

## Chapter 1

# Why then are we still reforming?

### WHAT THE GOLDEN KING BEGAN

This account of the past's hold on post-revolutionary England opens with the stories of two doubting Thomases – Thomas Woolston and Thomas Rundle. One questioned Christ's miracles, the other, Christ's divinity. They rehashed heresies from antiquity and both suffered when their doubts became public. The fates of these two doubting Thomases remind us of salient features of eighteenth-century England that most have forgotten. They remind us that the eighteenth-century English obsessed about the past and debated furiously what guidance it should have for the present. They remind us of the places where and the ways in which the eighteenth-century English fought their positions. They remind us of the character of the post-revolutionary politics of religion. They remind us of the role of restraint – official and unofficial, overt and unspoken – in shaping and managing public debate. And they remind us of the central role played in those public debates by clerics. Those eighteenth-century English polemical divines tried to use Renaissance tools to solve Reformation problems that had caused seventeenth-century religious wars. When they failed to solve those problems, the English state did. In the end, Leviathan won.

Both the Woolston and Rundle controversies were fights about the past. The controversy centring on Thomas Woolston (1668–1733) erupted during the late 1720s, almost three centuries after the English Reformation had begun; but the Reformation was the framework within which many located it. Just after Christmas 1728, for instance, Edmund Gibson, bishop of London, received a pseudonymous letter from Christodulus. '[B]y the very same Sophistry wherewith you Protestants a Century or two ago unfortunately explained away the points of Holy writ, the authority of the church and the real presence ... one of your brotherhood has explained away the whole and the same foul breath that raised your Bubble of a church has blown it into nothing', Christodulus charged. '...[Y]our first step over the brink of heaven naturally landed to hell, the first step you took with your Back to the

Catholic Church naturally led you to Deism and Bold Woolston has but ended what the Golden king began, our unhappy Henry the Eight'.<sup>1</sup> Christodulus referred to Thomas Woolston's recent work on Christ's miracles. Woolston argued that 'the literal history of many of the miracles of Jesus as recorded by the Evangelists, does imply Absurdities, Improbabilities and Incredibilities, consequently they, either in whole or in part, were never wrought, as they are commonly believed now-a-days, but are only related as prophetic and parabolical Narratives of what would be mysteriously and wonderfully done by him'. Jesus, Woolston acknowledged, was the Messiah, but prophecy, not miracles, proved it. Woolston promised 'not [to] confine myself only to Reason, but also the express Authority of the Fathers, those holy, venerable and learned Preachers of the Gospel in the first Ages of the Church, who took our Religion from the Hands of the Apostles and of apostolical Men, who died, some of them and suffered for the Doctrines they taught, who professedly and confessedly were endued with divine and extraordinary Gifts of the Spirit'.<sup>2</sup> Woolston's six discourses (1727–29) denied the literal truth of Christ's miracles, caused a furore and sold nearly twenty thousand copies. The Roman Catholic Christodulus saw in Woolston's denial of miracles the natural terminus of Protestant logic. Leading figures in the Protestant English church-state judged differently, reckoning Woolston a 'fool and madman' whose works caused 'mischief'.<sup>3</sup> Woolston, an idiosyncratic figure with no powerful patron, got punished as a cautionary example. Many of the established Church's leading figures rebutted him in print and the state brought the royal justice to bear against him.

Woolston's 1729 trial for blasphemy took place at the Court of King's Bench.<sup>4</sup> There the crown's prosecutors argued that Woolston's view of Christ's miracles was illegal. '[T]his was the most Blasphemous Book that ever was Published in any Age whatsoever', claimed Attorney-General Philip Yorke. In it 'our Saviour is compared to a Conjuror, Magician and Imposter and the Holy Gospel, as wrote by the Blessed Evangelists, turned into Ridicule and Ludicrous Banter, the Literal Scope and Meaning wrested and the Whole represented as idle Romance and Fiction'. Woolston's writings, Yorke warned, threatened to cause 'the truth of the Holy Scriptures to be denied and to weaken their authority and thereupon to spread among the king's subjects irreligious and diabolical opinions'.<sup>5</sup> Yorke had made an analogous argument in *Rex v. Curll* (1727). There Yorke had contended that by publishing an obscene book Edmund Curll had committed an 'offence at common law, as it tends to corrupt the morals of the King's subjects and is against the peace of the King. Peace includes good order and government and that may be broken in many instances without an actual force. 1. If it be an act against the constitution or civil government; 2. If it be against religion: and, 3. If against morality'.<sup>6</sup> Theological heterodoxy threatened the state because it could disrupt the peace.

Woolston countered that he had not aimed 'to bring Our Religion into

Contempt, but to put Our Religion upon a better Footing and shew, That the Miracles of our Saviour were to be understood in a Metaphorical Sense and not as they were Literally Written'.<sup>7</sup> When denying Christ's transfiguration or healing miracles, Woolston protested that he had followed primitive precedent. 'I do profess here before God and the World that I am a Christian', he pleaded, 'for if I am not a Christian, not even the Fathers themselves are Christians since they believed exactly as I do'. In fact, he continued, 'the Fathers say Christianity in the Allegorical Sense of the Scriptures' and no less than St Jerome had argued 'that the literal sense is contrary to Christianity'.<sup>8</sup> His discourses aimed only 'to establish the Christian Religion upon the Foundation of the Fathers and to interpret the Scriptures as they did'.<sup>9</sup> Woolston's defence failed to sway the jury, which convicted him of blasphemy. Neither were the judges lenient: they punitively fined him and jailed him in the King's Bench prison in Southwark, where he remained on and off for the next four years before influenza killed him. Woolston's supporters claimed he had 'dyed under Persecution for Religion'.<sup>10</sup> Leaders of the English church-state, by contrast, thought they were protecting truth and ensuring civil peace. Either way, there was no denying that the church-state had sent an unmistakable message to heterodox polemical divines through Woolston's exemplary punishment.

The message that heterodoxy harmed clerical careers likewise got sent in the case of Thomas Rundle (1687–1743).<sup>11</sup> Nearly a year after Woolston's death, Lord Chancellor Charles Talbot put forward his domestic chaplain, Rundle, for the vacant see of Gloucester. Queen Caroline also supported Rundle. Yet, from the outset, Edmund Gibson, whom some called Robert Walpole's 'pope', sought to scupper Rundle's candidacy. The nomination, Gibson reported, had 'given very great offence to the clergy; and I may truly add, that the uneasiness is general, among the Whig as well as the Tory part of them'.<sup>12</sup> There were longstanding rumours that Rundle was an Arian, something neither Rundle nor his supporters publicly denied and something to which his friendships with heterodox figures lent credibility.<sup>13</sup> Moreover, Richard Venn, a hyper-orthodox and politically well-connected London priest, recounted to Gibson a long-ago conversation in which Rundle had argued that Abraham's almost-sacrifice of Isaac was 'an action unjust and unnatural, that it was the remains of his Idolatrous Education and proceeded from a vain affection of exceeding other Nations, that had indeed been guilty of human sacrifice ...; that in order to justify and heighten his character in the esteem of his friends, he pretended a Revelation from God, commissioning him to enter upon this bloody affair'. Venn charged that Rundle had 'falsely accused the Father of the Faith, or else I am sure the whole Christian Religion must be false itself'.<sup>14</sup> Others provided corroborating evidence. Charles Lamotte, a Northamptonshire clergyman, wrote unbidden to Gibson, informing him that years earlier Rundle had been 'very free with his speech and very loose in his Religion; talking sometimes like an Arian, sometimes like a Socinian'.<sup>15</sup>

The prospect of a Christologically heterodox new bishop who had also questioned the Bible's historical accuracy was too much for Gibson and most clergy. '[T]he general sense of the Bishops and Clergy, will not permit me to concur or acquiesce in it', Gibson informed Walpole, before adding that the episcopate's obeisance to the state had earned it the right to have its wishes heeded on Church matters: 'The Bishops, on account of their dutiful behaviour to the Court, might hope for some regard to their inclination and good liking in the choice of every new member of the Bench'.<sup>16</sup>

In the end, Walpole withdrew Rundle's nomination.<sup>17</sup> Contemporaries got the message. '[T]he case of Dr Rundel admonishes me, as indeed my own case had done before, of the danger of touching the third & most important article above, Religion. For the Informer against the Dr is not watchful only over the Episcopate, but extends his care to the lowest order of the Clergy', the talented and ambitious Cambridge cleric Conyers Middleton observed. 'Thus they guard the gate of Paradise, as it was of old, with a flaming sword; & treat freethinking or any thinking different from their own, as the sin against the Holy Ghost; never to be remitted, either in this life or the next.'<sup>18</sup> Where Middleton read the Rundle affair as a sign of the Church's power, some orthodox bishops actually feared that it had exposed the Church's weakness. '[W]hat has passed with [Rundle], shews too strongly, how vain an attempt it will be to endeavour to exclude others, against whom there shall be no other objection, but a want of Orthodoxy, in some certain points', Francis Hare, bishop of Chichester, lamented to Gibson.<sup>19</sup> Hare feared that the Church could not always expect the support and forbearance that its senior partner, the state, had recently shown. He was right.

