THE DEVELOPMENT
OF RELIGIOUS TOLERATION IN ENGLAND DURING THE LATE
SEVENTEENTH AND EARLY EIGHTEENTH CENTURIES.

by

George Harold Goff Paul

A Thesis submitted for the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS
in the Department
of
HISTORY

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
OCTOBER, 1951.
CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION......................................................... 1

CHAPTER I.

THE BACKGROUND OF THE RELIGIOUS QUESTION............... 1

CHAPTER II.

THE FAILURE OF PERSECUTION TO UNITE THE ENGLISH PEOPLE........ 18

CHAPTER III.

THE COMING OF TOLERATION ................................. 44

CHAPTER IV.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF TOLERATION ........................... 69

CHAPTER V.

SOME EFFECTS OF TOLERATION ................................. 100

BIBLIOGRAPHY ...................................................... 1
INTRODUCTION.

It has long since become customary to credit the rationalistic movement with the development of religious toleration. From this point of view Christianity is placed on par with all other religions. It is thereby insinuated that all religions are more or less foolish when brought into the clear light of human reason.

Since the writer does not hold this view, in this essay he will endeavor to show that there is another explanation of the development of toleration, and, what he considers to be, a better one. First of all, he believes that the spirit of intolerance is foreign to that of Christianity, and that it crept into the church almost unnoticed in the early Christian era. The early Christian fathers opposed it but could not check it. It soon became omnipresent and by the time of the Reformation intolerance of religious differences was admired as a sign of sincere conviction. So strong did this spirit become that it eventually replaced the spirit of Christianity.

Now any idea that is inherently wrong is bound to bring about unfortunate results. Intolerance, that spirit which sought to compel all people, by secular means, to conform to one Church, was inherently wrong, whether manifested by Protestant, Catholic, Anglican or Puritan.
Not only was it unjust but it could not be put successfully into practice, except in a State where one religious group was in absolute control.

In England during the period 1660 - 1689 such was not the case. Men therefore were compelled to see that there were issues far more important than that of religious uniformity. Consequently they were taught the lesson of toleration in the hard school of experience and toleration was finally officially introduced. Church and State affairs were largely separated and permitted to develop naturally.

Thus the question of religious tolerance had been finally settled in accord with the teachings of common sense. Men saw that such a persecution as they had been carrying out was utterly useless, and now rendered it impossible. Rationalists at this point did great service by seeing the folly of their religious friends who naturally could not see it themselves. Intolerance had nothing to do with the fundamental truth of Christianity but its presence in the Church caused many men to lose their entire faith.

Thus it was the force of circumstance and the teaching of common sense rather than the rationalistic attack on Christianity, that was responsible for the development of religious toleration.

The Revival of Christianity that came after the establishment of toleration would seem to prove that nothing essential had been taken out of its teachings and that the rationalistic movement had not been vital. It rather seemed to show that once this outstanding imperfection had been removed Christianity could come back to its own and soon could exert a greater influence than ever before.
CHAPTER I.

THE BACKGROUND OF THE RELIGIOUS QUESTION.

One great difference between Christianity and most other religions is to be found in its early relations with the secular powers. At the time of its origin no sign was ever given that it was to depend for its success upon a union between Church and State, rather the Founder and his immediate followers enjoined obedience to the "powers that be". They placed the emphasis on the improvement of the life and character of the individual, so that if there was to be any improvement it would come as a result of the example and teaching of those who had accepted the new religion. There was to be no compulsion of secular reform exerted by the mailed fist of a spiritual lord, but rather he was expected to show unto all a more excellent way by example as well as by precept. The two spheres of life were to be kept separate, and change in the political life of the times was only to come as the ideals of the lives of the people of the nation were altered. Thus all parties concerned would be able to watch both realms and in making any changes would be enabled to follow the dictates of their own convictions.

But such a condition of affairs did not last long in the early Christian era. Pagan tradition had been all to the contrary.
The ancient religions were all state religions. The worship of a nation was sacred within its territory and among its own people. But to introduce foreign rites, or make proselytes of Roman citizens, was contrary to Roman law, and was severely punished. (1)


Therefore when Christianity was recognized by Constantine, it was done most cautiously and done largely because of political reasons.

He did not openly announce his conversion but rather tried to reconcile heathen and Christian by vague monotheistic terms. What he wanted was a religion to unite the Empire. It was primarily the political possibilities of Christianity that attracted his attention. To him it seemed to possess a power and a vigour lacking in other religions, and consequently seemed to be so much the more suitable for his purposes.

"Here then was something that could realise the religious side of the Empire in a nobler form than Augustus or Hadrian had ever dreamed of - a universal Church that could stand beside the universal Empire and worthily support its labors for the peace and welfare of the world." (2)


He also expected that this Church, if allied with the State would do as he directed. Thus the spiritual ends of the Church were made secondary to political purposes, and consequently were bound to suffer.

Since Christianity as recognised by the Emperor, was intended to serve his own purposes, by uniting all religious groups in one body, the weight of public opinion was thrown against the person of steady convictions and in favour of the religious opportunist. Thus was a great section of the nation united against vital religion.
As a result of these conditions many beliefs and customs were retained and injected into the so-called Christian Church, chief among which, for the purpose of this thesis, was that intolerant bigotry which would compel a subject or a captive to choose between offering sacrifice, on the national altar or dying.

Under these circumstances Christianity, as it had originally been taught and practiced, rapidly declined until little was left besides an outer covering of ritual and superstitious practices along with a collection of moral precepts far superior to any other, it is true, but yet unknown to the vast majority of the inhabitants of the Empire itself.

The creed thus degenerated became part and parcel of the bellicose marauders of that day; and the execution of the judgments of God was constantly carried out contrary to all His teachings. The popular belief came to be that if a person held a different opinion from one's own, he was ipso facto an enemy of God, a child of the devil and as such should be hurried out of this world.

Nowhere was this spirit more clearly manifested than in the capitulary articles which Charlemagne issued to the vanquished Saxons. As Davis says, "The following articles need no comment:

1. If any man despise the Lenten fast for contempt of Christianity, let him die the death.
2. If any man among the Saxons, being not yet baptised, shall hide himself and refuse to come to baptism, let him die the death." "(3)

Thus by the eighth century intolerance had become so dominant that it had reduced a ceremony of the greatest spiritual significance to one of a value purely political.
For so many years was this erroneous belief put into practice that by the time of the pre-Reformation era, the Shepherds had taken the place of the Biblical wolves and were ready to devour any sheep that could not be driven into their fold. Luther called on his princely supporters to put down the Anabaptists with fire and sword, while the Dutch Disciples of Calvin slew and drove into exile the followers of the peace-loving Arminius, after Calvin had himself burned Servetus at the stake.

By this time intolerance had advanced one step further, it had now become a sign of Godlike zeal. So far was Calvin from perceiving that such an attitude was contrary to the very fundamentals of Christian doctrine, that he wrote on one occasion the following choice bit of advice,

Seeing that the defenders of the Papacy are so bitter and bold in behalf of their superstitions; that in their atrocious fury they shed the blood of the innocent, it should shame Christian magistrates that in the protection of certain truth they are utterly void of spirit. (5)

(4) c. f. Fisher, pp. 195 - 200
(5) ibid p. 195.

How thankful he should have been that there were some magistrates free from that "spirit", instead of reprimanding what he considered to be Professor their slackness. But just as Clark says, such was not the case either with Calvin or anyone else at that time. Rather,

The prevailing note of the theological writings of the century is ferocity. --- Within the Churches, as in their relations with one another, intolerance and exclusiveness pre-
vailed whenever a serious division of opinion arose. (6)

Paradoxical as it may sound, --- there was much in common between the histories of the different churches and sects. Although there was so little communication or mutual understanding between them, there are striking resemblances. --- The tendency to define and persecute was, common to almost all of them. --- Molière's Tartuffe, a satire on the lay confessors who worked among the French Quakers, as well as on all hypocrites, served almost equally well, with a few minor alterations by the translator, as a satire on the English Puritans. (6A)

---

(6A) ibid - p. 316.

Thus throughout the whole of Christendom was present that strange prodigy, a belligerent evangelism, coupled with a hypocrisy which obscured the real spirit and teachings of Christianity, attached a stigma to them where they were seen and added bitterness to the terrible internecine strife of the time.

To this general rule England formed no exception. Christianity had first come to England from the continent and from there too had come that system which so highly featured intolerance. Like the continentals, England had also had Reformation and just as in Europe so in England the mutual spirit of bigoted intolerance had remained almost equally in both religious parties. But in England, unlike most other countries at that time, political conditions had been such that some measure of toleration had been forced on the country, particularly in the reign of Elizabeth. This toleration in the most literal limited sense was to be seen in the creed of the Church and also in the
judicial winking at Recusancy and Nonconformity.

But such a state of affairs satisfied no one and both sides were continually warring with one another, trying to gain ground from the majority or to take it back from the minority. Just as elsewhere, so in England, questions of Church and State were seemingly inextricably mixed. The advice of the moderates was finally left unheeded and the nation divided by war. In the midst of all this turmoil there came forth on the side of the Puritans, a leader, Oliver Cromwell, who, as Mr. Clark says, "Had that rare kind of greatness which combines intense conviction with a generous respect for some of the sincere beliefs of others". But even after he came into power he was forced to allow his own regiments to

Decide all controversy by.
Infallible artillery;
And prove their doctrine orthodox,
By Apostolic blows and knocks."

(Hudibras i, l 197) (8)

(7) Clark, p. 311.


Such an unfortunate state of affairs as this was in itself sufficient to insult the intelligence and provoke the indignation of the people, particularly when they were suffering at the hands of a minority. But other factors also added their weight so that the Government of the Protectorate was not only disliked but roundly hated.
It is quite true that the Government at this time was more tolerant of beliefs than any there had yet been in England. But this good feature was more than outbalanced in the minds of the many persons who were tired of being dragooned into morality by the intolerant moral zeal of the same Government. The result was that,

Even if the bulk of the religious people of England were Puritan, the bulk of the non-religious were now as heartily against the Puritans as they had formerly been against Laud. The rule of the Major-Generals, the closing of the theatres, the frequent interference with sports, the occasional punishment of vice, the arbitrary arrests, imprisonments and banishments, the effacements of the old leaders of society, the abiquity of solider and saint, and the Englishman's latent sense of humour, were all secretly preparing an incredible resurrection of things killed and buried. (9)


To make matters worse the actions of some of the supporters of the Government, added contempt for religious principles to hatred of their secular activity. As Gardiner says when speaking of the Puritans of this time,

On their side were all the worst and most contemptible hypocrites of the day, who found it easy to imitate their forms of speech, and to chatter of saving grace and the interest of the soul to cover the vilest iniquity. (10)

While on the other hand to annoy the Nation,

Their spiritual fervour regarded with disdain the ordinary mass of humanity, and, as always happens, the ordinary mass of humanity was irritated at being so regarded. (11)

Consequently it mattered little how righteous the ends may have been the means used to achieve them were wrong and as always happens the harm done apparently more than counteracted the good.

"Never yet was any effort successful to raise a people by compulsion above its average standard", (12) yet this was what Cromwell and the Puritans had inadvertently been trying to do.

(12) ibid - p. 153.

Thus on practically every side some cause was given to the majority to hate and despise the ruling minority; their virtues were hidden from the eyes of the public by the passion their faults had aroused against them; the nation was tired of the continual turmoil which such an unnatural union of high moral principle and omnipotent civil authority had constantly aroused. They hated the system because of the hypocrites they had seen; and proceeded to pass sentence upon the whole religious movement in accordance with the abuses which formed no part of the doctrines of Christianity itself. However while the great majority in England may be held culpable of passing an undiscerning judgment, a judgment as varied in its origin as it was in its effect, arising on the one hand as a result of pure common sense but on the other from such low passions as envy, pride, hatred and revenge, those upon whom the judgment was passed were undoubtedly responsible. So far had they wandered
from the spirit of the One whom they professed to follow and who had taught that they should love their neighbor as themselves, that it was no longer a matter of purifying ritual and reforming customs of their own because they believed, yea, were convinced that such changes were absolutely necessary, but rather was it a case of persecuting their brother because they thought he was wrong and they were right.

Once again the insidious presence of intolerance was nullifying the efforts of some of the most conscientious and upright men in History. The inevitable came to pass while the enemies made were waiting for their opportunity to take revenge. The opportunity, that they were awaiting came when on Cromwell's death no one was found capable of continuing his work, the nation exhausted by a long period of compulsory thought were anxious to return to the old ways, while those who had suffered under the new Government were more than anxious.

General Monk occupied London and declared for a free Parliament. As Ranke points out;

Nations are not guided by comprehensive views, they are rather impelled by powerful feelings. Charles I. had rendered himself unpopular by his encroachments upon the fundamental rights of the people, by undermining the constitution of Parliament, and by an apparent leaning towards Catholicism. But during the struggle with him the army and the bigoted sectaries had together established a rule far more distasteful still to the convictions and feelings of the nation. It was the dislike felt to a mode of Government which disguised violence and oppression under the cloak of freedom that led to the restoration of the old constitution. (13)

It was to be to General Monk's everlasting credit that he recognized that "The cry for a free Parliament, which was first raised against the commonwealth, was implicitly a demand for the monarchy." (14)

(14) Ranke, III, 311.

All that was needed to bring about a Restoration of the Stuart regime, was a Declaration that would assure the various interested parties of at least a fair Parliament treatment as to what should be done with their property, which in many cases they had bought from the Government during the days of the Civil War and Protectorate, and that the question of their political relationship, as to whether or not they had been guilty of treason should be settled by some act of oblivion. If they were satisfied on these scores and if they received some assurance as to the not too drastic alteration of religion, the whole nation would welcome back the King with open arms. But toleration was not to be won so easily.

Over in France Charles had quite naturally been eagerly watching the political horizon of his de jure kingdom. He, unlike his father, had grown up in conditions that would force him to learn some thing of diplomacy and equally unlike his father he did learn a great deal. Foremost amongst his desires was the wish to be restored to his father's throne and in the process of obtaining his hearts desire he was willing to go a long way towards conciliating the various factions amongst his erstwhile subjects. He was continually receiving a good deal of advice, both indirectly, through royal partisans, and directly through the
messengers of the various parties sent over to sound him out after the Restoration appeared to be inevitable.

Thus when the time was ripe for him to publish some statement of his point of view, it is not surprising that his Declaration was worded in such a way and written in such a spirit as to appeal to the dissatisfied people and give them some plausible ground on which they could come together.

However, he fully realized that he would have to tread softly, since the layer of forming ice would just bear his weight and if he unduly emphasized his presence, he would immediately be precipitated into the icy-depths of Civil War and political despair.

This element of cautiousness was clearly demonstrated in the very opening of his, now famous, "Declaration of Breda". (15)


It was addressed "To all our loving subjects, of what degree or quality soever", and proceeds to offer his services to assist in guiding the storm tossed ship of state past the crags at the entrance to the harbour of political, social and economic confidence, or to give his own words,

If the general distraction and confusion which is spread over the whole kingdom doth not awaken all men to a desire and longing that those wounds which have so many years together been kept bleeding, may be bound up, all we can say will be to no purpose, however, after this long silence, we have thought it our duty to declare how much we desire to contribute thereunto; and that as we can never give over the hope, in good time, to obtain the possession of that right which God and nature hath made our due, so we do make it our daily suit to
the Divine Providence; that He will, in com-
passion to us and our subjects, after so long misery
and suffering, remit and put us into a quiet and
peaceable possession of that our right, with as little
blood and damage to our people as is possible; nor do
we desire more to enjoy what is ours, than that all
our subjects may enjoy what by law is theirs, by a full
and entire administration of justice throughout the
land, and by extending our mercy where it is wanted and
deserved. (14)

(14) Gardiner op. cit. p. 465.

When circumstances demanded it of him, Charles could act with
toleration. His years of harsh education had not all gone for naught.
True one can trace the old Stuart twang in the references to "ours" and
"what God has given us", etc., but there is none of the village-school-
master collection of political maxims, that so delighted his grandfather.
Neither is there any sign of that open duplicity and weak stubborness of
a narrow-minded sovereign like his father; rather one feels that Charles
sees in the English nation a people whom he must woo cautiously and
diligently if he is ever to gain control of them. He has heard and seen
too much of those despised Turkey gowned round-headed Puritans to risk
dismissing them as people of little intelligence and less importance. He
has found out that Englishmen cannot be driven into supporting any set
political theory, any more than they can be compelled to line up to Bibli-
cal standards of morality.

Feeling his way Charles went on to deal with each of the three
major questions that were troubling the people. First regarding the past
actions of those whom the Royalists termed the Rebels,
To the end that the fear of punishment may not engage any, conscious to themselves of what is past, to a perseverance in guilt for the future, by opposing the quiet and happiness of their country, in the restoration of King, Peers and people to their just, ancient and fundamental rights, we declare, that we grant a free and general pardon, which we are ready, to pass under our Great Seal of England, to all our subjects, of what degree or quality soever, who, within forty days after the publishing hereof shall lay hold upon this our grace and favour, and shall, by any public act, declare their doing so, and that they return to the loyalty and obedience of good subjects; excepting only such persons as shall hereafter be excepted by Parliament, those only to be excepted. (15)

Then to make this point even clearer, the Declaration goes on to say,

Let all our subjects, how faulty soever, rely upon the word of a King, that no crime whatsoever committed against us or our royal father before publication of this shall ever rise in judgment or be brought in question against any of them, to the least endamagement of them, either in their lives, liberties or estates, or (as far forth as lies in our power) so much as to the prejudice of their reputations, by any reproach or term of distinction from the rest of our best subjects; we desiring and ordaining that henceforth all notes of discord, separation and difference of parties be utterly abolished among all our subjects, whom we invite and conjure to a perfect union among themselves, under our protection, for the re-settlement of our just rights and theirs in a free Parliament, by which upon the word of a King, we will be advised. (15)

(15) Gardiner, p. 465.

Thus Charles plainly declares that, in so far at least as lies in his power he will do his best to bring about a reconciliation that the various militant differences in the nation may be smoothed out.
Of the various questions that would have to be settled before peace would reign at all, much less supreme, there stood out two that augured ill for any restoration unless they were settled, or at least some promise was given that would tide the worst fears over the early period of the new reign. These questions were religious and agrarian and in both cases reasonable assurance of an amicable settlement was given.

Regarding the religious question Charles wrote the following:

Because the passion and uncharitableness of the times have produced several opinions in religion, by which men are engaged in parties and animosities against each other (which, when they shall, hereafter unite in a freedom of conversation will be composed or better understood), we do declare a liberty to tender consciences, and that no man shall be disquieted or called in question for differences of opinion in matter of religion, which do not disturb the peace of the kingdom; and that we shall be ready to consent to such an Act of Parliament, as, upon mature deliberation, shall be offered to us, for the full granting that indulgence."

