Proceedings of the Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society, Vol 84, 1939-1941, Manchester, 1941.

Morris, Richard, Cathedrals and Abbeys of England and Wales, J.M Dent & Sons, London, 1979.

Musgrove, Frank, The North of England, Basil Blackwell Inc, Oxford, 1990.

- Newton, Lady, Lyme Letters 1660-1760, William Heinemann Ltd, London, 1925.
- Newton, Lady, The House of Lyme, William Heinemann Ltd, London, 1917.
- Orcibal, Jean, "The Theological Originality of John Wesley and Continental Spirituality" in Davies, Rupert & Rupp, Gordon (Eds), A History of the Methodist Church in Great Britain, Epworth Press, London, Vol 1, 1965.
- Overton, J.H, Life in the English Church 1660-1714, Longmans Green & Co, London, 1885.
- Overton, J.H, The Nonjurors, Smith Elder & Co, London, 1902.
- Patrides, C.A "The High and Aiery Hills of Platonisme: An Introduction to the Cambridge Platonists" in Patrides, C.A (Ed), The Cambridge Platonists, Edward Arnold, London, 1969.
- Petrie, Charles, The Jacobite Movement, Eyre & Spottiswoode, London, 1948.
- Questier, Michael.C, Conversion, Politics and Religion in England 1580-1625, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996.
- Rack, Henry.D, Reasonable Enthusiast - John Wesley and the Rise of Methodism, Epworth Press, London, 1992.
- Reed, C, A Short History of St. Ann's Church, Manchester.
- Rees, Thomas, History of Protestant Nonconformity in Wales, John Snow & Co, London, 1883.
- Rice, Hugh A.L, Thomas Ken, Bishop and Non Juror, SPCK, London, 1958.
- Rogers, Nicholas, "Riot and Popular Jacobitism in Early Hanoverian England" in Eveline Cruickshanks (Ed), Ideology and Conspiracy, John Donald Publishers, Edinburgh, 1982.
- Rose, Craig, "The Origins and Ideals of the SPCK 1699-1716" in Walsh, John, Haydon, Colin & Taylor, Stephen (Eds), The Church of England 1689-1833, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.
- Rupp, Gordon, Religion in England 1688-1791, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1986.
- Snape, Michael, The Surey Impostor, Lancashire and Cheshire Antiquarian Society, Vol 90, Manchester, 1994.

- Spurr, John, "Latitudinarianism and the Restoration Church" in The Historical Journal, Vol 31, No 1, 1988.
- Spurr, John, The Restoration Church of England 1646-1689, Yale University Press, London, 1991.
- Stevens, T.H.G, Manchester of Yesterday, John Sherratt & Son, Altrincham, 1958.
- Stoughton, John, Religion in England 1702-1800, Hodder and Stoughton, London, Vol 1, 1928.
- Swindells, T, Manchester Streets and Manchester Men, Manchester, Vol 1, 1903.
- Sykes, Norman, Church and State in England in the Eighteenth Century, The Historical Association, London, 1930.
- Sykes, Norman, From Sheldon to Secker, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1959.
- Sykes, Norman, Man as Churchman, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1960.
- Sykes, Norman, William Wake, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, Vols 1 & 2, 1957.
- Sylvester, Dorothy, A History of Cheshire, Darwen Finlayson, Henley on Thames, 1971.
- The National Trust, Dunham Massey, Hatfield, Hertfordshire, 1986.
- Thomas, D.R, A History of the Diocese of St. Asaph, James Parker & Co, London, 1874.
- Thomas, Keith, Religion and the Decline of Magic, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1971.
- Thomas, P.D.G, "Jacobitism in Wales" in Williams, Glanmor (Ed), The Welsh History Review, University of Wales Press, Cardiff, 1960.
- Thomson, W.H, History of Manchester to 1852, John Sherratt & Son Ltd, Altrincham, 1967.
- Tout, T.F, Religion in the Seventeenth Century, Manchester.
- Trevelyan, George Macaulay, England Under Queen Anne, Longmans Green & Co, London, 1932.
- Trevelyan, George Macaulay, The English Revolution 1688-9, Thornton Butterworth Ltd, London, 1938.

Vaughan, Herbert.M, "Welsh Jacobitism" in The Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion, Vol 1920-1921, London, 1922.

Walsh, John & Taylor, Stephen, "Introduction: The Church and Anglicanism in the "long" Eighteenth Century" in Walsh, John, Haydon, Colin & Taylor, Stephen (Eds), The Church of England 1689-1833, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.

Wand, J.W.C, Anglicanism in History and Today, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1963.

Wand, J.W.C, The High Church Schism, Faith Press, London, 1951.

Ware, Samuel Hibbert, Foundations of Manchester, Chetham Society, Manchester, 1865.

Ware, Samuel Hibbert, Lancashire During the Rebellion of 1715, Chetham Society, Manchester, 1865.

Ware, Samuel Hibbert, The State of Parties in Lancashire Before the Rebellion of 1715, Chetham Society, Manchester, 1865.

Watson, E.W, Religion in the Eighteenth Century, Manchester.

Welldon, Rev. Bishop, Dean of Durham, "Sermon" in A Quincentenary Celebration - The Ancient Collegiate Church of Manchester, Sherratt & Hughes, Manchester, 1921.

Whiffen, Marcus, Stuart and Georgian Churches, B.T Batsford Ltd, London, 1948.

Wood, A.Harold, Church Unity Without Uniformity, Epworth Press, London, 1963.

Yates, Nigel, "Church Buildings of the Protestant Establishments In Wales and Scotland: Some Points of Comparison" in Guy, John.R & Brown, Roger.L (Eds), The Journal of Welsh Ecclesiastical History, Cardiff, Vol 9, 1992.

Young, Geoffrey, Country Churches, George Philip Ltd, London, 1991.