The government scuttled Thomas Rundle's episcopal nomination and prosecuted Thomas Woolston for blasphemy not simply because of clerical lobbying but also because polemical divines successfully used print to shape opinions and to mobilize support. In the public debates over both Rundle and Woolston, participants returned regularly to contested patches of the Christian and English past. Woolston's opponents argued that he and his supporters had perverted ancient Christian truths.<sup>20</sup> The 'Primitive Martyrs and the Reformers ... gave us Truth', Daniel Waterland insisted; those who advocated prosecuting Woolston acted 'from a true Christian and Apostolical Spirit'.<sup>21</sup> Richard Smalbroke likewise accused Woolston's supporters of perverting primitive Christianity. 'Persons, ... under the specious Colour of Liberty are employing all their Artifices to reduce us again to a State of Heathenism and the Religion of Nature', he fretted. Tellingly, he contended 'that the Present Licentiousness bears too near a Resemblance to that which was Previous to the Public Confusions in the Age of our Forefathers; Confusions, that ended in the Ruin of the Constitution of both Church and State'.<sup>22</sup> Woolston's supporters also hearkened to the previous century. They countered that Smalbroke's arguments for 'persecution' called to mind Judge George Jeffreys (1645–89) and that '[a] proceeding like this would

have incurred an Impeachment in former Times and Arch-Bishop Laud was brought to the Scaffold, for Offences much less injurious to his Country'.<sup>23</sup>

Thomas Rundle's proposed promotion to Gloucester similarly got related to England's past.<sup>24</sup> *The Weekly Miscellany*, a Gibsonite newspaper edited by the acidulous William Webster, savaged Rundle's candidacy in a way that implicitly connected the present with the past. '[T]here is not an Infidel, Deist, or modern Freethinker in the Kingdom, who is not zealous for [Rundle's] Promotion', Webster's newspaper pronounced. Conversely, Rundle's heterodoxy rankled the orthodox. Indeed, the *Miscellany* argued, the putatively Arian Rundle was a heretic, since both Elizabethan and Williamite statues had unambiguously hereticated Arianism. Furthermore, Rundle's opponents were moderates, ones who recognized that there was a 'Medium between no Toleration and an absolute, unlimited Toleration': by implication, some things – like Christological heterodoxy – were intolerable.<sup>25</sup> *The Old Whig: or, the Consistent Protestant*, a pro-Rundle newspaper, judged differently but similarly recalled older debates. It not so subtly warned its readers that the fight over Rundle's candidacy signalled the revival of the previous century's religio-political battles. 'The nation is on all Hands alarmed with the Growth of Popery', it fretted. Worse than the papists themselves were the papist wolves in Protestant clothing. '[T]here are not wanting Men amongst ourselves, who, though Protestants by Profession, yet retain and inculcate the most dangerous Principles of Popery', the *Old Whig* claimed. But, unlike the seventeenth century, when the English monarchs had been crypto-papery's most powerful proponents, in the mid-1730s it was the Church of England's leaders who sought to subvert English liberties. The established Church's priests were 'Advocate[s] for the Inquisitorial Power and for the Subjection of the Crown itself to the Lordly Claims of the more sacred Priesthood!' Let those with longer historical memories retort that Whigs had spearheaded the last successful plot to overthrow an English monarch, the *Old Whig* editorialist reassured its readers that he 'brings with him no more of Republican than he doth of Slavish Principles, is a hearty Friend to the present Constitution and an Enemy to none but those who are Enemies to the Religion and Liberties of his Country'.<sup>26</sup>

The fundamental problem evinced by both the Rundle and Wolston affairs was how to manage religious difference, especially when unmanaged religious difference had so recently torn apart England's civil order. That the seemingly arcane theological views of two doubting Thomases worried leaders of Church and state during the 1720s and 1730s suggests that grave concerns about the post-revolutionary settlement's stability remained. Those worries stemmed from the inability definitively to solve epistemological, theological, ecclesiological and political problems unleashed by the Reformation. What magnified these problems was that all were subject to intensive public debate long after the seventeenth-century wars were done. For some, religious polemic was a way to manage religious difference, one

which offered the prospect of defeating one's ideological foes publicly and finally. In practice, public polemic was a style of conflict management that tended to roil waters, not calm them.

Among the many changes catalysed in England by the seventeenth-century revolutionary wars and the Reformation that spawned them was an explosion of printed material, which even until the mid-eighteenth century mostly concerned religion. This book gives an account of both the content and content-producers of English polemical divinity in the third of a century or so after the Hanoverian succession of 1714.<sup>27</sup> That stretch of time comprises a significant chunk of that thing we now call England's Enlightenment.<sup>28</sup> This book tries to think about the world of eighteenth-century polemical divinity as those at the time thought about it. None of them thought they were living during the Enlightenment. Instead, eighteenth-century English polemical divines had a common metaphor to describe the character and to identify the stakes of their efforts – *warfare*. Daniel Waterland, one of Woolston's opponents, disagreed with those who argued that 'all polemics were unbecoming our calling as Christians and our profession as divines'. Rather, he countered, 'The Church is militant and such soldiery is our profession and business and such warfare our proper employment'.<sup>29</sup> Or, as his contemporary William Warburton later put it, '[my] life is a warfare upon earth (that is to say with bigots and libertines, against whom I have denounced eternal war, like Hannibal against Rome at the Altar)'.<sup>30</sup> This metaphor of intellectual combat recurred in contemporary analyses of the age. But what was that 'warfare' all about? Where did it begin? And how did contemporaries think that it could be won?

What follows is the story of that polemical war told from four proximate, yet distinct, vantages, the intertwined lives and careers of Daniel Waterland (1683–1740), Conyers Middleton (1683–1750), Zachary Grey (1688–1766) and William Warburton (1698–1779). Each was an influential polemical divine during the mid-eighteenth century and each instigated or contributed to charged public debates in ancient and modern history, philosophy, literary scholarship and theology. Their contemporaries recognized them as some of the most important producers of polemical divinity. Daniel Waterland, who wrote mostly about primitive Christianity, was orthodoxy's paragon; Conyers Middleton was not, for, while he matched Waterland's erudition, he reached far different – far more heterodox – theological conclusions than his hated Cambridge contemporary. Zachary Grey likewise knew much about Christianity's early history, but he knew far more about sixteenth- and seventeenth-century English history: in defending orthodoxy, he brought to bear that deep knowledge of England's internecine religious wars. William Warburton too claimed to have read everything published in England during the 1640s and 1650s; indeed, he seems to have known a lot about most everything. In this idiosyncratic polymath was to be seen both the apotheosis and the futility of the 'warfare upon earth'.