The agrarian difficulties were also to be settled by Act of Parliament.

Because, in the continued distractions of so many years, and so many and great Revolutions, many grants and purchases of estates have been made to and by many officers, soldiers and others, who are now possessed of the same, and who may be liable to actions at law upon several titles, we are likewise willing that all such differences, and all things relating to such grants, sales and purchases, shall be determined in Parliament, which can best provide for the just satisfaction of all men who are concerned.

Then to complete this sincere conciliatory offer, Charles declared,

that we will be ready to consent to any Act or Acts of Parliament to the purposes aforesaid, and for the full satisfaction of all arrears due to the officers and soldiers of the army under the command
Thus Charles had done practically everything in his power to pave the way for his return to power.

The problems he had to face were as intertwined as were his offers of peace. The religions were mixed with the political and the economic with both. It was going to prove next to impossible to handle any series of problems without seriously affecting, because of the close relation between them, through the related problems, a much greater portion of the nation. Thus if Charles wished to alter some part of the law for political purposes the religion of his allies or of those most interested in the change would be carefully scrutinized. At the same time however, his pecuniary necessities would force him either to humour Parliament as much as possible and compromise with it, thereby falling short of realizing his own ambitions, or else to seek elsewhere for the means of satisfying his ever-increasing number of creditors. Times had so changed during the past years, that under ordinary circumstances no King could impose his will on the whole nation contrary to their united wishes.

In the realm of politics the long experience of the Civil War had made an Independent out of almost every Royalist, in so far as he was no longer just for the King on principle but because it was to his own interests to be for the King; and as Charles soon found out no one was more ready to oppose him than his most hearty supporters as soon as he thwarted them obtaining some measure to which they were constitutionally
entitled and which they had for some reason or other of their own,
determined to have. Just as the Republican philosopher Harrington was
supposed to have said;

Let the King come in and call a Parliament
of the greatest Cavaliers in England, so they be
men of estates, and let them sit but seven years,
and they will all turn Commonwealths' men. (17)

(17) Hallam, Henry - The Constitutional History of England - eleventh

The implication of all this is that whilst the Puritan Revolu-
tionists had won a war only to surrender their laurels after holding them,
the political principle for which they had fought had with equal stealth-
iness overthrown the old blind devotion to the sovereign, and by raising
themselves had lowered the nobles until they were one in so far as they
were all endeavoring to get control of the Government in order that they
might run it as suited themselves, and not as in pre-Revolutionary days
as suited the King. Thus the Revolution had been an unconscious success
for the rebels.

Similarly in religious questions there was to be an unconscious
victory, but only through force of circumstances. "The English could not
be argued into toleration by their reason, but they could be forced into
it by their feuds." (18) In the pre-Revolutionary days it was that party
in the religious world which had no chance of forcing its beliefs on the
rest of the nation, that first saw that a persecution of those differing
from themselves was not a necessary qualification of inheritors of etern-
al life. When this party, under Cromwell's leadership, came through
force of circumstances, into control of the country, the uselessness and impossibility of persecuting all other creeds save their own was forcefully brought home to themselves and here and there such men as Cromwell came to appreciate the ideal of toleration.

But the fact that Cromwell's Government had learned the necessity of religious toleration was no guarantee that the Restoration Government would profit from the result of his experience, however it does show that just as the Cromwellians found it necessary to be tolerant so when they and their supporters were again in the opposition, would the Restored Parliament be eventually driven into, a grudging acceptance of this principle.

If such was eventually to be the case, much would depend on whether or not the monarch, or monarchs, who ascended the throne would do so, with such aims and ambitions as to eventually drive into alliance and consequently into mutual, at least temporary, toleration two or more ordinarily hostile factions.

But for the first few years was employed the same old policy of trying to unite a nation politically and spiritually by force, with the result that the nation was left more dissatisfied and divided than ever before.
That Charles, the ablest of the Stuarts, lived as he did wasting his time, ruining his health and befuddling his brain by dissipation is both a tragedy and a blessing. A tragedy because such a life greatly assisted in preventing his becoming one of the outstanding figures of History, and on the other hand, a blessing because it likewise assisted in preventing his overthrowing the cause of English liberty and self-Government.

Although Charles had learned much through his many experiences and from observation of the results of his father's life, he had not been drawn one whit nearer Democracy, in his ideals, than had Charles I. In fact he was, if anything, more fond of power and, because he was of a much greater mental capacity and had possessed himself of a diplomatic technique, he was really much more dangerous. The older Charles had been brought up amongst much prattling about the Divine Right of Kings, but his son had seen his father executed, his family and himself driven into exile. A series of events naturally resulting in a very deep resentment and hatred of such doctrines and theories as had led to such a catastrophe becoming a part of his very nature, as did moreover a determination to never again resume his travels just because of his own
wilfulness. Furthermore as a result of his own exile, in contract to his father, he grew up in a land where Divine Right was practiced to such an extent that no one needed to preach it. There

There Charles saw and studied the system which he most admired, one in which the king was all in all in a state united both in religion and politics. There too, he became more and more thoroughly acquainted with the religion to which his Mother belonged and as an adherent of which he would doubtless have been officially brought up had his Father and advisors not prevented this change for political purposes.

In Charles' mind despotism and Catholicism were closely linked. He felt that the former would never be safe without the latter and although,

Charles and James returned to England at the Restoration convinced Catholics, -- (17) -- Charles loved his throne more than his conscience and when it came to a question of politics or principle he followed the course dictated by policy. (18)


Any leaning towards toleration which Charles may have had was based either upon grounds of political expediency or religious indifference. Of any scheme either in Church or State that threatened to check the development of his plans he was absolutely intolerant. All his friends the Presbyterians, to whom he owed so much, needed to do in order to alienate him, was to haggle over the terms of the Religious settlement when the Cavalier party were ready to give him all the support
he desired.

But above all else he kept to his principle of obtaining as much power as possible for himself and only abandoned this pursuit when some unforeseen stumbling block was found, due to the complexity of the various problems to which reference has been made above, a block which threatened on occasion to upset the very throne upon which Charles had so recently been seated.

Such then was the background, likes and dislikes of the Prince who was to rule England for twenty-five years.

The Declaration of Breda, which has been discussed in the last chapter, had an immediate effect. The Presbyterians, and the Army under Monk's control, were reconciled to Charles return, yea, they were even relieved that it was about to be accomplished.

Charles continued his careful conciliatory policy, with even more watchfulness after he had received the welcome of a body of troops that had long fought against the very ideals which he hoped eventually to set up anew. One very good example of the mutual nervousness in which the Restoration was effected, maybe seen in the manner in which both Charles and Monk acted when the latter presented the former with a list of suggested candidates, chiefly Presbyterians whom he was willing to back as members of the prospective council. Charles nervously accepted the list and wondered if this gruff old general was about to play the "mayor of the palace" with him. On the other hand Monk felt keenly the fact that he had worried Charles by his well-meant, but rather unpolished, manners, and hastened to assure him that the list, was only a list of suggestions, and that he did not wish Charles to feel compelled to choose any, much less all, of the councillors from it.
The vision of that high-spirited, well disciplined army compelling him to go on his travels again, flitted as quickly out of Charles' mind as it had entered and very soon all uneasiness had departed and mutual confidence and co-operation had finally taken its place between these two chief negotiators. Charles never forgot the man to whom, perhaps more than to any other single person, he owed his restored throne.

"Till the veteran passed away Charles never ceased to fear his power and love the hand that used him so gently." (19)

Hyde, soon to be made Earl of Clarendon, had long been the new King's chief adviser, and under his guidance, Charles proceeded to continue Monk's policy of bringing about a restoration of all things, at least as far as would be possible. In doing so he was careful to do nothing either illegal or unconstitutional. But even such a limitation as this allowed him plenty of scope. In the old pre-Revolutionary days, the King and his party had been intolerantly supreme. Thus the question that should have been troubling the Nonconformists at this time, was to what extent the Restoration would go. They knew that those whom they had been persecuting were just waiting for an opportunity to get revenge. They should have seen that this party's triumph at the polls was as inevitable as would be the King's yielding to their demands, especially since he was at least to some degree in favour of the demands they were sure to make regarding their common former enemies. Inseparable as were the questions of Church and State, the question of religion was sure to come up and be decided in an intolerant fashion contrary to the interests

of the Puritans.

However in spite of what may seem obvious to us the Presbyterian's placed their trust in what they deluded themselves into believing was the King's promise to look after their interests, when in reality he only said he would do as Parliament decided. Having thus given the lie to common sense they declared themselves satisfied and heartily supported the movement for the recall of the King. "They did not foresee that a Restoration in religion would follow from the restoration in society and politics". As Neal says, "It is hard to account for this conduct of the Presbyterians, without impeaching their understandings."

(20) Trevelyan, p. 335.

However it was not long until they were sadly disillusioned. But first efforts were made that seemed to suggest the presence of a more tolerant spirit.

Shortly after the return of Charles, efforts were made to discover some way whereby such alterations might be made in the Church as would be necessary to permit the inclusion of the Presbyterians. With this end in view it was agreed that a Conference at Savoy should be held the next year, whither should assemble the leading clergymen of both parties in order to discuss the various points which prevented the union of the two groups. Herbert Andrews writing in the Contemporary Review says,

The Nonconformists are often accused of formulating division, but as a matter of fact
they were most of them busily engaged in striving to find the formula for unity. (22)

And so it turned out on this occasion. The King's initial conciliatory gestures had been accepted, and Reynolds, one of the most outstanding Presbyterian Divines had already accepted a Bishopric.

In the conference itself their arguments and objections were, relatively speaking, cautiously worded and supported with restraint. However they found, amongst the majority of their opponents, little or no co-operation. The Church Party by this time saw and felt no need for conciliating these past persecutors. "They knew that they had only to bide their time." The new Parliament to be known through History as the Cavalier Parliament, was just assembling.

The people were mad with loyal enthusiasm. The capital was excited by preparations for the most splendid coronation that had ever been known. The result was that a body of representatives was returned, such as England had never yet seen. A large proportion of the successful candidates were men who had fought for the Crown and the Church, and whose minds had been exasperated by many injuries and insults suffered at the hands of the Roundheads. (24)

Little wonder then that the Bishops felt secure and as a Historian of their own Church says, "


Their writings were written in an uncourteous, and captious spirit, not indicating the slightest disposition to conciliate, but foreclosing the possibility of removing objections: for they said, the alteration asked would be a virtual confession that the Liturgy was an intolerable burden to tender consciences, a direct cause of schism and a superstitious usage, that it would justify past Nonconformity, and condemn the conduct of all Conformists. The document presents an angry defence of Church formulas; and whilst there is much in the reasoning which commends itself to admirers of the Liturgy, the temper betrayed is of a kind which many of them will condemn. (25)


When the time came to revise the prayer-book the task was carried out much as one would expect judging from the present temper of the Church. According to Firth, "Some 600 alterations were made, tending for the most part to make the Liturgy less palatable to Puritans rather than to meet any of their objections." (26)


Thus even the appearance of toleration was thrust aside and the old intolerance blossoming out afresh. Soon the Parliament commenced doing everything in their power to restore the Church to its previous position. The Convention Parliament had already restored the beneficed clergy who for causes of every sort had been deprived during the regime of the Commonwealth's men. Then the Bishops were restored to their traditional position in the House of Lords. With the passing of every
measure that brought the nation closer to the position that they believed they once had enjoyed, or with the repeal of every law that prevented them accomplishing such a task, at every step forward, their vengeful Zeal increased.

Even if the King had been desirous to fulfil the promises which he had made to the Presbyterians, it would have been out of his power to do so. It was indeed only by the strong exertion of his influence that he could prevent the victorious Cavaliers from rescinding the act of indemnity, and retaliating without mercy all that they had suffered. (27)

(27) Macaulay, I, 140.

If in this case his efforts were of some effect, when it came to the task of protecting the Dissenters they were useless.

The spirit which even the followers of Cromwell had possessed to a considerable degree, namely that of intolerance, had absolute possession of many of the new members, and if, as they found they must, they were to forget the greater part of those things that were past, as by revenge, far as obtaining any direct compensation, they were nevertheless determined to get back all that they had lost and to punish those who had temporarily deprived them of those things.

This party at best had been more intolerant than the Puritans. For years now they had suffered many of them without cause for their conscientious opinions. Consequently when they came back to power they would be determined never to loose control again, and to run the country in such a manner, that those persons, whom many of them sincerely believed to be deluded, should never again be able to do so much harm to the Government, the State and the Church.
Nor is it to be wondered that acting as the Puritans had, the Churchmen and the Cavaliers utterly failed to appreciate the real values of their opponents. For this state of affairs the Puritans were largely responsible themselves having hidden all their merits both religious and political under that despicable cloak of intolerance, which never has failed and never will fail to stir up hatred. Under these conditions the attitude taken by the Cavaliers is in no way surprising, however unfortunate it may be that they did not see that by granting some form of toleration they would gain more in the long run than they could ever get from their traditional policy.

In this spirit they passed the first of a series of Acts, now known as the Clarendon Code; a series which irretrievably divided the Church in England into Conformists and Nonconformists, and heightened the spirit of intolerance and mutual sectarian antipathy to such a degree, that had the Acts been permitted to be enforced continuously for several generations, a great part of spiritual life, true religion, and even freedom of thought, would have been crushed out with the quelling of the Nonconformists spirit. This first Act was known as the Corporations Act, passed to assure the exclusion of all Nonconformers from the various offices in the town-governments, throughout England. This task accomplished, they then passed the Act of Uniformity which was to be the heart of the "Code".

It was entitled,

An Act for the uniformity of public prayers and administration of Sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies. And for establishing the form of making, ordaining and consecrating bishops, priests, and deacons in the Church of England. (28)
This act opened with a grandiose laudation of the church as it had been established and regulated in the days of Elizabeth,

Upon the which the mercy, favour, and blessing of almighty God is in no wise so readily and plentifully found as by common prayers, due using of the sacraments, and often preaching of the gospel, with devotion of the hearers. (29)

This statement is followed by a description of the Nonconformists which is quite typical of the spirit of the times,

And yet this notwithstanding a great number of people in divers parts of this realm, following their own sensuality, and living without knowledge and due fear of God, do wilfully and schismatically abstain and refuse to come to their Parish Churches, (29) and other public places where Common Prayer, administration of the Sacraments, and Preaching of the Word of God is used upon the Sundays and other days ordained and appointed to be kept and observed as Holy days. (29)

Such was the product of the lofty judgment of the highly respected House of Parliament. Statements more intolerant, bigoted and more grossly unfair, than which it would be difficult to conceive.

The Act was drawn with the utmost vigour. "On or before the Feast of St. Bartholomew," it declared, "that every cleric of whatever rank soever, must make the following declaration before his congregation:"


Then the Act went on to prescribe the following oath for "every dean, canon, and prebendary of every cathedral or collegiate church", masters, fellows, chaplains and every school master.

I, A. B., do declare, that it is not lawful, upon any pretence whatsoever, to take arms against the king; and that I do
abhor that traitorous position of
taking arms by his authority against
his person, or against those that are
commissionated by him; and that I will
conform to the liturgy of the Church of
England, as it is now by law established:
and I do declare that I do hold, there
lies no obligation upon me or on any other
person, from the oath commonly called, The
Solemn League and Covenant, to endeavour
any change or alteration of government
either in Church or State, and that the
same was in itself an unlawful oath, and
imposed upon the subjects of this realm against
the known laws and liberties of this kingdom. (29)

(29) Robertson, C. Grant - Select Statutes, Cases and Documents -
Methuen & Co. - London - 1928 - last quotations
taken from the Act of Uniformity quoted at
length. P. 57

Today such an attitude if taken by any religious organization,
would leave them open to the highest censure. But not so in those times.
The spirit of intolerance was in the very air, it was not the fault of
one Church or of two Churches or of one group or another, it was the
fault of the whole nation. Intolerance was part and parcel of every Act
of their lives. Consequently until something happened to expose it and
make it no longer possible, such enactments must be expected.

The remaining sections of this Code were well calculated to
fill the Dissenters' cup of bitterness to overflowing. The Conventicle
Act (1664) forbade attendance at the various irregular meetings, resorted
to by these persecuted persons, when all other means of legal assembly
had failed on pain of fine, or on repitition of the offence, transporta-
tion on pain of death if the convicted person ever returned.

To make matters worse the Five Mile Act made these services even
more impossible by forbidding all Nonconforming Clergy to come within
"Five Miles" of the former scene of their labours. This not only reduced the possible number of conventicles but also prevented either, on the one hand, those of such a persuasion having their children instructed in their beliefs by an ex-preacher or on the other, those impoverished clergymen's earning a living at such an employment. Whereas the licensing act prevented all freedom of discussion regarding these questions. But a reaction was sure to set in.

Such acts as these were bound to offend people who were beginning to tire of the continued distractions brought about by such measures of religious intolerance, and if the party was not annihilated by such harsh treatment, chances were that a reaction would come in their favour, because conditions had changed with the times.

"The Church", had, "passed out of the hands of Parliament. The court of High Commission was not revived. The Bishops who had formerly been allowed to persecute by favour of the "House of Commons in despite of the King." (30)


This reaction was rendered even more probable because of the very stringency of the Acts and the intolerance of their supporters.

When the Act of Uniformity finally came into effect some 2,000 Ministers, amongst them some of the best educated and most respected Clergymen in England were deprived of their positions and penniless were thrown out upon the hard mercies of the country-side. Along with, and included in, this group was practically the entire Presbyterian party to whom Charles owed so much and for whom he had done so little.

Already, it is true, to only a small degree, toleration was being
forced upon intolerant people. Many of the Presbyterians had hated the other Nonconformists equally as much as the party that was now persecuting them. But since these erstwhile enemies were now compelled to undergo similar trials, and their means of persecution was removed, they were forced to view their fellow sufferers in a new light in which common sense had a chance to work, so that before long they were heartily co-operating one with the other.

On the other hand many of their former friends and supporters who conformed, without doubt regretted the electoral decision they had made in the heat of their joy at the Restoration, and well did Charles foresee their change of mind when, on meeting his first Parliament and being informed that "The new members were of loyal families, but young men for the most part, he replied that was no great fault, for he would keep them till they got beards." For it was certain that never would England give Charles such a Parliament as they had given him when born along on the peak of the tidal wave of reviving loyalty.