That war was not just about methods and sources. It was about individual

authors, too. The humanness of those involved in eighteenth-century polemical divinity is all too often missed, which means that much about its character and course are also missed. Waterland, Middleton, Grey and Warburton were human beings in the round, each with his own idiosyncratic aversions, affinities and associations. Each not only had arguments that he made but also had reasons why he made those arguments, reasons which often had more to do with the vagaries of contingent circumstance than with working out a line of thought's logic to its ineluctable conclusion. This means that the story on offer in this book tries to convey the eighteenth century as those living at the time saw it and to show how and where they fought over truth.<sup>31</sup>

This approach – covering much the same ground from four different points of view and often in fine-grained ways – yields a story that widens the scope of inquiry beyond the usual Enlightenment pantheon. Locke, Newton, Hume and Gibbon, for instance, each wrote works whose importance was recognized by contemporaries and which ultimately transcended the particular era in which they were composed. Yet the print culture into which Locke, Newton, Hume and Gibbon launched their works was religion-suffused, filled as it was by polemical divinity. Locke, Newton, Hume and Gibbon, put another way, were but soldiers – and not the only ones, or, at times, even the most important ones – in the ‘warfare upon earth’.

In addition, the book elucidates not just what polemical divines argued but why they argued what they argued and why they chose particular moments and media to convey their arguments. Printed sources are the obvious place to begin when studying polemical divinity, for they reveal much – though not all – of *what* was argued. But they can be maddeningly elusive at illuminating *why* authors argued what they argued. Manuscript sources, though, shed light on the reasons for composition and publication. They also can reveal the business of polemical divinity, helping us grasp what sorts of polemical works were and were not financially viable and, by implication, which were and were not publicly appealing. All of this together identifies the terrain upon and tactics by which the ‘warfare upon earth’ was fought.

Finally and perhaps most importantly, the book's approach shows what the ‘warfare upon earth’ was all about. Jettisoning stadial and supercessionist accounts of historical development, especially those which draw sharp distinctions between a premodern religiously infused past and an increasingly secular modern one, it rejects the notion that the primary tension within eighteenth-century English intellectual life was between an enlightened, secularizing modernity and its unenlightened, sacralised opposite.<sup>32</sup> It questions, in other words, the liberation narrative in which the liberating – and liberal – forces of enlightenment battled with and ultimately triumphed over, the benighted ‘kingdom of darkness’.<sup>33</sup> That morality tale is a reductive lumpen's tale, one which reduces eighteenth-century English intellectual life to a contest between the religious and the a-religious.

This, instead, is a splitter's book. Locating polemical divines in their

political, cultural, social, religious and intellectual contexts, it reveals the complexities, contradictions and, at times, the incoherencies of the period. For rarely, if ever, are there clean breaks between one epoch and the next and this certainly was the case for eighteenth-century England. There were, instead, a set of interrelated questions which had animated English political, religious and intellectual life from the Reformation's outset. But the English tried to answer those questions in constantly changing circumstances which themselves changed the sorts of answers that were plausible or workable. At no point did the Reformation-generated questions get answered definitively: some merely seemed more urgent than others at one or another time. Indeed, the very process of trying to answer the Reformation-spawned questions about religion and politics itself generated other, eventually more urgent, questions.

### PROMOTING TRUE RELIGION

The English Reformation spurred a long conversation, one which was fundamentally about what constituted truth. That conversation proved inconclusive, leading some to suggest that '[r]eligious and political diversity ... meant a state of relativism, in which good and truth were subjective and defining the motives of an individual or party became a fraught affair as the sincerity of anyone became a matter of partisan conjecture'.<sup>34</sup> The eighteenth-century English living in the grey dawn of modernity would have thought that post-modern hand-wringing about the very possibility of making non-scientific truth claims was wrong.<sup>35</sup> Truth, perhaps ineffable, was ultimately identifiable. Among the most prominent early eighteenth-century voices in the conversation about what constituted truth were the idiosyncratic nonjuror Henry Dodwell (1641–1711) and the Boyle Lecturer and heterodox churchman Samuel Clarke. In 1706, Dodwell published *An Epistolary Discourse*, which argued for mortalism, adducing evidence not just from the Bible but also from patristic writings.<sup>36</sup> For Dodwell, both scripture and Church history proved that the human soul was 'naturally mortal'; that only the Holy Spirit could grant the soul immortality; and that only an episcopal church whose clergy held office by apostolic succession could confer the gifts of the Holy Spirit by way of the sacrament of baptism. These arguments were characteristic digs by a nonjuror at what he took to be the not-apostolic Church of England. Yet Dodwell's was also an unexpected take from someone who combatted freethinking materialism and the theologically heterodox: to advocate for mortalism was to advocate for heresy. Not unsurprisingly, Dodwell's *Epistolary Discourse* elicited rejoinders, including from Samuel Clarke, whose retort pointed up Dodwell's philosophical and scholarly errors. What especially galled Clarke was the encouragement he thought Dodwell's discourse gave to the era's 'libertines'. In particular, Clarke fretted that *An Epistolary Discourse* removed the fear of a future state of rewards and punishments. As

he explained privately to Dodwell, 'this last Book of yours, was judged by all serious men of all parties and particularly by those, whose judgment your Opinions in some other matters should make you value most, to be of dangerous consequences; and in the event it appeared notoriously, that the loose and profane people about the Town and elsewhere embraced your notion with greediness and boasted of it with great pleasure in all companies'. Worse still, 'Loose men' had taken some of Dodwell's 'Quotations out of the Fathers, particularly your long one out of Tertullian' and had used them 'to Ridicule you and the Fathers, & indeed Religion itself'.<sup>37</sup>

The Clarke–Dodwell exchange illustrates that, for the eighteenth-century English, ideas had consequences; that some ideas were right, others wrong; and that properly reading the past was crucial to the task of distinguishing correct from incorrect ideas. At its heart, the 'warfare upon earth' was about Truth: or, as Clarke put it to Dodwell, it was about 'true Religion'.<sup>38</sup> Polemical divines like Clarke and Dodwell contested 'true Religion' along two connected fronts, the one concerning ideas, the other politics. The intellectual front concerned the ways Truth could be ascertained and defined, the political one, the ways Truth could best be promulgated and defended: the former was about scholarship, the latter, about anything and everything that touched upon the relation of Church to state.<sup>39</sup> Both were necessary because the eighteenth-century English disagreed vigorously about what actually constituted the truth and they aired those disagreements publicly and politically. That 'sincerity' was floated as one possible potential litmus test of truth did not mean that the eighteenth-century English were relativists.<sup>40</sup> To their way of thinking, their public sphere swirled not with a welter of truth-claims but with a welter of truths and untruths. This is why the literature of the period abounded with accusations of stupidity and imposture: Truth was Truth and those who denied it either were too thick-headed to ascertain it or else they were liars. Ferreting out liars was one of the polemical divine's chief tasks. The fixedness and immutability of the truth also explains why most thought that restraint and coercion were not just acceptable but morally necessary. The only questions were whom it was acceptable to restrain or to coerce and how to go about restraining or coercing them.

The origins of the eighteenth-century 'warfare upon earth' lay in the sixteenth century, in the Reformation, a religious movement meant to ground truth on something solid, irrefutable and irrefragable: *sola scriptura*. Rather than revealing or recovering truth, though, the Reformation unexpectedly and wholly unintentionally generated competing truth-claims. In the name of truth, it disturbed the peace, pitting man against man, Church against Church, nation against nation in violent struggle over what was the truth or, perhaps more accurately, over who or what had the power to determine or to assert the truth. In mid- and late seventeenth-century England, an intra-Protestant war and a political revolution erupted over these issues and, in their wakes, people sought again to establish truth on something firm and

permanent. A few proposed rationalistic metaphysics as that foundation.<sup>41</sup> Most did not, not least because that rationalistic metaphysics only catalysed the production of more and more truth-claims. Instead, far more tried to ground truth on history, since it was something which existed not in the mind's eye but in the actual, documented historical record. The past had happened and, presumably, was recoverable. Eighteenth-century English intellectual life was primarily about trying to recover or recreate a golden past, a state of primitive purity before things had gone badly wrong.<sup>42</sup> Where that golden past lay and precisely what constituted it formed the crux of English intellectual debate in the century after the revolutions. The past – its meanings, its guidance, its hold in the present – was terrain to be seized and secured in the 'warfare upon earth'.

In short, the eighteenth-century English were a revolution-haunted people. They, to borrow John Pocock's evocative description, 'lived with the memory of the civil wars as a nightmare from which [they were] struggling to awake, or, if you prefer, to go to sleep again'.<sup>43</sup> What made that nightmare doubly terrifying was that the debates which the Reformation had spawned and which the religious wars of the seventeenth century had sought to resolve were themselves unresolved. The eighteenth-century, then, was a chapter in the Reformation which had not yet ended, its story, the middle part of a longer one, rather than an early scene in a new one. In the age of enlightenment, English polemical divines engaged primarily in what they conceived of as a restorative project – the reformation of the Reformation. However, that restorative project – like the Reformation – also proved enormously creative. That creativity itself threatened to destabilize civil society unless it could be channelled, controlled or squelched.

## AN INSTRUMENT OF CONVINCING SOME MEN'S MINDS

The English Reformation had succeeded through coercion and persuasion. English Protestants, no less than their Continental counterparts, needed the state's support – and its coercive powers – to ensure that religious reform could survive.<sup>44</sup> But the Reformation's survival also depended on the success of those who jockeyed publicly to convince the English people that the Church of Rome posed the greatest threat to true religion and to their liberties. The English had to believe in Protestantism for it to survive and thrive. Yet precisely because the arguments being publicly debated were contentious, they had sometimes to be made anonymously lest the state might decide to punish those who, even unwittingly, disturbed the civil order.

This held true even after the Glorious Revolution. The post-revolution settlement's success required the state's support and required most people to believe in it. Yet making the case for that settlement meant reconciling it with a variety of Christian and English pasts. At times, it meant being discreet to avoid being coerced by the state. John Jackson (1686–1763) was one

of those still trying to come to grips with those pasts; and he was one whose polemical career also bears witness to the persistent need for discretion.<sup>45</sup> In 1714, he began his career as a polemical divine anonymously defending Samuel Clarke's Christologically heterodox *Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity*. In the ensuing years, Jackson turned his fire not just on the orthodox but also on other heterodox figures, including the prominent Socinian Stephen Nye (1647–1719).<sup>46</sup> In early 1715, Jackson wrestled with whether to affix his name to the title-page of his forthcoming anti-Nye piece. Clarke counselled him to remain anonymous, not least because it might stall Jackson's clerical career. Jackson recognized that publicly embracing Clarke's Christology might damage him: 'I have an increasing Family and for their sakes would not expose myself to more Danger than I believed to be absolutely necessary, knowing that their Calamities would make my sufferings the more grievous'. Notwithstanding this, he still wanted publicly to claim authorship and for reasons which are illustrative. To begin with, Nye might be more likely to defend his own position publicly if Jackson acknowledged his authorship; 'but if I were Anonymous, He might with some pretence neglect or despise me'. More importantly, though, if Jackson's identity were known, it might mobilize support to his and Clarke's theological position regarding Christ's nature. Firstly, if York clergy knew that Jackson had published a book, they would be more apt to read it and to rally around Jackson because in the diocese he was 'generally beloved'. Secondly, Jackson reckoned that he might 'be an Instrument of convincing some men's minds and possibly stir up some other men able and eminent in the Church openly to defend this Cause'. Finally, he reckoned that he might actually be able to avoid official punishment, especially in light of a recent deal which Clarke had struck with the bishops: 'I am apt to think that our Convocation will do nothing, unless yours proceed further; so that, I may be sheltered under your Wing'.<sup>47</sup>

Though a rural Yorkshire cleric, John Jackson displayed a careful shrewdness common to eighteenth-century polemical divines, who were thoughtful and skilled craftsmen. Moreover, Jackson's letter to Samuel Clarke reminds us that the whole point of polemical divinity was to convince others and to mobilize opinion. Print was the primary venue in which arguments were to be made. Eighteenth-century England itself was awash in printed material. The figures are striking. Before the English Civil War, around 850 individual imprints appeared from English presses each year; by the end of the century, that number had doubled to around 1670 imprints; and by the mid eighteenth century, that number had itself increased by half again to around 2500 titles.<sup>48</sup> These figures only count for single-title imprints, not variants or editions. Nor do they account for the expansion of newsprint during the eighteenth century. Simultaneously a cause and effect of this massive uptick in printed material was that people publicly made – indeed increasingly *had* publicly to make – their arguments in order to persuade and mobilize opinion.<sup>49</sup>

While many have noted the explosion of printed material, fewer have noted the degree to which eighteenth-century English print culture abounded with religious material: indeed, it was hard to open any popular periodical from the period without being struck not just by its presence there, but also by the sorts of subject and arguments on offer. A reader of the January 1736 issue of the popular *Gentleman's Magazine*, for instance, would have found it opening with a short defence of 'particular providence' by 'W.J.' from Oxford. The letter writer wrote to rebut a *Grub Street Journal* contributor – a 'Mr. Prompter' – who '[b]y the Discovery of Reason ... acknowledges the Existence of a Supreme Being, governing by general Laws and a general Providence', but who nevertheless denied God's particular providence. To W.J.'s way of thinking, Mr. Prompter was 'a very ignorant Philosopher, if he cannot by the light of Reason, how imperfect so ever it is, discover the Necessity of a particular Providence'. Rather than being one of the 'Inventions of human Pride' that have 'defaced [Christianity's] primitive Beauty', the belief in God's particular providence was entirely consonant with 'the sacred Writings'.<sup>50</sup> Having opened with this full-throated defence of providence and of the contemporary Church of England's primitive purity, the rest of the issue of the *Gentleman's Magazine* abounded with stories touching on religion, from a dissection of the papacy's claims to depose secular authorities to accounts of Henry II and John's 'scandalously submit[ting] to the Pope's extravagant Authority' to a paean to the colony of Georgia – 'a Charitable Benefaction of Heaven' – to a set of queries regarding Edmund Gibson's *Codex Juris Ecclesiastici*.

Near the back of the magazine appeared a register of thirty-five works which had been published that month. Twelve publications – works like William Warburton's *Alliance between church and state*; an English translation of Abbot Aelfric of Eynsham's *Testimony of antiquity concerning the sacramental body and blood of Christ*; and a selection of 'Athanasian Forgeries' drawn from William Whiston's writings by a pseudonymous 'Lover of Truth' – dealt explicitly with religious subjects. Yet at least six other works printed during the first month of 1736 touched upon religion. Two pieces on spirituous liquors addressed not just the physical and economic effects of the 'gin craze' but also its moral causes and effects, while Voltaire's *Tragedy of Zara* contained biting criticisms of both Muslims and Christians. Still other publications hearkened back to the internecine religio-political English conflicts of the seventeenth century, including a treatise on current party politics and a poem entitled *Britain: being the fourth part of Liberty*, in which the poet credited the Tudors before the Stuarts ruined things by abandoning Reformation political and religious principles.<sup>51</sup>

The *Gentleman's Magazine* was not anomalous – polemical divinity dominated eighteenth-century booksellers' catalogues, with between one-quarter and one-third of all titles, most narrowly conceived, being 'religious' ones. That percentage goes up steeply when we account for the fact that some titles

which might not seem religious (historical, philosophical or political works for example) were centrally concerned with religious issues.<sup>52</sup> Moreover, booksellers were not operating public charities, but were instead bottom-line-minded businessmen who printed what they thought they could sell. Some were likely willing to publish loss-leaders, but, for most booksellers, the line between profit and penury was thin.<sup>53</sup> There was, in other words, a vibrant market for polemical divinity: and there was a vibrant market because the issues which animated polemical divinity continued to matter.