Then too, a decline in religion immediately set in, inspired without doubt by the example of the Court the most notoriously immoral in British History, as to quote the description of the times as seen by that grand Old German of the early years of the War, Prince Rupert, "There never was a period in honest England in which all the virtues, and even the decencies of life were so disregarded." It became popular


to be sceptical, both as a result of thought and also as a result of the
lives of the nobles, who could not stand to be judged by the standards of any Christian Code.

Buckingham and Rochester, Halifax and Temple, Sidney, Essex and Peterborough lightly bore imputations of a kind which in an earlier age, would have been enough to destroy the political career of Pym, Hampden or Falkland. And it is well told that Shaftesbury, who in old days had sat a keen-eyed politician among the Barebone Saints, replied to a fair inquirer, "Madam, wise men are of but one religion" — Which one was that? --- "Madam, wise men never tell." (55)

(55) Trevelyan - op. 347.

Obviously a Court filled with such men as these could not long remain a citadel of religious intolerance, purely because of difference in religious opinions. Consequently while the more sincere and devout persons were learning toleration through common suffering, the members of the governing body were learning it through indifference, the only two ways for the truth to be discovered after it has been obscured by fanaticism.

But there were other reasons why Charles' Court could not long be expected to remain the back-bone of persecution. Charles himself was opposed to such a practice. He was at heart a Catholic and a French Catholic of that period of French History prior to the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. He wished to re-establish Catholicism along with the spirit of toleration, at any rate until such a time as he would be able finally to put down Protestantism (because of its weakened conditions.) But both these ends were only to be means to another and for him far greater, end, the establishment of a despotism of the stock European type. Consequently when his own Parliament adopted such an antagonistic
point of view to his own it was natural to expect him to, secretly at first, and openly later, oppose such a policy. This he proceeded to do.

During the period 1662 - 3 he carried out his policy in two ways. First, because he realized he must move slowly if he was ever to re-introduce successfully Catholicism into the State, he endeavored to persuade Parliament to allow him to use his dispensing power and exempt certain of the Dissenters from the effects of the persecuting laws. And when he found they were obstinate on this point, as Pepys relates, "the King was very highly incensed at the Parliament's late opposing the Indulgence". In his other effort to make some headway towards the carrying out of his plan, he equally failed to make any headway. He wrote to Rome and endeavored to persuade the Pope to sanction his establishing a Church somewhat similar to that with which he (vide the Pope) was having so much trouble in France. "The King wished merely to be assured that the man whom he might nominate would receive ecclesiastical institution from Rome." But the granting of such a request raised so many other objectionable points that the Pope refused and Charles was forced to look elsewhere for the help he required to bring to pass the desired alteration within his kingdom. Charles was evidently Gallican while the Pope was Ultramontane.
The only other power to which he could turn was to Despotic Catholic France. England's traditional foe. But as yet his hands were not free to make the change. Clarendon still held the reins of State.

Now, however mutually hostile the various sections of the English Protestant realm might be, there was one point on which they were all so thoroughly agreed, that if it were raised with sufficient force they would forget all else, even their own feuds, in the process of uniting to meet and settle this old question which was Popery. The idea of no Popery, no wooden shoes was in their very blood. To an Englishman of that day and age the words French and Catholicism were inseparably liked.

The stolid country squire was accustomed to reflect with the mixed emotions of fear and resultant hatred on such events and doctrines as were with him inextricably with all Catholicism. He thought of that horrible event which he doubtless recalled had been received with thanksgiving in Rome, that blot in the page of the history of western civilization, namely the massacre of Saint Bartholomew; or he might ponder over the belief held so commonly according to report, by the Jesuits, the dominant faction amongst the hated French, that it was not necessary to keep faith with heretics, that the end always justified the means, no matter how execrable the latter might be in itself, or how contrary to all tenants of Christian theology or common sense.

After such a consideration no matter who had originally suggested the question in the first place, even if it were one of the hated dissenting clergy, he vigorously denounced the French and the Catholics, hoped that those in England would be dealt with according to the law and in strongest terms declared his antipathy and hatred for any measure that
would make possible such a reign of terror as there once had been in England under their last Catholic Sovereign, Queen Mary.

Now while the Royalist and high church reactionaries were busy persecuting the sectaries, and Charles was eagerly looking for some opportunity to take his own paths and direct his kingdom along ways more suited to himself, and also while the disastrous and unpopular war with Holland was being waged, several events happened which the people instinctively connected up with a pernicious Catholic influence and caused them to be particularly alert against any sign of a reviving Catholicism.

Chief among these events were the plague and fire.

The rationalism setting in among the educated had not yet conquered the middle and lower classes --- they regarded the plague, the fire, and the Dutch in the Medway as a triple manifestation of God's anger against their governors ------ To the popular mind the fire was the vengeance of God, but none the less the work of the French. Louis XIV. was in a state of passive alliance with Holland against England, and though the French did nothing effectual by sea or land, they were regarded by our people as the more dangerous enemy of the two. For they were "Papists". (36)

That last was the damning phrase and woe betide the Monarch party, person, or government, to whom the popular mind attached it.

Such was the setting on all sides when in 1667 Charles dismissed Clarendon, much to the delight of all concerned. To the nation he had been on the one hand the arch-persecutor of them all, on the other, the restraining hand, the object of jealousy, the man whom the king had delighted to honour. While to the king he was the obstinate stickler for constitutionalism, the inveterate foe
of Popery and uncontrolled despotism. As Gardiner has said his fault lay in the fact that he failed to realize that,

Two persons cannot ride at the head of the same horse at the same time. (37)

He could rebuild the constitution on the old lines but he was not the man to reconcile conflicting parties, and his settlement contained the seeds of future strife. (38)

(37) Gardiner and Mullinger - Introduction to the Study of English History - op. cit. p.156

(38) Firth, C. H. - op. 92.

Whatever his faults were, Clarendon had worked hard for his master, and had done much for the House of Commons, in fact every class owed to him a great deal, even his dislike of the Catholics was not entirely doctrinal, he could wish them well to a degree at least. As he wrote to James late in his life,

Your Royal Highness well knows how far I have always been from wishing that the Roman Catholics should be prosecuted with severity; but I less wish it should be in their power to be able to prosecute those who differ from them, since we all know how little moderation they would or could use. (39)

A true statement worthily put.


However Clarendon found himself in a position which had not only been outgrown by Parliament and Sovereign alike, but outgrown to such an extent as to be not only unnecessary but also annoying. Consequently he
had to go and the King found himself free to do as he liked, so long as he did not antagonize Parliament. But he was to find that Clarendon's dislike of unconstitutional measure was to be carried on no longer in the form of advice but by Parliament in the form of decided refusals and vigorous opposition to plans of the King.

It was at such a time as this, when the nation was already suspicious of some popish design in the king's policy, when they were nervously suspicious of the events of chance as coming from some, popish or French source, and when furthermore Parliament itself was determined to have its constitutional rights, at such a time it was that Charles determined to take his chance and start the campaign he hoped would result in the recognition of Catholicism, so hated by the people and the establishment of absolutism, so heartily opposed by both Houses of Parliament. Had Charles tried purposely, he could not have worked out a policy more calculated to unite the nation against him. Even the English Catholics would be against him, for many of them were true Englishmen, hating France and despotism, conscious of their numerical weakness, mindful of their past suffering and certain of what would be in store for them if the king failed as any knowing person would feel quite satisfied that he would. But Charles had to learn from experience and little did he foresee what would be the result of his skilfully planned, and cautiously guarded, attempt at overthrowing the present system, when his bunglesome brother should undertake to enforce the scheme Charles saw to be impossible of successful completion.

The advance of France was about to be checked by the opposing triple alliance of England, Holland and Sweden, when Charles determined to play his hand. He allowed the alliance to be completed, but only in
order to force Louis' hand and make sure of his co-operation in the scheme Charles was planning. This he secured. In return for Charles assistance Louis promised him gold and troops, to aid in introducing Catholicism and an absolute monarchy. All these negotiations were carried out unknown to the Protestant members of the "Cabal" and with the help of the Catholic. But the war was very unpopular. The people disliked and suspected the Catholic alliance.

But even before war was declared the king had annoyed another section of the nation by publishing his Declaration of Indulgence. This document, while declaring his purpose to protect the Church of England, also suspended the action of all penal laws and promised to permit certain approved teachers to conduct irregular services, the Recusants being however expressly exclusive. (40) This declaration coming when it did could not have formed other than a part of his Catholic policy.

Of all the many unpopular steps taken by the Government the most unpopular was the publishing of this declaration. The most opposite sentiments had been shocked by an Act so liberal, done in a manner so despotic. All the enemies of religious freedom, and all the friends of civil freedom, found themselves on the same side; and these two classes made up nineteen-twentieths of the nation. The zealous churchman exclaimed against the favour which had been shown both to the papists and to the Puritan. The Puritan, though he might rejoice in the suspension of the persecution by which he had been harassed, felt little gratitude for toleration which he was to share with antichrist. And all Englishmen who valued liberty and law saw with uneasiness the deep inroad which the prerogative had made in the Province of Legislation. (41)

The House on assembling immediately attacked this declaration as being illegal. It was a critical moment, Shaftesbury saw it and joined the Commons, thus forcing the king to yield. It was the Catholic question that had made the change, as their next action clearly showed.

Throughout the whole nation, throughout every class, had been thoroughly aroused, that old hatred and fear of Catholicism one of the strongest prejudices of Englishmen. And only too well justified was this fear, as was shown by facts revealed later. Charles had been actually encouraged to drop his Religious policy, for the present in order that the war might go on, in return for the promised help of more gold and additional numbers of troops. What an uproar their would have been had this fact ever come to light.

(42) On this point see Ranke op. cit. III, 535.

But by this time Shaftesbury, was "sniffing Popery" beneath the royal schemes. Before this "Charles (had) laughed to himself as he fooled Ashley, and in the spirit of the jest raised him to be Earl of Shaftesbury (1672) and Lord Chancellor; but the man who made a fool of Shaftesbury was running risks for the future. He had not been subtle enough for Charles, but his hatred was terrible. Shaftesbury now decided that there

(43) Trevelyan, op. cit. p. 373.

was something in the nations feeling that some intrigue was on, and therefore lent his influence to encourage them to pass a law, reinforcing the execution of the penal statutes against the Catholics.
But by this time the whole nation was supporting the movement. Charles had found "there were two things which even gold could not buy in that House - friendship towards the Catholic religion and towards the French Crown."

The nation did not know much if anything, but the visible indications of danger loomed all the more big and black, because what lurked behind them was unseen. The unnatural alliance with France to destroy the Protestant State of Holland, the presence of a standing army under officers whose religion was suspect, the ill-concealed Romanism of the Duke of York, who controlled our fleets, and of Clifford, who controlled our, counsel, the abeyance of the penal laws throughout the country and the "flaunting" of papists at court, all combined to create a panic which for a few weeks overcame the desire of pensioners to earn their reward of dissenters to enjoy the Declaration of Indulgence, and of Anglicans to persecute dissent. (45)

(44) Trevelyan - p. 376
(45) ibid - p. 377

Intolerance and necessity were again preaching to the English the necessity of tolerating at least the Protestant Dissenters. Indeed this idea was openly spoken of in the House where the fear of the Popish peril reached its height when on the third reading of the Catholic persecuting Act, and otherwise little distinguished member rosed and moved an amendment to the effect,

That in future no one should be admitted to any office or public position unless he abjured the doctrine of transubstantiation. (46)

and furthermore this position was justified by Coventary who declared that,
For taking oaths like that of supremacy the Pope could grant dispensation, because they were forbidden by papal bulls, but the doctrine of transubstantiation was one of the articles of faith; from these the Pope could not absolve. (46)

(46) Ranke - III, 539.

The Bill was passed and went down in history as the famous Test Act. The disclosure it immediately made was startling. The Duke of York's religion was disclosed as was that of Clifford, with the result that the former had to resign his position as head of the navy, while the latter resigned from the Government and consequently broke up the Cabal. Thus the king's policy of uniting Catholics and persecuted Dissenters was forever blasted, even his active alliance with Louis was shortly terminated, henceforth to be maintained at best, only as a benevolent neutrality.

At this time it was unfortunate for the future peace of the kingdom that some sort of official recognition of the rising ideal of toleration was not given, and that such an act was shelved for several years to come by the revival of Anglican intolerance brought about under Danby's administration, by the King's separation of his mixed policy of Church and State, which had been opposed to national sentiment in both realms, and clinging only to his pet theory of absolutism now rendered this half popular, by obtaining a French-hating, Anglican minister who in himself united two of the dominating passions of the nations and excluded from his collection any one that seriously offended any great section of those in authority.
The King had carefully retained so far, his Cavalier Parliament in order that, much as he wished to grant toleration to the persecuted, the Puritans if they received it should receive it from, and not in spite of himself. But there were other points on which Charles could not agree and was forced to yield to Parliament's wishes, meanwhile checking their zeal for war as his only possible service for his French paymaster and secret ally, Louis XIV. the Despotic supreme. Even Danby definitely laid down the law on this point. "The King cannot hope to rule by force, but no Parliament, new or old, will help him financially, unless he definitely abandons France."


The other phase of Danby's foreign policy which made popular in England was the fact that he not only forsook the French alliance, as Mr. Feiling says, "He himself refused to have anything directly to do with handling the French money." but he also carried through an alliance with Holland, by marrying Mary, daughter of the Duke of York to William of Orange, recently arisen to power in the Netherlands.

(48) Feiling - c.c. p. 164.

But as far as the approach of any general relief for the Pope-hating, loyally English Protestants, there was little sign. Every year the laws were dampening the ardor of the opposing forces by preventing their freedom of worship and even the instruction of their children.
Those anxious to put an end to such proceedings were in a minority in the Houses, and Charles well knew that they would not only work for an introduction of legal toleration but also for a reduction of his power, consequently he retained his Parliament as long as possible, however much it annoyed him at times.

There now seemed to be only one point that could ever suspend the intolerant zeal of the present members long enough to permit any remedial legislation, and that was a revival of the fear of Popery. There was at this time ample material to blast a thousand persecutions, such as was being maintained at present, if it were only available. But it was not. However the chances became greater as time went on, and eventually when the hopes of the tolerant party, now led by Shaftesbury, were seemingly blighted beyond recovery, by his imprisonment because of an injudicious motion, these hopes suddenly were sent soaring far above their former highest point, by the remarkably successful efforts of that infamous Prince of Liars, Titus Oates.

What was needed was the Discovery of a Popish Plot. He wanted recognition and fame and happened to want it and plan to get it at the very time it was most needed. The long sought opportunity had come, Shaftesbury was to have his chance and the Nonconformists were to be safe once more from condemnation to virtual oblivion. But again they were to fail, and demonstrate the fact that rarely indeed can an Englishman foresee any great principle until force of circumstances compels him to adopt it.

Fear of Roman Catholicism was a legacy of the dreadful days of Queen Mary and of her sister's Protestant triumph. That legacy was a possession not of one sect or of one party alone. Cavaliers and Roundheads, Puritans and high Churchmen shared it alike. (49)

Consequently when this fear was linked with the fear of another
Revolution, all else would be forgotten.

Persecution had utterly failed to unite the nation, and had only
increased the mutual hatred and intolerance. However much the various
leaders might speak of obtaining toleration for Dissenters, it was not
made a party cry. Once more the sad result of the mixture of issues
was seen in the manner in which toleration was lost sight of as men were
carried away by the heat of their passions. It was only to be found
possible to unite the nation dampen its persecuting ardor and introduce
tolerations, when all hope of future peace had failed because of the mutual
distrust of King and people, and a man of vision and power having outlined
a satisfactory policy was invited to take over the reins of Government.
With his coming the darkness of perpetual persecution was permanently
riven by the rising sun of toleration. To trace the course of events
culminating in this dawn will comprise the subject matter of the next
chapter.
CHAPTER III.

THE COMING OF TOLERATION.

In the last chapter the great changeability of the passions of the English people was described. At one time they were hunting every Dissenter they could get trace of, whilst at another they were uniting with him in attacking the force that threatened the destruction of both, namely Catholicism. It has also been seen that the persecuting zeal was not possessed in entirety by any one party, rather was it so omnipresent that the intolerance of one group was tending to force mutual toleration on both.

At the same time more and more of the politicians were becoming indifferent to religion and consequently opposed to a purely religious intolerance. But as has been seen no single group was actively interested in toleration, at least sufficiently interested in it to legislate on the matter if an opportunity came. This secular mindedness and religious indifference thus had its disadvantages as well as its advantages. If on the one hand it reduced the zeal for persecution and substituted a liking for toleration, on the other hand, it caused these same persons to be so interested in other things, as not to be concerned about religious questions unless they impeded their political progress, which of course was seldom the case when they were in power.

Then too this movement was not only neglected by the Whig leaders,
but often directly hindered by their arousing a nation-wide resentment against certain of their policies inextricably linked up with the rest of their doctrines. Consequently when their opponents regained power and control they condemned the whole collection of opposing doctrines and revived their persecuting ardour with a vengeance. Such a train of events actually occurred during the late years of the reign of Charles I.

As has been noted previously, the High Tory party was in absolute control of the Government and rapidly exterminating all opposition when suddenly a plot, largely fictitious, was made known to the Government. Instantly all persecution of Protestant Dissenters ceased. Its author and discoverer, Titus Oates, was one of the most infamous men of his day. From his youth he had been,

*Notorious for the most shameless untruthfulness. He had a passion for startling people and giving himself importance by boastful and lying exaggerations, which he spiced with invective on every side, and confirmed with wild oaths.* (50)

That any plot such as he could hatch would be believed by any nation seems almost incredible. However he had managed to get hold of some real information and then skilfully weaving in what ever else he needed, gathering his materials from what he had heard as being suspected or else actually under discussion, he managed to produce a story that upset the whole Parliament, checked the King's policy, helped bring about the downfall of Danby and finally gained a Dissolution.

Almost every prejudice, conscious and unconscious was aroused by
the plot. The popular imagination was caught and held by the remarkable mixture of fact, and fiction, so closely related, at any rate, to what the great majority of the people thought possible. The "Hellish Plot" which he declared he learned of while amongst the Jesuits, was to the effect that there was a plan in existence among these Jesuits, "to fire the city, raise the Catholics in Ireland, conquer England by French and Irish arms, massacre every Protestant who refused to recant, and murder the King." (51)

(51) Trevelyan - p. 384

The effect of this exposure was instantaneous. The King, declared it to be a lie, but nevertheless he yielded to Parliament's wishes and increased his immediate body-guard, all the time trying to fathom what was at the bottom of it all, scarcely able to believe that Louis had reacted against him so suddenly or that his agents, namely the Jesuits, had got out of hand but yet convinced that there was something in existence that must be treated with the utmost caution.