Eighteenth-century English booksellers got their polemical divinity from authors who hailed from broadly similar backgrounds. Not all who wrote polemical divinity were themselves clerics – John Toland, Anthony Collins and Matthew Tindal, for instance – but, for the most part, those who did were clergymen. A few were Dissenters, but the vast majority, like the vast majority of the English nation itself, were members of the Church of England. This included even some of the most heterodox divines of the period, including Woolston. The Dissenters had usually gone to English Dissenting academics and sometimes to Scottish or Dutch universities, while the established churchmen had almost always spent time in the clerical factories at Oxford and Cambridge.<sup>54</sup> Some remained as college fellows there, but most dispersed to the four corners of the land to one or another of their ecclesiastical livings. From there, they kept abreast of new books and pamphlets primarily by way of newspapers, whose pages teemed with advertisements and recommendations of new titles and by way of extensive clerical correspondence networks. Like the rest of the nation, the clergy were politically divided, with Tories outnumbering Whigs early in the century, a numerical advantage that dwindled significantly as the Walpolean Whigs gradually and successfully convinced Tories that they too could safeguard the established Church's rights and privileges.<sup>55</sup> A great deal of polemical divinity produced dealt with those political divisions in Church and state and with the relationship between the Church and the state, though a shorthand definition of polemical divinity would be any published work that dealt either directly or implicitly with religious matters. Sermons, catechisms, biblical exegeses and church histories count among their number, but could also include works on politics, philosophy, literature, natural science or even works of hack journalism. To distinguish between dispassionate works of scholarship and of putatively raw polemic or between pastoral works and polemical ones, is mostly to make an artificial distinction.<sup>56</sup> The whole range of works of polemical divinity got published mainly by London-based presses or by ones in either of the university towns.<sup>57</sup>

Eighteenth-century English polemical divines were either *orthodox* or not. Affixing labels to the participants in eighteenth-century polemical divinity or to the positions they held is a fraught matter, not the least because the century itself was almost as awash in labels as it was in print.<sup>58</sup> Contemporaries employed *orthodox*, *heterodox*, *high church*, *low church*, *dogmatic*, *latitudinarian*,

*papist, popish, deist, atheist, infidel* and other labels simultaneously as terms of description and of abuse, no less than those in the previous century had bandied about *Puritanism*: eighteenth-century labels were at once substantive and contested categories.<sup>59</sup> Yet, perhaps surprisingly, *orthodoxy* was the most substantive and least contested of contemporary categories during the early and mid-eighteenth century. In general, contemporaries reckoned that *orthodoxy* entailed belief in the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds; the episcopal ecclesiology of the Church of England; and the necessity of the church's legal establishment, an establishment safeguarded by penal laws. Where contemporaries disagreed was over whether or not *orthodoxy* was a good or a bad thing, whether it contained the sum of all true doctrine and thus promoted moral and social order or whether it betrayed 'true religion' and was punitive and persecutory. Debates over *orthodoxy* tended to be about its value rather than about its content. By contrast, virtually every other label employed in eighteenth-century English polemical divinity was hotly contested.

To locate the line between orthodoxy and not-orthodoxy, eighteenth-century English polemical divines employed methods of argument that bore striking similarities to the methods employed by English polemical divines since the 1530s. The binary languages of *anti-popery* and *anti-puritanism* still proved enormously useful during the eighteenth century, as did that of *moderation*, with all of its implications regarding restraint and coercion.<sup>60</sup> So too did the apologetical triumvirate of *faith, reason* and *tradition* also continue to be invoked, though in the eighteenth century *tradition*, whose truths were discerned by the application of reason to the historical record, was the chief figure in that trinity.<sup>61</sup>

## REFORMATION IS GOOD, WHEN REFORMATION IS WANTING

If some of the methods of argument which characterized sixteenth- and seventeenth-century English intellectual life continued on into the eighteenth century, the circumstances in which they were employed had altered significantly. Revolutions have effects; multiple revolutions have profound effects. Eighteenth-century polemical divinity both reflected the changes to English society wrought by the seventeenth-century revolutions *and* was a debate about the character and nature of those revolutionary outcomes.

There are a few basic stories which historians tend to tell about what happened to England in the wake of the seventeenth-century religio-political wars. The predominant story is one of discontinuity in which issues of religion, the constitution, the succession and foreign policy imbricate seamlessly. On this reading, the revolution of 1688–89 provoked an 'Anglican crisis' which played out for the next quarter-century.<sup>62</sup> That crisis turned on the relationship between the established Church of England and the English state; and it at once overlay and informed the period's turbulent party poli-

tics. For many Church of England clergymen and their Tory supporters, the post-revolutionary settlement had betrayed the established Church. William of Orange's ascension to the throne forced the clergy to reconcile the new political realities with their post-Civil War public teaching about indefeasible hereditary right and the duty of loyalty and obedience to God's providentially chosen, divinely anointed monarch: another option, of course, was nonjuring and deprivation of one's livings. It was an attractive choice for few. That the new Dutch Calvinist king seemed initially that he might actively be trying to provoke the established Church by pursuing alliances with Protestant nonconformists; that the Toleration Act rendered the Church of England functionally a voluntary body; and that the state seemed unwilling to do anything to stem the rise of what many clergy saw as 'blasphemy' and 'irreligion' only made matters worse. The Church was 'in danger'. Clerical resentment over the post-revolutionary religio-political order soured steadily through the Convocation crisis of the late 1690s – which saw the archbishop of Canterbury marshalling the talents of rising clerical stars like Edmund Gibson and William Wake to make the (accurate) historical case that the Convocation sat at the king's pleasure – until matters finally came to a head during the Sacheverell crisis of 1709–10. The subsequent passage of the Occasional Conformity Act (1711) and the Schism Act (1714) were not, as it turned out, irreversible moments of high church triumph but high-water marks of Tory influence, for after the Hanoverian succession in 1714, the Whigs 'took their revenge and the Church of England went under the iron hand of patronage'.<sup>63</sup> First under the avowedly anticlerical Stanhope–Sunderland ministry and then under the slightly less confrontational Walpolean regime, Whigs brought the Church of England to heel so that religion would not rend the nation asunder as it had during the seventeenth century and as it had threatened to do during the first decade of the eighteenth.

Standing opposed to this story of the growth of secular politics and of its concomitant, political stability, in the wake of the post-revolutionary, religiously fuelled 'rage of party' is a second story, one which emphasizes continuities and highlights the continued importance of religion in the nation's politics and political thought. In this counter-narrative, the stretch of time between 1660 and 1832 is a coherent entity – the 'long eighteenth century' – an era inaugurated by the Restoration of the Stuarts in 1660.<sup>64</sup> Far from restoring the old order, the Restoration settlement actually attempted to reconcile new realities with older assumptions and practices. In particular, providentialist ideas of hierarchy found their instantiation and validation in the monarchy, while the Church of England was restored without some of its important prerogatives. Perhaps most significantly, 'the ideal of a church of all the English was, in practice if not in theory abandoned: now, a hegemonic established Church was to be the church of nine out of ten of the population', even as the 10 per cent of the populace who were religious dissidents were left to form their own uncomprehended churches while being 'accorded freedom

of worship'. This new religio-political order would survive, not unchallenged, until 1832, when the passage of the Great Reform Act marked an own-goal, the entirely voluntary 'end of the Protestant constitution'.<sup>65</sup>

This book synthesizes these two stories, giving due weight both to the continuities and to the discontinuities of the period. It begins by recognizing that, while the Restoration was a moment of disjuncture in English history, it was a disjuncture that itself resulted from England's distinctive Reformation: the civil war which the Restoration followed had erupted because the English Reformation had produced a particular set of intellectual and political problems. Furthermore, the book recognizes that the Restoration decidedly did not provide solutions to those Reformation-spawned intellectual and political problems, problems with which the eighteenth-century English continued to grapple. By the same token, this book appreciates the contradictory effects of the seventeenth-century revolutions. Much, admittedly, had not changed after them. The nation emerged from the seventeenth century retaining its monarchy and its parliament, while the established Church retained its episcopal ecclesiology and its articles of religion. But other changes were profound. After the Glorious Revolution, the Church was functionally, though not theoretically, the state's subordinate partner. That disconnect between theory and practice at once underlay, informed and fuelled religious debates during the eighteenth century.<sup>66</sup> Most fundamentally, what had changed since the seventeenth century were the revolutions themselves, the memories of which were debated and contested throughout the eighteenth century. The ease and frequency with which contemporaries invoked the Glorious Revolution might seem testimony to its widespread acceptance by the nation. The fact that the abdicated king had been a papist and his successors both relatives and Protestants surely helped to make the regime change easier to accept.<sup>67</sup> But the Glorious Revolution had been bloody and the religio-political order built in its stead proved fully satisfactory neither to many religious minorities, who thought the Toleration Act had not gone far enough, nor to many within the Church of England, who thought that the Toleration Act had gone too far.<sup>68</sup> The contorted and tortured logic which characterized the annual 30 January and 29 May sermons during the eighteenth century, though, more glaringly testified to the degree to which the causes and implications of those wars continued to disturb the nation long after their purportedly glorious resolution in the decade after 1688.<sup>69</sup> And this unease, this fear that things might relapse into a state of chaos and bloodshed, underlay the eighteenth-century cult of personal restraint through moderation, politeness and civility.<sup>70</sup>

Fear of relapse into anarchy also helps to explain some characteristic features of eighteenth-century English polemical divinity. The first was the common lament by the established Church of England's leadership that the spectre of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries made restraint more difficult. 'This is our misfortune; we are so afraid of the least tendency to

persecution, that we cannot bear the least restraint', Archbishop William Wake lamented in the run-up to the Woolston trial. 'It is a sad case that we cannot keep in the middle way and allow what is fit to be published, or may be read without reproach, but at the same time both restrain and punish what is openly blasphemous and tends to the ruin of all religion and indeed of all respect for everything that is either pious or serious.'<sup>71</sup> The second notable feature of eighteenth-century polemical divinity was the palpable frustration among polemical divines that they might have found themselves at an intellectual dead-end. Paradoxically, historical research – the process of making documentable, and hence presumably verifiable, historical claims that all could recognize as both legitimate and true – itself sometimes seemed to undermine truth. History did not resolve the debates between competing camps, it multiplied the fights and, unwittingly and unintentionally, helped to secularize thought, as Samuel Johnson and his contemporaries would have understood it: it took religion and made it 'worldly'.<sup>72</sup> This, from the perspective of eighteenth-century polemical divines was a tragedy glimpsed, if not always grasped. But it was, in retrospect, an almost inescapable tragedy because another of the Reformation's legacies was a univocal God, one who existed within and thus in relation to his creation rather than transcendently to it.<sup>73</sup> He was, then, subject to its rules and the evidences for his existence subject to the same standards of proof as anything else in nature. When the rules of historical evidence were incapable of proving definitively God's existence, much less illuminating his providential design for his creation, a notable feature of the modern world emerged, the state's functional monopoly on the truth. For when even history could not reconcile or arbitrate between competing truth-claims, into the breach stepped Leviathan. Thus, when Edmund Gibson admonished the clergy of London that one of the best ways to combat infidelity was 'to express a dutiful Behaviour to the Government and a Desire to promote Peace and Quietness in our several Stations', he was tacitly acknowledging what many at the time feared, that they were living through a Reformation without end.<sup>74</sup> Or, as Daniel Waterland exasperatedly put it, 'Reformation is good, when reformation is wanting: but to be always reforming is no reforming at all: it is behaving as children tossed to and fro with every wind of doctrine. All errors of any moment have been purged off long ago, by the care of our Reformers and why then are we still reforming?'<sup>75</sup>

## NOTES

- 1 Christodulus to Gibson, 31 December 1728 (BL, Sloane 4050, fol. 27). Cf. P. Rogers, 'God's Judgment upon Hereticks: A "Lost" Satire on Thomas Woolston and Edmund Gibson', *Review of English Studies* 65 (2014), pp. 78–98.
- 2 T. Woolston, *Discourse of the miracles* (1727: T077543), pp. 4, 5.
- 3 Waterland to Thomas Bishop, 1 January 1730 (MCC/MR).
- 4 D. Manning, 'Blasphemy in England, c. 1660–1730' (Ph.D. thesis, University of

- Cambridge, 2008), pp. 283–329; W. Trapnall, *Thomas Woolston* (Bristol, 1994), pp. 50–79, 133–67. The decision to prosecute Woolston in King’s Bench rather than in the ecclesiastical courts is notable: a conviction in the royal courts would ensure a harsher penalty. I thank Bill Gibson for this point.
- 5 [T. Woolston], *Trial of Thomas Woolston* (1729: N013667), p. 2; Trapnell, *Thomas Woolston*, p. 61.
  - 6 J. Strange, *Reports of adjudged cases* (1795: N012814), p. 789. Cf. [E. Curll], *Life of Mr. Woolston* (1733: T077528), p. 15.
  - 7 [Woolston], *Trial*, p. 3.
  - 8 Woolston’s speech at his trial for blasphemy, 1729 (BL, Add. 35886, fol. 26; TNA, SP 46/143/1, fol. 384). J. Whiston, *Historical memoirs* (1730: T036320), I, p. 198 traced Woolston’s heterodox theological method to his study of ‘Origen’s allegorical works’. J. Hunt, *Religious Thought in England* (1870), III, p. 383, reckoned that ‘Exclusive study of the Fathers made Woolston a maniac’.
  - 9 Woolston’s response to charges of blasphemy, 1729 (BL, Add. 35880, fol. 12).
  - 10 [Curll], *Life of... Woolston*, p. 31.
  - 11 N. Sykes, *Edmund Gibson* (Oxford, 1926), pp. 155–61; T. Kendrick, ‘Sir Robert Walpole, the old Whigs and the Bishops, 1733–1736’, *HJ* 11 (1968), pp. 426–8; S. Taylor, ‘Queen Caroline and the Church’, in S. Taylor, C. Jones and R. Connor (eds), *Hanoverian Britain and Empire* (Woodbridge, 1998), pp. 99–100.
  - 12 Gibson to Walpole, [December 1733] (SAL, Gibson 5285a).
  - 13 Chubb to Cox Macro, 18 July 1719 (BL, Add. 32556, fol. 140).
  - 14 Venn to Gibson, 27 December 1733 (SAL, Gibson 5293). See also Egmont, II, pp. 2, 23, 39, 49.
  - 15 Lamotte to Gibson, 26 October 1734 (SAL, Gibson 5289).
  - 16 Gibson to Walpole, 18 December 1733 (CUL, Cholmondeley Ch (H) 2106). Cf. Hervey, *Memoirs*, II, pp. 399–405; Egmont, II, pp. 136–7. More generally, see S. Taylor, ‘“Dr. Codex” and the Whig “Pope”’: Edmund Gibson, Bishop of Lincoln and London, 1716–1748’, in R. Davis (ed.), *Lords of Parliament* (Stanford, 1995), pp. 9–27; S. Taylor, ‘The Bishops at Westminster in the Mid-Eighteenth Century’, in C. Jones (ed.), *A Pillar of the Constitution* (1989), pp. 137–63.
  - 17 Bishops unsuccessfully opposed Rundle’s subsequent appointment as bishop of Derry: R. Mant, *Church of Ireland* (1840), II, pp. 537–43.
  - 18 Middleton to Hervey, 12 March 1734 (SRO, 941/47/8).
  - 19 Hare to Gibson, 4 August 1736 (SAL, Gibson 5311).
  - 20 M. Suarez, ‘“The most Blasphemous Book that ever was Publish’d”: Ridicule, Reception and Censorship in Eighteenth-Century England’, in W. Kirsop (ed.), *The Commonwealth of Books* (Melbourne, 2007), pp. 48–77; R. Lund, ‘Irony as Subversion: Thomas Woolston and the Crime of Wit’, in R. Lund (ed.), *Margins of Orthodoxy* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 170–94.
  - 21 [D. Waterland], *Defence of the lord bishop* (1730: T141508), pp. 20, 32.
  - 22 R. Smalbroke, *Vindication of the miracles* (1731: T105058), I, dedication.
  - 23 J. Jones, *Instructions* (1729: T115803), p. 11.
  - 24 Cf. C. Gerrard, *The Patriot Opposition to Walpole* (Oxford, 1994), pp. 27–34.
  - 25 WM (7 December 1734), p. 1.
  - 26 OW (13 March 1735), pp. 1, 2. See also A. Thompson, ‘Popery, Politics and Private Judgment in Early Hanoverian Britain’, *HJ* 45 (2002), pp. 333–56.