Amongst those accused by Oates, was Coleman, James' Secretary. This man had been in correspondence with the Papal Nuncio and Louis XIV Confessor Pere La Chaise. But he had carefully committed to the flames all the letters, doubtless which he considered to be of prime importance and of such a nature as to incriminate him. However when he was arrested and his house searched, a box was found which contained some of these letters which had either escaped his notice or else had been considered of comparatively so little importance as to not be worth bothering with. However these documents, were construed to confirm Oates statements
Particularly that statement of Coleman's which was as follows,

We have a mighty work upon our hands no less than the conversion of three kingdoms, and by the subduing of a pestilent heresy, which has domineered over a great part of this northern world along time; there was never such hopes of success since the death of Queen Mary as now in our days, when God has given us a prince who is become (may I say a miracle) zealous of being the author and instrument of so glorious a work ------ That which we rely upon most, next to God Almighty's providence and the favour of my master the Duke, is the mighty mind of his most christian Majesty (Louis) whose generous soul inclines him to great undertakings, which being managed by your Reverence's exemplary piety and prudence, will certainly make him look upon this as most suitable to himself and becoming his power and thoughts. So I hope you will pardon me if I be very troublesome to you on this occasion, from which I expect the greatest help we can hope. (52)

(52) Trevelyan - p. 388.

However this and other such writings might, as Macaulay says,

Express little more than the hopes which the posture of affairs, the predilections of Charles, the stronger predilections of James, and the relations existing between the French and English court, might naturally excite in the mind of a Roman Catholic strongly attached to the interests of his church. But,

as he goes on to say,

the country was not then inclined to construe the letters of Papists candidly; and it was urged, with some show of reason, that if papers which had been passed over as unimportant were filled with matter so suspicious, some great mystery of iniquity must have been contained in those documents which had been carefully committed to the flames. (53)

(53) Macaulay - I, 187
Assuredly such a conclusion was in accord with the facts available, and probably the facts of the case.

At any rate things soon began to happen. Within a few days of the discovery of this plot, Sir Edmundsbury Godfrey, a highly respected Magistrate was found slain;

"The jury," in connection with the inquest, "sat all day, and as the evidence was unfinished adjourned in the evening. On Saturday, October 19th, the inquest was continued ---- and late at night the verdict was given, (54) To the effect that Godfrey had undoubtedly been murdered by parties unknown. In arriving at this decision they were largely guided by the medical evidence available. Whether or not the verdict was correct does not concern this subject. The result of Godfrey's death would have been the same in any case.

---
(54) Pollock, John - p. 96. See also Trevelyan - appendix C, p. 523.

The nation immediately attributed his death to the Jesuits, and feared that a general massacre was to follow. Everywhere there was present an incredible amount of anxiety and fear.

Night after night each householder lay down, half expecting to be awakened by the alarm of fire or massacre. The cheerful tramp of the train bands echoing down the frosty streets as he lay awake, seemed to him the only reason why that mad Christmas passed in safety. (55)

---
(55) Trevelyan - p. 386.

The feelings of the nation were naturally reflected in Parliament.
There while men were thronging to see the corpse of "Good Justice Godfrey", and while no one dared, so much as to suggest that the plot might be faults, a declaration was passed in both Houses without one dissenting voice to the effect that,

There has been and still is, a damnable and hellish plot contrived and carried on by Popish recusants, for the assassinating and murdering the king and for subverting the government and routing out and destroying the Protestant religion. (56)

(56) Trevelyan - p. 389

The hold of the Cavalier spirit even on Parliament was thus almost broken and all that was needed to force the granting of a dissolution was for Montague to publish the letter regarding the granting of a pension, to which Charles had forced Danby to agree. This done the Parliament was immediately dissolved. The religious fear had been backed up by an outraged nationalism. Even before this, however in that Parliament where so long there had been the butt of ridicule, where they had worked so long, so desperately, but yet so vainly, Shaftesbury and his little group were now in complete control.

It only remained to see what use they would make of their new found power, and one does not have to wait long to seek that. They immediately set about making preparations to keep themselves in power as long as possible. With this end in view they organized and began to encourage and augment the terror, for well they knew that so long as this anti-popery cry was predominant, they would remain in control. But never once did they stop to consider whether what they were doing for the co
the good of the country, but rather they did it because it seemed to be a means to a justifiable end. But like most unjustifiable means, it in the long run reacted against the best interests of its imitators. Even before the Cavalier Parliament was dissolved the fatal reef upon which the Whig ship of state was to be broken, was in sight. In the midst of the debates Sacheverell rose and asked whether or not

(57) No relation to Dr. Sacheverell the famous clergyman of Queen Anne's reign. See Encyclopedia Britannica — eleventh edition — XXIII, 971.

it was possible for Parliament and the King to dispose of the succession. The question fell like a thunderbolt upon the House and no dared continue the debate immediately. However it was not long until they had not only ruled that they could do so, but had already drawn up a course of action. James was naturally rendered suspect when his own secretary was, even in the eyes of his fellow Catholics, found guilty of treason and especially when this same secretary declared before an examining committee of the House of Commons that his master (James) approved of all he had said and done. If such were the case, the Duke was better apart from then present with the King and one of the members so declared. From this point it was only a matter of time until they would find the absolute exclusion of the Heir Apparent, to be commensurate with their own plans. Accordingly the exclusion of James from the Succession became part and parcel of their plans. Thus James was alienated, a man of whom a tactful and disinterested person might have made something more useful than a permanent deadly enemy.

The Whigs next proceeded to alienate the King himself, by attacking him even more directly. A successor for the King had naturally to be
found. This person the Whigs determined to obtain by persuading Charles to divorce his present wife and re-marry, to which thing they did not expect he would give much opposition. However they did not understand Charles. However much he had insulted and neglected his wife he was not prepared to eclipse all with this final insult, especially when it was urged upon him by a party he so much detested. But what was of even greater importance to him if he repudiated his wife, a member of the Portuguese family Braganza, a pawn in Louis' game, he would also loose his most useful ally France, and consequently all possibility of putting into execution his favorite policy, Despotism. He therefore refused and forced the Whigs to look elsewhere for a candidate.

Now "the Whig was a combination of part of the aristocracy with the middle class to wrest political power from the Crown, and to force the squirearchy and the bishops to grant toleration to dissent." In their

(58) Trevelyan - p. 389.

Green Ribbon Club they comprised the first political party, organized along modern lines, to exist English history, and what is more important it possessed what most of the parties today have, namely an all-consuming selfishness.

This characteristic is amply demonstrated by their further discussion of the Succession. If James was removed the next direct in line of Succession was Mary, Princess of Orange. But she was married to one of the most astute politicians of his time and certain not to be the docile pawn that the Whigs, at this time wished their candidate to be.
Consequently they passed by Mary and took up the case of Monmouth and started the yarns by which they endeavored to prove that after all, this son of Charles II, was legitimate and had been born in wed-lock.

Thus not only Charles but also William was temporarily alienated by that party whose ideals were most compatible with his own. And along with these was gradually going that conservative element in the nation whose backing was most essential for Shaftesbury's success. No matter how low the standards of public morality had declined, it was nothing short of an insult to attempt to place on the throne a person such as Monmouth, who, according to the most recent evidence was not a son of Charles. Thus Shaftesbury was courting disaster the minute he declared for Monmouth.

Another factor contributing towards this alienation, was the farcical administration of justice meted out to many of the accused Catholics. But this was only one part of their practice of intolerance.

Never did a majority more ruthlessly use its power; twice at least a member was expelled the House for aspersing the complete credibility of Titus Oates, and the excellent Pepys went to the Tower under a charge of Popery. During the agitation of 'Petitioners' and 'Abhorrem' this tyranny rose to its climax. Abhorrence was styled 'to betray the liberty of the subject, and contributes to the design of subverting the ancient legal constitution of this Kingdom'. The Commons expelled a member for this 'crime against known law', as the speaker had the audacity to call it. They sent their sergeant, the famous 'Take him, Topham', careering all over England to arrest delinquents even those not members of their House. They impeached judges on general charges such as 'favoring Papists', imprisoned grand juries for loyal addresses, and prepared like their less cautious successors of 1709, to prosecute clergymen for foolish sermons. (59)

(59) Feiling - p. 177.
In the country the Whigs were as much in control as they were hated by the extreme Tories. Their perfection of organization and agitation placing them far ahead of their opponents. Consequently as they alienated the more conservative elements, the part of the nation came more and more to trust the king, until they became utterly servile in their adoration of him and his position. This would never have happened had the Whigs used some moderation, but this trait seemed almost foreign to them and the more annoyingly the King acted towards them so much the more violent did their measures become.

When in August 1679, Charles was seriously ill the country was threatened with civil war, it was the Whigs that would have been the aggressors, their political organization serving them in good stead. Again in the same year, the Whigs so worked up those taking part in the procession on the night of the Pope-burning parade that many feared a war might come anew, and not as previously, forced on the nation by some great all-important principle, but rather because of the selfishness of the Whigs.

The reviving Cavalier sentiment only needed a few such causes as this to entirely regain their past hatred of the Whigs and all they stood for. These occasions were soon found in the continued recklessness of the supporters of Shaftesbury. Monmouth returned and was almost openly supported. James was presented to the Grand Jury as a Popish Recusant, while Louise de Querouaille, the chief agent of Louis XIV, and, incidentally one of the King’s many mistresses, was indicted as a common nuisance.

Finally in the Oxford Parliament, Shaftesbury refused to support even a regency of William and Mary in the name of James. The Whigs expected that the King would be forced to yield because of lack of money.
But they had reckoned without Louis, who fearful lest they should attack him agreed to pay Charles a sum sufficient to permit him to rule without Parliament, and thus obtain his revenge. When the Whigs had rejected their final offer, one incidently Charles must have been most unwilling to make, Parliament was dissolved and their party blasted until William reconciled by Monmouth's death, called them together again after the Revolution. Once more the cause of freedom had suffered because of the selfishness of her foremost opponents.

The reaction that followed was the inevitable result of their own tyranny. The nation, driven into recognising their danger, and the futility of persecuting their Dissenting brethren grew tired of following such leaders and did not put up much resistance or create much disturbance when they were one by one removed from power.

The object support with which the Tories now backed the King was particularly noticeable. James now, in their eyes, became a long-suffering hero, and they, while savagely persecuting the Dissenters, considered it a breach of etiquette to speak against the Prince's religion.

Shaftesbury's papers were seized and amongst them a very useful list of Magistrates which he felt sure he could rely on. These were called "worthy men". On the other hand he also had a list of those whom he knew were hostile to his interests - these he called men worthy to be hanged. "To turn 'worthy men' off the bench, and to put 'men worthy' in their place was a task of which Charles could appreciate the full humour."

(60) Trevelyan - p. 419.
upon the spiritual enemies of the Church, this time envenomed and frequently directed because of past political actions. As Dr. Stoughton writes,

Throughout the last three or four years of the reign of Charles II the persecutions carried on against the nonconformists increased in violence; and the cause is to be found, not only in the religious character of the victims, but in the political course which they felt it their duty to pursue. Indeed latter in some cases mainly excited the party in power. Nonconformists generally had supported members of the Opposition at the last three elections. They were known to be advocates of constitutional liberty against the despotic designs of men in high places. "Which alone", observed John Howe, and his testimony is most trustworthy, "and not our mere dissent from the Church of England in matters of religion, wherein Charles II was sufficiently known to be a Prince of great indifferency, drew upon us, soon after the last of those Parliaments, that dreadful storm of persecution that destroyed not a small number of lives in goals, and ruined multitudes of families." (61)

(61) Stoughton - IV, 68, and note.

However Charles was careful to carry his friends with him, and not to needlessly antagonise them. As Green says,

In 1683 the Constitutional opposition which had held Charles so long in check lay crushed at his feet. A weaker man might easily have been led to play the mere tyrant by the mad outburst of loyalty which greeted his triumph. ------ But Charles saw that immense obstacles still lay in the road of a mere tyranny. ------ He was careful therefore during the few years which remained to him to avoid the appearance of any open violation of public law. ------ But while cautious to avoid rousing popular resistance, the moved coolly and resolutely forward on the path of despotism. (62)

(62) Green, J. R. - "England" - Peter Fenelon Collier & Son - New York - 1900 - IV, 1.
With the courts in their hands, the Tories gradually began to make their presence felt. Some of the members of the Green Ribbon Club were sought out, tried, and executed. But they were not satisfied with the smaller trophies but proceeded to attack Shaftesbury. "But Shaftesbury could not legally be tried outside London, and there no jury would convict him. The rejoicings by which the City celebrated his acquittal occasioned the last Whig demonstration of this period". (63)

But even Shaftesbury's acquittal seemed only to encourage the Tories to greater efforts. London had long been a republican thorn in the flesh of the Despotic Tories.

The capital rejoiced in an accumulation of privileges which had gradually grown up and yet were closely connected with one another and which gave it, with regard to internal administration and jurisdiction, a high degree of independence. It seemed to foreigners that the city was, as it were, a republic by the King's side. It ought to have been remembered that the independent spirit of the city and its religious and political temper, as opposed to an Anabaptist and republican government, had given one of the most important impulses to the Restoration. Now it was only felt that the agitation in the Capital became very inconvenient to the King's Government also, and it was thought necessary to take measures against it. (64)

The result of these measures was two Tory sheriffs were elected by a mixed policy of fraud and violence. These men appointed the juries, consequently the Whigs no longer felt that there was any hope of even
Justice for themselves.

The true policy of the Whigs was to submit with patience to adversity which was the natural consequence and the just punishment of their errors, to wait patiently for that turn of public feeling which must inevitably come, to observe the law, and to avail themselves of the protection, imperfect indeed, but by no means nugatory, which the law afforded to innocence. (65)

(65) Macaulay, p. 208.

But such a temporising policy was beyond the possibilities of the Whigs. They could only wait when they could do nothing else. Now they determined to appeal to arms. But as was inevitable their plot failed. "Cowardly traitors hastened to save themselves, by divulging all, and more than all, that had passed in the deliberations of the party."

(66) Macauley, II, 209.

The effect of this plot was, as had doubtless been foreseen by many, only to strengthen the reactionary Tory Movement and further discredit the other party. Evelyn describes the result as follows,

The public was now in great consternation on the late plot and conspiracy; his Majesty very melancholly, and not stirring without double guards; all the avenues and private doors about Whitehall and the Park shut up, few admitted to walk in it. The Papists, in the meantime, very jocund; and indeed with reason, seeing their own plot brought to nothing, and turned to ridicule and now a conspiracy of Protestants, as they call them. (67)

Everything was now in the King's hands and he could do just about
as he wished. Several of the leading Whigs and members of the Plot were
put to death, Charles meanwhile following up his advantage and making
his Government still more despotic. Local self-Government was now all
but abolished, the Charters thus taken from the towns and renewed in such
a way as to place the authority in the hands of the King. Then, although
there was no censorship yet such a rigid scrutiny of all opinions both
public and private, was kept, that "there was no more freedom of the press
than in the days of Laud. Whig pamphlets only appeared by stealth, and
words uttered in private and in public were more guarded than in the days
(68) of the Star Chamber." This was the second Stuart tyranny.

(68) Trevelyan, p. 425

Thus had Charles obtained part of his hearts desire a Despotism.
But he had obtained this only as a result of an alliance with a persecut-
ing Anglicanism, an alliance however nauseating to himself, nevertheless,
absolutely essential for the even partial attainment of his ambitions.
Charles saw this and wisely kept from disturbing his friends, for he had
twice seen the affects of trying to introduce Catholicism, and the last
reaction had been even worse than the first. Thus he had practically
been forced to give up hope of ever re-establishing Catholicism. If
Charles's successor would continue the persecution of both Dissenters and
Catholics, the Despotism might last, so cowed was the nation. But just
as sure as an attempt was made once more to foist Catholicism on the
people in a despotic manner, so surely would both despotism and intoler-
ance be ended. The English, through inertia, might slip into despotism,
but they never could be driven into it, especially if it was openly linked with Catholicism. As Trevelyan says, "If an attempt were made to convert it into a Catholic Despotism there would be hope for England yet." 

(69) Trevelyan - p. 425.

Everything then depended on James' character and the spirit in which the nation received him. Charles had been content to let sleeping dogs lie in hopes that they would the sooner die, but James was just calculated to awaken them and make them angrier than ever before. Such were the conditions when Charles died and James became king, swept on to his throne by the wave of loyal fealty and love sincerely felt for the time being, for the good-natured Charles.

All that the nation knew of James was not to his discredit. He had been a successful soldier under Turenne and had filled the position as admiral of the British fleet, quite satisfactorily. He had been made the butt of a great deal of persecution and had likewise been made the object of a great deal of devotion, on the part of the High Tories since the downfall of Shaftesbury and the Whigs. It is true that the nation knew him to be a Catholic, however,

As Duke of York he had worshipped God in private, and had said little in public about his religion; it was not yet known that the Jesuits had held their congregation under his roof. Churchmen therefore believed that he would always treat his creed as a private matter. It was on this supposition that they had placed a Popish Prince on the throne, and armed him with greater powers than had been enjoyed by his Protestant predecessors. (70)

(70) Trevelyan - p. 427.
His earliest act as Sovereign was well calculated to increase this favourable impression.

"I have", he declared to the Council within a quarter of an hour of his brother's death, "been reported to be a man for arbitrary power, but that is not the only story that has been made of me; I shall make it my endeavour to preserve this government both in Church and State as it is now by law established. I know the principles of the Church of England are for Monarchy, and the members of it have showed themselves good and loyal subjects; therefore I shall always take care to defend and support it". (71)

All the suspicions of a Catholic Sovereign seemed to have disappeared. "We have the word of a King", ran the general cry, "and of a King who was never worse than his word". (72)

However his opposing characteristics were even more important.

Of all the Stuart rulers James is the only one whose intellect was below mediocrity. His mind was dull and narrow though orderly and methodical; his temper dogged and arbitrary but sincere. His religious and political tendencies had always been the same. He had always cherished an entire belief in the royal authority and a hatred of Parliaments. His main desire was for the establishment of Catholicism as the only means of insuring the obedience of his people; and his old love of France was quickened by the firm reliance which he placed on the aid of Lewis in bringing about that establishment. But the secrecy in which his political action had as yet been shrouded and his long absence from England had hindered any general knowledge of his designs. (73)
One more quotation completes the picture. James possessed that proud stubborn stupidity so characteristic of the earlier Stuarts and so utterly lacking in his brother.