- 27 The eighteenth-century polemical divine is not an over-studied type, but see B. Young, *Religion and Enlightenment in Eighteenth-Century England* (Oxford, 1998); B. Young, 'Theological Books from *The Naked Gospel* to *Nemesis of Faith*', in I. Rivers (ed.), *Books and Their Readers in Eighteenth-Century England: New Essays* (London, 2001), pp. 79–104.
- 28 W. Bulman, 'Enlightenment for the Culture Wars', in W. Bulman and R. Ingram (eds), *God in the Enlightenment* (Oxford, 2016), pp. 1–41; J. Robertson, *The Enlightenment* (Oxford, 2015). On religion and the English Enlightenment, see Young, *Religion and Enlightenment*; J. Pocock, *Barbarism and Religion*, 6 vols (Cambridge, 1999–2016); J. Pocock, 'Post-Puritan England and the Problem of Enlightenment', in P. Zagorin (ed.), *Culture and Politics from Puritanism to the Enlightenment* (Berkeley, 1980), pp. 91–112; J. Pocock, 'Clergy and Commerce: The Conservative Enlightenment in England', in R. Ajello and F. Venturi (eds), *L'eta dei Lumi* (Naples, 1985), pp. 525–62.
- 29 Waterland to Bishop, 11 December 1733 (MCC/MR).
- 30 Warburton to Richard Hurd, 25 May 1763 (LLEP, pp. 346–7). Alexander Pope surely coined this phrase. 'The life of a Wit is a warfare upon earth; and the present spirit of the world is such, that to attempt to serve it (anyway) one must have the constancy of a martyr and a resolution to suffer for its sake': A. Pope, *Works* (1717: T005388), I, preface. Warburton was Pope's literary executor.
- 31 B. Gregory, 'Can We "See Things Their Way"? Should We Try?', in A. Chapman, J. Coffey and B. Gregory (eds), *Seeing Things Their Way* (Notre Dame, IN, 2009) pp. 24–45.
- 32 B. Gregory, *The Unintended Reformation* (Cambridge, MA, 2012), pp. 1–24; A. Walsham, 'Migrations of the Holy: Explaining Religious Change in Medieval and Early Modern Europe', *JMEMS* 44 (2014), pp. 241–80.
- 33 A. Pagden, *The Enlightenment* (2013); J. Israel, *A Revolution of the Mind: Radical Enlightenment and the Origins of Modern Democracy* (Princeton, 2011).
- 34 M. Knights, *The Devil in Disguise: Deception and Fanaticism in the Early English Enlightenment* (Oxford, 2011), p. 5. See also M. Knights, 'Public Politics in England, c. 1675–c. 1715', in N. Tyacke (ed.), *The English Revolution, c. 1590–1720* (Manchester, 2007), pp. 169–84.
- 35 Early modern scepticism and postmodern relativism differ in kind, not degree: R. Popkin and M. Goldie, 'Scepticism, Priestcraft and Toleration', in M. Goldie and R. Wokler (eds), *Cambridge History of Eighteenth-Century Political Thought* (Cambridge, 2006), esp. pp. 79–92; P. Graham, 'The Relativist Response to Radical Skepticism', in J. Greco (ed.), *Oxford Handbook of Skepticism* (Oxford, 2008), pp. 392–414.
- 36 B. Young, "'The Soul-Sleeping System": Politics and Heresy in Eighteenth-Century England', *JEH* 45 (1994), pp. 76–9; Wigelsworth, 'Samuel Clarke's Newtonian Soul', *JHI* 70 (2009), pp. 54–8. Cf. J.-L. Quantin, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity* (Oxford, 2009), pp. 366–95.
- 37 Clarke to Dodwell, [1706] (BL, Add. 4370, fol. 2).
- 38 Ibid.
- 39 W. Bulman, *Anglican Enlightenment: Orientalism, Religion and Politics in England and Its Empire, 1648–1715* (Cambridge, 2015); D. Levitin, 'From Sacred History to the History of Religion: Paganism, Judaism and Christianity in European

- Historiography from the Reformation to 'Enlightenment', *HJ* 55 (2012), pp. 1117–60.
- 40 M. Knights, 'Occasional Conformity and the Representation of Dissent: Hypocrisy, Sincerity, Moderation and Zeal', *PH* 24 (2005), pp. 41–57.
- 41 J. Henry, 'The Reception of Cartesianism', in P. Antsey (ed.), *Oxford Handbook of British Philosophy in the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford, 2013), pp. 116–43; A. Milton, 'Authority and Reason: The Seventeenth Century', in A. Hastings and A. Mason (eds), *Christian Thought: A Brief History* (Oxford, 2002), pp. 108–12.
- 42 Quantin, *Church of England* provides indispensable background. Cf. G. Bennett, 'Patristic Authority in the Age of Reason', *Oecumenica* (1971/2), pp. 72–87.
- 43 J. Pocock, 'Within the Margins: The Definitions of Orthodoxy', in R. Lund (ed.), *Margins of Orthodoxy* (Cambridge, 1995), p. 38.
- 44 E. Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars* (New Haven, 1992), pp. 377–593; E. Shagan, 'The Emergence of the Church of England, c. 1520–1553', in A. Milton (ed.), *Oxford History of Anglicanism. Volume I* (Oxford, 2017), pp. 28–44.
- 45 B. Young, 'Newtonianism and the Enthusiasm of Enlightenment', *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science: Part A* 35 (2004), pp. 645–63.
- 46 Unless otherwise noted, all quotations in this paragraph draw from Jackson to Clarke, 30 April 1715 (CUL, 7113). See also P. Lim, 'The Platonic Captivity of Primitive Christianity and the Enlightening of Augustine', in W. Bulman and R. Ingram (eds), *God in the Enlightenment* (Oxford, 2016), pp. 136–56.
- 47 Jackson eventually affixed his name to the title-page of J. Jackson, *Examination of Mr. Nye's explication* (1715: T096861).
- 48 J. Barnard and M. Bell, 'Appendix 1', in J. Barnard and D. McKenzie (eds), *Cambridge History of the Book, Vol. IV: 1557–1695* (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 783–4; M. Suarez, 'Towards a Bibliometric Analysis of the Surviving Record, 1701–1800', in M. Suarez and M. Turner (eds), *Cambridge History of the Book, Vol. V: 1695–1830* (Cambridge, 2009), pp. 42–4.
- 49 J. Peacey, *Print and Public Politics in the English Revolution* (Cambridge, 2013), provides essential background. Most early modern English historians have rejected Jürgen Habermas's definition of the bourgeois public sphere; his explanation for its emergence and transformation; and his chronology of its appearance and disappearance. They have, though, opted for a less technically specific, more capacious understanding of a practical public sphere – roughly, what people did publicly when trying to convince others to do what they wanted them to do: P. Lake, 'Post-Reformation Politics or, on Not Looking for the Long-Term Consequences of the English Civil War', in M. Braddick (ed.), *Oxford Handbook of the English Revolution* (Oxford, 2015), pp. 21–42.
- 50 GM (January 1736), pp. 3–4.
- 51 [J. Thomson], *Britain* (1736: T029680).
- 52 Suarez, 'Towards a Bibliometric Analysis'; J. Feather, 'British Publishing in the Eighteenth Century: A Preliminary Subject Analysis', *The Library*, sixth series, 8 (1986), pp. 32–46; I. Rivers, 'Religious Publishing', in M. Suarez and M. Turner (eds), *Cambridge History of the Book, Vol. 5: 1695–1830* (Cambridge, 2009), pp. 579–600. For an earlier period, Patrick Collinson, Arnold Hunt and Alexandra Walsham, 'Religious Publishing in England, 1557–1640', in J. Barnard and D. McKenzie (eds), *Cambridge History of the Book, Vol. IV: 1557–1695* (Cambridge,