He was not at all disposed to employ himself, on ascending the throne, in considering and thoroughly studying his position as king in its various bearings; he belonged to the number of those rulers who take up a distinct position as princes of the blood, and maintain it unaltered after their accession to power. (74)

(74) Ranke - IV., 212.- 213.

But utterly contradictory as there two estimates of James II's character may appear, there is no greater discrepancy between them than there was between the opinions held by James and the Church. The Church and the Cavalier party in general believed that James would be well satisfied with a High Dissent persecuting Tory policy. This fact was early evinced by,

A unanimous report from the Committee of Religion 'which suggested a petition to the Crown for the enforcement of the laws against all Dissenters whatsoever, and only extreme pressure on bishops, members, and placeman managed to quash it.' (75)

(75) Foiling, p. 206. p. 207.

Already he was beginning to differ with his Parliament on the question of religion;

From the first indeed there were indications that James understood his declaration in a different sense from the nation. He was resolved to make no disguise of his own religion; the chapel in which he had hitherto worshipped with closed doors was now
thrown open and the King seen at mass. He regarded attacks on his faith as attacks on himself, and at once called on the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London to hinder all preaching against Catholicism as a part of their "duty" to their king. He made no secret of his resolve to procure freedom of worship for his co-religionists while still refusing it to the rest of the Nonconformists, whom he hated as republicans and Exclusionists. (76)

(76) Green, p. 156

Thus already a cloud was gathering on the horizon that threatened to bring a storm of trouble. But for the meantime the fanatical love for the King was too strong. The question of religion was passed over even in this new Tory Parliament, which at the King's wish in order, contrary to custom, granted the King a revenue for like. Then occurred the event which alone was necessary to rouse the loyalty of the country to fanaticism, the invasion by Monmouth. This was quickly repelled and the leaders, including Monmouth, executed. But the manner in which those poor persons who had aided the Rebellion, were hunted out by Kirke and his Lambs, and gloated over by that inhuman wretch Judge Jeffreys, is too revolting to narrate. But fierce as this persecution was it did not arouse any great resentment. Everyone felt that they were rebels and as such should be punished. But James did not understand why it was that they were meekly putting up with such treatment. In his stupid way, he came to think that he could do just what he liked with the people, even in spite of their c/\..\., and do so just as readily and effectively as he had done with the rebels. Thus he felt free to do as he liked and, in spite of the example of his brother, began to make preparations to foist
Catholicism upon the nation. The Tory members of his Council were gradually weeded out. Halifax was dismissed in the fall of 1685, because he dared oppose the open breach of the Test Act. Later on Rochester was driven out because he refused to turn Catholic. Within a short time James was left with only a few Councillors and those of the very worst type for his own best interests.

Sunderland, though he did not announce his conversion till the summer of 1688, early showed that he had an open mind on the great controversy; he, therefore, with Jeffreys, the Jesuit Petre and some Catholic Lords, remained as the Counsellors who cheered James on to his ruin. (77)


But James did not need much encouragement the second time he met his Parliament, they were very much annoyed by the size of the Army which he had gathered about himself and wished him to reduce it; he on the other hand wanted them to repeal the Test Act and thus make legal his appointment of Catholics as officers in the Army. This the Parliament refused to do and were accordingly dissolved, to meet no more under the authority of James.

Meanwhile James was being greatly annoyed from another quarter. The English Church, so long abjectly loyal to the Government was once more attacking Catholicism with right vigorous blows, since it had begun once more to make inroads in their Church. James had forbidden them to discuss such questions and when they refused, he formed, contrary to law the Court of High Commission and suspended the offenders, all the while leaving vacant various appointments or else appointing those most inclined
towards Catholicism.

This same policy he carried out in the judicial realm, where shortly the greater proportion of the offices were in his hands. Consequently from a technically legal standpoint he could do almost anything he wished to do. But he had gone as far as he was to go without running into fierce opposition. Loyal as the English were they soon let the King know that Catholicism was not going to be established in their kingdom with their consent. They had seen and heard too much about the actions of those religionists to have consideration at all for such a line of action as the King had apparently laid down for himself. Just recently they had had another all too vivid example of the horrible intolerance of the Papist. The Edict of Nantes had been revoked and all Protestants commanded to recant.

In 1681 Louis began his atrocious system of dragonnating, which consisted on billeting ten or twelve military brigands in a Protestant family, with authority to do anything short of murder, for the conversion of its members to Popery. Cures shouted to there new apostles, "Courage, gentlemen, it is the will of the King". (78)

There persecutions had become a staple of conversation in many an English home; and many an English heart palpitated with deep sympathy, as stories of violence and suffering fell upon the ear. Each fresh gust of intolerance, as it broke on France, stirred the feelings of English Puritans, scarcely less than the feelings of French Protestants living on this side Dover Straits. (79)

(78) Stoughton - p. 75.
(79) ibid - p. 75.

No wonder then, with this as a possible advance edition of what might happen in England, when the King was breaking every law he wished
and declared he could do so legally, it is small wonder indeed that the Church and the Tories turned against him.

But James, the Royal Mole, as Dickens called him, had not yet had enough. He seems to have lost all common sense and like the proverbial ship, let himself drive. And if ever any ship headed straight for the crags, his bark of state certainly did. Even his fellow-Catholics could not advise him, he was absolutely given over to a fanatic of a group of fanatics, Father Petre. Consequently when he saw he had practically no supporters he determined to find them amongst those whom he had lately been persecuting, the hated Dissenters.

But his volte-face was too sudden, they well knew it to be but a hug that they might be squeezed later. Consequently they were very slow about accepting the King's overtures of friendship towards friendship. Moreover he was not the only one promising them toleration.

Meanwhile he began an attack on the freehold property of the Church which further alienated him from the people. In order to make Oxford University a Catholic seminary, the fellows from Magdalen College were ejected by him.

It was at this time that James issued his first Declaration of Indulgence to all Dissenters, to be followed by another boasting of the appointment of Catholics to various offices which they were not entitled by law to hold.

In this tense atmosphere the spirit of toleration actually begins to work. Those who had long believed in it or like the Presbyterians had been forced to practice it, found it spreading because of the mutual fear of a reviving persecuting Papistry. The Puritans had always been very firm for legality and were not very anxious to accept anything even if
it were a boon if it came in a way that was liable to prove detrimental to the Nation.

When there was a general meeting of the ministers to consider of their behavior in this crisis, and two messengers from Court waited to carry back the result of the debate, Mr. Howe delivered his opinion against the dispensing power, and against every thing that might contribute assistance to the Papists to enable them to subvert the Protestant religion. Another minister stood up and declared that he apprehended their late sufferings had been occasioned more by their firm adherence to the constitution, than their differing from the establishment; and therefore if the King expected they should give up the constitution and declare for the dispensing power, he had rather, for his part, lose his liberty, and return to his former bondage. (80)

(80) Neal - vy. 33.

But there was no danger of this, the Bishops, themselves having rallied to the cause of freedom and refused to obey the King and become party to his illegality, these men would be anything but anxious to send men back to their former state who were ready to stand by them now. Speaking of the church leaders, Neal narrates,

In this distress they turned their eyes all around them for relief, they applied to the dissenters, giving them the strongest assurances of a comprehension and toleration in better times, if they would but assist in delivering them out of their present troubles. (81)

(81) Neal - vy. 36 & 37.

At long last these men were beginning to approach that place wherein they could see each other's humanity and not merely the difference of
Thus it would be possible for them to carry out a common purpose. Of course it was necessary that the fruit of this tree should be picked immediately or else, as had often happened before, it might wilt, but this time never to bear again.

There was no one in England capable of successfully reconciling the various differences and in desperation all eyes turned to William of Orange, as a last resort.

In him they felt they had found one who would be able to solve their problems and establish peace and rest once more. With Monmouth's death, the way had been opened for the reconciliation between the Whigs and William. William had long been accustomed to managing a Protestant-Catholic alliance and not having his eyes closed to all but religious questions he had become more tolerant than most men of his day and age. Before he gave a decision as to what attitude he would take to the English problem he carefully weighed all the evidence obtainable and then declared against his father-in-law's decision.

He publicly replied that he hoped to see the Penal laws reduced, and freedom of conscience secured for Catholics, as well as freedom of public worship for Protestant Dissenters; but that he would not support the abrogation of those tests which excluded members of the Church of Rome from office. (82)

(82) Trevelyan - p. 441.
tion to William the flight of James.

The Pope and the anti-Jesuit section of the Church all over Europe, and the peaceable English Catholics, were satisfied with an offer which would save them from reprisals for the Jesuit policy. The Dissenters learnt that they would secure toleration. The Church was assured that the dykes which pend out the Roman flood would again be repaired. (83)

(83) Trevelyan - p. 441

Thus as a result of the fanaticism of the Whigs, the persecuting zeal of the Tories and the stupid "bunglesomeness" of James had been forced upon the people the recognition of the necessity of some form of toleration; whilst in William they expected to find the man who could lay a foundation that would outlast the natural reactionaries.
CHAPTER IV.

THE

ESTABLISHMENT OF TOLERATION.

No nation can be continually tormented without eventually attacking the source of its annoyance. James evidently thought a nation could. The English since the Restoration of the Stuarts had endured much and without doubt they would have endured much more had James not goaded them into action. However unfortunate such a course of procedure was for James, it certainly was fortunate for his subjects.

Very seldom, indeed, has anyone done so much for any cause to which they were so opposed as James has done for that of religious liberty. Both Charles and James had been interested in some measure of toleration. "But the toleration which the Stuarts wanted was toleration of Roman Catholics".

Furthermore they wanted their co-religionists tolerated in order that they might in time supplant and persecute the very persons who tolerated them. This fact had, of course, come to light and, as has been seen, had stirred up so much strife that the Protestants were willing to allow one another to worship God in peace, that they might, for the time being separate the political from the spiritual, unite and maintain their political rights, and in this case also their religious. Now if it had not been for James' foolishness his real intention would never have been known, his own plan of intolerant toleration rejected nor real toleration introduced in its stead, a toleration based on a distinction between matters secular and spiritual. But he did blunder on and thus stirred up the animosity which finally put an end to his reign.

Those who still remained loyal to him, advised him to alter his course, but he refused to listen to them.

Religious and personal motives co-operated to influence him, now as always. The Religious motive was that he would have had to concede to a Parliament summoned under these circumstances the continuance of the test oaths, which it was his precise object to abolish, he held this to be incompatible with his religious duty. And personally, it was just by the Tories that James II., felt himself most bitterly wronged; he was unwilling to procure for them the advantage which would have lain in the summoning of a Parliament in legal fashion and on their urgent request. Moreover he had promised his wife to follow her as soon as possible. Without even hearing the deputies of the lords he carried out his flight from Rochester to France to which no one any longer offered opposition. (85)
He did not even pause to make preparations for the maintenance of order during his absence. Not even all of the writs for an election were sent out.

The days that followed the flight of James saw even greater confusion in England than the months which preceded the Restoration, or those which ushered in the Civil War. Then there had been too many claimants to legal authority now there was no legal authority at all. Travellers were searched upon the roads by no warrant save that of public safety, villages were held by mounted men, the town gates by militia, in no name save that of the Protestant religion. The gentry and middle classes were up in arms, expectant of the unknown, while mobs were seeking Catholic Chapels and mansions, as the first rite in a saturnalia of thieves. Englishmen were drawn out as for war, armed, excited, in the grip of panic, ready to plunge the sword into one another at a word. (86)

But they did not do it, partly because they had profited from their experiences or those of their fathers, during the Civil War, and partly because of the presence of William and his army.

Order and set purpose were found only upon those western roads converging on the capital, where warriors drawn from all the chief Protestant races of Europe, side by side with a few regiments of red-coats and an enormous staff of Lords and gentlemen, moved under the flag of William of Orange. (87)
From this Prince every party in the Nation could expect a fair treatment,

And this statement even includes the outlawed Catholics, as was recognized by one of their friends later on in that century. The Spanish minister reported to his government, and, through his government, to the Pope, that no Catholic need feel any scruple of conscience on account of the late revolution in England, that for the danger to which the members of the true Church were exposed James alone was responsible, and that William alone had saved them from a sanguinary persecution. (88)


Nor was it long before William possessed the confidence of all concerned. The Peers met, and an informal Assembly of members of Charles' Parliament were called and hastily placed both Civil and Military power in the hands of the Prince. Then a regular election was held and a Parliament in all but law assembled.

It was this body that had to deal with the most difficult problem of reaffirming a refugee king or appointing a new one, and in the course of the debates one may clearly see that all parties were not by any means united in adopting any one settlement.

So fierce was party strife, that nothing short of the need to preserve society would have compelled the Tories to abandon hereditary right and religious persecution, and the Whigs to let their dead sleep without the atonement of blood. They both learnt their lesson, but could not forgive their Dutch schoolmaster. (89)

(89) Trevelyan, p. 447.

And it was the character of this Dutch schoolmaster and that of his
English wife that finally determined the Succession.

As would be expected the Tories were anxious to keep as closely as possible to their appointments to the dictates of their doctrine of hereditary right. Some wished to see ruling in James' name, as Regent, while others wished Mary to be appointed Sovereign. The idea of a Regency was early turned down, but not so that of bestowing the crown upon Mary. She had been born and raised in England and had possessed until recently, the right to the throne, next best to that of James himself.

But just here we find rather a refreshing example of martial affectation, refreshing by way of contrast to that of previous Sovereigns. Mary refused to accept the offer and "had communicated to Danby her high displeasure at the conduct of those who were setting up her claims in opposition to those of her husband". This unexpected turn of events naturally checked the progress of this plan and strengthened the Whig attempts to have William appointed sole sovereign. But it was William's action that really decided the question. In the final analysis he could almost dictate his sole appointment if he wished, for divided as England was, without him she must love all she had been struggling for.

He acted at length when he saw the time was ripe.

If the Convention, he said, chose to adopt the plan of a Regency, he had nothing to say against it, only they must look out for some other person to fill the office, for he himself would not consent to do so. As to the alternative proposal of putting Mary on the throne and allowing him to reign by her courtesy, "no man", he said, "can esteem a woman more than I do the Princess; but I am so made that I cannot think of holding anything by apron-strings; nor can I think it reasonable to have any share in the government unless it be put in my own person, and that for the term of my life. If you think fit to settle it otherwise I will not oppose you, but will go back to Holland and meddle no more in
Needless to say his terms were accepted. William and Mary were appointed joint-Sovereigns, but the power was placed in William's control as long as he should live. This change was accomplished by the Act of Settlement. Now when this and other similar political problems had been settled, and the Convention had declared itself to be a legal Parliament, the question of a religious Settlement was taken up. Here it was to prove impossible to find such a logical solution, as had been found for the Political difficulties, but for all that, there was found one more typical of the English Constitution, a new Act, meaning little in itself but implying a great deal.

(91) It should be remembered that William belonged to the Dutch Reformed Church - the National Church of Holland.

For the present at least, the Church seemed to have learned its lesson and to have recognized the foolishness of continuing its persecution of fellow Protestants, to whom it now owed so much. All Protestants alike, churchmen and Dissenters, had united in opposing James illegalities, and in welcoming William. They had, for the time being, forgotten about their differences, and had treated each other like men, not like persons who should, or could, be harried into their own particular beliefs. Thus common endeavors and sufferings, tended to unite them.

In the summer of 1688 the breaches which had
long divided the great body of English Protestants had seemed to be almost closed. Disputes about Bishops and Synods, written prayers and extemporeanous prayers, white gowns and black gowns, sprinkling and dipping, kneeling and sitting, had been for a short space intermitted. The serried array which was then drawn up against Popery measured the whole of the vast interval which separated Bancroft from Bunyan. Prelates recently conspicuous as persecutors now declared themselves friends of religious liberty, and exhorted their clergy to live in a constant interchange of hospitality and of kind offices with the Separatists. Separatists on the other hand, who had recently considered mitres and lawn sleeves as the livery of Antichrist, were putting candles in windows and throwing faggots on bonfires in honour of the prelates. (92)

(92) Macaulay, II, 268.

Something more than mere toleration would now seem to be possible. But just to what extent it would go would absolutely depend upon the degree of unity that actually existed, apart from the force of circumstances. Because, this brotherly love which was so admirable but yet so suddenly grown up, was not, in all probability, strong enough to withstand the necessary discussion of any settlement in Parliament. There when the members of the various groups were required to give some definite expression of their beliefs, one would still find a great variety of plans and opinions. However, there was one point on which they seemed to be agreed.

The situation of the Dissenters had been much discussed nine or ten years before, when the kingdom was distracted by the fear of a Popish plot, and when there was among Protestants a general disposition to unite against the common enemy. A draught of a law authorising the public worship of Nonconformists, and a draught of a law making some alterations in the public worship of the Established Church, had been pre-
pared, and would probably have been passed by both Houses without difficulty, had not Shaftesbury and his coadjutors refused to listen to any terms, and, by grasping at what was beyond their reach, missed advantages which might easily have been secured. (93)

(93) Macaulay, II, 276.

But now one of these same men came forward with bills similar to the two previously debated, of which the Bill of Toleration has had by far the greater influence. People today would consider such a bill a mere insult, instead of a compliment, but conditions were different in those days. It was a revolutionary change that made it possible for Presbyterians, Baptists, Congregationalists and even Quakers, to worship God as they saw fit. This result was brought about by suspending the persecuting laws from applying "to any person who should testify his loyalty by taking the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy and his Protestantism by subscribing the Declaration against Transubstantiation". (94)

(94) Macaulay, II, 276.

The ministers of these various denominations were likewise given some lea-way; for example they were only required to sign 34 of the 39 articles. But they had to sign those or all the rigours of the law continued to rest upon them and would practically prevent their being able to carry on their work. One exception however was outstanding. The Quakers who objected to taking the various oaths, were allowed to hold their meetings, if they signed three documents, a declaration against transubs
transubstantiation, gave their promise to be faithful, to the Government and made a confession of Christian belief.

No legal relief was given to any of the other classes, the Catholics continued to bear the weight of the Penal Laws, which however were only enforced occasionally. Neither was any respite granted to such heretical groups as the Unitarians, because of their disbelief in the Trinity, who were considered to be absolutely beyond the pale. As Professor Bury has characterised the Bill, "It was a characteristically English measure logically inconsistent and absurd, a mixture of tolerance and intolerance but suitable to the circumstances and the state of public opinion at the time." And one may add as such, almost certain to be highly successful. And indeed, it has proved to be so. That bill small


and seemingly unimportant as it was, drove in the wedge that finally separated civil and religious questions and made possible a natural development, and a consequent progress in both. But this was only part of the question.

For years many of the leading members of both sides had done their best to bring about a change in certain parts of the Established Church, in order that it might be possible to include the vast majority of Protestants within its borders. Such a state of affairs would, undoubtedly, have been ideal in many ways. One strong united Church would undoubtedly have been stronger than half a dozen weaker ones (provided the six retained their strength when they united). But this is debatable.
First of all what were the questions at issue? Were they fundamental? If they were union could never have been really beneficial because principal would have to have been sacrificed. However if they were only matters of detail then a union would undoubtedly have strengthened each individual church by removing the unnecessary beliefs and disbeliefs, and consequently readjusting things so that the emphasis could be laid in the proper place. To be able to achieve such a re-adjustment would require that all parties concerned be ready to follow the theories of their former opponents if they seemed sound. All prejudice, because of the habits of years and the tradition of centuries would have to be laid aside and the question dealt with honestly and openly by all concerned.

But never has there been a group of men assembled of the size required on this occasion that have been capable of bringing about such a change. Consequently it was sure to prove almost impossible to arrive at such a solution.

Then on the other hand it was not altogether desirable. Undoubtedly no person could or would distinguish in every case between detail and principle and even supposing they did, competition has always proven profitable for any human institution. Any church that has undisputed control tends to lose its vision and become more or less a secular institution. Very few great reformers have been developed by the whole-hearted support of any great number of people, rather they have come up in the face of tremendous opposition. Merely to refer to Christ himself and such of his followers as Luther, Calvin or Wesley, is sufficient proof of such a statements.

Thus however appealing comprehension might appear on the surface,
in the final analysis it was not really desirable even on purely religious grounds.

But the political interests have still to be considered. If, in the present union of Church and state, the Church should be strengthened, one particular party, the Tory, would be strengthened, and the other weakened. The power of the Dissenters as a body would be broken, by including a large number with the ranks of the Churchmen, driving the more conscientious with a weaker and more desperate position. The majority would then quite naturally, grow more and intolerant, and in the end, the cause of liberty both Civil and religious would suffer.

It was, then, with great differences of opinion that Parliament debated the question of comprehension. Even the economic element entered into the question to some degree. The ministers not so anxious to change on principle, were often also assured that a decrease in income would follow. While many of the churchmen were undoubtedly well cared for, the great majority, and that due frequently to the covetous opulence of the few, were really in penurious circumstances. This state of affairs

(96) Note the change for the better after the distribution of Queen Anne's Bounty. However the amount distributed was not large enough to produce an entire transformation.

was of course well known to the ministers of the Nonconforming Churches, and the wealthy dissentery ministers were probably more the exception than the rule. However such there were, and Macaulay makes his point although one cannot but feel that he overemphasizes it. As he says,

The voluntary contributions of his wealthy hearers, Alderman and Deputies, West India merchants and Turkey merchants, Wardens of the Company of Fish-
mongers and Wardens of the Company of Goldsmiths, enabled him to become a landowner or a mortgagee. The best broadcloth from Blackwell Hall, and the best poultry from Leadenhall Market, were frequently left at his door. On all political and literary questions the minister was the oracle of his own circle. It was popularly remarked, during many years, that an eminent dissenting minister had only to make his son an attorney or a physician, that the attorney was sure to have clients, and the physician to have patients. One of the great Presbyterian Rabbies therefore, might well doubt whether, in a worldly view, he should be benefited by a comprehension. (97)

(97) Macaulay, II, 288.

Thus the party that would naturally be expected to be most in favour of comprehension was anything but unanimous in desiring it. The Church itself, particularly one faction within it, were anything but desirous of alteration.

A very great majority of the clergy, known as the High Church party, who completely dominated the Lower House of Convocation, were only half loyal to the reigning Sovereigns, and were wild with hatred of Dissent. (98)


Whilst a great number of others who did not quarrel with the Dissenters on religious grounds particularly but rather were anxious to maintain their monopoly of office, also opposed any movement toward comprehension.

These several factors then combined and the Bill was defeated, much to the disappointment of the King of whom Tuberville writes, "There
is much reason to believe that William had the measure very much at heart".

(99) Turberville, p. 156.

Thus failed the measure that might have benefited the nation but chances are that it would not but rather would have opened the way for a great deal of harm to have been done. But one unfortunate result of the failure of one Bill to pass while its fellow did, was that the receiving of the Sacrament, the Holiest and most sacred ceremony of the Christian Church, was made the key to office, by men who were not as anxious that those that differed from their religious beliefs, be converted to their ways of thinking, as that they should remain as they were and permit their religious opponents to retain control of the Government. This question of Test Oaths had long bothered the legislators, and it was one of the unfortunate results coincident with the rejection of the Comprehension scheme, that such tests continued and were even made of greater importance. Many persons had foreseen this consequence.

They argued very properly that a hearty union among Protestants was a greater security to the Church than any test which could possibly be invented; that the obligation to receive the Sacrament was a test on Protestants rather than on Papists; that so long as it continued there could not possibly be that thorough union among Protestants which had always been desired, and which was at that time indisputably necessary; finally, that a greater caution ought not to be required from such as were admitted into offices, than from members of the two Houses of Parliament, who were not obliged to receive the Sacrament in order to enable them to sit. (100)

(100) Turberville, P. 151 - 152.
But these arguments failed to convince, or to change the background of the question and this question of Oaths to be taken in order to fill an office was to become so potent that it first of all greatly weakened the English Church itself and then because of an effort made by a certain faction to utilize the Church interests for his own ends, it threatened the very principle involved in the Act of Toleration, that of permitting a person to worship God as he chose, so long as he did not disturb the peace. But this Act had been passed as a result of a long struggle, and it had passed almost unnoticed. However the real reason for this change lay in the fact that people were beginning to distinguish between Civil and religious liberty. They had decided to re-pot the twin plants that had long been too large for their single container, and which, when re-planted would be enabled to resume their long interrupted growth.

Henceforth religion will be seen to be introduced into politics, mostly for political purposes. And to trace the gradual diminution of its introduction there, in relation to the Protestant Dissenting bodies, is to trace the final establishment of the principle of toleration to just that extent.

Now had it been possible to leave conditions just as they were there might have been fewer difficulties in the end. But such a policy was almost impossible. A great number of the Church clergy had for the past years constantly preached a most servile passive obedience. They declared in no uncertain terms that it was absolutely contrary to the law of God for a subject to resist his sovereign, no matter, some of them went on to say, if he were as vicious as Nero himself. But they had not foreseen that the day would come when the position of their own church would be threatened, and the very king whom they had so passionately de-
fended would undertake to make changes that would probably spell the ruin of the English Church in its reformed state. Thus they were forcibly shown that there was at least one exception to their rule, and many of the Church leaders led in the revolt. But these actions did not change their theories if they had been sincere in the past, and whilst they would in all probability not openly oppose the present sovereign, their past actions rendered their loyalty suspect. And so without reason Bishop Burnet, the most tolerant of men and clerics did his best to prevent the Government's demanding a declaration of their allegiance to the new Sovereigns by the clergy, because he felt that in many cases, many most conscientious and useful ministers, bishops and even Archbishops, would be driven into opposition if asked for a definite declaration of their position which, he well knew, they felt they could only take by breaking their former oath to James, and the Doctrines they had been preaching for a lifetime. And in maintaining this contention Burnet was backed by a majority in the upper House of Parliament. However this matter was definitely political in all its various aspects. The Church in linking so closely matters of Church and State, had long received the support of the State, but now they had to pay the price, for it.

It was absolutely necessary for peace to be thoroughly established throughout the country, that all those still ready to support James should be dismissed from positions of influence and authority and placed in a position where they would definitely show their colors. Since the Jacobites were quite numerous and the Church had been the very citadel of Royal support, it naturally contained a large number of the exiled Kings most loyal supporters. And these persons did not always maintain a discreet silence, so that even Burnet "confesses, that his feelings
changed somewhat by reason of certain discoveries concerning the conduct of some of the non-juring clergy," as those who refused to swear allegiance to William and Mary, soon came to be called.


These men held high positions throughout the land, some of them even sitting in Parliament. As Ranke says, the trouble from the Clergy's point of view lay in the fact "that their oath taken to King James from which he had not released them, must prevent them from taking an oath to another Prince". But it was just such reasoning as this that annoyed Parliament the most. Who, they asked, had made the former oaths but themselves? Who had appointed the new Sovereign, but themselves, who comprised the final authority in England if it was not Parliament. Consequently instead of softening their tone, they hardened it and proceeded to deal with these persons as they saw fit. They had quarreled with James originally because of his usurpation of their authority and as a result they asked on this occasion with a more self-righteous tone,

What was stronger than Parliament? Who could venture to resist its resolutions? And further, 'how could Bishops be tolerated in the House of Lords who were of opinion that there obedience was due to King James?' For one that had adhered to such a view the Parliament was no Parliament; King William III. was for him a usurper. (102)

(102) Ranke - IV, 567.

Moreover there very same Bishops and clergy had shown themselves none too anxious to reach a satisfactory accommodation with the Dissenters
and William had blamed them largely for the rejection of the Comprehension Bill. On the other hand many of the Whigs, their political opponents well remembered what they themselves had suffered in the past and consequently were not anxious to legislate for the benefit of their past persecutors. Accordingly, the law was passed requiring all clergymen to take the oath of allegiance, within a certain period, or else to forfeit their positions, with the power being given the king of granting these non-jurors one-third their former income as compensation.

By this means some of the very best men because of their conviction, were separated from the Church. The Archbishop along with the majority of the famous seven Bishops resigned their positions rather than break their oaths.

These and many men of obscure but saintly life were losses which the Church of England could ill bear. The Latitudinarian and Erastian tone which spread over the Church from the Revolution till the Wesleyan movement was due largely to the withdrawal of so many men of vital piety and self-devotion. (103)


The Latitudinarian element that Mr. Hutton refers to was introduced in various ways, by the interference of Parliament in the Church, in the manner just described, and also in a more positive manner by William's appointing men of acknowledged Latitudinarian leanings. He had been rather disappointed in the way the Church had acted and he did not wish the reactionary element to gain control, consequently he filled the Bishoperics with such men as Burnet, Tillotson, etc., men frequently
of outstanding ability, but holding beliefs that were not shared by the vast majority of their inferiors, particularly the lower orders of the clergy, those sitting in the lower House of Convocation. This change was made much to the chagrin of the Tories.

But it was only thus that the religious peace could be kept in England against the outcries of the country parsons and the intrigues of the High Church Party which was in that age distinguished, not by ritualistic practices, but by the desire to go back on the Act of Toleration. (104)


But this alteration was not altogether for the worse. Zeal is a very necessary thing in any organization, but there is nothing more harmful than misguided zeal. For years the most active spirits had been propagating a belief that was contrary to reason itself; namely the doctrine of non-resistence, whilst on the other hand a great deal of the enthusiasm had been built on a hatred of Dissenters and kept up by a fiercely intolerant spirit. Such condition of affairs is anything but desirable, consequently when the cause of these errors was removed and their continuance, officially at least made impossible, if the Church did decline in influence it was not really a tragedy but rather a blessing that things were being placed in their proper position. For, when such an alteration was accomplished the way would be cleared for their returning to the old paths, seeing their mistakes and correcting them by examining themselves by their original commission.

Thus Latitudinarianism was a good thing for the Church in so far as it aided it in getting back to essentials.
This mixed state of affairs was not only to be found in the Church itself but also among the Dissenting bodies. Many of them had lost the spirit of true Christianity and were being true to the faith of their fathers rather than serving the One whom their fathers had followed. Thus the very decline of religion was useful in itself, because it might, if it went far enough, permit or aid a Revival of true Religion.

But there were other results of William's interference in the Church that were not so favorable. By so doing he aroused the undying resentment of the Tory party. As Dr. Trevelyan says, "The appointment of Latitudinarian Bishops was the chief grievance of the Tories against William". and this fact added fuel to the already growing contagion of Tory resentment.

It will be recalled how hard the Tories had striven to have James retained as King, in name, at least, and then to appoint Mary as Sovereign, only to be overruled in both suggestions by William and the Whigs. But they were partially placated by Mary's being appointed as joint Sovereign and they regarded her more or less as their Queen and thus were kept more or less acquiescent to the various policies of the Government. However William's religious policy, as has been seen, greatly annoyed them. Then Mary died and William, the foreigner, was left as sole Monarch. Their resentment began to increase. The Whigs, the favorite war party, were more and more in power and were seemingly becoming more distasteful to the Tories on every occasion. They were a mercantile group in control of the Bank anxious to carry on the war, and loyal supporters of the Kings. They also were the traditional exponents of toleration and religious liberty.

(105) Trevelyan, p. 451
To each and every one of these policies the Tories either had been or still were opposed. On religious questions they had recently become much more tolerant, more however by necessity than volition. But now they regarded William as a foreigner who was interfering in the management of their Church in such a way as to benefit their political rivals. Consequently they reacted against toleration far more enthusiastically than they had ever supported it. But it was not so much the religious element that they objected to as to the practice that had grown up of taking the Sacrament once a year in order to qualify for some political or civil position. Such a practice, apart from its cheapening effect upon religion, tended to break down the monopoly of office possessed, theoretically at least by the Tories, to a greater degree.

But for the first few years things went on quietly enough. The nation recognized the efforts of William to obtain the best for his new kingdom and quickly responded to his dissolutions by electing the opposite party when one had commenced to go to extremes. By this means, he was able to guide the ship of state through many a dangerous shoal. For a number of years he had been at odds with his Sister-in-law whose bosom friend Sarah Churchill and her husband had actually been engaged in some treasonous intercourse with the court of the exiled James. However with Mary's death and Anne's assured succession this influential clique became one of William's staunchest supports and it was to Churchill later known...
as Marlborough, that William left the command of this continental army. Accordingly when William died, mourned by few, but respected by most, Anne succeeded him and Churchill rose to prominence as her first minister.

Now Anne had long been a staunch churchwoman and a Tory. She like her sister had been born and raised in England, and likewise was very popular.

As many persons thought, the late King had been 'entirely Dutch'; the pretender if restored must be 'entirely French'; the Electress of Hanover if she succeeded might be 'entirely German'; delightful then to bask in the sunshine of an 'entirely English' Queen! (107)

(107) Stanhope, Earl - History of England - comprising the reign of Queen Anne, until the peace of Utrecht (1701 - 1713) John Murray, London, 1870 - p. 20?

But in those times what was often considered to be a good Church member was not necessarily a real Christian so much as a nominal one.

According to Ashton,

Religious life in Anne's time was not active. At least in the Church of England. Even the dignitaries of the Church, with very few exceptions, were men of no mark, nor were there any among the inferior clergy who could be called to the higher estate, and so help to leaven and wake up the Episcopate. For the Church was asleep, and with the exception of the Sacheverell episode - when the name of the Church was dragged in to serve party purposes - nothing was heard of it. There were priests in the livings then as now and they duly baptized, married, preached to, and buried their flock, but there was little vitality in their ministrations, little or no zeal or earnestness as to the spiritual state of those committed to their charge, and very little of practical teaching, in the way of setting before them a higher social standard
for them to imitate. The Church services had no life in them, with the exception of the cathedrals the services were read and the soul-depressing parson and clerk duet had its usual effect of deadening the religious sensibilities of the so-called worshippers. (108)

To be called a good churchwoman - in such a Church, is not then such a high compliment and indeed such a questionable compliment is well suited to Anne as her own declaration, when speaking of the Countess of Marlborough clearly shows.

I am sure there is nobody in the world has better tokens of religion than she has. I am sure she is not as strict as some are, nor does she keep such a bustle with religion; which I confess I think ne'er the worse, for one sees so many Saints Devils that if you be a good Christian the less stir one makes is better in my opinion. As for her moral principles, it is impossible to have better and without that all the lifting eyes, (and) going to Church will prove but very lame devotion. (109)

A very commonplace statement, quite in keeping with Anne's character. However, what was to her, the more pertinent subject, of the Church, she could speak with more enthusiasm, an enthusiasm which certainly must have gladened the hearts of her Tory friends. At the end of her first Parliamentary session she clearly outlined her position.
I hope that such of my subjects as have the misfortune to dissent from the Church of England will rest secure and satisfied in the Act of Toleration, which I am firmly resolved to maintain, and that all those who have the happiness and advantage to be of our Church will consider that I have had my education in it, and that I have been willing to run great hazards for its preservation, and therefore they may be very sure I shall always make it my particular care to encourage and maintain the Church as by law established, and every the least member of it in all their just rights and privileges; and upon all occasions of promotion to any ecclesiastical dignity I shall have a very just regard for such as are eminent and remarkable for their piety, learning, and constant zeal for the church. (110)

(110) Hutton - p. 256.

This she declared herself in full accord with the religious policy of the Tories, they were, for the time being, quite willing to maintain the Act of Toleration, but they were and would continue to be anxious to pass such Acts, as would guarantee their retaining their monopoly of office. Thus they would be certain to attack the practice of occasional conformity. As has been previously intimated, they strenuously objected to William's appointment of Latitudinarians to all the important positions in the Church, accordingly they would receive with thankfulness Anne's declaration that she would "have regard for such as are eminent and remarkable for their piety, learning and constant zeal for the church." Whatever may be found fault with in Anne's religion or character, she certainly zealously supported the church in all its aspects. "The queen may not have been a strong-minded woman, nor a high type of Christian, but all her public influence was thrown into the scale of religious earnestness". Such a

Queen then would be very apt to follow the lead of the High Church Tories, and no one could tell just where this alliance would stop, if once it got control.

One has no notion of the hatred against the Presbyterians with which the Anglican fanatics greeted the event of a Princess of the House of Stuart, ascending the throne. For fourteen long years, they said, the church had suffered from associations and exactions of oaths, without any respect to consciences which were bound by an earlier oath of allegiance; but now it was necessary to fling out the snake from their bosom, which had been so long fostered there. No Monmouth or Shaftesbury was living now: the reign of the Dutch saints was over: the moment must be seized for plucking out the enemy root and branch, without caring about being reproached with cruelty; each true son of the Church must steel his heart against the oppressors of the church. (112)

(112) Extracts from the writings of the day in Bonnet, quoted by Hanke, V, 312.

But this faction in the nation was to be held in check, throughout the greater part of Anne's reign, by the alliance built up while William was still alive, between Anne, the Marlboroughs, the moderate Tories and the Whigs, an alliance based principally upon the continuance of the War.

In the early years of his reign, William had detected Marlborough in some treasonous correspondence, carried on primarily to assist Anne, but, he had over looked it and when the death of Mary opened the way to a reconciliation between William and Anne, William soon recognized his merits, and on his own death designated Marlborough, or as he was then known, Churchill, as General for the next French War.