- 2002), pp. 29–66. For sermons, easily the most popular form of polemical divinity, R. Dixon, ‘Sermons in Print, 1660–1700’, in P. McCullough, H. Adlington and E. Rhatigan (eds), *Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon* (Oxford, 2011), pp. 460–79; W. Gibson, ‘The British Sermon, 1689–1901: Quantities, Performance, Culture’, in W. Gibson and K. Francis (eds), *Oxford Handbook of the Modern British Sermon, 1689–1901* (Oxford, 2012), pp. 3–30. Jamie Latham’s forthcoming Cambridge Ph.D. thesis (‘The Clergy and Print in Eighteenth-Century England, c. 1714–1750’) will be indispensable for scholars of print culture.
- 53 J. Raven, *The Business of Books: Booksellers and the English Book Trade* (New Haven, 2007).
- 54 H. McLachlan, *English Education under the Test Acts* (Manchester, 1931); J. Gascoigne, *Cambridge in the Age of Enlightenment* (Cambridge, 1989); W. Ward, *Georgian Oxford: University Politics in the Eighteenth Century* (Oxford, 1958).
- 55 J. Chamberlain, *Accommodating High Churchmen: The Clergy of Sussex, 1700–1745* (Urbana, 1997); S. Taylor, ‘Church and State in the Mid-Eighteenth Century: The Newcastle Years, 1742–62’ (Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge, 1987); Sykes, *Edmund Gibson*.
- 56 Cf. D. Levitin, *Ancient Wisdom in the Age of the New Science: Histories of Philosophy in England, c. 1640–1700* (Cambridge, 2015); I. Green, *Print and Protestantism in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 2000).
- 57 J. Raven, ‘London and the Central Sites of the English Book Trade’, in M. Suarez and M. Turner (eds), *Cambridge History of the Book, Vol. V: 1695–1830* (Cambridge, 2009), pp. 293–308; I. Gadd (ed.), *The History of Oxford University Press* (Oxford, 2013), I; D. McKitterick, *A History of Cambridge University Press* (Cambridge, 1998), II.
- 58 S. Taylor, ‘Church and State’, pp. 215–16.
- 59 P. Lake, ‘The Historiography of Puritanism’, in P. Lim and J. Coffey (eds), *Cambridge Companion to Puritanism* (Cambridge, 2008), pp. 346–71; P. Lake, *Boxmaker’s Revenge: ‘Orthodoxy’, ‘Heterodoxy’ and the Politics of the Parish in Early Stuart London* (Stanford, 2001).
- 60 For an earlier period, P. Lake, ‘Antippery: The Structure of a Prejudice’, in R. Cust and A. Hughes (eds), *Conflict in Early Stuart England* (1989), pp. 72–106; P. Lake, ‘Anti-Puritanism: The Structure of a Prejudice’, in P. Lake and K. Fincham (eds), *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England* (Woodbridge, 2006), pp. 80–97; E. Shagan, *The Rule of Moderation: Violence, Religion and the Politics of Restraint in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2011).
- 61 J. Champion, *The Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken: The Church of England and Its Enemies, 1660–1730* (Cambridge, 1992); R. Ingram, ‘Nature, History and the Search for Order: The Boyle Lectures, 1730–1785’, *SCH* 46 (2010), pp. 276–92.
- 62 D. Hayton, *The House of Commons, 1690–1715* (2002), I, pp. 28–35, reliably surveys the historiography. R. Ingram, ‘The Church of England, 1714–1783’, in J. Gregory (ed.), *Oxford History of Anglicanism. Volume II* (Oxford, 2017), pp. 49–67, surveys post-revolutionary ecclesiastical politics. Cf. C. Dudley, ‘The Decline of Religion in British Politics, 1710–1734’, *British Scholar* 3 (2010), pp. 43–60.
- 63 G. Bennett, ‘Conflict in the Church’, in G. Holmes (ed.), *Britain after the Glorious Revolution, 1689–1714* (1968), p. 174.
- 64 J. Clark, *English Society, 1660–1832: Religion, Ideology and Politics during the Ancien*

- Regime* (Cambridge, 2000). Clark's work has buttressed important research on religious institutions and belief in eighteenth-century England: M. Goldie, 'Voluntary Anglicans', *HJ* 46 (2003), pp. 977–90. S. Taylor, 'Un Etat confessionnel? L'Eglise d'Angleterre, la constitution et la vie politique au XVIIIe siècle', in A. Joblin and J. Sys (eds), *L'identité anglicane* (Arras, 2004), pp. 141–54; J. Gregory, *Restoration, Reformation and Reform, 1660–1832* (Oxford, 2000); Champion, *Pillars*, offer trenchant criticisms of Clark's thesis.
- 65 Clark, *English Society, 1660–1832*, pp. 63–4.
- 66 G. Bennett, *The Tory Crisis in Church and State, 1688–1730* (Oxford, 1975); N. Sykes, *From Sheldon to /Secker: Aspects of English Church History, 1660–1768* (Cambridge, 1959), pp. 36–67; N. Sykes, *Church and State in England in the XVIIIth Century* (Cambridge, 1934), pp. 284–331.
- 67 G. Glickman, 'Political Conflict and the Memory of the Revolution, 1689–1745', in S. Taylor and T. Harris (eds), *The Final Crisis of the Stuart Monarchy* (Woodbridge, 2013), pp. 243–72.
- 68 R. Stevens, 'Anglican Responses to the Toleration Act, 1689–1714' (Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge, 2014).
- 69 S. Connolly, 'The Church of Ireland and the Royal Martyr: Regicide and Revolution in Anglican Political Thought, c. 1660–c. 1745', *JEH* 54 (2003), pp. 484–506; J. Caudle, 'Measures of Allegiance: Sermon Culture and the Creation of a Public Discourse of Obedience and Resistance in Georgian Britain, 1714–1760' (Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1995), pp. 235–61.
- 70 M. Peltonen, 'Politeness and Whiggism, 1688–1732', *HJ* 48 (2005), pp. 391–414.
- 71 Wake to Turrentini, 28 November 1728, quoted in N. Sykes, *William Wake* (Cambridge, 1957), II, 170–1.
- 72 S. Johnson, *Dictionary of the English Language* (1799: T116650), II, unpaginated. 'To make worldly' was Johnson's second definition of *secularize*; his first was 'to convert from spiritual appropriations to common use'. See also B. Young, 'Religious History and the Eighteenth-Century Historian', *HJ* 43 (2000), pp. 849–68; B. Young, "'Knock-Kneed Giants": Victorian Representations of Eighteenth-Century Thought', in J. Garnett and C. Matthew (eds), *Revival and Religion since 1700* (1993), pp. 79–93. I. Hunter, 'Secularization: The Birth of a Modern Combat Concept', *Modern Intellectual History* 12 (2015), pp. 1–32, is especially perceptive. A. Walsham, 'The Reformation and "the Disenchantment of the World" Reassessed', *HJ* 51 (2008), pp. 497–528, highlights some of the analytical flaws of K. Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic* (1971), a work whose premises and conclusions still exert scholarly influence.
- 73 B. Gregory, 'The Reformation Origins of the Enlightenment's God', in W. Bulman and R. Ingram (eds), *God in the Enlightenment* (Oxford, 2016), pp. 201–14. See also J.-L. Marion, 'The Idea of God', in D. Garber and M. Ayers (eds), *Cambridge History of Seventeenth-Century Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1998), I, pp. 265–304; M. Buckley, *Denying and Disclosing God: The Ambiguous Progress of Modern Atheism* (New Haven, 2004), pp. 1–24. Cf. P. Lim, 'Not Solely Sola Scriptura or, a Rejoinder to Brad S. Gregory's *The Unintended Reformation*', *JMEMS* 46 (2016), pp. 603–28.
- 74 E. Gibson, *Charge of... 28th day of May, 1730* (1731: T068116), p. 28.
- 75 [D. Waterland], *Remarks upon Doctor Clarke's Exposition* (1730: T046863), p. 94.