For almost half of Anne's reign this alliance held good. It did
not matter whether the Tories or the Whigs were in power, the maintenance of the War was the main thing. The High Tory Party all through those years did their best to pass the Bill against occasional Conformity, but although they were supported by the Queen's sympathy, they did not always receive her active assistance. She at this time was almost entirely under the control of Lady Marlborough, who in turn was constantly working in the interest of her husband. Now the monied interests, on which, Marlborough was so dependent, were heartily opposed to the Occasional Conformity Bill, and consequently might be alienated from Marlborough if he allowed the Bill to pass. Therefore as time went on and the Tories became more and more insistant that the Bill should pass, Marlborough, was driven more and more towards the Whigs and a determination that the Bill should not pass, for political reasons. Even the Queen opposed the Tory factiousness on occasion. "I am not discouraged," she said, "from persisting in the same earnest desire that you would go down into your several counties so disposed to moderation and unity, as becomes all those which are joined together in the same religion and interest". (113)

(113) Morgan, 90.

Another part of William's policy also, served to keep in check the persecuting element, throughout a great part of Anne's reign, and that was his religious policy. William, because of his love of toleration had consistently appointed Bishops of a similar point of view. Accordingly there was a strong majority in the House of Lords that could
be banked on to defeat any persecuting measure, so long as the political conditions remained the same and so they did for almost eight years.

But about 1710, the war on the continent had reached such a stage that it could be closed advantageously. But the Whigs, who were in control did not wish to do so. In recent elections they had been retained in power, only because of the War, and Marlborough who was becoming more and more unpopular with the Queen and whose wife had already been dismissed from her presence, well knew that if the war ended, his career would end also. Accordingly he began to strain every nerve in order to prevent the consummation of the peace negotiations. But he was much hindered by the foolish vindictiveness of the Whigs.

The various Governments of England had long been tantalized by a veritable host of pamphleteers; but as time went on the more important writers had constantly escaped detection, and as a rule the authorities paid little attention to those who could only vilify the Parliament. However the House of Commons made one unfortunate exception. The High Church clergy had long been preaching doctrines that were the very antithesis of the beliefs of those then in power. But one of these persons apparently outstripped the others. This cleric was the now famous Dr. Sacheverell. He,

Had preached a powerful but truculent sermon before the Lord Mayor, containing scandalous accusations and reflections on the Government. From the text "In perils among false brethren" he charged the Whigs with a sinful betrayal of the church by secret treachery; they were the false brethren "who let her adversaries into her bowels under the holy umbrage of sons, who neither believe her faith, own her mission, submit to her discipline, nor comply with her liturgy". (114)

This sermon and another even more objectionable, was printed and widely distributed.

The author of these spiritual and spirited denunciations of secular affairs was such a person as one would expect to be unworthy of a Parliament attack.

The doctor himself was a most unattractive figure - a blustering, violent illiberal man, whose strength of language was the source of his popularity. 'He was', says Burnet, 'a bold, insolent man, with a very small measure of religion, virtue, learning, or good sense'. This was the man who by crying up the doctrine of non-resistance and passive obedience was responsible for the downfall of the Whigs. (115)


Now while this description doubtlessly is prejudiced nevertheless the essentials agree with those given by others.

All the pent up feeling against the Government suddenly burst forth in the form of a most servile adulation of a most undeserving man. But yet so potent was this wave of popular emotion, that the Whigs were literally swept off their feet. True they won their case but at what cost! Feeling ran so high that they were forced to let him off with only a slight sentence, a victory for his supporters which was celebrated throughout the Kingdom.

The Government was divided and condemned to destruction. The Queen, long alienated from lady Marlborough chose this moment to send her from the court. Soon every Whig was tremulously awaiting his fate.

"Everything", (Swift) wrote to Stella, "is turning upside down. Every
Whig in great office will, to a man, be infallibly put out, and we shall have such a winter as hath not been seen in England". (116)


The rout of the Whigs after August 1710 was complete. In every department of State Tories succeeded to office, both principal and subordinate. It is curious to find Marlborough spoken of as the only member of his whole party who remained in office ------- He was regarded with suspicion on account of his correspondence, real or alleged, with the Pretender. He thus concentrated in himself the hatred which the English people cherished for the Whigs in so far as they were Presbyterians, and the hatred which they cherished for the Tories in so far as they were Jacobites. (117)


Thus Marlborough was placed in an exceedingly difficult, and almost impossible position. He saw his position clearly and now became ready to sacrifice everything in order that the war might go on. The High Church reaction had already set in and the occasional Conformity Bill was once more being vigorously pressed. "In the churchmanship of some high Tories there was not a great deal more than a fanatical detestation of Dissenters;" Marlborough doubtlessly realized this state of affairs and determined to bury their support, to defeat the Peace, by

(118) Turberville, op. cit. p. 293.
withdrawing his opposition to their Bill. The Dissenters were told that if the ministry fell the persecuting Act could soon be repealed; 'Jack' as the Tory satirists put it, had been induced to hang himself on the promise that he would soon be cut down'. But before this could be accom-

(119) Trevelyan, p. 507.

plished, the rival party filched away the knife and left "Jack" hanging. The Occasional Conformity Bill was carried, while the Queen created enough peers to guarantee the acceptance of the Peace, and removed Marlborough from his position at the Head of the British Army. In the following election the Tories regained power by a huge majority.

But even now the cause of religious freedom was not threatened. The Occasional Conformity Bill struck at the political rights of a group but it did not take from them the right to worship God as they chose. However the question of religion had been once more brought into the political arena to serve political purposes, and no one could tell just where the matter would end, if religious conditions came to be decided by the question only of political expediency and the expediency of a re-actionary Tory party..

When the small group of reactionaries, led by St. John, finally got control, things began to look very serious indeed. He was not satisfied with the position the Occasional Conformity Bill gave his party, but he wished to forever stamp out their opponents. Accordingly in 1713 he introduced and passed the Schism Act. As Turberville says,

The hand of Bolingbroke was clearly in evidence in the Schism Bill, which was aimed against the thriv-
ing Dissenters schools, which it was intended to destroy by requiring that teachers should have a bishop's licence. (120)

Thus he hoped to unite all the Tories under his leadership, and to doom forever the Dissenters and consequently a great part of the Whigs, to political oblivion. But in accomplishing this end he had unconsciously over-stepped the mark.

Anne was left without an heir, and like Elizabeth, she never could tolerate any discussion of the question as to who should succeed her, and still retain her good will for that person. The Tories accordingly dropped the question, with the result that there was great danger of the "Pretender" regaining the throne, if he should suddenly claim it on the death of his half-sister. Such a possibility once more aroused the nation and once more the revival of the hatred of popery saved the cause of religious freedom. The Whigs had long been the champions of the rights of Hanover, and now fixed themselves securely in the good will of that court. The nation was uneasiness itself. "The generality", wrote one Tory Peer to another in March 1714, "thinks of nothing after the Queen, but the House of Hanover, there is such an aversion to Popery". Bolingbroke saw

what was coming, and did his best to prevent it by giving all the important positions to his supporters, in order that they might dictate the
terms of the accession. But it was too late. Fortune had deserted him. Anne died, George ascended and the Whigs came into power; the Schism Act never came into force, and the Act against Occasional Conformity was repealed within four years.

Thus the question of Protestant toleration was forever removed from the realm of politics, and thus the issues on both sides were clarified. There no longer was to be found any reason for graggooning one group of Protestants into accepting the dogma's of another, rather the way was opened whereby the persuasiveness of truth and conviction could play the part it had so long been prevented from playing by the relation of Church and State. Similarly in the political realm statesmen would be freer to look after the civil needs of the state. The tracing of such developments will form the task for the next chapter.
CHAPTER V.
SOME EFFECTS OF TOLERATION.

At long last a victory that was to prove lasting, was won in the fight for religious liberty, the Occasional Conformity and the Schism Acts were finally repealed and thus religious and political questions were farther separated than ever before. Consequently there was less opportunity of the one hindering progress in the other by further dividing the nation by giving a religious tinge to every political question or vice versa. Religious and political matters were to be left to themselves. It was therefore the duty of those particularly interested in each to work for a development in their own field. The opportunity was theirs and theirs would be the blame, if progress was not made. And this door was not opened in vain, despite the fact that immediately after the establishment of toleration more inertia has seldom been seen, in modern times, both in the church and in the state.

But the first effect of the final establishment of limited toleration, was the discovery of the real state of affairs in the country. While men's minds were taken up with the problem of defending their church's sole right to legal recognition, or of endeavoring to establish on oppositions claim, the true spiritual condition of both factions was not recognized. The energy that should have been devoted to instructing the people, both by precept and example, in the way they should go, was
too often unprofitably expended in apology if not in open calumny.

The Church of England accepting position as the sole established Church, at the same time made an alliance which tended to cause her to sacrifice principle to politics and certainly encouraged the intolerance that was then existant in almost every denomination. In the past pages many examples have been given of the efforts made by Churchmen to persecute their rivals, until such a work came to take a foremost place in their minds. The England Church as we know it, came into existance by a compromise, and maintained its position in a similar manner. Now religious conditions are radically different to political questions in so far as in the one a compromise usually destroys while in latter, generally speaking it improves. Under the present conditions the Church at best could only be run by a series of compromises, that is insofar as it was controlled by a more or less uninterested lay body. (i. e. Parliament) Consequently, as J. Baldwin Brown put it, "There seems to be a fatal fault, not mainly due to wilful wrong in rulers, in all State management of religious affairs". He then goes on to explain why he makes such a statement, because,

The highest element in the matter seems always to be let slip. ------ A Government may arrange a due administration of the Sacraments, and a certain pastoral oversight of the people, with tolerable ease ------ But when the preaching of the Gospel by men profoundly penetrated by its spirit is the thing which is demanded, the State provision inevitably and miserably fails. (123)

(123) ibid - p. 302 and p. 303.
He then sums up and drives home his argument by saying,

It is by no means a question as to the right of the State to take cognizance of the religious condition of the people; it is really a question of its power to do anything but the clumsiest spiritual work. (124)


In other words religion, at least Christianity, is a matter of individual persuasion and conviction, and consequently as such cannot be effectively managed, by any political institution. Therefore the Church, under the conditions of that day and age, was actually handicapped.

But this alliance was particularly unfortunate because of the prevalent belief that one section of the population had a divinely appointed right to prescribe the beliefs of another.

Everybody knows how far Nonconformity is due to the Church of England's rigour in imposing an explicit declaration of adherence to her formularies. But only a few who have searched out the matter know how far Nonconformity is due, also, to the Church of England's invincible reluctance to narrow her large and loose formularies to the strict Calvinistic sense dear to Puritanism. (126)

when the Dissenters left the Church, very few, if any, realized that the intolerance of the Church was a foreign element that had long since crept in and had lain there so long that it had made its hideous self unnoticed save as part and parcel of every the ecclesiastical system.

The Church may have had the position and authority but a very noticeable section of the Nonconformists had at least an equal amount of pride-of-sect.

Thus fatal self-righteousness, grounded on a false conceit of knowledge, made comprehension impossible, because it assumes the possession of the truth and the power of deciding how others violate it; and this is a position of superiority, and suits conquest rather than comprehension. (127)


So much for the Dissenters.

Similar statements can also be made about the Church itself. For example to quote Mr. Brown,

One hears much, and with no small amazement of the toleration of the Church of England. Thrice she has deliberately purged herself of her purest and strongest life. In the Sixteenth Century she began that hurrying out of the Puritans which King James completed in the Seventeenth, she cast out the Nonconformists, and in the Eighteenth she shut her doors against the Methodists. (128)


To sum it up the same spirit of intolerance had long been present on both sides only it had manifested its presence in different ways, as
would naturally be expected, from the different circumstances in which
the two bodies found themselves.

It was this spirit that had been dealt, what it is hoped was a
mortal blow, by the final establishment of toleration, limited as it
may have been, with the result that a great deal of the political inter-
ference with the Church or by the Church in politics was done away with.
As a result there was a noticeable decline in activity both in church and
state, for the time being. As Lecky says,

A great variety of causes had led to the gradual
evanescence of dogmatic teaching and to the discredit
into which strong religious emotions had fallen. The
virulence of theological controversy had much subsided
after the Revolution, when the Act of Toleration secured
to most sects an undisturbed position; and the Nonjuror
Schism, the abandonment of the theological doctrine of
the divine right of kings as the basis of government,
the scandal resulting from the adhesion of many who had
held that doctrine to the new government, the suspension
of Convocation, and lastly the latitudenarian appointments
of the early Hanoverian period, had all in their different
ways contributed to lower the dogmatic level. (129)

(129) Lecky, W. H. III. 2.

But it was such events as the coming of toleration, the division
and quasi-insincere change of opinions, that were altogether responsible
for the widespread disrespect for the Church. There were also abuses,
which had long been present but now became almost omnipresent as a result
of the large departure of fixed convictions from the minds of the clergy.
Even such apologists as Overton and Relton admit that the Church as it
existed in the early eighteenth century, presented anything but a
pleasant picture, or to give their own words,
It is true that a lover of the English Church cannot study it, (i.e. this period) without a blush. It is a period, for instance, of lethargy instead of activity, of worldliness instead of spirituality, of self-seeking instead of self-denial, of grossness instead of refinement. There was a grovelling instead of a noble conception of the nature and function of the Church as a Christian society, an ignoring instead of a conscientious and worthy carrying out of the plain system of the Church, work neglected instead of work well done. All this meets him at every turn. (130)

It was at this period that the practice of non-residence became more common than not. As Mr. Bydney says,

Clerical non-residence was the rule, and the pastoral care of the parishioners was confided to a curate, whose services were enlisted at a stipend oftentimes far lower than that which was received by a groom or a coachman. ——— What is more strange is that the idea seems to have been entertained by rulers that non-residence on the part of the clergy was a necessary evil. (130)

Yes, one even finds such dignitaries as Archdeacon Paley advising the non-resident incumbents, "to distribute the tracts of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge". (131)

The Bishops, obviously the worst offenders in this respect, did not hesitate to declare their approval of the practice, rather did they...
express their dislike for compulsory residency. For example,

William Warburton, white Bishop of Gloucester, complained that 'the inconvenience of that public station' prevented him from bestowing attention upon his books, and Dr. Seeker could view his summer visit to Cuddesdon Palace in no better light than that of a delightful retirement for his favourite studies. (132)

Of course all the greater clergy were not of this type nor were all the lesser clergy of such poor calibre as has frequently been portrayed, as Goldsmith has shown in his "Deserted Village".

Here and there, anchored in lonely parishes, might have been found men who, both by their preaching and living, taught their little congregations to reverence whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely and of good report; men who added sunlight to daylight by making life happier." (133)

But such men were not customary, nor were they popular amongst their brothers of the cloth; such men as Henry Venn were openly attacked, and an index of the spiritual condition of his enemies may be obtained from the voluntary defence accorded him by one of the opposing group.

'If the whole body of the clergy were like ourselves', said an old Surrey fox-hunting parson, in defending the character of Henry Venn from the aspersions of some of his brethren at a clerical meeting, 'the world would see that we were of no use, and take away our tithes but of few of these pious ones redeem our credit, and save for us our livings'. (134)

(132) Sydney, p. 342.

(133) Sydney, p. 343.

(134) ibid - p. 345.
Factors other than the actual decline of activity and spirituality abetted the decline of the Church's influence, particularly among the upper classes. These persons accustomed to think for themselves, and at this period, particularly anxious to have their own way were ready to judge the creed by the professors, and snatch at any means of discrediting it and establishing themselves in what they knew to be their own unrighteousness.

These conditions then encouraged the spread of deism or natural religion and gave quite a vogue to the intellectual air that plumes itself on being superior to those bound up by the old foolish religious traditions of their ancestors. Nothing worth while has ever been accomplished unless it was backed by sincere self-sacrificing conviction. Consequently when real spirituality declined, largely because of the conditions of the times, most positive theological teachings disappeared and at best the Church became, what Matthew Arnold later considered it to be,

A great national society for the promotion of what is commonly called goodness. (135)

and the Methods whereby such a promotion was to be achieved an even lower level than in Gladstone's day when he declared,

That, if the method of the gospel for our salvation from sin and its penalties was the theme, it was dealt with as a sort of joint-stock transaction, to which man was to contribute repentance and faith as conditions previous, and thereupon God would mercifully grant all that we stood in need of. (136)

Under these circumstances it was quite natural that men would interpret the findings of science in such a light as to be unfavorable to the religious system of the times. The rationalising and popular sophisticated criticism kept spreading until, Butler in writing his advertisement for his famous Analogy, declared,

> It is come, I know not how, to be taken for granted by many persons, that Christianity is not so much a subject of inquiry; but that it is now, at length, discovered to be fictitious. And accordingly they treat it as if, in the present age, this were an agreed point among all people of discernment; and nothing remained but to set it up as a principal subject of mirth and ridicule, as it were by way of reprisals, for its having so long interrupted the pleasures of the world. (137)

Thus with the spread of Laodiceanism within the Church, the development of active criticism without and the reaction against Puritanism existing as a hang over from the Puritan Despotism, it was quite in the course of events that the standard of public and private morality should be lowered and even the effectiveness of the Church as an organization for the propagation of goodness, greatly impaired. Such actually was the state of English Society during the regime of the Georges.

The eighteenth century, following as it did almost immediately upon that season of thick moral darkness and spiritual depression which hung like a curtain over the country during the reign of Charles II. - the reaction against the domination of the martial saints who had in the eyes of the nation inherited the earth far too long - cannot be pronounced as an improvement upon it, if regarded from a religious and moral point of view. That the profligacy of the age was neither so open nor yet so unblushing may perhaps be admitted, but that its de-
pravity was quite as deep is beyond all question. The court until long after the accession of George III still continued to be tainted by much of that shameless licentiousness with which it had been characterised during the last forty years of the preceding century; leaders, both in Church and State, careless in their lives and ungodly in their conduct, neglected their duty and became corrupt and altogether abominable; while the public and private life of the aristocracy, of the upper and middle classes, as of the lower orders, was marked by nothing so much as duplicity, conjugal infidelity, dissoluteness and unity. (139)

(138) Sydney - II. 322 - 323.

If such was the case among the upper class members of society, the class responsible for setting the moral and religious standards of the times, it is little to be wondered at that the lower classes, were, relatively speaking, equally degenerate.

Either in town or country, law and order was scarcely in existence.

Robbery was at that period carried on on a fearful scale in the streets of London, even by daylight. Hosebreaking was of frequent occurrence by night; and every road leading to the metropolis was beset by bands of reckless highwaymen, who carried their depredations into the very heart of the town ———— On one day we are told that 'all the stage coaches coming from Surrey to London were robbed by highwaymen'. (139)


Even the laws themselves were calculated to increase crime, rather than diminish it. The common practice among legislators of that day seems to have been to make death the penalty for any offence that became annoy-
ingly frequent. They seem never to have thought of creating a more efficient means of enforcing the law. The watchman of that day and age reminds one of their fellows in the orient who carry a gong to let the thieves know when they are coming, so the common rumour goes. The brutalizing effect of such a system is self evident. If a man was going to steal, for which he could be hung, it was safer for him to kill his victim, than not, if there was any chance of detection. The extent to which these abominable laws went can be seen from the following quotation.

At the Old Bailey Sessions held during January in the year 1718, among those sentenced to death were, one for murder, five for robberies on the highway, three women for breaking open houses in the day-time, a boy for shoplifting, and a man for stealing a woman's pocket.(140)


Now while the upper and lower classes had greatly degenerated the middle class, as usual, had remained the most constant. But even there a great decline had taken place. Commerce held the foremost place in their lives while other things of equal or superior value were, as elsewhere, greatly neglected.

In Government circles during this period, ministers were straining whatever nerves they did strain, to maintain things as they were. With the exception of the Jacobite rebellion men's minds were taken up with questions of personal gain. This was the age of the famous South Sea Bubble, the solving of the financial situation created thereby do-
Ill

ing so much to increase the prestige of Walpole. He made use of political corruption to gain his own ends, and winked at all such practices so long as things remained quiet. Indeed Walpole and his fellows filled with the spirit of their motto "Quieta Non Movere" were the very antithesis of Tennyson's Ulysses who in declaring "How dull it is to pause, to make amend, To rust unburnished not to shine in use," breathed the very spirit of the age that was to come, feverish with activity. And the beginning of that movement was not far away, but was hidden at the present time. Yet, however, unpleasant conditions were they were actually immeasurably superior to what they had been under the rule of the last of the Stuarts.

The social inconveniences and exasperances of the German Court, on which contemporary opinion so readily fastened, were a small price to pay for a throne resting on the principles of the Revolution System. If Anne, James II, and Charles II prove anything, it is at least arguable that a Stuart Court in 1714 would not have been more moral and elevated, less amenable to backstairs intrigue and the corrupt competition of men and women who were courtiers first and last, than the Hanoverian St. James. (144)


At any rate the conditions under the Georges were generally known and consequently more easily attacked. This was the period when the economic foundations of the American Revolution were being laid by officials who were not a whit troubled by the growth of a great illicit trade which was eventually to form an intrigue part of the mechanism of the economic life of the colonies.
Such a condition of affairs as has been portrayed as existing both in church and state, in the upper classes and the lower, could not long remain. Mere defence of fundamentals, however useful and necessary it may be, is not sufficient to mould the lives of any nation. That active dynamic force that is characteristic of all truly efficient organizations, whether religious or political had seemingly left the country.

"The new spirit needed in the English Church was not to be found in the lawn sleeves of the lords spiritual nor in the country rectories and the universities", any more than that needed in politics was to be found in the antichambers where Walpole cleverly appeased the wrath of petitioners and damped the ardour of enthusiasts of every form and degree. Rather was it to be found in the Church Societies being formed for such purposes "The Reformation of Manners", in the writings of at the one time obscure non-juring clergyman William Law, in the despised rectory at Epworth, or in the new type of figure now about to appear in politics, symbolized and led by Pitt.

There, was to be found the real result of the coming of toleration and from those humble beginnings came the new force and energy that was to alter and eventually re-model both social and political life in England. Had Toleration never come, these men and movements would never have been able to accomplish what they did, because of the continual legal opposition they would have met with.

The decay had come first in the church, and there the Revival came first also. In a previous paragraph it was pointed out that while
speaking as a whole, religion had declined in England, yet, there were still to be found some from whom all Evangelistic fervour had not departed. This section as time passed on, was greatly increased by the reaction that developed quite naturally as a result of the conditions of the time. Men of understanding saw the great discrepancy that existed between what had been taught in the past, and what was taught now, between what had been done, and what was done now. The idea of Christian individual experience and personal relationship to God, was almost entirely a thing of the past. Men started at the outside of man and gradually worked inside.

The efforts made by the various societies like those for the Reformation of Manners, helped at least to awaken public opinion. They started out very well. "These societies," writes Lecky, "were at first purely devotional, and they appear to have been almost identical in character with those of the early Methodists". However it did not take long for them to change their character.

They divided themselves into several distinct groups, undertaking the discovery and suppression of houses of ill-fame, and the prosecution of swearers, drunkards and sabbath-breakers. They became a kind of voluntary police, acting largely as spies, and enforcing the laws against religious offences. (147)

(146) Lecky - p. 33.
(147) ibid - p. 34.

Now however useful this kind of thing may be, from a religious point of view it is doubtful if it does more good than harm, because of
the opposition aroused by such high-handed methods. Thus little progress would have been made if this reaction had not been guided along different lines. Christianity teaches that these various statutes should be kept voluntarily, as a result of a change in the life of the person concerned. Any deviation from this point only brings trouble. It was therefore a glad day for England when William Law, in 1728 published his, now famous, book under the title "A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life". The influence was instantaneous and widespread. In it the standard of Christianity was raised once more and men were enabled to see that a devout Christian was not only a steady payer of tithes, a regular attendant at church, and a respectable citizen. "Devotion", wrote Law, "is neither private nor public prayer, but prayers, whether private or public, are particular parts or instances of devotion. Devotion signifies a life given, or devoted, to God".


The results of the efforts of this clergyman were far-reaching. The mystical emphasis placed upon practical religion, in the Serious Call soon exerted a very great influence.

This book was for many years the standard devotional treatise which the more pious clergy-men were accustomed to read to their parishioners, and the more pious masters to their householders. To this book Dr. Johnson ascribed his first strong religious impressions. Gibbon has left an emphatic testimony to its merits, and Wesley not only recognised it as having had a powerful influence on his own mind, but even dates the whole religious revival of the eighteenth century from its appearance in 1730. (149)

(149) Lecky - III., p. 36.
But such a book was valuable only to those who were in a position to understand and appreciate its teachings. It was valueless to the masses who at this period never entered a church door and were left to themselves even by such men as Bishop Butler. Ignorant and neglected they lived and died, hated and despised by the upper classes who considered themselves to be of another superior race entirely and fiercely resented preaching that put them all in the same class.

For any lasting results to follow, some one was needed who would be ready, to profit from the teaching and revival of religion that was already beginning, but who would be ready to preach it, anywhere, at any cost, to those who needed it most. Such a man was found in John Wesley whose teachings formed the very culmination of the revival in England. The movement had started with a protest against the practices of the time had advanced in a revival of religious duties, so clearly emphasized by, and was to culminate in the declaration of the necessity of each individual experiencing a change of heart and consequently of life. Wesley contained in his doctrines all the good that earlier reformers had taught but he brought out with a new zest and clarity, the necessity of a personal relationship that should exist between God and a converted man or woman.

Wesley believed himself to be and always urged others to be, loyal members of the Church. And to the day of his death he remained within the pale. But the methods he used during his life, justifiable as they were; were little calculated to please the greater majority of the incumbents. He saw the need of the lower classes for something to lift them on to a higher plain. As a result of his own personal experience, he was convinced that he could point them out the way whereby that very
end might be achieved. His own experience and vitality of belief was so different from the greater number of those around him that he came to regard the world as his parish. He was very loathe to act contrary to the instructions of the Church dignitaries but where he was convinced that his own way was best for the cause, he refused to follow theirs. Open air preaching was a good example of this, and who can say that Wesley was wrong when he accepted Whitefield's invitation and preached in the open air to the unfortunate neglected Kingswood miners; or again when as a result of his own and his friends efforts hundreds and thousands of followers had been raised up throughout the country, he instituted his system of lay preachers, finally ordaining Bishops for the American work, when others refused to do so? Wesley did not choose so to do, but the need had to be met, no one else met it, so he did.

As a result of his efforts thousands of lives were entirely transformed. The movement had not started amongst the lower classes. "Needed sorely enough but unheeded by Oxford common rooms, it found its readiest hearers", among the middle and lower classes. But in reality from a

(150) Robertson - P. 208.

national point of view it was fortunate for England that it did take effect in the middle and lower classes. For as Voltaire said the Englishmen are like their beer, froth on top, dregs in the bottom, but good between; if the dregs had risen while the good part decreased, it would have been a catastrophe indeed. But as actually was the case the clear was increased, while the dregs and froth were lessened.
The practical nature of the Gospel as preached by the Methodists could not be effective in cleansing the national constitution from many ills. Before they were in a position to get any religion at all, it was necessary for them to recognize their sinfulness, be willing to make it right with man and then approach God through the merit of the Son's sacrifice. The people's eyes were taken off their neighbors and turned upon themselves. The question became what is the matter with me instead of what is the matter with you. Now when the improvement starts in individuals it does not take it long to spread.

"No man ever stood at the head of a great revolution whose temper was so anti-revolutionary". Every new step was taken only because the old was no longer tenable. He always instructed his people, wherever possible, to submit to the powers that be. The immense value of such instruction at a time when France was seething with Revolutionary ideas, can scarcely be overestimated. Some may point at Wesley's lack of vision in objecting to the American Rebellion. But would the same persons have desired him to have encouraged the more than equally oppressed people at home, to have taken a similar way out? Obviously not. By laying so much emphasis upon the necessity of loyalty to the Government and that of course meant the utilization of legal means of redress, the tendency that has been so customary in the last century, to wait and work things out without war, was greatly strengthened. Thus Wesley did much by building up the national character, and consequently showing up abuses,
but yet laying on all the compulsion of restraint that required a legal 
means of solving the difficulty to make possible the political progress 
in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, without the turmoil 
strife and bloodshed of other nations. "Methodism and the French 
Revolution are the two most tremendous phenomena of the century."


It is true that Methodism finally separated from the Church but 
as Leckey says,

It also exercised a profound and lasting in­ 
fluence upon the spirit of the Established Church, 
upon the amount and distribution of the moral forces 
of the nation, and even upon the course of its 
political history. (153)

(153) Lecky - III., 1.

In the church, those who did not follow Wesley's followers out 
established what came to be known as the Evangelical party, who, in time, 
were to do almost as much for the Upper Classes as Methodism had done for 
the lower, while in the political world they used their influence to 
pass reformatory laws against slavery for example, which the Methodists 
could never have done themselves, however much they opposed it. Men 
Meanwhile changes had also been taking place in political circles. 
There too, men had tired of prolonged marking time, amid tremendous 
corruption. With the coming of War, someone was needed who could feel 
the public pulse, open the eyes of the people and despising corruption
lead them along the roads of progress.

Such a person was found in William Pitt, the Great Commoner. Vision he had, to direct successfully, the War that finally sent the Union Jack around the World; convictions he had to step in convinced that he could work things out correctly when Government was at a standstill, and besides respect for public office was his to a then remarkable extent.

He once spoke of that sense of honour which makes ambition virtue, and he illustrated it admirably himself. He was entirely inaccessible to corrupt offers, and, unlike the great majority of his contemporaries, not content with declaiming when in opposition, he attested in the most emphatic manner his sincerity when in power. (154)

(154) Lecky - II, 389.

Such was the man that came to power after the period of Walpole domination.

Thus one sees on every side a revival of interest, and something more, a clear-eyed outlook in every matter. Statesmen are tending to their affairs, and churchmen to theirs, consequently they are helping one another. There are signs of a new tone in political circles because the standards of Christianity so long forgotten or confused in the intercine fight for existence, have now come into the clear to where they affect men's lives without any political implications. He is given new standards, consequently the will work for higher things. But how has this state of affairs come about? Designedly? No. Un chattably. Men would have been legally persecuting one another still, among the Protest-
ant groups, only they found it impossible to continue doing so and survive. The indifference of some then assisted force of circumstances to lead the advocates of both sides to the light of common sense and strike the mortal blow at intolerance, thus permitting both the Church and the State to go their own way, about their own business. In so far then as the Dawn of Toleration however limited it was opened the way for real progress it is without question one of the greatest and most beneficial events in the History of England.

FINIS.
BIBLIOGRAPHY.

A. CONTEMPORARY

Aiken, G. A. Later Stuart Tracts.

Burnet, G. History of My Own Times. 3 vols.

Clark, A. Aubrey's Brief Lives. 2 vols.


Collins, J. C. An English Garner.

Encyclopedia of Religion (Modern) and Ethics.

Ellis, Henry Original Letters.

Evelyn, John Diary of, 4 vols.

II.


Jusserand, J. J. A French Ambassador at the Court of Charles II.


This book contains some useful material which throws light on the political conditions at the Court of Charles II.

Locke, John The Works of, Vol. VI.


Neal, Daniel A History of the Puritans. 5 vols.


It tells the Puritan side of the case quite effectively. It contains a good deal of original material.

Paston, George Side-Lights on the Georgian Period.


Pepys, Samuel Diary of, 8 vols.


Robertson, C. G. Select Statutes, Cases and Documents.


Somers Tracts. 16 vols.

F. Cogan, London, 1748.


### III.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### B. MODERN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Publisher/Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contains some very useful material on the social side of History.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This highly critical book is very stimulating.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Heroes of the Nations Series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Translated from the German by Mary Agnes Hamilton.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This book attempts to explain the psychological side of the revival but is of little value as an historical production.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felling, Keith</td>
<td>A History of the Tory Party 1640 - 1714.</td>
<td>Oxford, 1924.</td>
<td>The author of this book is an ardent admirer of Toryism, and writes accordingly. However he tends to obscure his thinking by giving too many facts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green, J. R.</td>
<td>England.</td>
<td>Peter Fenelon, Collier &amp; Son, New York, 1900.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VII.

Greenwood, A. D.
George Bell and Sons, London, 1909.

Halevy, Elie
A History of the English People in 1815.
Harcourt, Brace & Company, New York, 1924.

Hallam, Henry

Head, F. W.
The Fallen Stewarts.
Cambridge, 1901.

Holmes, D.
The Wesley Offering.
Derby and Miller, Auburn, 1852.

Hutton, W. H.
The English Church (1625 - 1714).
This book is written from the Anglican point of view, but treats the matters dealt with quite fairly.

Hunt, William

Inderwick, F. A.
Side-Lights on the Stuarts.
Sampson Low, Marston, Searle and Rivington, London, 1891.
Contains several good essays on various members of the Stuart family.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Publisher and Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A splendid interpretive work by a scholar who certainly knows the period. Lecky is above all else, a rationalist.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IX.

Lingard, John

History of England.


Lunn, Arnold

John Wesley.


The best biography of Wesley.

Luttrell, U.

A Brief Relation of State Affairs. 6 vols.


Macaulay, T. B.

The History of England. 3 vols.

J. M. Dent and Sons Ltd., London, 1913.

McCarthy, J.

A History of the Four Georges. 4 vols.

Harper and Brothers, London, 1901.

Mahon, Lord

History of England.

Bernard Taucheuter, Leipzig, 1853.

Massey, Wm.


Morgan, W. T.

English Political Parties and Leaders in the Reign of Queen Anne 1702 - 1710.

Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn., 1920.

This work certainly makes clear the political conditions during the early years of Anne's reign.

Overton, J. H., and Relton, Frederic

The English Church, From the Accession of George I. to the end of the Eighteenth Century (1714 - 1800).

The writer does not see the century as a whole and consequently cannot place the men in their proper perspective. He seems to be helplessly bound by the "Great-Man" theory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Publisher/Location</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

This book traces the development of the Sects very well.
Shafer, Robert

Christianity and Rationalism.

Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn., 1926.

Southey, Robert

John Wesley.


Spooner, W. A.

Bishop Butler.


Stanhope, Earl

History of England, Comprising the Reign of Queen Anne (1701 - 1715).


Stephen, Leslie


Smith, Elder and Co., London, 1876.

Stephen, Leslie

English Literature and Society in the Eighteenth Century.


Stoughton, John


Quite good.

Strickland, Agnes


Sydney, W. C.


This is an excellent book which, containing as it does numerous quotations from contemporary sources, enables one to get a real glimpse of the times.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fourteenth Edition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unfortunately this book was not available when I was working over this field.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The best work available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
XIII.

Contains some excellent illustrations.

Vernon, J.
Reign of William III.. 3 vols.

Wingfield, Stratford, E.
The History of British Civilization. 2 vols.
George Routledge and Sons Ltd., London, 1928.

The author is clever and knows it.

C. MAGAZINE ARTICLES

American Historical Review Vol. 20. (1914) p. 64.
Anglican Outlook on the Colonies in the early Eighteenth Century. B. Everts.


Consular Service in the Reign of Charles II. Violet Barbour.

Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine.

The Church of England and the Dissenters. Y. Y. Y.

Camden Society Publications.

Camden Miscellany Volume the First, 1847.
Diary of Dr. Edward Lake, Chaplain and Tutor to the Princesses Mary and Anne, 1677 - 8.

Camden Society, 1851.

Moneys received and paid for Secret Services of Charles II. and James II.

Camden Society, 1862.

Lists of Foreign Protestants and Aliens, resident in England, 1618 - 1688.

Camden Miscellany Volume the Fifth, 1864.

Letters of Charles II., Communicated by the Marquis of Bristol.

Camden Society, 1874.

Letters addressed from London to Sir Joseph Williamson while pleni­potentiary at the Congress of Cologne in the years 1673 and 1674.

New Series, Vols. XXII. and XXIII. (1878).

Correspondence of the Family of Hatton.

Century Magazine.

Vol. 66. (1903) p. 389.

John Wesley.
C. T. Winchester.

Vol. 66. (1903) p. 492.

Wesley's Days of Triumph.
C. T. Winchester.

Vol. 66. (1903) p. 633.

Wanted: Another Wesley.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magazine</th>
<th>Volume/Year</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Article Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naval Preparations of James II.</td>
<td>J. R. Tanner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The English Government and the Relief of Protestant Refugees.</td>
<td>W. A. Shaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History.</td>
<td>Vol. II. (1926) p. 333.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Queen Caroline and the Church.</td>
<td>Norman Sykes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the Evangelical Sects.

Vol. 157. (1884) p. 32.

The English Church in the Eighteenth Century.


Domestic Everyday Life, Manners and Customs, in this Country from the Earliest Period to the end of the Eighteenth Century.

George Harris.


The Development of Political Parties during the Reign of Queen Anne.

Walter Frewen Lord.


John Wesley.

Augustine Birrell.


The Evangelical Movement.

W. E. Gladstone.


Anglicans and Nonconformists.

A. E. Baker.